


AMERICAN OPINION

Oliver Exhibit No. 1

An Informal Review

MARCH, 1964

\$1.00



OLIVER EXHIBIT No. 1

Editor

ROBERT WELCH

Managing Editor

SCOTT STANLEY, JR.

Associate Editors

SLOBODAN M. DRASKOVICH

FRANCIS X. GANNON

REVILO P. OLIVER

E. MERRILL ROOT

Contributing Editors

COLM BROGAN

MEDFORD EVANS

WESTBROOK PEGLER

CHARLES CALLAN TANSILL

HANS SENNHOLZ

Editorial Assistant

MARIAN PROBERT WELCH

Circulation

DONALD R. GRAY

Business Manager

RICHARD N. OBER

Editorial

Advisory Committee

The following group of distinguished Americans give the editor comments and advice which are helpful in determining the editorial policy, contents, and opinions of this magazine. But no responsibility can be attributed to any members of this Committee for any specific articles, items, or conclusions which appear in these pages.

GEORGE W. ARMSTRONG, JR.

K. G. BENTSON

LAURENCE E. BUNKER

F. GANO CHANCE

MARTIN J. CONDON, III

ROBERT B. DRESSER

CHARLES EDISON

WM. J. GREDE

J. BRACKEN LEE

CLARENCE MANION

N. FLOYD MCGOWIN

W. B. MCMILLAN

LUDWIG VON MISES

J. HOWARD PEW

J. NELSON SHEPHERD

ROBERT W. STODDARD

ERNEST G. SWIGERT

W. H. WILBUR

GEORGE H. WILLIAMSON

CONTENTS — MARCH, 1964

Assassination	Honorable Martin Dies, Sr.	1
Tito	Charles Callan Tansill	11
They Paused To Remark		20
Nine Men	Alan Stang	21
Ad Hominem	Taylor Caldwell	33
If You Want It Straight	Robert Welch	41
Principles Of Economics	Hans Sennholz	47
Moffitt On Films	Jack Moffitt	49
Oliver On Books	Revilo P. Oliver	53
The Idea	E. Merrill Root	57
Marxmanship In Dallas	Revilo P. Oliver	65
A Review Of The News	Francis X. Gannon	79
To The Editor		91
Poetry	edited by E. Merrill Root	95
Oil Portrait	Daniel M. Canavan	Cover

February 14, 1964

Dear Reader:

Mark Twain said that a difference of opinion is what makes horse races. It is also what makes magazines.

If we did not disagree with many people on many things there would be no point in publishing AMERICAN OPINION. While if we did not disagree among ourselves, we could have this magazine written by the office boy. (Which he thinks would mean a big improvement.)

The core of this discourse is that, contrary to what you have recently been told by about half of the press of the United States, AMERICAN OPINION is not the voice of *The John Birch Society*. It is not even the voice of your editor, except in those paragraphs which are published over my name. In fact, in connection with the very article in our last issue which caused several dozen assorted editorial writers to have apoplexy, I disagreed with a part of the major premise and with some of the conclusions. But I still say, as I did then, that it was a superb commentary, which we were delighted to present to our readers.

Naturally my views are the only completely orthodox ones extant. But in this current issue, from what I have seen at the galley proof stage, there are enough heresies to start a new magazine. For we are not publishing the work of robots, but of several of the best informed and most brilliant writers in the whole realm of American Conservative thought.

May you, as Milton would have put it, find their opinions helpful in the building of knowledge.

Sincerely,

Robert Welch

AMERICAN OPINION—is published monthly except July by Robert Welch, Inc., 395 Concord Ave., Belmont, Massachusetts 02178 U. S. A. Subscription rates are ten dollars per year in the United States and Canada; twelve dollars elsewhere. Copyright 1964 by Robert Welch, Inc. We use almost no articles except those written to order to fit our specific needs, and can assume no responsibility for the return of unsolicited manuscripts.

Second Class Postage Paid at Boston, Mass.

ASSASSINATION

And Its Aftermath

Congressman Martin Dies of Texas served seven years as Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the historic Dies Committee. Now practicing law in Texas, Congressman Dies remains one of the most outspoken foes of the International Communist Conspiracy. He is author of the recent and explosive volume, Martin Dies' Story—which we recommend.



■ IN THE FIRST chapter of Theodore Roscoe's *The Web of Conspiracy*, which is the story of the assassination of President Lincoln, Roscoe says that the murder of Lincoln by John Wilkes Booth could not be concealed by official censorship, or the government's juggling of English, or a propaganda treatment, or re-writing of history:

What censorship, phrase-juggling, propaganda, and the doctoring of history did conceal was the fact that Booth could not have murdered Lincoln had not Lincoln been betrayed. . . .

The betrayal which permitted a lone gunman to walk into a theater in the nation's capitol and shoot down the President was securely hidden away.

This concealment and distortion of the truth is a black chapter in our nation's history. Such a thing may be far more serious in the tragic case of

the murder of President Kennedy.

I

IT IS DIFFICULT to understand why President Johnson at first approved a Texas Inquiry by the Attorney General of Texas, and then appointed a commission headed by Chief Justice Warren, and then yielded to Warren's insistence — *accompanied by a threat of resignation* — that the Texas Inquiry not be held.

What Constitutional authority is there for such a Presidential commission? Why was not the Committee on Un-American Activities, or the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee permitted to conduct the probe? And why did President Johnson ignore the proposal of a close personal friend of the President and a member of the Presidential commission, that a bipartisan Committee of Congress conduct the investigation? Why was it deemed necessary to establish a commission of dubious Constitutional authority — to say the least — handpicked by a President seeking reelection?

Why was Chief Justice Warren appointed chairman of this commission? As a member of the Supreme Court he may even be confronted with the appeal of Jack Rubenstein. Though he disqualifies himself, his inconsistent roles as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and chairman of the commission may taint the findings of the commission, as well as a later decision of the Supreme Court. It has even been widely reported that Warren is on record as opposing the impropriety of

MARCH, 1964

Oliver Exhibit No. 1

OLIVER EXHIBIT No. 1—Continued

such a dual role. He did not, however, refuse the chairmanship. Why choose Warren when there are millions of Americans, rightly or wrongly, who do not have confidence in the Chief Justice because of his persistent defiance of the great legal principle of *stare decisis* (to stand by decided cases)?

The doubts expressed here are not meant to reflect upon the patriotism of Justice Warren or the other members of this commission. But, under our system of freedom, Americans have a right, and it is their duty, to ask such questions.

II

WITHIN ONE HOUR of the President's death the Dallas police arrested Lee Harvey Oswald, and the fact that he was a pro-Castro sympathizer and a "Marxist" was made public. Nevertheless the usual "Liberal" spokesmen blamed the President's death upon "right-wing extremists" and "hate mongers." The Voice of America beamed to the world the indictment that Dallas was a city "of the extreme right-wing movement." *Tass*, the official Russian News Agency said: "President Kennedy of the United States has been assassinated. His death is blamed on extreme right groups." It reported that it got this information from the Voice of America.

Even after the news services published the facts about Oswald — his defection to Russia; his affidavit renouncing American citizenship; his residence in Russia; his record of Communist beliefs and activities, which were well known to our government and nationally publicized before the murder of the President — the spokesmen for so-called "Liberals," and the duped or uninformed, continued to link "right-wing extremists" with "left-wing extremists" as responsible for the murder. Oswald has almost always been described as a "Marxist" and not a

Communist, even after the evidence was conclusive that he was a Communist and that, like so many Communists, he used the words *Marxist* and *Communist* interchangeably. While it is true that Socialists, Social Democrats, and other Left-wing groups, as well as many so-called "Liberals," derive their social and political philosophy from Karl Marx, the only groups whose members label themselves "Marxist" are Communist. As a matter of fact the Communists have always contended that they are the only true Marxists in the world. After all, Karl Marx did write the *Communist Manifesto*.

To many uninformed people a Marxist is much different from a Communist. It is therefore extremely important for the "powers that be" to conceal or becloud the fact that the President of the United States was murdered by a Communist whose record of Communist activity was well known to our government; whose place of work on the day of the murder was well known to our government, and who was thus—knowingly—allowed a perfect opportunity to kill the President. The enforcement of our anti-Communist laws and the most elementary precaution could have prevented the dastardly act. Our government knew about Communist Oswald but it did not act as the law required!

