

# THE BLEEDING OF AMERICA



*By Herman H. Dinsmore*

*Herman H. Dinsmore*

---

**THE  
BLEEDING  
OF AMERICA**

---

To  
Mr. and Mrs. Jan Iserberg,  
With my best wishes,  
Herman H. Dinsmore  
April 30, 1975

# ***THE BLEEDING OF AMERICA***

*by Herman H. Dinsmore*

“Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.”—George Santayana, American philosopher, in *The Life of Reason*, 1905-6. *The Bleeding of America* is written for the many millions who could not know the past in the fullness necessary for them to prevent a repetition of it.

“If men could learn from history, what lessons it might teach us! But passion and party blind our eyes, and the light which experience gives is a lantern on the stern, which shines only on the waves behind us!”—Samuel Taylor Coleridge, 1831. To passion and party must be added ignorance and the fear that comes from uncertainty; hence this book.

Copyright © 1974, by Herman H. Dinsmore  
All Rights Reserved under International and Pan-American  
Copyright Conventions

Printed in the United States of America

First Printing: September, 1974  
Second Printing: December, 1974

MOCOA PRESS

610 Cathedral Parkway 8D New York, New York 10025

# Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
PREFACE	v
CHAPTER I: <i>How To Construct An Enemy Complete With Atomic Bombs</i>	1
CHAPTER II: <i>Starting A Balance Of Power</i>	11
CHAPTER III: <i>Building A Balance Of Power</i>	23
CHAPTER IV: <i>Russia Minus United States Is Not A Going Concern</i>	39
CHAPTER V: <i>The Cliche Era: Mental Warfare Against The People</i>	57
CHAPTER VI: <i>War: The Bleeding Of America</i>	73
CHAPTER VII: <i>Revolt Against War Without Patriotism</i>	81
CHAPTER VIII: <i>Death Of The Monroe Doctrine</i>	89
POSTSCRIPT: <i>Pearl Harbor, "A Date Which Will Live In Infamy."</i>	101
EPILOGUE:	107
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY:	109
INDEX:	112

MOCOA PRESS

New York, New York

Cover figure: Laocoon, a citizen of ancient Troy, warned his countrymen against the introduction of the great wooden Trojan Horse into the country. Thereupon two powerful serpents swam across a river and attacked his two sons. When Laocoon came to their defense, the serpents killed all three. The posture of the United States is that of Laocoon. The regional map (9302.1), on which the Laocoon group is superimposed, was issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

## *Acknowledgments*

The author's debt to the many persons who, wittingly or unwittingly, contributed to the creation of this book is great, and he happily acknowledges his obligation to them. From Boston to Seattle, from Atlanta to San Francisco, from New York to Los Angeles, from Winston-Salem to San Diego, from Pittsburgh to Medford, Oregon, from Gary, Indiana, to Las Vegas, and from San Bernardino and Hemet, California to El Paso and Charleston, and many other points, those persons gave the writer "tips," books, pamphlets, the names of friends and other authors, and every encouragement to amass the materials for another book with a still larger point of view than *All The News That Fits*.

From California the writer sent a large box of books and papers to his home in New York City. After some strenuous months of speaking in many States, he rested in the east, and began collating his findings. The idea that the United States of America was under attack from some of its own citizens developed very slowly. It was not until the writer read Dr. Medford Evans' *The Secret War For The A-Bomb* that he became convinced that a true effort was under way to set up a global check upon this country—to balance off other nations against it, to prevent the winning of wars, to clip the wings of the American eagle, and prevent it from soaring at will.

The author would like to name *all* those who encouraged him, and all of the publishers who kept the manuscript for three months (each) before turning it down, in one case with only a printed rejection slip. The list would be too long. Let the reader decide who were right. But many hurrahs for those who helped. The book is presented here in a shorter form than the original. It thus becomes more available to the public.

# Preface

Knowing that most of the people cannot spend a large amount of their time searching for the facts, the author of this volume has sought to present his own findings and those of many other investigators in succinct form under the title, *The Bleeding of America*. The aim is to provide an original synthesis to show how the United States of America has been consistently thwarted and bled since the end of World War II and even during it. The writer is constantly being reminded of the wide need for this volume as he is asked, for example, "Why did we suffer more than 360,000 casualties in Indochina without invading and vanquishing North Vietnam?" Or, "What was the aim of the national news media or a particular newspaper in what appeared to be a belligerently no-victory attitude?" Or, "What *is* or who *are* behind the debasement of the dollar?"

