

The Bogus Business Plot

Part 2: Smedley Butler, “The Lying Quaker”

With Commentary on the Boxer Rebellion, the Chinese Revolution & the Bonus Army

By Josh G



Maj. General Smedley Darlington Butler, Jr.

In [the previous installment](#), we learned that FDR and his closest advisors had many deep and longstanding business and social ties to the DuPont family and JP Morgan, Jr., two of the key figures allegedly behind the so-called “business plot” to usurp FDR’s presidential powers. The most telling of these is the marriage between FDR’s son and a DuPont heiress just a couple of years after the business plot was revealed by the alleged bravery and patriotism of Smedley Butler. We also learned that FDR had worked on Wall Street for many years and that the major provisions of the New Deal were essentially dictated by his cronies, who were all top industrialists and financiers. So there was really no reason for them to oppose FDR’s presidency; instead their opposition was manufactured to boost FDR’s public image as the savior of the American people. In other words, the business plot was a PR move. A publicity stunt.¹ Finally, we

¹ Actually, “publicity stunt” is exactly what Thomas Lamont, a partner in J.P. Morgan’s firm, is reported to have said about Butler’s accusations about the business plot. He meant it as a way of dismissing Butler’s claims—that he was just seeking publicity. As usual, they tell us the truth openly but misdirect at the same time.

also learned that J.P. Morgan was a Spencer and that both the Spencer and Roosevelt families are crypto-Jewish.

But what about Smedley Butler himself? Even if the business plot was bogus, isn't it possible that he was set up? Perhaps he was chosen precisely because DuPont and Morgan knew that he was a man of such integrity that he would spill the beans, giving them exactly the kind of publicity they wanted. In other words, maybe Butler was simply a patsy who played right into their hands. And if he surprised them by agreeing to go along with them, then they could expose him for treason. After all, he was going around giving speeches and writing pamphlets about the obscene profits they earned during World War I while the common man suffered. Maybe they would have been happy to have him out of the picture. Either way it was a win-win for them. How can we be so sure he was in on it? Well, it turns out there is no smoking gun. But a close and skeptical look at Butler and his career will tell us all we need to know, and a whole lot more.

BUTLER'S BACKGROUND & GENEALOGY

To get us started, note that Smedley Butler was a Quaker. Does being a Quaker mean someone is necessarily an agent or crypto-Jewish? No. But we can count it as a red flag. An even bigger red flag is that Butler was no recent convert; his family roots went back to the original Quakers that Miles exposed in his paper on [George Fox](#). On top of that, his family was very prominent and wealthy. How prominent? Here is a taste from [a PhD dissertation](#) by Eric Myers at UCLA:

Smedley Darlington Butler was born in West Chester, Pennsylvania on July 30, 1881, into a well-established Quaker family. Endowed with a wealth of familial connections and professional opportunities, Smedley grew up in the shadow of many prominent men: his father, congressman Thomas S. Butler, paternal grandfather Samuel Butler, head of a local bank and State Treasurer from 1880-1882, and maternal grandfather Smedley Darlington, who served two terms as a representative from Pennsylvania [and was also a banker]. Smedley's father, Thomas Stalker Butler, was an attorney and judge before he would follow in his own father's footsteps to become a fourteen-term member of the U.S. House of Representatives (1897-1928), occupying the position of chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House for nearly the entire length of his son's military service.

One of Smedley Butler's nicknames was 'the Fighting Quaker.' This is odd because one of the core Quaker beliefs is that war is incompatible with living a Christian life. Quakers are pacifists; 'fighting Quaker' is a contradiction in terms. Butler actually came from a long line of war-mongering Quakers. Again from Myers:

The first recorded ancestor of the family, Noble Butler, arrived in Pennsylvania in 1710, and soon after the family began its long line of Pennsylvania Quakers. During the American Revolution, while the majority of Quakers abided by the directive to remain

peaceful, some - mostly younger members swept up in the "war for freedom" - disobeyed. Groups of Quakers joined up with the army and one of them - Nathanael Greene - was the first to earn the nickname, "Fighting Quaker." Smedley's family would continue this tradition - his father served on the Naval Affairs Committee, and one of Smedley's grandfathers, according to Smedley, was "put out of Orthodox meeting" for enlisting to fight in the Civil War.

And yet despite this multigenerational apostasy, they still remained prominent and accepted members of the Quaker community - or so we are told.

Compiling more red flags, I remind you that the name Butler has appeared in at least two of Miles's papers. There were Butlers in [his paper on Marx](#) (related to Charlton Heston) and also the [C. S. Lewis paper](#). Smedley's middle name Darlington has a connection to Miles's recent paper on the artist [Mr. Turner](#), since one of [Turner's](#) "most successful [house portraits](#)" is of Raby Castle, the seat of the Earl of Darlington (the 3rd Earl of Darlington later becoming Duke of Cleveland). Wiki has this to say of the 2nd Earl of Darlington: "He joined the Army as an Ensign in the 1st Foot Guards in 1745, rising to Lieut-colonel in 1750." We have seen that rank many times.

Myers tells us the earliest recorded ancestor of the Butler family is Noble Butler who arrived in Pennsylvania in 1710. Another source tells us that his ancestors included three prominent Quaker families: the Smedleys, the Darlington, and the Butlers. And yet curiously his published genealogy on Geni and Wikitree is stubbed and scrubbed. And that's putting it mildly. His paternal great-grandfather is 'no name Butler' (nn Butler) and the line ends there. His paternal great grandmother is not given at all. His maternal great-grandmother is Mary Edwards Baker (reminds us of Mary Baker Eddy, née Mary Morse Baker), but her parents are not given. Curious that his genealogy appears to be well-known yet not publicly available.

The only relation that leads anywhere is his maternal great-grandfather, Smedley Darlington. So Smedley Butler appears to be named after his great-grandfather. This Smedley Darlington's mom is Edith Darlington, née Edith Smedley. So here is another example of these people giving surnames as first names, often taken from the maternal line. Edith Smedley's mom is Mary Yarnall, née **Bennett**. Mary Yarnall had a son (brother of Edith), named Bennett Smedley. Again, first name is mother's maiden name. Mary Yarnall's husband is Isaac. Her parents are given as James Bennett and Elizabeth Albin, but their parents and siblings are not given. We also see **Pierces**, **Grays** and **Taylor**s sprinkled throughout her genealogy. The Yarnalls/Yarnells, by the way, are a very wealthy and prominent family,² including among others Admiral Harry Yarnell, a contemporary

² C. Yarnall Abbott of Pennsylvania listed as a member of the Baronage Class in [this 1915 book](#) on the [Baronial Order of the Magna Charta](#) (Runnemedede). Membership is limited to people who can establish genealogical proofs that they descend from one of the twenty-five Magna Carta Surety Barons. What are those? Those are the Barons who were given the power to ensure that King John abided by the terms of the Magna Carta. The whole episode surrounding the Magna Carta deserves further unwinding. It seems to me like a possible turning point when crypto-Jews really began to usurp the power of the British throne.

(and cousin) of Butler who also played a role in the Boxer Rebellion in China—an event about which I will have much more to say.

But [here](#) we hit pay dirt: “three of general Butler’s ancestors came over with William Penn. Among these direct ancestors was Dr. Griffith **Owen** of Welsh lineage, another was William Clayton. Most of General Butler’s [ancestors] were moreover Quakers, among them Elizabeth **Hooton**, the first woman preacher and companion of George Fox.” [Hooton is a variant of Houghton or Howton or Houton – as in Erica “the Disconnectrix” Howton—and maybe also Hutton.] We also learn there that his 5g-grandfather, Abraham Darlington, was commissioned as coroner of Chester County, PA upon arrival in the New World. We have learned that Intelligence likes to control the coroner’s office in order to fake deaths. So the red flags are piling up fast and furious. And while we’re at it, we might as well plant one on the tip of Butler’s glorious schnoz (don’t tell me you didn’t notice).