III

IT IS EQUALLY important for the government to convince our people that Oswald was acting on his own initiative and not in furtherance of a foreign or domestic conspiracy. (Later I will show why there has been a concerted campaign to disassociate Oswald from Communists at home and abroad.) On November twenty-third there was an *Associated Press* story from Washington which quoted authorities of the State Department as saying, "they have no evidence indicating involvement of


the Soviet Union or any other foreign power in the assassination of President Kennedy." The *Associated Press* said on November twenty-third that Oswald was a "loner" and kept pretty much to himself. This line was followed many times in the so-called "Liberal" newspapers and on television and radio.

Stories appeared in the newspapers to the effect that, when Oswald was a child in New York, a teacher warned of his mental condition. The "Liberal" columnists and television commentators continued to emphasize that President Kennedy was the victim of "extreme rightists and hate mongers." Ministerial associations, even in Dallas, warned against "extremists" and "hate mongers," CORE and NAACP issued a statement that President Kennedy was killed because he championed human rights (meaning the Civil Rights Program). Even President Johnson, in his first speech to Congress, warned against "extremists and hate mongers." In fact the vast majority of "Liberal" leaders, in and out of the government, seized upon this opportunity to divert attention from the all important facts that President Kennedy was shot by a Communist; that thirty years of investigation of Communism by Congress and by other countries proved the basic and elementary fact that every Communist must accept ironclad discipline and obey orders, and that Communists never commit political crimes except in obedience to orders of superiors.

In the first Report issued unanimously by the Dies Committee — composed of Democrats, Republicans, "Liberals," and conservatives — we found:

The Communists in the United States openly admit their allegiance to the Communist International at Moscow, and glory in the fact that they obey all the orders issued from there immediately and implicitly. . . . The following statement appears on

the 1938 membership card of the Communist party, originals of which were introduced as evidence before the committee: "The undersigned declares his allegiance to the program and statutes of the Communist International and of the Communist Party of the United States of America, and agrees to submit to the discipline of the party and to engage actively in its work." . . . The Communist International is dominated by the Russian Communist party



What Communist Oswald saw as he assassinated President Kennedy.

and Soviet officials, and could not exist without the wholehearted support of the leaders of the Russian Communist party and the financial backing of the Soviet Government.

That Report was submitted to Congress on January 3, 1939, and a copy of it went to every member of Congress and of the Executive Branch of the government. It was printed in newspapers throughout the country and distributed to public libraries. The quoted

MARCH, 1964

Oliver Exhibit No. 1

OLIVER EXHIBIT No. 1—Continued

excerpts have been reaffirmed by every Committee of Congress or agency of the Executive Branch which has ever investigated Communism. This principle of discipline (unquestioned execution of orders of superiors) has been demonstrated throughout the world upon too many occasions to enumerate.

It is true that since our investigation and exposure of Communists in this country the Communist Party stopped issuing cards and printing other incriminating evidence. But Communism is dogmatic. It may change its tactics from time to time to deceive the unwary, but its basic principle of absolute Party discipline, and its objective of world conquest, never changes.

IV

IS THERE any question that Oswald was a Communist?

The *Associated Press* in a story from Dallas quoted Dallas Police Chief Jesse Curry as saying that Oswald admitted he was a Communist. Curry added, "He didn't try to hide it." In another *Associated Press* story from Dallas, dated November twenty-eighth, Dallas Police Chief Curry is quoted as saying: "He [Oswald] readily admitted he was a Communist. Apparently he was proud of being a Communist. Last year Oswald said in New Orleans he was not a Communist but a Marxist. But actually Oswald has never drawn any distinction between the two."

District Attorney Henry Wade was quoted by the *Associated Press* as saying, "There was lots of material (in Oswald's room) dealing with Communism, such as the *Daily Worker* [sic] and there was even more material dealing with Fair Play for Cuba Organization." In the same story Chief Curry is quoted as saying that, after Oswald's arrest, photographs were found "showing him standing at attention with a rifle in one hand and in the other a copy of the Communist

newspaper, *The Worker*."

When Oswald was arrested, according to the *Associated Press*, "he announced he wanted for his lawyer John Abt of New York, well known for past Communist defendants."

An *Associated Press* story dated November twenty-fourth reported that "When Oswald on November 2, 1959 turned in his American passport to our Embassy in Moscow he presented his affidavit which stated: 'I affirm that my allegiance is to the Soviet Socialist Republic.'" And he told American Embassy officials, "I am a Marxist."

Four years ago, in Oswald's interview with Priscilla Johnson, on the third floor of Moscow's Hotel Metropole, he referred to the Soviet Government as "my government" and he said: "Even if I am not accepted [for citizenship] on no account will I go back to the United States." He said (and this was a most significant statement) that when he talked to Soviet officials they warned that neither Oswald's wish nor theirs would determine whether his citizenship application was to be accepted. They said it depended on the "over-all" political atmosphere at the moment. Meanwhile they offered Oswald the sanctuary of a prolonged stay in the U.S.S.R.

The husband of one of Oswald's landladies (he had a room for his wife in Oak Cliff and a room for himself near his job under the name of O. H. Lee) was reported by the Press as saying "Oswald talked Marxism, Marxism, Marxism. Oswald refused to eschew violence as a method for achieving ends." [The above statement of Mr. Paine was reported by Sid Moody, *Associated Press* newsfeatures writer.]

There is no dispute about the fact that when Oswald was in New Orleans he was active in the Fair Play for Cuba's local committee, of which he claimed to be Secretary. (An investigation and Report by the Senate Internal Security

Sub-Committee showed conclusively that these groups were largely financed by Castro. FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover stated that these committees were heavily infiltrated by Communists.) He was even shown on a national television network carrying a pro-Castro placard.


In a story which appeared in the *Dallas Morning News*, Assistant District Attorney William F. Alexander is quoted as saying that evidence found in Oswald's Oak Cliff room proves he was "an active worker in the Communist Party." He said the evidence included letters in which a Communist leader thanked Oswald "for past services."

How much more evidence would be required to prove that Oswald was a Communist? For years the Communist Party has not issued membership cards or kept written records. During the early years of the Dies Committee we were able to secure membership cards from the various police departments and other sources. We compiled the only list of Communists in the United States that is in existence. The original list was left with the Committee when I quit Congress in 1945. What happened to that list I do not know. I do know that, since the Communist Party discontinued keeping any written records, there is no evidence more conclusive of Communist membership or affiliation than the evidence marshalled against Lee Harvey Oswald.

V

IN MY NEXT article, I hope to discuss the circumstances linking the Soviet Union with Oswald's murder of the President. Naturally such evidence must be circumstantial and based upon the dogmatic pattern of Communist behavior. The Communists are too clever to leave any trace of connection with Oswald other than certain circumstances I hope to discuss.

I shall also suggest the probable answer to the question that is being



Oswald bragged to Police Chief Jesse Curry about being a Communist.

asked by many people: "Will the Warren commission report the truth?" This question does not infer that the members of the commission are lacking in integrity and patriotism. But one columnist pointed out we cannot expect very much from the commission because no member of the commission has had any investigative experience and the commission must rely upon the reports of other groups. In a sense each of these agencies is itself under investigation. This columnist, who writes for a large newspaper chain, said that it is naive to expect these officers to bear witness against themselves or, indeed, each other. He commented that it is not in the nature of bureaucracies to destroy their carefully nurtured fables of omniscience.

I am not prepared to fully agree with the columnist. But as I shall explain, there are strong and compelling political reasons, as well as present international factors, to influence this probe and prevent a full disclosure of all of the ugly facts that have been camouflaged for

MARCH, 1964

Oliver Exhibit No. 1

5

OLIVER EXHIBIT No. 1—Continued

years but have now come to a climax in the assassination of President Kennedy.

It must be remembered that all governments, including our own, suppress or distort facts in the name of national security or international policy. All of us recall that after our U-2 was shot down over Soviet territory the State Department issued a statement that this plane had strayed from its course, into Russian territory. When the Communists challenged our release about the plane, our President admitted that it was engaged in observation of military installations in Russia. It was finally admitted that we had been making these flights for some time.

One must also keep in mind that it is not difficult for any Administration to persuade any Congressional Committee that it must suppress vital facts in the interest of national security or our international policy. The Congressmen have no way of knowing or discovering whether certain facts will endanger our national security or international policy. They must rely upon the judgment and integrity of the Administration in power, which presumably has all the necessary facts upon which a correct judgment must be based.