Few persons, relative to the total, have the least notion how the Soviet Government, while unable to grow enough grain to feed its country regularly, has been capable of gaining what appears to be superiority in atomic weaponry. At the same time the Soviet Government has been building a great Navy and a large merchant fleet, and generating war and revolutions in the Far East and Middle East, in Latin America, and in Africa, while keeping Eastern Europe in thrall. The startling facts in regard to the American help given to the Soviet Government in exploding and building atomic weapons will amaze many readers, who will be reluctant to believe the facts, but confirmation is presented.

Here is a single volume listing the hands and fingers that prevented the United States from exerting the leadership that the world cried out for in 1945, and step by step this book is designed to show how America has been held back and hurt, in every way that the New World Balance could devise. It is a story that every American should know. Let him or her then make up his or her mind whether we are on the right course. This book is history, not politics. The people must know the historical truth before they can begin to determine their fate.

H.H.D. New York, N.Y. May, 1974

## CHAPTER I

# *How To Construct An Enemy Complete With Atomic Bombs*

There has been no book, known to the writer, that both explains the basic philosophy in the transfer of power from the United States to the Soviet Union and also gives details of the transference. In the Atomic Age this would begin with President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Then, after the outbreak of World War II, the United States frenetically moved vast stocks of materials—atomic, military, and industrial—blueprints, and diplomatic documents to the Russians, whose agents had a free run of this country that was matched by no other foreigners in our history. From that massive basis the transfer of power and possessions, most probably including some atomic bomb components from Los Alamos, has been consistent.

It is wrong to call this *appeasement*. Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain appeased the Nazi Germans in 1938 because Britain was weak. The United States has never been weak in relation to the Soviet Union. On the contrary the United States has always been stronger, and it saved the Russians from defeat in World War II. (The authority for that statement is the best—Joseph Stalin, who said at Teheran in 1943: "Without the United States as a source of motors, this war would have been lost."\* It was modest praise for the American help, which went far beyond motors.)

Hence the transfer of American power to the USSR has been deliberate policy, designed by some to build an enemy, and by others to trade and make money while taking the chance of developing an enemy into a friend. Those were the two prongs of United States Government policy. The persistence of the efforts to build an enemy or to make

\**America and Russia in a Changing World* by W. Averell Harriman, p. 23.

money and a friend suggest that either would be generally satisfactory; but since an enemy is what the United States got, it must be assumed that that was the more satisfactory aim of the majority of those who controlled United States policy.

That the great majority of the American people never had a clear idea of what was happening is not open to doubt, for even the most knowledgeable among them have expressed great surprise and concern over some of the facts revealed to them. On April 13, 1972, the writer spoke to the District of Columbia Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars at the Army and Navy Club in Washington, at which he told of the revelations in the book *The Secret War For The A-Bomb*, by Medford Evans, a brilliant, profound and fearless statement of the probability that atomic bombs had been stolen from Los Alamos and/or Oak Ridge and Hanford. That volume, published in Chicago in 1953, was never reviewed by the newspapers in New York, Boston or Washington. Yet two weeks after that talk, which may have been the first public expression (certainly in Washington) on the subject of atomic bomb thefts, a story in *The New York Times* offered some confirmation for Dr. Evans' strong hypothesis. (Dr. Evans was the security officer of the United States Atomic Energy Commission in the early 1950's but resigned when his security recommendations were rejected.) On April 26, 1972, *The Times* reported in a spread story the opposition of 31 scientists and other persons in the professions to the Nixon Administration's plan to build a nuclear breeder reactor for the production of electricity. The protesters questioned whether such plants would be safe, and asserted that some of the plutonium generated might be secretly "diverted"—that is, stolen—for the illegal manufacture of atomic bombs. Thus *The Times* reported the idea 19 years after Dr. Evans tried to bring the matter before all the people in his book.