In Part 1, I noted that the story of the business plot has actually been covered and promoted by many, many mainstream sources. But Butler himself was also famous in his own time. Again from Myers:

He had appeared on the cover of *Time* magazine in June of 1927. Humorist Will Rogers mentioned him in his columns. And writer and radio personality Lowell Thomas lobbied Butler for the privilege of writing his biography. Following his retirement, Butler embarked on a career as a public speaker, often addressing crowds numbering in the thousands and holding court through a regular radio address for six months in 1935 that was broadcast across the East Coast. In 1935, famed Louisiana politician Huey Long proclaimed in his book *My First Days in the White House*, that if he were elected President he would appoint Butler as his Secretary of War.

So we see he enjoyed major promotion from mainstream (controlled) sources—long after he started ranting against the war profiteers and calling out the Du Ponts, the Morgans and others. His promotion by controlled opposition Huey Long, who Miles outed in his paper on the [Pulse shooting hoax](#), is another huge red flag. But an even bigger one is the extent to which he was promoted by lifelong propagandist [Lowell Jackson Thomas](#), who also wrote a prologue to a version of *War is a Racket* that was published by *Reader’s Digest*. When have you ever heard of anything truly subversive being published by *Reader’s Digest*?

I encourage you to take the above link to Thomas and read his wiki entry, which has spook markers all over it, including this gem: “When the United States entered World War I, he was part of an official party sent by President Wilson...to ‘compile a history of the conflict.’ In reality, the mission was not academic. The war was not popular in the United States, and Thomas was sent to find material that would encourage the American people to support it.” That entry also firmly plants a big red flag on T.E. Lawrence (“of Arabia”), since Thomas is credited with

“discovering” Lawrence and making him famous. My eye is also drawn to the names **Lowell** and **Jackson**, but digging into every genealogy of every spook that crosses my path would bog me down, so for now I’ll pass. [[Here’s a shortcut](#) for the curious.] *The point is*: if the governors didn’t want Butler’s message to get around (as controlled opposition), they would not have promoted him as they did.

BUTLER’S MILITARY CAREER: A PACK OF LIES

You’ve probably heard enough already to make up your mind about Butler. But there is much we can still learn about fake history by carefully dissecting the military career of a fraud and a liar. Now, I realize that all we’ve ever heard about Butler is what an honorable man he was and how much he cared for grunts and regular folk. In the book, *The Plot to Seize the White House* (you see how that implies the White House was not already seized), Jules Archer describes Butler as “a man of incorruptible character, integrity, and patriotism.” So where do I get off calling him a fraud and a liar?

To answer that, we need to start by questioning the basic logic and sense of this whole story: After retiring from the military, Butler started going around the country giving speeches denouncing the war profiteers and admitting that his career in the Marines was spent as a racketeer for capitalism. But if he was a man of such integrity and incorruptible character, then why was he willing to do the dirty work for them for all those years?

In one of those speeches, transcribed [here](#), he brags that he was a racketeer for capitalism for **33** years:

I helped make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenues in. I helped in the raping of half a dozen Central American republics for the benefit of Wall Street. The record of racketeering is long. I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers 1909-12. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916.³ I helped make Honduras "right" for American fruit companies in 1903. In China in 1927 I helped see to it that Standard Oil went its way unmolested. During those years, I had, as the boys in the back room would say, a swell racket. I was rewarded with honors, medals, promotion. Looking back on it, I feel I might have given Al Capone a few hints. The best he could do was to operate his racket in three city districts. We Marines operated on three continents.

And yet, during all that time, he never had any qualms about it? Given his alleged moral character, this is what we would expect of him once he realized the orders

³ Recall that in part 1 we saw that Adolf Berle’s first assignment upon graduating from Harvard Law School in 1916 and joining the Army as an intelligence officer was to assist in increasing sugar production in the Dominican Republic. This means that he overlapped there with Butler and likely knew him personally.

he was following were wrong. But instead he goes around boasting about it. Perhaps he suddenly had a change of heart? A transformative epiphany that what he was doing was wrong? No, not according to him. So what made him suddenly start denouncing his former deeds? Here is his explanation, [from a speech](#) given in 1933 (and also in the speech transcribed above):

I suspected I was just part of a racket at the time. Now I am sure of it. Like all members of the profession I never had an original thought until I left the service. My mental faculties remained in suspended animation while I obeyed the orders of the higher-ups. This is typical of everyone in the military service.

So apparently he would have been against it all along but didn't realize what was really going on. And we're just supposed to believe that? He had no idea what he was doing? As a Major General he suspended his mental faculties and just obeyed orders?

Now, as much as I like to think that high ranking military officers really are brain-dead, what he says here simply isn't true. At least not according to the official historical record, such as his published remarks and personal correspondence (which of course I admit could be entirely fabricated, as I discovered during [my research on Dreyfus](#)).

For example, in *Smedley Butler, USMC: A Biography* we learn that while stationed in Beijing (Peking) in 1927 during the Boxer Rebellion, Butler wrote a letter to his commanding officer:

...he noted he had seen a report from the Chamber of Commerce stating that since the Marines arrived in China and settled in, American business had increased by twenty-five percent in the last five months. Butler attributed this in part to the difference in how his Marines treated the Chinese people compared to other foreign powers. He had made it a point to keep friendly relations with them and even hired a prominent Chinese businessman as a translator, a fellow with many contacts who could make arrangements for the Marines an American could not. Butler asked Lejeune for money to use for entertaining Chinese officials. Since 'none of the other foreigners pay attention to them,' he thought doing so could benefit American business interests considerably (p.104, emphasis mine).

Not only was he fully aware of his role, he was thinking up new and better ways to drum up business for his masters. If 1927 is too close to the end of his career to convince you that he was aware of what he was doing all along, consider these nuggets (among the many I could choose from) regarding Butler's time in Haiti from 1915-1917:

It was also in Haiti that Butler gained an intimate understanding of the private financial powers involved in the occupation of a country. The prime example was the relationship formed between Butler and a powerful capitalist by the name of Robert Farnham.

Farnham was both vice president of the National City Bank, president of the National Haitian Railway Company...and he was in close contact with the U.S. State Department. Farnham was such a prominent figure in Haiti that one historian described him as the "spokesman for the American financial interests in Haiti," calling him "astonishingly influential," and remarked that, "Farnham had been a frequent caller at the State Department since 1911, and during the Wilson administration he exercised an influence on policy which was rather surprising in view of Secretary Bryan's general attitude toward Wall Street." [Bryan's apparent "attitude" was just a pose, since Wall Street apparently had the military at its beck and call.]

Butler hosted a visit by Farnham on the island in November of 1917 and the letters between Farnham and Butler during this period are especially telling. In one, Farnham praised Butler's accomplishments in Haiti....