Sometimes the request of an Administration is sincere. Sometimes it is made for political purposes at home, which have nothing to do with national security or international policy. Having associated with politicians all my life, frankness compels me to confess that the great majority of them are strongly influenced by the all-important consideration of winning elections. Their business, whether Congressman or President, is getting elected and staying elected. Politicians, with very rare exceptions, never confess mistakes. An Administration will do a great deal to prevent the exposure of its blunders.

Perhaps in these human weaknesses politicians are not much different from

the general run of humanity. The great difference is that we have a right to expect our public officials to put our country's real interests above their own political interests. All of them solemnly swear to God that they will subordinate self in the service of our country. There have been many glorious periods in our history when the great majority of public servants performed their duties faithfully in fulfillment of oaths of office. These bright periods are becoming increasingly less frequent — to the dire peril of our American Republic.

Will the Warren commission be different? On January nineteenth, counsel for the Warren commission stated that the commission will have to consider the possible timing of its report. What he did not say was that a commission which will consider the "timing" of its report will likely consider the political effect of that report.

VI

IN ORDER to overcome the skepticism of millions of Americans who have honest doubts about the Warren commission, the commission must discover and publish all of the facts about the role of Jack Rubenstein in the assassination of President Kennedy. The commission has at its command the services of thousands of intelligence agents and police detectives to uncover the truth about Jack Leon Rubenstein, who in 1947 changed his name to Jack Ruby. A private citizen has very limited facilities. However, I have searched some of my records and I have come up with certain interesting facts that may have no significance.

I have been informed that the name Rubenstein is a common name among the Jews. There could be several or more Jack Rubensteins. According to my records some of the Rubensteins spelled their name *Rubinstein*. At any rate there is no question but that in 1929 a man by the name of Jack Ruben-

stein was on the Executive Board of the Young Communist League in the United States. We have an exhibit taken verbatim from the Communist *Daily Worker* to prove this fact. The Young Communist League is an organization for Communists under twenty-one years of age. In 1929 the Jack Rubenstein, who shot Oswald, would have been approximately nineteen years of age.

According to our records the Jack Rubenstein who was a member of the Executive Committee or Bureau of the Young Communist League also assisted in the formation of The Revolutionary Youth and the publication *Revolutionary Age*.


I have read in news stories that the Jack Rubenstein who shot Oswald has a brother Hyman Rubenstein and a sister named Ann Rubenstein. Our Committee Hearings mention an H. Rubinstein and an Annette Rubinstein and a Leon Rubenstein.

Now all of this may be mere coincidences and should be given no probative force until it is proved that the Jack Rubenstein in our records is the same person as the Jack Rubenstein who shot Oswald. The names Hyman and Ann are common names and our records only mention an H. Rubinstein and a Dr. Annette Rubinstein. I should mention, however, that in all my seven years of experience in conducting a vigorous probe I found only one instance of such duplication of names. If the Dallas Jack Rubenstein is not the same person as the Jack Rubenstein who was a prominent official of the Young Communist League in 1929, the Warren commission should produce the real Jack Rubenstein or account for his whereabouts or death.

There was a story from Chicago that the police records for this period (1929-1930) have disappeared. When I held Hearings in Chicago they had extensive records of Communists, including their

fingerprints. But even if these records are gone, I have furnished one who will participate in the inquiry with the names of known associates of the Committee's Jack Rubenstein. It is reasonable to believe that some of these associates are alive. Somewhere there must be a photograph of the Jack Rubenstein who was in the Young Communist League in 1929.

The H. Rubinstein and Ann Rubinstein could well be different persons than the H. Rubinstein and Dr. An-



A Jack Rubenstein was a member of the Executive Board of the Young Communist League.

nette Rubinstein mentioned in our Hearings. Unless it is proved otherwise it must be assumed that they are different persons; but even if they are, it does not explain the fact that in 1929 there was a *Jack Rubenstein* in the Communist apparatus. Or does it, Mr. Justice Warren?

VII

EVEN IF THE Jack Rubenstein who shot Oswald is a different person from the Jack Rubenstein who was on the

MARCH, 1964

Oliver Exhibit No. 1

OLIVER EXHIBIT No. 1—Continued

Executive Bureau of the Young Communist League in 1929, there are other suspicious circumstances about Rubenstein's role in the assassination which must be explained.

According to a story appearing in the *Dallas Morning News* of January twenty-first, Jack Rubenstein went to Cuba in 1959, about nine months after Castro became that country's Communist dictator.

A report which appeared in the *Houston Chronicle* December 1, 1963 said: "Ruby (he had changed his name to Ruby from Rubenstein in 1947) was born Jack Rubenstein in Chicago, where he was known to police as a labor organizer, a ticket 'scalper' and a gambler with reputed underworld acquaintances." Victor Riesel reports in his column dated November 30, 1963, that he had discovered that Ruby's night spot at one time was a haunt of Chicago hoods who came to Dallas to "case it" for a possible "take." He also disclosed what he found out about the underworld connections of Rubenstein when he lived in Chicago.

Jack Rubenstein has one of the best known and highest-paid lawyers in America, who announced that \$100,000 in cash had been raised for his client's bail bond. At the hearing to determine whether to grant Rubenstein a bail bond, two psychiatrists testified he was mentally unbalanced. One was Dr. Walter Bromberg, Clinical Director of the Pinewood Psychiatric Hospital in Westchester County, New York. The other was Dr. Roy Schafer, a psychologist on the staff of Yale University. It further appears uncontradicted that he cultivated Dallas policemen who frequently visited his night club. If he is mentally sick and has been for many years, even in his childhood, is it not strange that some friend, some member of his large family, or some policeman would not have said or done something to indicate that *someone*

considered him mentally sick?

VIII

WHO IS IT that is so anxious to defend an obscure operator of a third-rate night club with the record Ruby is reported to have?

An *Associated Press* story summarized the report of the FBI as concluding that "Lee Oswald was the solitary and unaided assassin and that *Jack Ruby had no connection with Oswald or his deadly plan.*" And, Victor Riesel reported that the White House was desperately "eager to avoid an international incident by appearing to give the slightest insinuation of an international plot to assassinate John Kennedy."

It appears fantastic that this operator of a cheap night club would receive aid from every influential source. I am now staring at the headline which appeared on the front page of the *Houston Chronicle* of January twenty-first. That headline reads, "'Hero-minded' Ruby awaits word on Bail." Another story says he cried. Still another reports that when he was interviewed on television he "broke down" when he spoke of President Kennedy. We are told by his friends, and some members of his family, of his great emotional upheaval when he learned of the President's death.

At first the defense fed the propaganda mills the story that his "great devotion" to the President produced temporary insanity which was responsible for his act. This "line" became ridiculous in the light of the revelation that he did not view the cavalcade, nor pay his poll tax, and that he loitered around the jail with a gun from the time Oswald was imprisoned until he had an opportunity to shoot Oswald. The "temporary insanity" lasted too long.

Of course Jack Rubenstein should not be tried in the Press or by anyone


who must rely upon Press stories. That is not the American way. But when a well-organized campaign, evidently supplied with ample money, is conducted to brainwash the American people in advance of the trial we have a duty to raise these honest questions.

IX

I KNOW THAT the great majority of our people do not realize that there is, and has been since the organization of the Communist Party, a gravely menacing and remarkably successful Communist Conspiracy — in the United States and throughout the world. Despite more than twenty years of investigation and the exposures of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the Internal Security Sub-Committee of the Senate, and the vast quantity of literature including the various public statements of FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover, our people still do not understand or believe that there is a sinister conspiracy seeking the overthrow of our country.

One major reason is because few people will read or heed the warnings of the Red menace.

Another reason is that revelations about this conspiracy are fantastic to the Western mind. Many people stooped to laugh about serious findings of the Dies Committee. Unfortunately, the media of information in this country have too many times discredited grave and truthful revelations as a "publicity stunt." And this general disbelief, carefully and shrewdly encouraged by the Communists, has greatly facilitated their conquest of one-third of the world's population. But I have listened to the testimony of many credible former Communists, including the man who was in charge of their espionage for Western Europe (who himself died in a Washington hotel under mysterious circumstances) and I have helped uncover Communist crimes; and



Ruby's sister and brother; two others have names corresponding to those of known Reds.

from all this experience, study, and observation I can often recognize the "fine hand" of the Communist Conspiracy.