Although the writer of *The Bleeding of America* was an editor on the leading newspaper in the United States for some years (whose duty it was to know every story that went into the paper every day while he was editor of the International Edition of *The Times*), he knew nothing about *The Secret War For The A-Bomb* or the ideas in it as late as 1971, 18 years after its publication, and nothing about the *Diaries* of Major George Racey Jordan until 1969, 17 years after its publication. (The *Diaries* volume was reviewed in *The New York Times* but very quietly and only in the Sunday Book Section. That book, of considerable news value, deserved more prominent treatment.) Books written by scholars and professors show a similar lack of knowledge of



current or near-current history. The many volumes written by members of the Roosevelt, Truman and other Administrations that fail to mention these works could disclose ignorance or deliberate omissions. In any case, they are sadly deficient in their aim to impart knowledge.

Here is an instance of what is meant. At the Potsdam conference of President Truman, Prime Minister Attlee of Britain, and Premier Stalin, Mr. Truman reported to Stalin on the explosion of the first atomic bomb at Alamogordo, New Mexico, July 16, 1945. Mr. Truman wrote in his *Memoirs*, page 416, Vol. I:

"At Potsdam, as elsewhere, the secret of the atomic bomb was kept closely guarded. We did not extend the very small circle of Americans who knew about it. Churchill naturally knew about the atomic bomb project from its very beginning, because it had involved the pooling of British and American technical skill.

"On July 24 I casually mentioned to Stalin that we had a new weapon of unusual destructive force. The Russian Premier showed no special interest. All he said was that he was glad to hear it and hoped we would make 'good use of it against the Japanese.' "

Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, who was present at that conference, reported in his book, *Speaking Frankly*, page 263,\* on Mr. Truman's colloquy with Stalin:

"Stalin's only reply was to say that he was glad to hear of the bomb and he hoped we would use it. I was surprised at Stalin's lack of interest. I concluded that he had not grasped the importance of the discovery. I thought that the following day he would ask for more information about it. *He did not.*" (emphasis added.)

Both the President and Secretary of State of the United States apparently did not know that the United States had shipped enormous amounts of atomic-bomb-making materials (nearly 23 million pounds by 1944) to the Soviet Union and that the Manhattan Project and State Department were honeycombed with spies and agents of the Soviet Government, who were keeping Stalin fully informed on every development. Mr. Truman's statement strongly suggests that he did indeed feel that "the secret of the atomic bomb was kept closely guarded." It was not, so far as the Russians were concerned, though the American people were totally in the dark about it. Mr. Byrnes' words indicate that, since he felt that Stalin did not understand the importance of the discovery, the Soviet Premier did not know what was going on. Major Jordan wrote that Stalin probably knew more about the bomb than Truman and Byrnes together.

\* *Speaking Frankly* by James F. Byrnes. 1947. Harper & Brothers, New York, N.Y.

## THE BLEEDING OF AMERICA

This is a remarkable instance of misinformation or a lack of knowledge at the top, for we know now that the Russians were desperately anxious to get every scrap of information and material as regards the atomic bomb from the United States from as early as 1942, and that the Lend-Lease Administrator of the United States, Harry Hopkins, strongly supported by President Roosevelt, was just as eager to give "all" to the Russians.

Charles E. Bohlen, who was the interpreter for President Truman at Potsdam, looked on as Mr. Truman told Stalin through another interpreter, Stalin's V.N. Pavlov, about the bomb. Mr. Bohlen wrote in his book, *Witness to History*, page 237, that it seemed to him that the President did not say to Stalin that the weapon exploded was an atomic bomb, and that, in any case, the Soviet Premier showed no great interest. Bohlen said he looked intently at Stalin's face as the President spoke to him, and that so unresponsive was the Russian leader that a question rose in Bohlen's mind whether Stalin grasped what the President was telling him. But, the American diplomat remarked, he (Bohlen) ought not to have been deceived, because some years later Marshal Georgi K. Zhukov disclosed in his memoirs that Stalin on that same night had ordered a message sent to the Russians working to build an atomic bomb that they should hurry up about it.

Mr. Bohlen, a perceptive American, was one of the most astute diplomats ever sent to the Soviet Union by the United States. His book is one of the guideposts for fellow citizens, though he knew relatively little about the enormous build-up of the Soviet Union to establish a balance of power against the country for which he worked so hard and well within the limitations of his position.\*

The onset of the Atomic Age has caused a great disturbance not only in the ways of statesmen, but in scholars, newspaper men, and radio and television observers and commentators. The objectivity that we have lived by has been widely discarded, in favor of an artificial body of information (sometimes made up out of the whole cloth) in the hope that something will turn up to make the deception unnecessary. And there is one still more frightening thought. It is that this kind of thing cannot work in a free country. As it stands now, however, much of the nation, except for special pockets of resistance and enlightenment, lives in a kind of blackout. Will it be deemed necessary to extend this to the entire country, or will the whole land become enlightened? That is the kind of unthinkable thought that Senator J.W. Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, did not have in mind when he asked that we think un-

\* *Witness To History* by Charles E. Bohlen. 562 pp. 1973. W.W. Norton & Co., New York.

thinkable thoughts.