Butler claimed to not be aware of Farnham's plans for Haiti, "I don't know anything about his aims or ambitions down here, but he made a deep impression on us and I am really hungry to see him again, for no particular reason except to have him around." Writing to Farnham in February of 1918, Smedley would discuss an instance of the gendarmerie working with the unloading and selling of freight, deferring to Farnham: I sincerely hope that I have not messed up your plans down here and assure you that anything I have done to date can be readily undone and that we are all standing by ready to lend a hand whenever possible. We can handle this freight and in fact can put over nearly any other 'roughstuff' you may suggest. (Myers, *A Soldier at Heart*, pp.68-69)

More significant than the homosexual innuendo here is how eager Butler seems to step and fetch for Wall Street looters. And we also have this:

One of the American financial interests connecting the U.S. with Haiti was Roger L. Farnham, vice president of National City Bank [now Citibank] and soon to be vice-president of the Haitian National bank. It is in these circumstances Smedley Butler would first cross paths with Farnham, establishing a revelatory relationship that would last well beyond the Haitian years... (p.51)

And here on the time that Butler spent in charge of the Quantico training base:

When Butler took over Quantico in 1920 ... [he] was at first bored [and] eager to find useful occupation for himself and the marines under his command. This was especially evident in his correspondence with Roger Farnham - the banker he had met in Haiti and with whom he apparently maintained a close connection. In one letter, Butler inquired if there were not, "some fresh enterprise for a lot of us Marines to sail to, as life in the service now is more stupid than a Quaker meeting."

If Farnham might invest his vast resources into another foreign country, marines might then be called to protect them and Butler would have his ticket out of Quantico. While the letters to Farnham are indicative of Butler's awareness of the intertwined nature of business interests and military actions, in 1920 he seemed to welcome such a relationship if it benefited his personal short-term goals - especially leaving Quantico. (p.85)

So what Butler said about suspending his mental faculties and never having had an original thought is a bold-faced lie. And, since he never provided any other explanation for his sudden transformation from being a willing racketeer for Wall Street (and eager handler of Farnham's "rough stuff") to being one of its most outspoken (and widely promoted) critics, we may conclude this transformation never happened and his criticism was just a pose all along. So much for Butler's reputation for being an incorruptible, honorable Marine. But while we're at it, let's look at some other juicy lies from him his military career, shall we?

To being with, we see in his career many of the same signs of connections to Intelligence. For example, he was (allegedly) able to enlist below the minimum age, at 16 years old. According to his biography: "Butler, swept up in enthusiasm for the Cuban war, volunteered for the Marine Corps in the spring of 1898. At sixteen he was two years underage and callow for an officer recruit. His way was eased by family political connections."

Another sign is his promotion through the ranks at lightning speed. At 16 years old he quit high school to join the Marines and was immediately commissioned as a 2nd Lieutenant upon enlisting. [Wikipedia tells us that he was nevertheless awarded a diploma by his high school.] That's not the way it works: that rank is normally given to those with a college degree. It is said that one of his instructors at basic training, a sergeant, would stand at attention whenever Butler, who outranked him, spoke in class. Butler arrived in Cuba after its invasion and capture. He was then posted aboard the cruiser USS New York for four months after which he was discharged. But, just two months later, he was promoted to 1st Lieutenant, for reasons unknown. He made Captain by his 19th birthday. Just to give you a point of comparison: when he arrived as a fresh recruit to Cuba, his company commander at Guantanamo was a Captain. He was 61 years old.

So Butler's promotions remind us [somewhat of Custer's](#), as well as other fakes Miles has exposed.

Let's take a look now at four specific episodes in Butler's career: Mexico, Haiti, Nicaragua, and The Boxer Rebellion.

Mexico

I'm going to start with Mexico, not because it was the earliest or most important episode, but because it will set the stage for how to view other episodes in Butler's storied career. It is also the only point in Butler's career where it is openly admitted that he (allegedly) acted as an undercover Intelligence operative:

In 1914, the Wilson administration initiated an investigation into the prospect of an invasion of Mexico. Smedley Butler was assigned as a spy in Mexico City, and for at least ten days posed as either a guidebook writer or a U.S. Secret Service agent searching for a criminal who supposedly joined the Mexican army, depending on who was asking. Butler gained access to military forts, and was able to obtain and draw a series of maps that detailed the location and status of the Mexican military. The intelligence gathered was never utilized in a U.S. invasion [because the alleged invasion plans were cancelled], but Butler's experience of *posing as a writer* would later provide him with material when he did become an actual writer and co-authored a fictionalized account of the incident in a 1927 book he wrote, *Walter Garvin in Mexico*. (Myers, p.47)

Butler's subsequent autobiographical, 'fictionalized' versions [of his spy mission in Mexico] follows the same basic story line... Most flamboyant and elaborate was the boys'-story potboiler *Walter Garvin in Mexico*... It projects the entire escapade squarely in the genre of popular pulp military-adventure literature, replete with warrior manliness, homoeroticism [oh my!], fair play, patriotism, righteous vengeance, and native protagonists either despicably cunning or hopelessly naïve. And indeed the actual spy mission and intended expedition were remarkably felicitous to the same formula.

[Although the U.S. did not invade Mexico City, they did occupy Veracruz. The boring occupation] was conducive to braggadocio, a mood fueled by sixty-odd increasingly desperate war correspondents. These journalists, including the premiere American adventure writers of the day—Richard Harding Davis, Frederick Palmer, Jack London—whetted the appetites of the American public back home with racist-imperialist teasers...

One of these reporters, after a month gone by without action, came up with the story of Butler's spy mission, reportedly told by a first-class seaman on the battleship *Utah*. The published version...appeared under the headline 'Major of Marines Invades Mexico Alone; Smedley Butler Maps Route to Capital; Latest Adventure is Fully in Keeping with Whole 'Dime Novel' Career of Youthful Warrior.' The story continued in the familiar overblown epic style: 'Kipling's heroes have nothing on one Smedley Darlington Butler... Heroism is an everyday sort of occurrence with Butler...' The rest of the piece consisted of filler rehashing 'the life story of Major Butler [which] reads like that of some hero of boy literature.' (*Maverick Marine*, pp.65-72)

Perhaps the reason Butler's life story reads like an overblown pulp novel with homoerotic overtones is because it was written that way? We are told that the spy story was fictionalized, implying that it was an embellishment of some true story. But what's to stop us from believing the entire story was fiction from the get go? We know that the plans to invade the country were scrapped, replaced with the more limited move of capturing its major port, Veracruz. If they no longer

intended to invade the country—if ever they had—they were at liberty to invent whatever cockamamie story they wanted about Butler’s spying adventures,⁴ since the issue was moot. For that matter, what’s to stop us from believing that most of Butler’s exploits were simply made up, his life story written by some hack hired to test the gullibility of the American public with absurd lies? Let’s see what kind of absurd lies Butler’s life hack came up with.

Haiti

Let’s look now at the alleged actions that won Butler his second medal of honor. In 1915, the Marines were sent in to Haiti to pacify the resistance against the banksters’ puppet government. The rebels were called “the Cacos,” and Butler later bragged that during his time in Haiti he “hunted them like pigs.” [In a letter home to his wife, he said they were “bad niggers as we would call them at home. Shaved apes, absolutely no intelligence whatsoever, just plain low nigger.”] Charming. The climactic moment came during the so-called Battle of Fort Rivière, when then-Captain Butler allegedly led a force of about 100 men against 200 Cacos holed-up in the old fort, a relic of the French occupation. It was:

...an old bastion fort, about 200 feet square, with 25-foot high walls of stone with loopholed masonry walls, and was built on the summit of Montaigne Noire (Black Mountain). It was in disrepair, the crumbling parapets were overgrown with trees and brush, and the original northern entrance of the fort was clogged with dirt rubble. To gain access to the fort, the Cacos had dug a 15-foot long passage through the weakened western wall. This entrance was not wide enough for two men to enter abreast. Inside, the parade ground was overgrown with high grass and bushes. Fort Riviere’s front was reachable only by a steep, rocky slope; the other three sides fell away so sharply that an approach from those directions was considered to be impossible. “General” Josephette, a former Haitian cabinet minister, had formed a guerrilla band of about 200 men to oppose U.S. military operations, and was using Fort Riviere as his headquarters...