If the newspaper reports from which I quote in this and the succeeding article are correct, certain conclusions are inescapable. Since these conclusions are based upon newspaper and television reports, I do not of course pretend that they are in any sense final. If all of the sworn evidence available is received and released uncensored and undoctored by the Warren commission, it could render my conclusions incorrect. But my long study, investigation, and observation of the *modus operandi* of the Communist Conspiracy leads me to certain tentative conclusions.

On the basis of what has been reported by reliable and trustworthy reporters, I believe that Oswald was acting under instructions which had their original source in Moscow, probably relayed through Castro. How Oswald received these instructions I do not know. He may have gotten them

when he went to Mexico City ostensibly to apply for a visa to Russia by way of Cuba, or he may have gone to Mexico City to arrange for his escape after the murder of the President. He may have received his orders through one of the numerous Communist couriers who enter and leave this country at will.

I believe that the reason Oswald was not granted citizenship, which would have been of great propaganda value to the Communists, was because he was of far greater value to the Communists as an American citizen than as a Soviet citizen. In permitting him to marry a Russian girl, to travel freely in Russia, and to be issued a work permit, the Communists obviously realized that they could use him for some purpose. He may have been analyzed as useful up to a point. I have seen cards the Communists kept of fellow travelers: Each fellow traveler was carefully studied and tried and his value to the cause stated on the card.

I believe that Oswald was acting in accordance with the carefully considered plans of the most successful conspirators the world has ever seen. Those plans included a method of escape. What it was may never be discovered. It may well have been that the plan included the liquidation of Oswald. Of course this part of the plan would have been unknown to him. But if the Communists believed that Oswald would talk under strong pressure the plan certainly included his death.

One thing is certain — the murder of the officer was not planned. Communists, the same as the criminal underworld, forbid the slaying of

policemen: under such circumstances because they know that the chances of apprehension are greatly increased. A police force cannot let the murder of a policeman escape detection and punishment because all policemen would be in greater jeopardy. It may be, therefore, that the murder of this policeman by Oswald was his death knell. No Communist is ever permitted to disobey an order or ignore any detail of his instructions.

As to the reason Moscow and Castro wanted the liquidation of President Kennedy, no one will ever know. Of one thing we may be certain: The reason, to the Communists, was urgent. Further speculation is idle.

In my opinion it is unlikely that the Communist conspiracy to kill the President will ever be fully proved. Even if there were evidence linking this crime to a Communist country, it is doubtful that the evidence would ever be released, for fear of an international "incident" or harm to international policy.

On February fourth, Chief Justice Warren said that the commission had heard testimony which might not be available in a lifetime. On February fifth, he said that he was being "a little facetious" in his statement but that some of the testimony could possibly touch on national security matters. It is therefore probable that the truth will never be known about the murder of Mr. Kennedy and the reasons Rubenstein murdered Communist Oswald, unless patriotic individuals and organizations discover and publish the truth. ■ ■

WHAT HATH GOD WROUGHT?

■ In a friendly exchange of telegrams recently the chairman of the Amherst Town Committee, Carl A. Keyser, edged Governor Nelson Rockefeller in the political game of upmanship. Here are the telegrams: "To Carl Keyser: 'Happy and I want you to know that Ass't Atty. Gen. Don Whitehead and Rep. Bob Hahn, both of Stoughton, have agreed to head my Massachusetts campaign. We would deeply appreciate any advice and assistance you can give Don and Bob. Cordially, Nelson A. Rockefeller.'" "To Nelson A. Rockefeller: 'Dottie and I want Happy and you to know that we are already committed to Peggy and Barry. Please advise Don and Bob. Carl A. Keyser.'"

MARXMANSHIP

In Dallas

[Part II]

Revilo P. Oliver is Professor of Classics in the University of Illinois. During World War II, he was Director of Research in a secret agency of the War Department. He has traveled widely. Dr. Oliver is an academician of international reputation who has published scholarly articles in four languages within the pages of twelve learned periodicals in the United States and Europe.



■ HENCEFORTH, no American has an excuse for illusion. He has had an ocular demonstration of who and what his enemies are. And that lesson is repeated every day as his enemies, recklessly exposing themselves, try to carry out their original plan in spite of Comrade Oswald's bungling.

The assassination and its aftermath must have given to many Americans the shock that each of us must somehow feel in his own being before he can understand what Communists really are and why they are seeking to kill or enslave him. That understanding does not automatically come from mere information. We all carry in our minds a great accumulation of items of information, such as that a continent lies under the ice of Antarctica or that the natives of the Andaman Islands are pygmies, which have no effect on our thinking because such facts seem irrelevant to our own lives. By this time, every literate American has in his own

mind a good deal of information about Communists, although often as detached and unrelated items that seem remote from his quotidian concerns. Even copious and systematic information may remain, so to speak, inert in the mind until illumined by a perception that carries conviction.

The Moment Of Truth

The perception usually comes from some personal experience or observation. It may be some minor shock, such as the falling apple is said to have given Newton; but at that shock a thousand bits of scattered knowledge latent in the mind arrange themselves into a coherent whole and exhibit a basic truth.

When I was a youngster, I knew a man of substance who told me that he had almost been enlisted in a Communist-front operation to release from prison a creature named Mooney, who had murdered nine persons in California to show how much he loved Humanity. Although moved by the plausible and pathetic story told him by the Editor of a "literary" periodical, the gentleman was canny enough to check a few facts and then visit the headquarters of the organization soliciting his support. His unannounced visit gave him his moment of perception. He returned with the conviction that he had seen specimens of a criminal gang that was burrowing its way beneath the foundations of society, bent on undermining the whole nation. I thought his alarm preposterous, and, I am afraid, smiled at it.

In college, I could not overlook the

MARCH, 1964

Oliver Exhibit No. 1

OLIVER EXHIBIT No. 1—Continued

65

young Communists. It required no great acumen to see that their idealistic squeakings about "social justice" and the "downtrodden" were mere pretense to cover the malice and phrenetic rancors seething within them. But I did not really understand them until I met, during the great Crusade to Save the Soviet, a young lawyer who had been provided with a direct commission and a "vital" job in Washington to preserve him from the kind of military service that may be bad for the skin. He explained to me the wickedness of making a profit, and he told me how "social justice" would come to businessmen. "We'll shoot them in the belly," he said rapturously; "they die longer that way." And the greasy-faced creature licked its dry lips.

A professional man tells me that his moment came at the time that Irreproachable Ike, violating the Constitution he had sworn to uphold, used the Army to help the Warren Crew get the race war under way. He was talking to a clergyman of the "social gospel" variety whose emotional perturbation he did not understand until some indiscreet exclamations let him see that the holy man was inwardly trembling with eagerness for news that Americans had been bayoneted or machine-gunned on the streets of Little Rock.

The moment came to another man when he was one of a party of four in the bar of a private club. One of the four, an evidently urbane and cultivated gentleman — who had come to the United States as a refugee and had been given a salary and security that he could never have attained in the land whence he came — took a Scotch or two too many and began to make it painfully clear that he regarded Americans as detestable swine who need to be taught, with the toe of a boot, their place in One World.

A university professor tells me that his moment came two years ago when a

senior colleague, who had for many years pontificated about the "market-place of ideas," and, serene as a seated Buddha, had beamed benignly when Gus Hall and Gordon Hall spoke on the campus, "because we need to hear all sides," began to yell like a Comanche at a scalp-dance. What had shattered academic serenity was the discovery that there was a horrible "hate-sheet" read by "Fascist war-mongers" who must be "stamped out" or, at least, have their teeth kicked in. As for contributors to the hate-sheet, said the Sakya Muni of Academic Freedom, whom I quote verbatim, "they must be exterminated. Shooting is *too good* for them." The hate-sheet in question was that mild and self-consciously "moderate" fortnightly, *National Review*, and my informant believes that the Double Dome would have run amok with a kris, had he even suspected the existence of AMERICAN OPINION. As it was, however, the yells sufficed to make my informant suddenly realize what makes "Liberals" tick — and he compared them to certain well wrapped and disguised packages that are occasionally discovered by a postal inspector or the baggage master of an airline because they also tick.