It is entirely possible that Mr. Truman, while he was Vice President under President Roosevelt, and Mr. Byrnes were not informed about the vast shipments of atomic materials and documents to the Russians from 1942. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, who was in command of the Manhattan Project, which made the atomic bomb, was not informed of those shipments until they came to his attention through Major Jordan in 1949. (President Roosevelt did little to groom Mr. Truman for the Presidency.) We still do not know the whole story because many of the documents—those which were not sent to Russia—are classified in Washington: that is to say, kept under lock and key. *That* part of the atomic bomb story is indeed a “closely guarded” secret, in the United States.

Those of us who in our adult years lived through the phases in the reduction of the power of the United States vis-a-vis the Soviet Government did so in stunned disbelief at what was being made to happen to the strongest and best-natured country on earth, but we know that others, like this writer, had no real grasp of what was happening. The pitfalls of current history are many, even for the best-informed person who makes a great effort to find answers, but when a deliberate effort is made to confuse and confound, the resulting chaos can provide a large cover for strange behavior on the part of the communications media in domestic as well as foreign affairs. The victimized Americans (and, of course, others) will not know for years what hit them, though now gradually the truth is becoming known.

The steps followed to construct an enemy complete with atomic bombs in order to create a balance of power against the United States, while bleeding it and its Allies, were as follows:

1. Make the U.S.S.R. an atomic power by supplying United States atomic-bomb-making materials in the millions of pounds during World War II, and afterward probably component parts of atomic bombs themselves.

2. Build up the Soviet Union industrially to help make it the equal of the United States. This was done even while the U.S.S.R. was fighting the U.S. in Korea and Vietnam, was expanding into Cuba, where at one point it threatened atomic warfare, and gaining other footholds in Asian, African and American hemisphere countries, such as Chile, which has now been regained for freedom.

3. Permit the Soviet Government to take over Eastern Europe, including Poland, the very country over which the Second World War broke out.

4. Hand China over to the Communists.

5. Encourage "national liberation" movements everywhere.

6. Fight no-win wars. That guarantees the **non**-expansion of freedom.

7. Permit the Communists to dominate the United Nations in order to prevent it from being a peace-keeping organization—a situation that makes the Russians jolly happy.

8. Encourage every kind of violence and confusion, as Americans die in faraway lands, in order to prevent the American people from thinking straight.

9. Deliberately hand over Cuba to the Communists, and never mind that Cuba's living standards were probably the second highest in Latin America, after Venezuela. This was done to set up another badgering agency against the United States—against American will power and stability.

10. Plan to hand over the Panama Canal to Soviet puppets in order to keep the citizens of the United States thoroughly confused and frustrated.

At the same time no move has been made to get the Russians to give up any secrets, or territory, or to live in conformity with the United Nations Charter, and the Soviet regime has shown itself to be as secretive as possible, following in this respect the practices of the Russians from ancient times. Stalin often said, "I am an Asiatic," suggesting a Russian *Drang nach Osten*—an urge to the east, while keeping the Europeans at arm's length. But the appearance of the atomic bomb and rockets to carry it to the four corners of the earth have changed Soviet policy, except that much of the groundwork laid down by Stalin remains in place.

Whenever one points out that 90 to 95 percent of Russia's industry and technology were provided by the West, chiefly the United States, it is observed in rebuttal that the Soviet Union was the first to put a satellite (the Sputnik) into space in 1957. Scientists and technologists generally agree that this was not very difficult, though it was a sensational feat. At that time the Russians had a greater amount of thrust power because Stalin saw from the beginning that, if atomic bombs were to become the great new weapon that they promised to be, the Russians would have to have the power to deliver them upon the United

States—that is, have the *power* to do so, if only for blackmail purposes. Hence he ordered the Russians, with all the foreign help they had and could get, to develop a rocket that would have the capability of hurling the bomb 5,000 miles and more. So for some years the Russians actually had greater rocket thrust ability than the United States—a situation that might have suggested to many persons that the Russians possessed greater total strength than the Americans. (That Stalin received strong help in rocketry from outside the Soviet Union is not only possible but a certainty.)