At about 7:45 am, the quiet jungle morning was pierced by three quick blasts of a whistle, Capt. Butler’s signal for the attack to commence. Immediately, Campbell’s and Barker’s force began a steady barrage of gunfire on the fort. The Cacos responded with heavy, but highly, inaccurate fire of their own (apparently, most of the Cacos did not understand the use of gunsights). Capt. Butler then

⁴ I think my favorite one is where Lowell Thomas, writing for Butler in the first person in *Old Gimlet Eye*, attests that at Puebla, “Pretending to chase a butterfly, I dashed into one of the forts and made a hurried inspection before the astonished guards could shove me out.” #thathappened

led his 26-man section across the open ground to the west of the fort, which sloped slightly upwards.

[BTW $26+1 = 27$ is a favorite number of Intelligence because it is both 3^3 ; and $2+7=9=3 \times 3$; see for example "the 27 club."]

Here is the continuation of the story written in the 1st person perspective from Lowell Thomas's *Old Gimlet Eye: The Adventures of Smedley D. Butler*, published in 1933:

When we reached the wall, we discovered that the original entrance—the old sally-port—had been closed with stones and brick. Cautiously we skirted the walls to look for an opening. On our side of the fort we found the Caco entrance—a drain four feet high and three feet wide extending back for fifteen feet into the interior.

Stowell, the fat lieutenant, poked his head into the dark passage. Bang, came a bullet. Stowell fell back and rolled over and over like a rubber all down the mountain. I thought at first he had been shot, but he was merely startled...

I knew that the only way to get into the fort was through that hole. I it was who had brought the crowd up there. I it was who had bragged how easy it would be to take the fort. So now it was up to me to lead the procession. A stream of bullets was crashing through the passage. I simply didn't have the courage to poke my head into the drain, although I might have worked myself up to the infernal plunge, if I had been given time—a long time.

I had never experienced a keener desire to be someplace else... I glanced across at [Sergeant] Iams. My misery and an unconscious, helpless pleading must have been written all over my face. Iams took one look at me and then said, 'Oh, hell, I'm going through.'

Before I could stop him he had jumped into the hole. [Private] Gross was a gallant little fellow. I tried to follow, but Gross shoved ahead of me and beat me to it. I was third in the single file that started to crawl through the drain.

The big bandit ... now fired right into our faces from the inner end of the passage... We were almost completely blocking the hole. It seemed incredible that the revel's bullet should have gone wild.

Iams was creeping forward with his rifle across his chest, pulling the trigger with his left thumb without daring to take time to bring the gun to his shoulder. Before the guard at the hole could reload and fire again, Iams pushed through the opening and shot him. He was a brawny Negro giant, stripped to the waist, with prize-fighter's muscles. He reeled, flung up his arms and fell back dead.

Gross and I, close at Iams' heels, emerged into the fort. Sixty or seventy half-naked madmen, howling and leaping, pounced down on us. Gross and Iams killed the two leaders, who were cheering their men forward. At the same time a strapping Negro made a frenzied rush for me. I fired at him with my automatic but missed. Just as he was bringing down a heavy club on my head, Gross aimed his rifle and finished him.

It seemed an eternity that we three were alone in this den of wild Cacos, but it probably wasn't more than a few seconds before the rest of the company began to pop out of the hole like corks out of bottles.

Cacos and Marines scrambled together. The bandits in their panic reverted to the primitive. They threw away their loaded guns [sure they did!] and grabbed swords and clubs, rocks and bricks, which were no match for bullets and bayonets. Those who were not killed jumped over the ramparts and were taken prisoners. The other three companies now began hopping over the wall and helped us to haul out the natives who were hiding in the casements and vaults...



We're supposed to believe that there are 200 Haitian rebels inside this fort armed with rifles waiting for these three guys to just come out of the hole one-at-a-time, and yet they remained completely unharmed—not a single Marine was shot?

We're supposed to believe the Haitians just threw down their guns and started throwing rocks? Really?

The Marines slaughtered all the Cacos. They then brought in a ton of dynamite and leveled the fort. Butler's alleged exploits apparently caught the eye of then Assistant Secretary of the Navy in charge of the Marines, a one *Franklin Delano Roosevelt*, who recommended him, Iams and Gross for the medal of honor.

Now here's the punchline, from *Smedley Butler, USMC: A Biography*, page 65:

In 1931 the Haitian minister to the United States, Dantes Bellegard, publicly stated that the fort (Riviere) did not exist and Butler had made up the story of its capture. A furious Butler made a formal complaint to the Department of the Navy. Under pressure, Bellegarde backtracked and said he meant to say he had never heard of that place, not that it did not exist. The Secretary of the Haitian Delegation, Numa Rigaun, made no such apology, saying, "In Haiti we think General Butler is a very imaginative man. He says he took a fort which so far as is known in Haiti never existed... He says he blew it up afterwards and that is why we cannot find it today. He says he took it alone by crawling through a hole. It is very amusing.

You just have to laugh. Three Marines were given the medal of honor for made-up heroics. I wonder how many other military medals and accolades have been granted under false pretenses. Oh and by the way, according to the book, [*Maverick Marine*](#), prior to this fake battle his commanding officer had already reached an agreement with the top Cacos generals whereby the Americans would buy the rebels' rifles and the rebels would disband with the chance to be hired by the local police force that the Americans were about the form, the Gendarmerie. "There were also allusions to possible political patronage for leaders in the emerging government, plus \$6,600 in bribes." We are told that the Cacos at Fort Riviere were recalcitrant hold-outs. But it appears that the opposition had already been co-opted, and the Americans were free to concoct whatever fanciful dime-novel narrative they wished.

Butler was subsequently promoted to Lt. Colonel and put in charge of the Gendarmerie until 1918. During that time, FDR visited Haiti, and Butler accompanied him on a four-day tour across the country. Apparently, in addition to a skinny dip in a stream, his tour included a visit to port Riviere, but since it had allegedly been blown to smithereens and anyway couldn't be found, it's hard to imagine that they would have made the difficult journey. Probably spent the time skinny-dipping. And it is all the more strange for Roosevelt to have written in his travel diary that the fort had potential as a tourist destination, and that guests could use it "with its cool nights for living purposes" (*Maverick Marine*, p,90). Yes, isn't that the first thing that always comes to mind with demolished military forts located in hard-to-reach mountain tops?

In *Maverick Marine*, we also learn that FDR's cousin, Major H.L. Roosevelt, served as Butler's quartermaster in the Gendarmerie. He was there trying to scope out business opportunities (such as port development, sugar plantations, cattle, cotton, coffee, etc.) for *FDR* and his business associates. There was only one speed bump: the Haitian constitution forbid foreigners from directly owning land in Haiti. But once again Butler interceded on his masters' behalf:

The most dramatic moment in Butler's time in service came in late spring and early summer of 1917. In April, the National Assembly of Haiti convened to rewrite the Haitian Constitution. Shortly thereafter, the American Ambassador to Haiti, Arthur Bailly-Blanchard, delivered a list of eight revisions for the Haitian government, the most contentious of which allowed for foreigners to own property in Haiti, breaking from traditional Haitian policy. In June, the National Assembly rejected the proposed revisions, and moved to pass a clause that prohibited foreign ownership. To prevent the passage of this clause, U.S. naval commanders in charge of the mission ordered Butler to dissolve the Haitian Assembly. With the support of the Haitian President, Sudre Dartiguenave, Smedley delivered a "Decree of Dissolution" to Stenio Vincent, President of the Assembly, marching into the assembly with a squad of armed gendarmes.

But of course good ol' Smedley had *no idea* of the wider implications of what he was doing. He was just blindly following orders. Right.

Nicaragua

We find more pulp fiction from his time in Nicaragua, helping the banksters take control of the country. He was (allegedly) dispatched by train from Managua to reassert control over the railway line that had been seized by rebels who were described as barbarous and wanton, kidnapping and torturing prominent merchants.