A New Yorker says that his moment came early in December when he read a column by Walter Lippmann, whom he had long supposed to be suffering from nothing more serious than a cerebrum bloated with ideals. In that column the punctate pundit, wrapping his feet about his neck in one of his customary verbal twists, claimed that "in a free [*sic*] country" criticism of "Civil Rights and Russia" is "inherently subversive." Not content with having thus exposed himself, Big-Brained Walt went on tactlessly to yowl that because Oswald scored a bull's-eye, "the *only* solace for the nation's [*sic*] shame and grief can come from a Purge"—a purge, of course, of the awful Americans who think they still have a country. Thus,

said my correspondent, was long covert hatred of Americans and dissembled blood-lust made manifest for all to see. It is possible, to be sure, that the quoted phrase was just lipography, and that Lippmann meant something else, such as forced feeding of castor oil to Americans; but the phrase served to give at least one of his readers an impulse to put together and comprehend many data that his mind was holding in suspension.

Ex uno disce omnes

Oswald was a young Communist punk, but, aside from his fortuitous notoriety, there was nothing unusual about him. You have seen thousands like him, and you are paying taxes to breed or nourish swarms of them.

You saw a representative selection of them in that excellent film, *Operation Abolition*, which is now more timely than ever. You saw the veteran criminals, who should have been deported or imprisoned long ago, riot and yell at the House Committee, an official delegation of the highest governmental authority in our nation. You will not have failed to recognize in them rabid beasts grown insolent with long impunity. You saw also the rioting swarms of young creatures that had crawled out from the woodwork of the University of California and other tax-supported institutions of "higher learning." You had an opportunity to study their hate-contorted faces.

You can see fledgling Oswalds in the flesh whenever, as occasionally happens, a loyal American is permitted to speak on or near a college campus. The young "progressives" will be there to jeer and quibble. It will be instructive to observe how many are deformed in body or feature as well as mind, and, if you approach near enough, you can see the hatred glistening in beady eyes. (For a close approach, a handkerchief sprinkled with ammonia will minimize the dis-

comfort.) And you should reflect that you are financing, directly through taxes or contributions or indirectly through the institution's tax-exemption, the hatching and "education" of young murderers.

You can see the species wherever you look. And with just a little patience and dexterity, you can make all but the most hardened and experienced disclose their inner emotions — perhaps in a spate of verbiage, but at least for a moment in an unguarded word or glare in the eyes; and you will feel like a swimmer who has glimpsed, six fathoms down, the flat, greenish flicker of a turning shark.

You can see them on television, on the floor of Congress, and in their pulpits; you can read them in the Press. And you need have no doubts. Whether they are trying crudely or subtly to use the Communists' assassination of Kennedy to incite hatred against "right-wing extremists," you can no longer fancy that they are just ignorant "intellectuals" with mixed-up ganglia. They are lying. They are lying with conscious calculation. They are lying with murderous intent.

You cannot mistake them when, in your very presence and with breath-taking effrontery, they discharge the diseased hatreds and homicidal lusts that fester in their gangrenous little minds.

From direct observation, you, as an American, can now recognize your enemy and know what he is. And if ever you are tempted to doubt the evidence of your own eyes and ears, remember that such monsters are no novelty — that in the brief span of man's sad and dolorous history one can find almost innumerable recorded instances of recrudescence savagery and of the frenzied and exacerbated rage of anthropoid beasts that cannot bear to be dragged toward civilization and humanity. The best illustration in a book that I have

seen is Louis Zoul's *Thugs and Communists* (Public Opinion, Long Island City 4; cf. AMERICAN OPINION, January, 1962, pp. 29-36).

The vital thing is that you, as an American, realize that you are being hunted by a feral and stealthy pack. And that this is no nightmare, from which you will automatically awaken in a moment, nor yet is it a vision excited by the writers who strove to be more *outré* than Poe. That is a reality which you must face, if you are to survive at all.

The Time Is Now

With the nature of our enemies thus made manifest, and with such unmistakable indications of their numbers and power, an American who does not wilfully close his eyes and drug his mind can scarcely escape a perception of the magnitude and immediacy of our peril. This is the year of decision. We cannot hope for a complete victory this year, but we must end thirty years of unvaried retreat and, for a change, advance a little to recover some of the ground we have lost and to turn the tide of battle. A mere stalemate is scarcely possible, and another defeat will be our last. With another defeat, you and I may not be alive in 1965—or, if we are, we may regret it.

Now that Providence has given us a last chance, we must use it wisely and well. We must act with courage and determination, and, above all, with a rational and realistic understanding of our situation. We are fighting against enormous, though not insuperable odds, and we shall need the utmost effort of every American who will work with us. Our greatest handicap is that we, unlike our enemies, do not have a unified and secret command which plans the total strategy without need to disclose or explain it to anyone, and which carries out that strategy by issuing orders that are obeyed without question.

Against a conspiracy that makes its decisions in secret and coordinates with the efficiency of a single organism the movements of its numerous and often hidden tentacles, we can oppose only the voluntary efforts of individuals who are loosely organized into a large number of voluntary organizations, which must, in turn, voluntarily cooperate with one another. In these circumstances a secret strategy is impossible, and we must rely on the rationality and self-control of responsible individuals to supply that minimum of unity and coordination without which we could do nothing against a conspiracy that has almost absolute control over its agents through its appeal to their criminal instincts, their complicity in past crimes, and, if need be, fear.

Our enemies plan in secret, but they have a standard technique for dealing with Americans that has long been obvious to every observer. While the vast majority of Americans are kept, so far as possible, in a state of ignorant complacency and confusion by the lie-machine, conservative and patriotic organizations are destroyed by inciting them to fight one another and by paralyzing each one with internal dissension. That technique has been used for more than forty years, and, without exception until the past few years, accomplished its purpose speedily and infallibly. Its success depended partly upon our enemies' vast financial resources and long experience in covert and subtle manipulation of individuals, but even more on the fact that loyal Americans are divided in their personal interests and beliefs.

That we Americans are so divided is our basic weakness in the present struggle, but it is not one of which we need be ashamed. It is the weakness of all societies of free men, and hence it is, in large part, precisely what we are trying to preserve. But our conflicts of interest and belief must be candidly ad-

mitted and accurately defined, if we are not to succumb to the manipulations of our enemies.

The Unity Of Dissension

As Americans, our one bond of effective unity is the American tradition, which is, in its essentials, a severely *practical* one. It is our first and most urgent duty to take a lesson from our forefathers, the citizens of the thirteen colonies, who, confronted by overwhelming odds, achieved independence because they had the intelligence and self-control never to lose sight of their real objective; although the colonies were deeply divided by opposed economic interests, vehement religious dissensions, and cultural differences that were, within the ambit of Western civilization, comparatively great. The governing bodies of each colony well knew that they could make an extremely advantageous settlement by deserting the other twelve. And the larger colonies must have been often tempted to seek opportunities, during the long struggle, of extending their influence and power at the expense of others in the hope of dominating whatever confederation might come out of independence.

A desperate undertaking, which most political analysts would have pronounced impossible *a priori* for peoples so sundered by divergent interests and creeds, succeeded because -- and only because -- our forefathers were able to transcend those differences and maintain an effective unity for the specific and strictly limited purpose of attaining political freedom.

Our task as Americans today is to attain and maintain an effective unity for the specific and strictly limited purpose of (a) preserving our national independence by recovering our federal government from the international vermin who have stealthily captured it, and (b) restoring as rapidly as may be

--and that will be over a period of more than a decade--our Constitutional government that those vermin have all but totally subverted. As a *practical* imperative, all other purposes, however passionately important they may be to us personally, must be recognized as secondary and even irrelevant, so far as the cause in which we must unite is concerned.

Our problem, I grant, is far more complex and delicate than that which confronted our forefathers. Their opponents were men who frankly and honorably declared themselves and disdained disguise. Our enemies are secret criminals whose principal weapon has always been deceit, dissimulation, and stealthy subversion. But our problem, surely, is not beyond the power of reason. And we should derive a stimulus to use it from the consideration that we have much more at stake than did our forefathers.

Who Is The Enemy?

Every one of us who tries to calculate our chances of victory must be continually astonished, and not infrequently dismayed, by the fantastic fact that what should be our greatest strength is also our greatest weakness. We have so indulged our human propensities to sentimentality and emotionalism, and we have been so subtly conditioned to fear shibboleths and bugaboos, that we squander in acrimonious debate over conjectures the energies which, if rationally directed, could save us from annihilation.

Our enemy is the International Communist Conspiracy. Of that, there can be no possible doubt. Every time the fetid nest of vermin in Washington spends our money and (usually) the lives of American soldiers to enslave and barbarize another country, that country is invariably handed over to Communists -- never to Fabian Socialists, Illuminati, or similar groups. East

Germany, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, China, Cuba, and the many others are all obviously and notoriously *Communist* provinces. And it is perfectly obvious that what the nest is preparing for the United States, through "civil rights," disarmament, and the like, is a *Communist* regime.