On November 25, 1971, the Associated Press sent out a dispatch from London reporting that a Soviet space engineer who had defected in England made a startling charge in a book published in Britain on that day. He asserted that “Moscow’s space program is a gigantic bluff covering bad workmanship and technical inadequacy.” The news media in New York and no doubt in many other parts of the country did not publish the dispatch. Why? Because the same sources that had helped so much to build up the Soviet Union were not going to tear it down by publishing that unfavorable piece of information. That AP dispatch said:

“Leonard Vladimirov, a Soviet engineer and journalist, who defected while on a visit to Britain in 1966, said the Soviet space program originally began (in 1957) as a series of publicity stunts.

“In his book, *The Russian Bluff*, Vladimirov said these stunts were aimed at persuading the West that the Soviets had reached a high level of advanced technology comparable with that of the United States. Vladimirov’s book describes political pressures and frustrations under which Soviet scientists and technologists work, always separated by security barriers. [Inside a Soviet factory or plant, the writer was escorted from one door to another, with each door of each room being unlocked and then locked again. Reporters and others on one Moscow newspaper in 1972 had to take their typewriters to a closet where they were locked up for the weekend.]

“Vladimirov said the West has always overrated Soviet strength in space because of early Soviet successes.

“Russia knew a long time ago that she could not beat America to the moon because she cannot build a moon rocket,” he said. “Even today the Soviet Union cannot produce any significantly big jet nozzles.”

“Such nozzles, said Vladimirov, are essential to launch a manned moon flight. Vladimirov said that two-and three-men Soviet flights of the Voskhod series of the mid 1960’s were short because the capsules were overloaded. He said the Voskhod spacecraft really were the older

Vostok type with some equipment removed. Last-minute patching up of the modifications was a disgrace to engineering, he said."

Is there any earthly or lunar reason why an American newspaper should not publish that? None except the reason already given. As a matter of fact, this is a fairly ripe piece of news that deserves a place on the front page. It would not make Americans over-confident; it is doubtful that anything today will. They would digest it, and eventually get it and the Soviet Union into perspective. But, again, that is not at all the plan.\*

In regard to perspective, Dr. Antony C. Sutton, the greatest authority on Western industrial and technological assistance to the Soviet Union, wrote the following in a letter to the author:

"In sum, the Soviets have great technical ingenuity and were working on atomic energy almost before the West. They published a number of key articles in the 1930's. They still have great technical ingenuity. However, they lack the technical *ability* to convert this scientific endeavor to practical technical systems—that's where Western technical assistance comes in. It enables them to convert their extraordinary scientific abilities to practical usable systems."

The massive amount of the transfers of industrial equipment and technological expertise that has been made to the Soviet Union decade after decade ever since the Soviet regime was founded indicates the gap between what freedom produces and what the Russian system known as Communism can turn out. And the eagerness with which those persons in control of the destinies of the United States have embraced the opportunities to serve the Soviets in this way indicates more than a desire to make money. The great weight of the evidence in this volume will show that the aim of the manipulators of our national and in-

\* ACCURACY IN MEDIA, INC. reported in its *AIM Report* of August-September, 1973, that "*Jane's Fighting Ships* Declares Soviet Navy Most Powerful In World, But New York Times Keeps This News From Its Readers." This is identical with the deliberate omission of the news about the Soviet space bluff. In one case the Soviet Union was characterized as too weak to suit *The New York Times*; in the other case the Soviet Union was portrayed as too strong to suit the New York paper and its 362 client papers.

AIM made this report:

"On July 26 (1973), The Baltimore Sun carried a front page story under this headline: SOVIET NAVY IS STRONGEST, JANE'S SAYS.

"The story continued:

One of the world's leading authorities on naval power says the Soviet Navy with its own air arm and a greater range of submarines is now the most powerful navy in the world. Capt. John Moore, editor of *Jane's Fighting Ships*, writes in his first foreword as editor to the 1972-73 edition of the most authoritative annual on the world's navies, that the Soviet Navy had made 'staggering advances' in the last year.