Outside Leon, a rebel detachment demanded that the train return to the capital, but Butler bluffed his way through. Alexander A. Vandegrift, at the time a young lieutenant, retold the story in his memoirs "as an example of the flair for showmanship and desire for fun that were so characteristic of Smedley Butler: With a fat rebel general looking on, two husky Marines cranked up a generator of a spark-gap radio that possibly would carry ten miles [far out of range]....Butler dictated to an operator who sent a great shower of sparks and odd noises. After thirty minutes Butler nodded imperceptibly to the men, who repeated the performance with the operator taking down [Admiral] Southerland's 'message,' Frowning in concentration Butler read this and then told the general he was sorry but orders were to carry on. So impressed was the poor man that he took his force and disappeared."

Further down the line, they encountered the main rebel force manning a barricade of stones across the tracks. [They were outnumbered 1,000 to 100 men.] With the opposing forces facing each other across a trestle, Butler...stood up to a pistol-brandishing rebel general by simply disarming him with dime-novel audacity: 'I couldn't retreat and lose face. If I signaled to the Marines to shoot, there would be a frightful slaughter. I had to act quickly. I made a grab for the General's gun [that he was pointing at me] and had the luck to tear it out of his hand. A bit theatrical, I emptied the cartridges out of the barrel. His army burst out laughing. They could appreciate a joke, even when it was on them. I made the General ride with us as a hostage and the train proceeded across the bridge.'"

I'm not making this up. They really expect us to buy it. And we have. Once again they are telling us the truth disguised as metaphor: his "[dime-novel audacity](#)" is exactly that: made up by a dime novelist and then passed off by so-called historians as fact. You can find plenty of more giant whoppers in Thomas's [Old Gimlet Eye](#). Give it a read if you want a laugh.

The Boxer Rebellion

Probably the biggest pile of B.S. in all of Butler's military career is the [Boxer Rebellion](#). What was the Boxer rebellion? From Wikipedia:

The Boxer Rebellion..was a violent anti-foreign, anti-colonial, and anti-Christian uprising that took place in China between 1899 and 1901, towards the end of the Qing dynasty. It was initiated by the Militia United in Righteousness (Yihetuan [literally "The Righteous and Harmonious Fists"]), known in English as the "Boxers", and was motivated by proto-nationalist sentiments and opposition to Western colonialism and associated Christian missionary activity.


Foreign powers had defeated China in several wars, forced a right to promote Christianity and imposed unequal treaties under which foreigners and foreign companies in China were accorded special privileges, extraterritorial rights and immunities from Chinese law, causing resentment among the Chinese. France, Japan, Russia and Germany carved out spheres of influence, so that by 1900 it appeared that China would likely be dismembered, with foreign powers each ruling a part of the country. Thus, by 1900, the Qing dynasty, which had ruled China for more than two centuries, was crumbling and Chinese culture was under assault by powerful and unfamiliar religions and secular cultures.

One of the things that the Boxers were notorious for was their viciousness. In fact, they were so vicious they were known for decapitating their innocent victims. Sound familiar? Yes, that's right: ISIS Intelligence just dipped into their bag of tricks and reused a contrivance from an earlier project. It worked like a charm then as now. And just like we are shown fake videos of ISIS beheadings

nowadays, they were shown fake Boxer beheading films back then. [Here is a link](#) to two short fake propaganda film clips about the Boxers from 1900. Notice that in the first one, we see the Boxers beheading a Chinese man, probably supposed to be Christian.⁵ Same old trick.

Butler and the Marine Corps got involved in the Boxer rebellion when they besieged the foreign legations in Beijing (then called Peking). The foreign legations were basically a large four mile square section of Beijing that was designated by the Chinese government for foreigners to live and do business. It was sandwiched between the Imperial (Forbidden) City to the North and the massive wall that ringed and fortified Beijing to the South. Eastern and Western ends were demarcated by large streets.

Western nations (including Russia and Japan) created a prototype of a “coalition of the willing” in what was known as the [Eight Nation Alliance](#). They were setting the stage for more international cooperation to come. There is almost no documentary evidence of any combat, but plenty of what looks like a fashion photo-shoot:



The foreign legation was surrounded on all sides by various Chinese and Boxer forces, and a siege began. The most curious thing about the siege was that it happened at all, because sieges are usually done when you can't conquer some city or castle by brute force alone. If you read about [the siege on Wikipedia](#) and other sources, you can see that the foreign legations were apparently surrounded on all sides and massively outnumbered:

The American and German marines held positions on the Tartar Wall behind their legations. The 409 guards had the job of defending a line that snaked through 2,176 yd (1,990 m) of urban terrain... The guards were not well armed. Only the American marines had sufficient ammunition.

⁵ Those clips are from a film archive and are labeled 'fake.' I don't know if they were treated as real footage back in the day. My assumption is yes, based on my Dreyfus research. But I was not able to find out anything more about these two clips.

The entry is replete with descriptions of many skirmishes between Western and Chinese troops. We are given the impression that foreign troops, with support from Western civilians living there, were able to hold back the Chinese forces due to the barricades they were able to erect on the Western and Eastern sides of the legation quarter, and maintaining control of the walls to the North and South. Here are some more details from the Wikipedia entry on the liberation of the foreign legation:

Five national contingents advanced on the walls of Beijing on August 14: British, American, Japanese, Russian and French. Each had a gate in the Wall for its objective. The Japanese and Russians were delayed at their gates by Chinese resistance. The small French contingent got lost. The Americans scaled the walls rather than attempting to force their way through a fortified gate. However, it was the British who won the race to relieve the siege of the legations. They entered the city through an unguarded gate and proceeded with virtually no opposition. At 3:00 pm the British passed through a drainage ditch—the "water gate"—under the Tartar Wall. Sikh and Rajput soldiers from India and their British officers had the honor of being the first to enter the Legation Quarter. The Chinese armies ringing the legation quarter melted away. A short time later the British commander, Gen. Alfred Gaselee, entered and was greeted by Sir Claude MacDonald dressed in "immaculate tennis flannels" and a crowd of cheering ladies in party dresses.

The foreigners were united in declaring the miraculous nature of their survival. "I seek in vain some military reason for the failure of the Chinese to exterminate the foreigners," said an American military officer. Missionary Arthur Smith summed up the Chinese military performance. "Upon unnumbered occasions, had they been ready to make a sacrifice of a few hundred lives, they could have extinguished the defense [of the Legation Quarter] in an hour." However, the equivocation on the part of the Chinese to use their military assets decisively against the Legation Quarter does not deny the fact that soldiers on both sides fought and died in large numbers.

[Chinese general] Ronglu later took credit for saving the besieged: "I was able to avert the crowning misfortune which would have resulted from the killing of the Foreign Ministers." Ronglu was being disingenuous, as his forces came very close to breaking the ability of the besieged to resist.

Yes, I too seek in vain some reason why the residents of the legation quarter were not exterminated. How fortunate indeed that the Chinese just happened to leave an important gate to the city unguarded. And what an incredible stroke of luck that the British immediately found a passageway way through the drainage ditch, which the Chinese forces had somehow forgotten about and overlooked during the 55 days of the siege. [*55 Days at Peking* was the name of a 1963 film about the siege starring Charlton Heston as Major Matt **Lewis**. Yet one more indication of a giant hoax.] And it was nothing short of a miracle that the Chinese forces mysteriously "melted away" instead of defending their city.