Although the Conspiracy is secret, we have learned a great deal about it by (a) studying its operations, and (b) utilizing the testimony of defectors from the Conspiracy and of our own counter-espionage agents who were able to penetrate some distance into the organization. The information thus obtained is necessarily incomplete, and, for obvious reasons, it becomes the more scanty, the nearer we approach the Conspiracy's inner core; and fails us completely before we reach that core.

The information that we have is sufficient to give us a good working knowledge of the general structure of the Conspiracy, although, of course, there are a great many details and possibly some very important elements about which we urgently need to know more.

Only the most naive persons today are puzzled by the operations of what is the lowest level in the Conspiracy (although it includes persons of great social or political prominence). The Conspiracy, engaged in total subversion, naturally finds and exploits all the weaknesses that are inherent in our society as in all human societies. It finds, and uses as its unconscious instruments, fat-heads and dunces who can be stirred to glutinous sentimentality or a rancorous resentment of their betters. But it uses above all the criminal tendencies that always have been present in all large populations and always will be present to the utmost verge of the foreseeable future. Every large aggregation of human beings produces, by biological necessity, its sneak-thieves, robbers, shysters, "intellectuals,"

perverts, sadists, and other degenerates. As is known to everyone who has thought about it at all, the continued existence of a civilization, like that of a large city, depends on the efficiency of the sewage system that disposes of its organic waste: On this level, all that the Conspiracy has to do is stop up the sewers (which civilized societies seem naturally disposed to neglect anyway, since no one likes to think about such unpleasant necessities). By this time, we have all learned not to waste time arguing whether a given person, who is knowingly serving the Conspiracy's ends, is a member, an accomplice, a hireling, or just a petty criminal who has been given opportunity and encouragement.

The structure of the main Communist apparatus in this country is reasonably clear. There is a large number of them and, so far as is known, they operate independently of one another. The official Communist Party, the more concealed "Trotskyite" apparatus, the military and naval espionage rings directed from the various Soviet embassies, the industrial and technological espionage directed from the various consulates, and the Secret Police are all controlled directly from Moscow, and are believed to have no contact with one another in this country, except that the Secret Police watch all the others and probably supervise the transfer of talented criminals, recruited by the Party, to the more secret units. The vast crypto-Communist apparatus no longer has large cells, such as the one of which the infamous Hiss was a member; and is now so organized that no cell has more than three members and most of the criminals know the identity only of the superior from whom they receive orders. Most observers believe that this operation is handled by the Secret Police. There are other apparatus and transmission belts, some possibly of strategic importance, which *may* operate in this

country independently of the ones I have mentioned. But given the criminals' success in preventing or halting all official inquiry into their more clandestine activities in the United States, we can only speculate about the chain of command in operations that we cannot even *prove* to be Communist. Most observers would agree in identifying some of these by cogent inference from copious circumstantial evidence; about others, so little is known that competent observers differ widely in the surmises that they base on admittedly fragmentary indications; and it is quite possible that there are some whose true nature has not even been suspected.

So far as we know, however, the various Bolshevik apparatus are controlled from Moscow. Whenever we can trace their organization at all, we can follow the wires until they disappear in the massive walls of the Kremlin. (In recent years, some circuits have been rewired so that the lines from this country go to Peking; cf. *AMERICAN OPINION*, January, 1964, p. 71. That merely shows that a new exchange has been installed for operational convenience.) All observers, I believe, would agree that, so far as is known, the criminals in our country get their orders, directly or indirectly, from Moscow.

Now there are very good reasons for believing that the foul brute that is titular Boss in the Kremlin is merely a subordinate, an executive of limited powers. So long as the unspeakable thing called Stalin was alive, most (but not all) observers thought that he was the real head of the Conspiracy. Events subsequent to the death (or, perhaps, liquidation) of that monster have made it increasingly apparent to judicious observers that the organization of the Conspiracy is more complex than was once generally supposed—that the bloody beast named Khrushchev is like a "star" in a show on Broadway in that

his personal appetites and eccentricities will, within rather narrow limits, be tolerated, since he represents a considerable investment in publicity; but who can always be fired by the producers of the show, and *will be* eliminated the minute that he gets out of hand so far as to endanger the success of production. So, who are the producers?

The question may be too precipitately asked. Let us state it first in more simple terms: Who controls Khrushchev and the organizations on which his power is evidently based?

An experienced and highly qualified anti-Communist organization, which has probably penetrated as far into the Kremlin and its secrets as any human beings, summarized its findings in a report that the Honorable Timothy P. Sheehan read to the House of Representatives on August 5, 1957. (You probably never heard of it. The unanimity with which daily liepapers ignored sensational, and therefore potentially profitable, news, and the extraordinary exertions made by prominent sub-humans to avert the re-election of Congressman Sheehan, serve only, so far as prudent and rational Americans are concerned, to validate and confirm the report he communicated to Congress.)

The kernel of this long and circumstantial report is that, superior to Khrushchev and similar administrators, and superior even to the Secret Police, is another and more select organization of truly international scope, the Communist Security System (CSS), which has penetrated and controls even the Secret Police. The existence of such an inner organization was first suspected by cautious observers in 1939, when the purulent blob of anti-human protoplasm called Nicolai Yezhov was blotted out and replaced by the equally loathesome thing called Lavrenti Beria. That suspicion, however, remained hypothetical, in the eyes of most observers,

until 1953, when the ease with which the Beria-thing was in turn liquidated made it apparent to thoughtful analysts that the Secret Police, of which Beria had been the absolute and unchallenged master, must be in turn subordinate to some inner and even more secret apparatus. The CSS, as described in the report, precisely corresponds to that more secret apparatus, as its characteristics were deduced by many observers before the report was made public by a courageous and patriotic Congressman at the cost of his own political career.

Not all qualified observers find the report on the Communist Security System as convincing and cogent as I do, although I know of none who would categorically reject it. Since no member of the CSS has ever defected and confessed, the intelligence report concerning it can be corroborated only by deduction and inference from numerous, scattered, often ambiguous, and sometimes conflicting data. The most that any observer can say, therefore, is that he accepts the report's description of the CSS as highly probable, since it fits the known pattern of conspiratorial organization and provides the most comprehensive and consistent explanation thus far proposed of the facts which indicate that the Conspiracy is controlled by some inner circle.

But if the CSS is the controlling organism, we have merely pushed the ultimate question one step farther back. Who controls the CSS?

That, of course, must be the darkest and most jealously guarded secret of all. As was to be expected, the report can only state that "the guiding [i.e. controlling] members of the Communist Security System" are "fellow travelers, rich financiers, and secret Communists" whose identity is known only to themselves and the few trusted agents through whom they, as an invisible government, transmit their orders. That description suggests — even implies —

that most or all of the real directors of the Conspiracy live outside of Soviet territory. There is nothing implausible in that. Indeed, there never was any real evidence to support the gratuitous assumption that the Conspiracy's headquarters were moved to Russia after the conquest of that country in 1917.

Our Secret Enemy

Whatever hypothesis we may form concerning the inmost structure of the Communist Conspiracy, we can scarcely do other than postulate that the supreme direction must come from some supreme council which, in all probability, has not less than ten nor more than five hundred members. Whatever we may suspect, we do not know who they are; we do not know where they meet or how they communicate with one another; we do not even know what rational end (if any) they propose to themselves other than a Satanic dominion over the whole world. We only know that they must be phenomenally intelligent and unutterably evil.

Now, at the risk of laboring the obvious, we cannot too often remind ourselves that our ultimate enemies are the members of that council, *whichever* they are, *however* they work, and *whatever* their secret designs. And the International Communist Conspiracy by definition consists of the unknown members of that council and *all* of the instrumentalities and subordinate organizations that they direct. That is the conspiracy that we must defeat, at least in our own country, if we are not to perish most miserably at its hands. And I do not see how any American who has observed what has been done to his nation in recent years, and thought about it, could disagree with either the definition or a statement that only the most dedicated and united efforts of American patriots can save us from an imminent and unspeakable horror.