"This report was top news by any standard. The Baltimore Sun story came from an AP London dispatch. The UPI sent a lengthy story about the startling assessment of Russian naval strength. It was front page news in *El Universal*, in Mexico City. . . .

"The New York Times, which boasts that it carries 'all the news that's fit to print,' told its readers absolutely nothing about this disturbing news out of London! Why???" The Times refused to explain the omission to AIM.

ternational destiny is control of the nations through balances of power and through other internal checks and restraints upon the nations.

That a conspiracy is and has been afoot for years is not open to doubt, but that it is sure of its work every inch of the way and will succeed in setting up a world government, which it would also control, is open to doubt. There are dangers in the conspiracy theory, to be sure; yet it is naive to believe that the great bankers and industrialists of the United States and Europe have no understanding among themselves as to what they do to expand and control their fiscal and industrial empires. Unfortunately, only the tips of the icebergs have been seen. There are no minutes of the meetings of the Bilderbergers, the Pugwash gatherings, and other secret meetings of international persons. We can, however, clearly chart the course of the United States in relation to the Soviet Government by what has happened, knowing, then, that it was made to happen.

For instance, it is not widely known that fifty top United States military intelligence officers, all with the rank of colonel or above, recommended that the Government should seek to discourage the Soviet Government from entering the Asian phase of the World War. It is charged that Gen. George C. Marshall, then Chief of Staff, ignored the farsighted recommendation, dated April 12, 1945, which read as follows:

The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic war would be a political event of world shaking importance, the ill effect of which would be felt for decades to come. Its military significance at this stage of the war would be relatively unimportant. . . . The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic war would destroy America's position in Asia quite as effectively as our position is now destroyed in Europe east of the Elbe and beyond the Adriatic.

If Russia enters the Asiatic war, China will certainly lose her independence, to become the Poland of Asia; Korea, the Asiatic Rumania; Manchuria, the Soviet Bulgaria. Whether more than a nominal China would exist after the impact of the Russian armies is felt is very doubtful. Chiang may well have to depart and a Chinese Soviet government may be installed in Nanking which we would have to recognize.

To take a line of action which would save few lives now, and only a little time—at an unpredictable cost in lives, treasure, and

honor in the future—and simultaneously would make the Atlantic Charter and our hopes for world peace a tragic farce. Under no circumstances should we pay the Soviet Union to destroy China. This would certainly injure the material and moral position of the United States in Asia.

Yet even after Russia entered the war, five days before it ended with the surrender of Japan, the Chinese Nationalist Government remained in being, and could have been maintained with even a modicum of help from the United States. Strangely, it was General Marshall himself who arranged the destruction of the Nationalist Government on the mainland, and virtually assured that the dire predictions of his intelligence officers would come true, in large part. It is now generally agreed in the free world that the transfer of China to the Communists was a catastrophic mistake.



## CHAPTER II

# *Starting A Balance Of Power*

*Franklin Delano Roosevelt: "In politics nothing happens by accident. If it happens, you can bet it was planned that way."*

*Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield: "Man is not the creature of circumstances. Circumstances are the creatures of men."*

During and after World War II the machinery was put in motion in the United States to set up a great balance of power against it—an action without parallel in the annals of nations. From time immemorial governments and leaders have sought balances that distributed power in such a manner as to protect, not menace, the country that sought a balance. In this case persons and forces within the United States sought and gained a "balance" that was so close to giving the Soviet Government a preponderance of power that many specialists in arms declared that the Soviet Union had received superiority, if not supremacy, in nuclear weapons.

In all the history of the pursuit of a balance of power there is no precedent for the deliberate self-stripping of a nation, such as was done by the United States, in order to give another country the power or the semblance of power to establish a balance. It is just possible that the United States cannot make Russia strong enough, at least in the immediate future, for her to undertake the conquest of the world or the complete reduction of the United States in pursuit of such an aim. This is food for thought—and satisfaction, despite the enormity of what has been done by Americans, the Government itself, and a large coterie of