It's clear that the Boxer Rebellion and the siege was yet another manufactured and managed conflict, at the end of which Western nations gained even greater control over China, along with reparations paid in silver that would be valued at approximately \$10 billion today. It's also worth mentioning that one of the figures allegedly involved in the Business Plot was [Robert Sterling Clark](#), heir to the Singer sewing machine fortune and one of Wall Street's richest bankers and stockbrokers. According to Wikipedia he served under Butler during the Boxer rebellion where his nickname was "the millionaire lieutenant." Right.

I don't have enough background knowledge about China and the various factions involved to unwind this manufactured conflict. It appears to me that Ronglu was compromised and probably the key sell-out, but that is just a hunch. Regardless of exactly how this event was managed and to what extent the Boxers were real, the outcome at least seems clear: Beijing was conquered and sacked by Western forces. To me this clearly demarcates a key turning point, or perhaps a *coup de grâce*, of Western control over China. And since we're learning who was in control of the West by this time, we know who was working in this period to gain full control of China. I believe they achieved it after the Boxer Rebellion, if not before, and have maintained control ever since.

But what about Mao Zedong and the Communist Revolution? This is not the place to try to unwind the Chinese revolution, but after looking into it a bit, I will point you to some red flags: Before Mao seized power, the Chinese revolution was led by Sun Yat-Sen, Chen Qimei, and Chiang Kai-shek. All of them came from wealthy families, yet all of them allied themselves at some point with the communist faction and the Soviet Union (more on that in a moment). Yat-Sen was educated at an Anglican boarding school in Honolulu. Qimei was the eldest member of one of the four most powerful and influential Chinese families at the time. Qimei and Kai-shek both studied in Japan, with Kai-shek studying at the Imperial Japanese Army Academy. This is a huge red flag, since Japan was already a tool or ally of Western Imperialists at this point, as we can see in their joining in the 8-nation army sacking of Beijing. Certainly no friend of China. So it is suspicious to see the leader of the Chinese nationalists going to school at this Japanese military academy.

Another figure here is Eugene Chen, who was born in Trinidad. We've seen the West Indies pop up in many of Miles's papers mainly due to the sugar plantations owned by wealthy Jews. So it is curious to see one of the revolutionaries coming from Trinidad. Although Chen himself appears to have been born to Chinese parents, we learn from his Wiki page that he married a French creole whose father owned one of the largest estates in Trinidad. Chen was one of the people who worked with representatives of the Soviet Union to forge a pact with these nationalist leaders to form an alliance with Chinese communists and receive backing from the Soviet Union. The two figures cited as being influential in this agreement were the Soviet ambassador to China, Adolph **Joffe**, and Mikhail Borodin, born **Gruzenberg**. **Adolph** was from a wealthy background and is described on Wikipedia as a Karaite, which is just a sect of Judaism. Mikhail was also from a wealthy background and also Jewish. [His bio on Wiki](#) offers a


cornucopia of red flags. Here is the ridiculous paste-up Wikipedia gives us of Borodin allegedly meeting with Chiang Kai-Shek in 1927:



There appears to have been a rift between these nationalists and the Chinese communists leading to civil war. So we might entertain the possibility that Mao broke from Western-backed powers. But the fact that he was also from a very wealthy land-owning family (although later supported land confiscation) and allied at various times with the nationalists are worth noting. But the biggest red flag on Mao is that it is publicly admitted that from 1943-1945, Mao's Red Army was [armed and trained](#) by the OSS—the precursor to the CIA. In fact, in doing this research, I learned that I am hardly the first to suggest that Western intelligence put Mao in power. But then they misdirect you into blowback. Don't believe it. Or I don't.

Also telling is to see what happened to China: the government seized land and confiscated wealth, but rather than this resulting in greater equality, we can see that it was simply a redistribution of that wealth into the hands of members of the communist party, who I presume are controlled by or allied with the same Western (Jewish) financiers, as with Soviet Russia. But more empirical support for that argument will have to be pursued another time. I will simply close by pointing out that there is [a long history of Jews in China](#).

THE BONUS ARMY



As we have seen, Butler had a long career after retiring from the Marines. Almost every biopic or description of his life includes a mention of the Bonus Army. We are told Butler supported the Bonus Army and even gave speeches to rally them. Well, he spoke to them alright, but it was as controlled opposition, as we will see. First some background [from Wikipedia](#):

Bonus Army was the popular name for an assemblage of some 43,000 marchers—17,000 U.S. World War I veterans, their families, and affiliated groups—who gathered in Washington, D.C. in the summer of 1932 to demand cash-payment redemption of their service certificates... The contingent was led by Walter W. Waters, a former sergeant.

Many of the war veterans had been out of work since the beginning of the Great Depression. The World War Adjusted Compensation Act of 1924 had awarded them bonuses in the form of certificates they could not redeem until 1945. Each service certificate, issued to a qualified veteran soldier, bore a face value equal to the soldier's promised payment plus compound interest. The principal demand of the Bonus Army was the immediate cash payment of their certificates.

On July 28, U.S. Attorney General William D. Mitchell ordered the veterans removed from all government property. Washington police met with resistance, shots were fired and two veterans were wounded and later died. President Herbert Hoover then ordered the Army to clear the veterans' campsite. Army Chief of Staff General Douglas MacArthur commanded the infantry and cavalry supported by six tanks. The Bonus Army marchers with their wives and children were driven out, and their shelters and belongings burned.



Walter Waters, the Bonus army's leader, writes in his memoirs of this period, [B.E.F.: The Whole Story of the Bonus Army](#), published in 1933: "The B.E.F. [Bonus Expeditionary Force] began as a group of men demanding the pre-payment of their adjusted service certificates voted by Congress in 1924. It soon became for a vast number of men a means of protest against the economic conditions in our country in 1932, a *safety valve for dissatisfaction*. It was not recognized as that at this time."

He writes, "In 1925...I hitch-hiked into the State of Washington and there got a job in the harvest fields. I even used a new name, 'Bill Kincaid,' the first name to flash into my mind when asked, as if to break more decisively with the past. [Nothing suspicious about that.] Under that name I met and married the girl who is now my wife."

From *1932: The Rise of Hitler and FDR* by David Pietrusza, we learn that:

Walter W. 'Hot' Waters was by 1932 pretty much of a drifter, from state to state and job to job—farm hand, auto salesman, a worker in bakeries and canneries. He had at one time (for whatever reason, most likely not a good one) even changed his name to "Bill Kincaid." The Depression hit Waters hard. He lost his savings and pawned what he had. When Portland veterans made vague moves to head for Washington to lobby for an accelerated payment of their World War bonuses, the well-spoken Walters slowly emerged as their 'Assistant Field Marshal.' Rail-thin, blue-eyed, smartly attired in riding boots and breeches, he looked very much like a jobless version of Charles Lindbergh. Quickly he replaces the asthmatic, sticky-fingered former sergeant Chester A. Hazen as the protesters' 'Commander-in-Chief' (p.184).

Waters writes of his and his wife's troubles: "Our savings vanished and the hope of work with them during the winter of 1931-1932. In the meantime our personal belongings, one by one, found their way to the pawn shops and by March, 1932, we were not only penniless but had nothing left except a very scanty wardrobe." Here is a screencap of a picture of Waters from a [PBS Documentary](#) on the Great Depression. There are others like it on the web.



He really looks like a penniless unemployed itinerant worker with a scanty wardrobe, doesn't he? The bowtie and Brylcreem are always the last things to go. A man's gotta keep his panache, after all.

As for the Bonus Army, that started out in Portland, Oregon, "They possessed no transportation nor supplies nor publicity apparatus.... But what they did have was this: the nuisance factor. Wherever they might go, people...desired them elsewhere. That's how they departed Portland. The Union Pacific, tired of their milling about its rail yard, finally determined that the easiest method to rid itself of these pesky loiterers was to simply grant them free outbound passage on its multitude of empty cattle cars. At Council Bluffs, the Wabash line reached the same conclusion and transported them east to St. Louis" (Pietrusza, p.185). And so on and so forth until they magically arrived in Washington D.C. Tens of thousands of veterans poured into the nation's capital in the weeks to come.