No reader of AMERICAN OPINION, I

AMERICAN OPINION

am sure, will be confused, even for an instant, by the semantic quibble made possible by the fact that the Communist Conspiracy is not directed by Communists, if by that term we mean persons who believe in "Marxism." The barbarous jargon and confusing twaddle of "dialectical materialism" has always been what Marx designed it to be, an elaborate deception triply useful for enlisting recruits, stultifying ignorant "intellectuals," and concealing serious purposes. On the lower levels of the Conspiracy, many members of the Communist Party believe, or pretend to believe, that drivel as an article of faith; while the more sincere and intelligent rack their brains trying to solve a set of quadratic equations that were designed to be insoluble (and eventually they either defect or get the point and move upward to the next level). We may be quite sure, I think, that anyone who attains the rank of assistant to an immediate subordinate of a branch manager, such as Castro, has left belief in "Marxism" as far behind him as belief in Santa Claus. So, unless we find an adolescent's pleasure in the paradox that Khrushchev and his kind are not Communists, we must understand that by "Communist" we mean a conscious participant in the International Conspiracy, without reference to his real or feigned reasons for participation.

Some Theories

It has long been apparent that the Communist Conspiracy was something quite different from the picture that its members tried to hold before the general public. It was clear to judicious observers a century ago that the degenerates who publicly headed or secretly financed the International were not in the least interested in the "workers" or the "proletariat" about whose "oppression" they pretended to snivel. When the Conspiracy effected its first territorial conquest in 1917, only the simple-

minded could describe as "Russian" a revolution whose leaders and executives had, almost without exception, swarmed into Russia a few months before the take-over, and had been financed from both Germany and the United States, although those two nations were technically at war with one another. And after the conquest of Russia, it was clear that the total resources of that hapless and more than decimated land were utterly inadequate to finance an international conspiracy. And although Trotsky, Lenin, Stalin, and the rest were, without doubt, viciously cunning monsters, it was extremely improbable that they had either the brains or the time to direct such a conspiracy while discharging their duties as executives in Russia and, incidentally, clawing at one another's throats.

Long ago, therefore, observers very reasonably began to look for a conspiracy behind the Soviet. The existence of such an inner or directing conspiracy was strongly suggested, as I have said, by the known facts in the history of Communism from the time of Marx to the present. It was also indicated by analogy to the structure of criminal conspiracies known to history. For example, Weishaupt's Illuminati* were organized in a set of concentric circles; all members, even those in the outer circle, were given the impression that they were "on the inside," but the members of each inner circle regarded the members of outer circles as neophytes to be prepared for more advanced work or as suckers who were useful because they could be made to believe anything. The Assassins, founded by Hasan-i-Sabbah, were similarly organized: The members of the lowest grade (*Lasiqs*) were fanatical believers in the *Koran* and Islam, while guru members of the grade next to the top (*Da'i i-Kabir*) found it difficult to

* See AMERICAN OPINION, June, 1962, pp. 33-37.

keep a straight face while talking to boobs they considered so stupid as to believe in Allah or any god.

Since it was clear that there was a conspiracy inside the outer (Marxist) shell, it was only natural that attempts should be made to identify it. Various sincere and thoughtful writers have positively identified the inner conspiracy as composed of one of the following: "Force X," Illuminati, Satanists, "Bildbergers," Zionists, Pharisees, Khazars, Fabian Socialists, International Bankers, Rockefellers, Rothschilds, or a gang of otherwise unidentified "messianic materialists." Good and authentic evidence drawn from the present or the recent past can be assembled to support each of these identifications, and it is easy to argue convincingly that each is right, provided that we can assume an extraordinary degree of stupidity or short-sighted venality in some or all of the others. And although some of the groups I have listed overlap others, or may do so, it is clear that *all* of them cannot be the *one* central conspiracy. Furthermore, we cannot assume that there are a number of *major* conspiracies independent of one another but all blithely working together today with no thought of the morrow.

Let me take as my example the "Force X," recently brought into prominence by Kenneth de Courcy in his excellent and generally reliable *Intelligence Digest*. And let me hasten to add that, although I feel confident that I recognize the entity to which Mr. de Courcy refers, I do not pretend to have at my disposal the mass of information and documentation that has presumably been assembled by Mr. de Courcy's private intelligence organization, which largely consists of former members of British Military Intelligence now stationed throughout the world as representatives of British industries or in similar capacities.

Mr. de Courcy has *not* said that

"Force X" was the inner core of the Communist Conspiracy, but many of his readers have drawn that inference from the indications that he has provided. Mr. de Courcy has described "Force X" as "basically a criminal group," which "directs the entire drug traffic of the world," high-class prostitution and homosexual rings, and many other forms of profitable crime. But he says that it "has made use of Communism," that "its power far exceeds that of Communism," that "in Russia, Trotsky, Zhdanov, Beria, and Liavinov" were its agents (as were, in Germany, "both Ludendorff and Himmler"), and that its executive head, a homosexual and necrophilic degenerate, gave advice to Stalin and now advises both Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung. Mr. de Courcy concludes that "the alliance between this person and Communism is very close, although there are fundamental clashes of aim. Neither seems to mind this at present."

It is at that point that I have my doubts. As Communist agents and fuddled fops are forever telling us, there is only one world — and, what is worse, it is less than 25,000 miles in circumference at the equator. It is much, much too small for *two* conspiracies of "One Worlders," and if, perchance, there are two, the heads of both must have realized long ago that the more successful they were, the sooner one would have to liquidate the other to escape liquidation itself. I could believe that "Force X" is subordinate to the International Communist Conspiracy, and I could believe that "Force X" is the inner core of that Conspiracy and so controls Khrushchev and similar vermin, but I cannot believe that two wolves are peacefully munching one rabbit.

Less Blood-Pressure, Please

If not two, then not three or five or ten. What we have said about "Force X"

will apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to any other conspiratorial group that we may consider in connection with the Communists. Let us, therefore, draw some conclusions.

On the basis of the information supplied by Mr. de Courcy, and on the basis of our own deductions concerning the probable structure of the Conspiracy, we recognize that "Force X" may be:

(1) An inner circle, comparable to, if not identical with, the Communist Security System.

(2) A formal arm of the Conspiracy, comparable to the official Communist Party in the United States or the Secret Police, and like them controlled from above.

(3) A large and highly organized gang of racketeers, who, like all ordinary criminals, "take the cash and let the credit go," intent only on loot today and loot tomorrow, but with no long-range plans or cosmocratic ambitions. Such a gang would naturally be encouraged and protected by the Communists, and would naturally perform services for cash fees or in exchange for protection and opportunities. (Note that China is now the principal source of the narcotics commonly used by drug-addicts, so that one of the most profitable branches of the gang's business depends on supplies from Communist territory.) This, however, would make the gang, for all practical purposes, a Communist subsidiary or instrumentality, and it could not be "more powerful" than its employers.

Those are, I think, the three most probable explanations, but others are possible, viz.:

(4) That our inferences about the Conspiracy are incorrect, and that "Force X" and the Communists really are independent in the sense that neither controls the other.

(5) That the data supplied by Mr. de Courcy are wrong, in part or in their entirety, either because his informants

were mistaken or because they were supplied with false information (a common trick in all intelligence work) or because they or Mr. de Courcy have some interest in deceiving us. Thus "Force X," as described to us, may not exist at all.

Now we may differ widely in the percentage of probability that we assign to each of those five explanations, and it will certainly do no harm to argue about them for the purpose of clarifying our own thinking and of eliciting from one another such incidental information as each of us may have that is relevant to the subject. But obviously, no one of the five hypotheses is *certainly* right or *certainly* wrong. And I trust that no one will place an extraordinary strain on his neuro-vascular system to shout at the rest of us.

Serious argument is futile when what we obviously need is more evidence. That evidence is available. A great deal must now be in the possession of various police forces throughout the United States and either has not been assembled or has been suppressed by political pressures. A vast amount of evidence was concealed when the gang around Mr. Macmillan succeeded in covering up most of the Profumo scandals, but the greater part of it is still there. In the opinion of the best informed observers, a *thorough* investigation of the activities of Bobbie Baker, and his high-ranking accomplices in the Administration, would uncover a vast cesspool of corruption necessarily connected with the one in England, because some specialists in vice and crime shuttle back and forth from one country to the other. Probably any one of the hundreds of known nests of drug-addicts, perverts, and degenerates in Washington (or others found in any other large city) would expose a trail that could be followed back to the lair of some criminal syndicate or subsidiary thereof.

What "Force X" is or is not can be ascertained only by systematic and relentless inquiry conducted with governmental powers; and while it might take a long time for such an investigation to attain certainty, every bit of additional evidence would enable us to calculate probabilities more accurately. In the meantime, you can't prove anything by waving your arms.