foreign allies inside and outside of the country.\*

As this is written, the United States is building the largest truck-manufacturing plant in the world in the Soviet Union. That should be a large step toward making it at last the strongest power in the world—at least on the face of it. Its menacing power should then be such as to justify other large measures of ostensible appeasement, buildup really, by the United States Government to force the American people to accept a coalition with the Russians in a world government through the United Nations. That is the declared American policy, but not the declared Russian or Soviet policy. Presumably the menacing moves and propaganda would then be turned upon the Soviet Government to force its compliance with the aims of those who are undertaking to direct the foreign affairs of the United States and of the world. (A beginning in this direction was already apparent in 1974.) It should be remembered that those persons could work only in the free countries of the world and, far more important, that all previous efforts to arrange the affairs of the world by the distribution of power, and in this case nuclear power, have resulted in wars and carnage. Contemporary efforts, including those of the Bilderbergers (Prince Bernhard and other elite members),\* and the Council on Foreign Relations offer no solid promise of world peace and unification, because those efforts are so essentially cynical and immoral, so poorly thought-out, and so reckless of America's strength and good-will, that they do not inspire the world to greatness.

Much of the United States foreign policy has been undertaken as clandestinely as possible, with as little public and even Congressional consultation as each Administration through an increasingly furtive State Department could contrive—a State Department greatly deprived of security checks. While foreigners have been invited to participate in the formation of American foreign policy, and Americans have journeyed to Moscow for that purpose, the American public has often not even been told what the basis of American foreign policy was and is.

After World War II the Soviet Union emerged, and was helped to emerge, as a super power. Stalin's strategy of moving toward hegemony over Europe and Asia was put into effect as he realized the factitious weakness and real confusion of the West, which his emissaries and allies in the United States and other countries kept him well informed

\* See *National Suicide: Military Aid to the Soviet Union*, by Antony C. Sutton, 1973. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801.

\* See note at end of chapter.

of, and which they helped to manufacture. He knew that he had powerful friends in the United States who assisted him above and beyond the call of duty during the great war. The Truman Doctrine did not contain in East Europe, and it was never meant to contain China as a non-Communist power. Moreover, after the gift of China to the Communists, the Doctrine was sufficiently relaxed to bring on the Korean War, which the United States, restrained by friends and foes in the United Nations, did not win (but also did not lose). The principle of the no-victory war, however, was established.

When Washington permitted a stalemate in the Korean War, neither the Soviet Government nor Communist China was capable of holding out against the power of the United States. Soviet Russia, which devised the war, and Communist China were not ignominiously defeated and punished; there was not even any talk of expelling the Russians from the United Nations for their flagrant violation of the Charter, but by that time it had become obvious to all that the Soviet Government never had any intention of abiding by the Charter and that the other nations never had a real desire to uphold it. (In Vietnam the Communists sought to push the no-victory attitude of the United States one step farther—namely, defeat. Their allies in America pressed this aim with the cry that the domino theory was fallacious. The truth is it was all too sound, since the defeat of the United States after such a long war—the longest in its history—with millions of casualties, counting those on both sides (more than 360,000 American casualties)—such a defeat could deeply divide and confuse the nation and the world.)

The principle of the no-win war was a most convenient tool for Communist expansion, but it was only an extension and continuation of the policy underlying all American and free-world actions and inactions—namely, not to contest too strongly, when at all, the expansion of Communist power. The refusal of the United States and its Allies in the United Nations to win the war in Korea demolishes the theory—and the excuse—that Russia might then have used her atomic power against us, since such atomic power as she then had was of a dubious nature (as will be explained in some detail later in this volume), and, in any case, it in no way matched American atomic power at that time. In brief, the balance of power was deliberately set up by transferring power to the Soviet Union. The decisive defeat of Russia and Communist China in Korea would have had the most salubrious results for the United States and world freedom, but that was not the plan.

The Allied, or United Nations, aim in the Korean War was political, rather than military, but it had no solid base since the United Nations

was not united but divided—riddled with treason, it might be said (as it had been from the start), because the Russians were actually using the United Nations to syphon off war information—battle knowledge—to apply in the fight against the United Nations troops in Korea. Knowledge of this was crystal clear in Washington, though President Truman was surrounded by men who would hardly have urged him to take strong action, and some of them undoubtedly withheld information from him. Mr. Truman only reluctantly came to believe that Alger Hiss betrayed his country. He never did come to understand the perfidy of others—Harry Dexter White, for example. The government that started the Korean War and continued it to its inconclusive end was the Soviet Government, which was a most active member of the United Nations except in the size of its dues and its abstention from the payment of assessments. The Russians did everything they could to test the will of the West to expel them from the United Nations. They learned that there was no limit that they could not successfully exceed.