I am reminded of the influx of well over a million migrants and refugees that have allegedly poured into Europe in the last couple of years, the so-called migrant crisis that kicked into high gear in 2015. We're told that these refugees fleeing wars and systemic poverty each paid somewhere between \$2,000 to \$6,000 just for transport to Southern Europe and then "made their way" North to places like Normandy, Germany and Sweden. But the logistics of how a million or more impoverished migrants can "make their way" *en masse* to every corner of Europe is never explained. It is presented to us as given. It "just happened." We see evocative (and to my eye faked or staged) photo-ops of migrants waiting at train stations or even boarding trains. In some accounts the migrants just walk across Europe. I encourage you to try that with no money and even less public sympathy. Set out from Hungary carrying a big suitcase and try to walk to Sweden or Normandy. I suppose many took trains, and yes, train travel is ubiquitous in Europe. But you still need to buy tickets, and travelling from one end of Europe to another is expensive. You also need food, etc. How are these refugees paying for all this? Take a look at a map of Europe and then try to see how easy and cheap it is to buy a train ticket from Athens to Stockholm.

Like the bonus army "spontaneously" making its way to D.C., I suggest to you that the migrants' appearance in huge numbers all across Europe in a matter of months was manufactured in the same way to lend it the appearance of spontaneity while it was really guided by a hidden hand. [Recently, a controlled and [limited release of misdirection](#) around this issue has begun, trying to [pin](#)

[some of the blame on NGOs](#) who are sponsoring and helping the migrants make the journey to Europe. But not only is this just the tip of the iceberg—or fingertip of the hidden hand—it is also trying to lay the blame on the wrong culprits to further the divide-and-conquer strategy.] I also suggest to you that the numbers of refugees have been grossly exaggerated ([Wikipedia](#) tells us the foreign-born population of the EU in 2014 was **33** million people), and the alleged assaults on white European women almost entirely faked as a part of a deliberate strategy to tear Europe apart at the seams. [The “they’re raping our women!” panic is one of the oldest and most reliable canards in the divide-and-conquer arsenal.] I will not try to make that case here. But, if anyone can point me to a single video from one of the 1,200 alleged sexual assaults on German women by migrants on New Year’s eve 2015/16, I will eat my hat.

Back to Washington, D.C. in the spring of 1932. The ‘Bonus Expeditionary Force’ began organizing and electing its leadership. Remarkably, the army elected Pelham Glassford its secretary-treasurer. Who was Glassford? Only the *superintendent of the D.C. police*. He apparently was such a swell guy that they decided to put the police chief of the city they had occupied in charge of the purse strings. _(^▽^)_/

Of course we need to ask if the Bonus Army march and sit-in ever even happened. It *could* all have been entirely fake, I suppose. And some of the pictures do look a little fishy. But not all of them. And also not the film footage. On the basis of all the evidence I’ve looked at, I do not believe the event as a whole was faked—although the numbers may have been exaggerated, and its leadership was undoubtedly controlled. I believe the idea for the Bonus Army was hatched, as Walters later admitted, to act as a release valve for people who were at the end of their ropes (just like they later admitted about the Indian National Congress in [my paper on Gandhi](#)). For those who did not directly participate, the Bonus March served as a kind of vicarious catharsis or at least gave them something on which to focus their attention and pin their hopes. Of course the goal they were fighting for was pretty anemic. Here millions of people were deliberately rendered destitute by a bunch of corrupt thieves and instead of demanding a major overhaul and some real justice, they were shepherded into demanding an advance payment on certificates with an average value of \$1,000 (worth about \$18,000 in today’s dollars). They had been diverted into fighting for table scraps.

The movement appears to have been led by spooks—if not from the start, then definitely by the time Waters and Glassford took leadership positions. But I think it started to get out of hand. They had some 40,000 destitute people camped out near the Capitol building, and I think they realized they were playing with fire. At first they tried to entice the veterans away, but most refused to leave and more continued to join. So they decided they needed to put an abrupt end to it by force. But they didn’t want to take any chances, so just before burning down the camp, they called in Smedley Butler to talk the veterans out of doing anything rash. He gave two speeches to them in the days just before MacArthur and Eisenhower led the troops against them (the timing was hardly a coincidence).



"And this is how Morgan liked to give me his 'rough stuff.'"

He played his part brilliantly. But his intent was clear as day:

"This is the greatest demonstration of Americanism we have ever had. Pure Americanism. Willing to take this beating as you're taking it. Stand right steady. You keep every law. And why in the hell shouldn't ya? Who in the hell has done all the bleeding for this country and for this law and for this constitution anyhow except for you fellas? But don't, don't take a step backwards. Remember that as soon as you haul down your camp right here and clear out this evaporates in thin air. And all this struggle will have been no good." He then encouraged them to make sure to vote for pro-bonus candidates once they went back home. In his speech the following day he told them: "You're all right so long as you keep your sense of humor. If you slip over into lawlessness of any kind, you will lose the sympathy of a hundred twenty million people in the nation." So basically he played on their sense of patriotism, nationalism and (misplaced) faith in the democratic process to counter their anger and desperation that might have turned into violence. Classic controlling of the opposition. After all we've seen, it's safe to say that Smedley Butler was nobody's patsy, just an eager lackey of the powers that be.

BUSINESS PLOT MISDIRECTION

I could end the paper now, as I believe the floor has been thoroughly mopped with the tattered shreds of Smedley Butler's undeserved reputation. But I can't help myself from devoting a few more pages to discussing the misdirection surrounding Butler and the Business Plot.

The first comes courtesy of Antony Sutton. Sutton was a well-educated Brit who worked in America. I couldn't find anything on Sutton's family and history, but if nothing else he looks and acts the part of a proper English gentleman (BTW there are over 600 Suttons listed at thepeerage.com). He was an economist at CSU-LA who then was a research fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford

from '68 to '73. Miles has mentioned the Hoover Institution in previous papers as a red flag, and I agree. I find it curious that after leaving the Hoover Institution (or being kicked out for his radical research, depending on the story), he basically became an independent researcher. I find this curious because he did not sell enough books to make a living that way. It suggests he was either wealthy or had another covert source of income. I take it as another red flag.

At one time I would have considered Sutton's mainstream credentials as a sign of credibility. No longer. However, if you are looking to bolster an argument with someone about how Nazism and Communism are just scarecrows created by wealthy bankers to lead the opposition, frighten the population, and line their pockets with wartime profits, you could do a lot worse than invoking Sutton's work. His book on Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution shows how Wall Street financiers funded the Bolsheviks, and another book of his showed how they funded the Nazis. He also showed that the Soviets had received financing and other support from Western bankers and industrialists all through the Cold War. From his Wikipedia page:

His conclusion from his research on the issue was that the conflicts of the Cold War were "not fought to restrain communism" since the United States, through financing the Soviet Union "directly or indirectly armed both sides in at least Korea and Vietnam" but the wars were organised in order "to generate multibillion-dollar armaments contracts." [Sounds a lot like Butler's 'War is a Racket,' doesn't it?]

The update to the text, *The Best Enemy Money Can Buy*, looked at the role of military technology transfers up to the 1980s. Appendix B of that text contained the text of his 1972 testimony before Subcommittee VII of the Platform Committee of the Republican Party in which he summarized the essential aspects of his overall research:

"In a few words: there is no such thing as Soviet technology. Almost all – perhaps 90–95 percent – came directly or indirectly from the United States and its allies. In effect the United States and the NATO countries have built the Soviet Union. Its industrial and its military capabilities. This massive construction job has taken 50 years. Since the Revolution in 1917. It has been carried out through trade and the sale of plants, equipment and technical assistance."