Horrid Hypotheses

So far as I can see, all hypotheses regarding conspiracies that may be associated with the Communist Conspiracy are in the same status as views about "Force X." The evidence comes, of course, from other sources, is of varying degrees of probability, can be reconciled with more or less difficulty with what we know or think we can deduce with some assurance concerning the Communists, and is susceptible to different ranges of alternative interpretations. In some cases religious belief will strongly affect our estimates: A formidable and powerful conspiracy of Satanists will seem likely only to those who believe in a Devil having the power to intervene, directly or indirectly, in the affairs of this world. In others, a recognition of adverse interests or inveterate antipathies is very likely to color our opinions. But we are certainly dealing with hypotheses based on inadequate data. The most probable cannot be reasonably stated as a certainty; the least probable cannot reasonably be pronounced an impossibility. To prove or disprove anything, we shall need many more facts than we now have at our disposal.

I confess that I cannot understand the extraordinary amount of passion that can be generated by violent asseverations and hysterical denunciations of theses that can be established or refuted only by ascertaining facts. Quarrels on this subject remind me of two men whom I once saw engage in a violent brawl to determine which of

two teams would win a ball game on the following day. I could not but wonder whether they imagined that their exertions would, through some sympathetic or metempsychic magic, affect the result.

Less Heat, More Light

No display of temper will change historical facts. The hair-pulling matches in which some Americans engage to vindicate their favorite hypotheses would be comic, if they were not tragic in their consequences: personal antagonisms, disruption of conservative organizations, and, quite possibly, defeat and death for all of us. I should suppose that even the most perfervid champions of antithetical hypotheses would realize, if they paused to think about it for a moment, that the only way to settle their argument—to say nothing of accomplishing something for their country—is to unite in demanding of their state and federal governments the kind of searching and unremitting inquiry into the Communist Conspiracy that we have urgently needed for fifty years and have never had.

Few Americans realize that all of our uncertainties and the futile quarrels that they occasion are directly caused by the International Communist Conspiracy's success in stifling, frustrating, or preventing official investigation. A raid, carried out jointly by the State of Michigan and Federal officers in 1922 on the headquarters of a nest of homicidal vermin disclosed evidence that should have scared every sober American as much as though a bullet had whizzed past his ear. But the net result was that a gang of subversives, headed by the malodorous Felix Frankfurter, stopped in 1925 all Federal investigation of the enemies in our midst. Nothing more was done by our Federal government, despite its obligation under the Constitution to protect us from foreign enemies, until a great American, Martin

Dies of Texas, established what became the House Committee on Un-American Activities (see his new book, *MARTIN DIES' STORY*; The Bookmailer, New York; \$5.00). Mr. Dies' committee accomplished a great deal, despite open opposition and clandestine harassment from the great War Criminal in the White House and the scabrous louts with which that being surrounded himself.

In the Senate, a valiant beginning was made by Senator McCarthy, but we all know what happened to him; and we know that all inquiry into treason in Washington was effectively stopped when Eisenhower issued his un-Constitutional order to protect the vicious vermin lodged in our government from interrogation.

Both the House and the Senate Committees have done the best that they could, I believe, in the face of enormous pressures from the criminals who had captured the Treasury of the United States and could use our money to prevent us from learning about our blood-thirsty enemies. But such inquiries were necessarily limited to the peripheral and superficial.

Some years ago, Judge Robert Morris, one of the most experienced and staunch of all Congressional investigators, in a radio broadcast, stated that *no* Congressional committee had *ever* been able to investigate subversion and treason effectively, because the investigation, whenever it began to approach the higher echelons of the Conspiracy, was stopped by "*irresistible pressures*."

Obviously, what we Americans must do, if we wish to go on living, is to generate pressures which make those that once seemed "*irresistible*" seem as puny as the waving of a cockroach's antennae.

The information is there and available in vast quantities. It is constantly and almost automatically coming to light; the trouble is that, if you read the

liepapers, you never hear of it. For example, in December of 1963, Texas Rangers, on the authority of the Attorney General of Texas, raided a criminal hang-out and discovered documents that astonished even seasoned observers. The membership of the Communist Party in Texas had been officially estimated at about five hundred. That was obviously too low, but few were prepared for the discovery of a list containing the names of *ten thousand* international criminals, members or conscious accomplices of the Conspiracy, residing in Texas. As I write, it is rumored that Earl Warren, if not soon impeached and brought to trial, will make heroic efforts to suppress that list, acting either in his capacity as Boss of the Warren Crew in the Supreme Court Building or in his capacity as chairman of Johnson's special Committee to Conceal. Whether those efforts succeed will depend on you, my fellow Americans.

Armageddon

I venture to suggest—even to urge—that we Americans suspend our vexatious *disputailerie* about conjectures and concentrate our united efforts on obtaining the basic information that we need, not merely to settle our arguments, but to survive.

I do not see how there can be a reasonable objection to that policy, with which even the most incensed should concur. We are prudent men and we therefore know that every prudent man knows that—if it happens that he is unjustly accused of a crime of which he is innocent—he cannot destroy public documents and sandbag witnesses on their way to the Grand Jury without arousing some grave suspicions that he may be less innocent than a new-born lamb on the hills of Arcadia.

We must obtain all possible information quickly, and we must be willing, as reasonable and practical men, to pay

the requisite price for it, recognizing that the primary responsibility for the demoralization of American life falls on you and me, who were too timid, too busy, or too lazy to do anything about it during the past fifty years. That means, specifically, that we must be prepared to condone and forget venial sins in public life—anything, that is, which is short of treason. We could all argue for a year, vehemently and inconclusively, about what should be a general standard of sexual morality. I hope that we would agree, however, that that standard, however much we prize it, is less important than our lives and those of our children. That question is vital, if, as informed sources in Washington assert, fifty-five Senators — a majority, mind you — are now kept in line by blackmail made possible by highly-trained and expert “call girls” operating, at the expense of American taxpayers, in collaboration with secret agents who installed concealed microphones and hidden cameras, including infra-red equipment. That, it is said, explains votes for “disarmament” and also explains the massive resistance that would be opposed to any proposal for an open and searching investigation. In the present crisis, I think it not too much to ask of even Mrs. Grundy that she look the other way for a while.

In the meantime, we certainly know enough about our enemies to attack effectively the Conspiracy on fronts that can absorb all our energies. Enough of

our enemies have exposed themselves in acts of open treason to make inquiry into their motives or antecedents a waste of time. And time is what we cannot afford to waste: We have so little of it left.

It is entirely possible that we may never be able to identify the head of the octopus, but that will matter little, if we can lop off enough of its tentacles.

I know that apocalyptic visions of cosmic disaster are usually born of disordered imaginations. I know that men tend always to exaggerate the importance of their own countries and hence of the crises of the moment. But look as I will, I cannot see a future for Western civilization anywhere in the world, if the United States is lost. What another race may do in five hundred or a thousand or ten thousand years is beyond our prevision; but the fate of human civilization as we know it depends, I fear, on what we do this year.

This is not Valley Forge: Had our forefathers lost, they would have reverted to the status of British colonies and still have enjoyed a good fortune greater than that of most of the rest of civilized mankind. This is Châlons or Tours, and the issue, quite simply, is whether the world's most hated minority, the Christian West, shall be forever obliterated by the infinite barbarism of irrational hordes. Or, to put it in less general terms, the issue is whether your children will regret having been born. ■ ■

SAINTED RELICS

■ A vase for flowers, purchased for \$27, brought the highest price among 250 items sold at an auction conducted at Valkill, for many years the home of the late Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

A “nice crowd” gathered at the cottage off Route 9G in Hyde Park where many items, once used by Mrs. Roosevelt and her husband, the late President Roosevelt, had been stored, said auctioneer Wilson Proper. Two old trunks, carved with the initials “F.D.R.” brought \$2.50 each and a third was sold for \$3.

Mr. Proper said a rosewood chair used by the President “didn’t bring \$10,” and went unsold. He also said he kept a tray that Mrs. Roosevelt had used in bed. “I couldn’t get an offer of \$2 for it,” he observed.

The sale brought less than \$300. “I just don’t understand what happened,” Proper said. “I had as many as 300 people standing out there on the lawn of the cottage at one time or another but they practically laughed in my face when I started asking reasonable prices.”—FROM THE POUGHKEEPSIE JOURNAL