Sutton's next three major published books (*Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, *Wall Street and FDR* and *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*) detailed Wall Street's involvement in the Bolshevik Revolution to destroy Russia as an economic competitor and turn it into "a captive market and a technical colony to be exploited by a few high-powered American financiers and the corporations under their control" as well as its decisive contributions to the rise of Adolf Hitler and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose policies he assessed as being essentially the same "corporate socialism," planned by the big corporations.

Ah yes, he also wrote that book about Wall Street and FDR, from which I quoted extensively in part 1 of this paper. He showed that the building at 120 Broadway where FDR had his office in the 1920's housed the very same financiers and organizations who funded the Bolsheviks and the Nazis. He devotes an entire chapter in that book to Butler and the business plot. You might think that someone who wrote a book on how FDR always and ever worked to further the interests of his Wall Street cronies would have the ability to see through Smedley Butler and the business plot. But no. He asks if Butler was making it up and quickly concludes that he wasn't:

General Butler was an unusual man and a particularly unusual man to find in the armed forces: decorated twice with the Medal of Honor, an unquestioned leader of men, with undoubted personal bravery, deep loyalty to his fellow men, and a fierce sense of justice. All these are admirable qualities. Certainly, General Butler was hardly the type of man to tell lies or even exaggerate for a petty reason. His flair for the dramatic does leave open a possibility of exaggeration, but deliberate lying is most unlikely.

As I hope you can now see, everything he writes here is 180 degrees from the truth. Another thing is that he starts out the chapter by quoting the *New York Times* coverage on the affair, which stated that the plan was to overthrow Roosevelt and establish a fascist dictatorship. He then says that this is the accusation that was later repeated by Jules Archer and other writers. And indeed this is almost always how the Business Plot is recounted. But that was not the original accusation leveled by Butler [when he testified](#) before the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Investigation of Nazi Propaganda Activities and Investigation of Certain Other Propaganda Activities (wink, wink). This HUAC was a precursor to McCarthy's House Un-American Activities Committee, which is another red flag in this whole affair. Butler testified that someone (in this case, Grayson Murphy, who worked for Morgan Guaranty) told him that they wanted to convince Roosevelt to "go along" and do what they wanted. If he didn't, they would create a new cabinet position that would be a kind of 'general secretary' and would take over the president's duties. They apparently hit upon this solution because establishing a new cabinet position was compatible with the Constitution. In other words, they were not plotting to establish a dictatorship, fascist or otherwise. To do that they would have to tear up (or re-write) the Constitution and overthrow the Congress or somehow do away with the separation of powers. They simply wanted to put 'their man' in the White House to do their bidding, and they wanted to do so in a way that would not violate the Constitution. Or at least that was the story they tried to sell. Of course we know that they already had their man in the White House who was doing their bidding, so the whole plot to oust FDR was as phony as a three-dollar bill. Incidentally, Butler's role in all of this was to lead a force of some half million veterans so FDR would realize he was being made an offer he couldn't refuse.

So what does all this have to do with Sutton? Well, he goes out of his way to make it very clear what the outlines of the plot were and what they were not, but

then later in the chapter (and elsewhere in the book) he goes on to repeat the lie that the goal of the plot was to create a dictatorship. Curious, to say the least, especially for a scholar known for scrupulous attention to detail. He then documents extensively the many ways in which the plot was allegedly covered up. The “cover-up” can now be seen for what it was: a “cover-op” designed to make the plot seem real. Sutton’s straightforward treatment of the cover-op serves the same purpose. And that’s how he ends his chapter on Butler and the business plot.

Nowhere does he address the glaring contradiction between the rest of his book—where he shows that FDR did the bidding of Wall Street—and the chapter on Butler where he shows that Wall Street financiers and industrialists who had FDR in their back pocket tried to remove him from power. Instead, he disingenuously repeats the line about making Butler a fascist dictator. Although I was vacillating on Sutton’s authenticity despite the red flags, his handling of the Butler case pushed me over the line. I’m convinced he’s misdirecting on purpose.

And speaking of misdirecting on purpose, here’s what Lyndon Larouche’s [Executive Intelligence Review](#) had to say about the efforts of the “Morgan-centered cabal of powerful financial interests” leading the Business Plot:

Their efforts came close to succeeding and might have, had it not been for the courage of America's then-most decorated officer, Marine Corps Maj. Gen. Smedley Darlington Butler, and the extraordinary political leadership of FDR himself. While Butler exposed the plot, FDR and his allies waged war against the power of the private investment banks that sponsored fascism at home and abroad, seeking to curb their power, and placing the sovereign power of the U.S. government and Constitution over them. In asserting that all economic policy must serve the constitutionally mandated principle of the General Welfare, FDR put the nation on a pathway out of the chaos and pessimism....

Each of [his] actions struck blows against the power of the financial oligarchy; together, they amounted to a virtual declaration of war against the financial powers who for too long had held sway over the economic and financial policy of the United States....

Meanwhile, what was to be exposed as a coup plot against FDR, financed by Morgan and allied interests, was already well under way.... Smedley Butler appeared to be an unlikely candidate for the fascist coup plotters....

[During Butler’s court-martial in 1931] Franklin Roosevelt, then the Governor of New York, and a friend of Butler's dating from FDR's days as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, worked to help the general and spoke out against his court-martial.

In August 1931, Butler chose an address made before an American Legion convention in Connecticut to deliver perhaps the most remarkable speech ever given by a serving officer about the

misuse of military power. "I have spent 33 years.... being a high-class muscle man for Big Business, for Wall Street and the bankers."

[In subsequent speeches,] Butler continued to hammer away on the theme that the American military was being deployed to collect bankers' debts and secure looting rights in foreign countries.

On Dec. 5, 1931, an article under his byline appeared in Liberty Magazine, titled "To Hell with the Admirals! Why I Retired at 50." In it, Butler...attacked a number of Central American leaders as Wall Street stooges, naming again Brown Brothers and Morgan.

All of this would make it seem remarkable that the Morgan interests would even consider turning to Butler as the putative leader for their fascist coup against Roosevelt.

Yes, yes it would, now that you mention it. So why in tarnation would Morgan and DuPont turn to Butler—a friend and ally of Roosevelt's, a man who had campaigned for him, a man who was widely considered to be a staunch patriot of unquestionable moral character, a man who was outspokenly critical of them—to lead their coup?

Those behind the [plot] believed that every person has his price, be it monetary, sexual, or other inducement. Butler seemed easy prey: After he had left the service, his financial situation bordered on the catastrophic, and he was heavily in debt. If all the appeals to the general's ego and all the "promises" of support for his soldier causes failed, Butler, could be "bought," they thought.

Except, as you might have guessed, that isn't true. There is no evidence that he had any financial difficulties. In fact, he was being paid handsomely to give his 'War is a Racket' speech all over the country. According to the book, *Maverick Marine*, he was paid several hundred dollars for each speech, which in those days was a lot of money, especially during the Depression (\$300 in 1934 is over \$5,000 in 2017 dollars). According to [this website](#), he gave over 1,200 speeches in 700 cities in the early 1930s. That's the equivalent of \$6,000,000 in today's dollars. So ultimately the plot unravels itself through its total lack of internal logic and consistency.

For questions or comments on this or Part 1, see my new blog, <https://cuttingthroughthefog.com/> (with no implied or express endorsement by Miles). I can be reached at josh-g1@live.com or on Reddit: u/daddie_o And please, take a moment to feed the web kitty!