The present balance of power against the United States began with Lend-Lease to America's Allies during World War II. Dr. Anthony Kubek in his powerful and scholarly work, *How The Far East Was Lost* (Henry Regnery Co., 1963) points this beginning. He noted that, during World War II, President Roosevelt ordered all United States agencies to press the shipment of supplies to the Russians ahead of all other considerations, and that Gen. John R. Deane had said that "the measure taken by the President was one of the most important decisions of the war . . . it was the beginning of a policy of appeasement from which we are still suffering." Dr. Kubek also noted that during the war, "with the enthusiastic help of Harry Hopkins," the Lend-Lease Administrator, the United States shipped "millions of pounds of atomic bomb materials" to the Soviet Union.\*

Dr. Kubek recalled that in 1942 Dr. Nicholas J. Spykman of Yale University published a book, *America's Strategy in World Politics: The United States and the Balance of Power* (Harcourt, Brace, New York). Dr. Spykman urged a wise balance, saying, "A Russian state from the Urals to the North Sea can be no great improvement over a German state from the North Sea to the Urals." He felt, also, that the whole balance in the Far East should not be upset.

But other persons, far more powerful, in the United States had wholly different ideas about the new balance of power, which was to be created not for the protection of the United States, but against it in order to weaken it vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in Europe, and Com-

\* *How The Far East Was Lost*, pp. 45-47.

munist China in the Far East. Other parts of the excerpt from *How The Far East Was Lost* show how the build-up of Soviet military and industrial might by the United States was begun and continued at great sacrifice. Dr. Kubek at one point cited the testimony of Major George Racey Jordan in regard to the shipment of atomic-bomb making materials to the Soviet Union during World War II. Major Jordan wrote a sensationally important book, *From Major Jordan's Diaries* (Harcourt, Brace—New York, 1952), which created little stir in the eastern part of the country but received a spine-tingling review in the *Chicago Tribune*, Sept. 14, 1952, written by Walter Trohan. Here is a paragraph from it:

“It is a tale surpassing belief and one to make shivers race up and down the spine in contemplating the threat of World War III. The diaries of Major Jordan present an astounding account of arrogant Soviet connivance and of blind American trust, with ominous overtones of treason.”

One wonders why other reviewers were not equally disturbed, instead of brushing off this work as questionable. The truth is that up to that time (1952) and beyond (probably close to 1970 and in some important cases beyond that) the atomic bomb had been made completely undiscussable by the left-wing national news media, which were building up the Soviet Union for all they were worth. Major Jordan received no Pulitzer Prize or George Polk Memorial Award (either from Long Island University or the Overseas Press Club of America) or any other public encomium for his devotion to the interests of the United States. Nor did the newspapers compete for the rights to publish his book in daily installments so that the public would be widely informed of the existence and contents of this noble work. In brief, the Diaries, of immense importance to all of us, failed to make any impact upon the nation. Major Jordan's only reward from the United States Government for his eagerness to check on what was being shipped by air to the Soviets through Great Falls, Mont., was removal from that post.

Major Jordan made a meticulous and extensive record of United States shipments to the Russians, because he believed that eventually there would be a scandal about them. He knew nothing about the Manhattan Project, or uranium, or any of the plans of the United States to create an atomic bomb, but he was a bulldog American, with great self-respect and boundless loyalty to his country, and he came out of his experiences at Newark, N.J. Airport, the air base at Great Falls, Mont., and visits to Alaska and the Soviet Union with a

broad knowledge of what the United States was giving to the Russians.

While President Roosevelt had promised to give them "almost everything they want," Harry Hopkins went a step further at a Madison Square Garden Russian Aid Rally in New York in June, 1942, when he said, "We are determined that nothing shall stop us from sharing with you all that we have." When an American Airlines passenger plane brushed against a medium bomber to be delivered to Russia and slightly damaged it at Newark Airport in May, 1942, the Russian officers there were outraged. They complained to Washington, and every aviation company was ordered to cease activities at the Newark Airport for the duration of the war. Major Jordan wrote in his book that he had to pinch himself "to make sure that we Americans, and not the Russians, were the donors of Lend-Lease." He then decided to start a diary.

He noted that he "felt a foreboding that one day there would be a thorough investigation of Russian Lend-Lease." The most complete study that has been made of Lend-Lease and other transfers of power to the Soviet Union is the very excellent work of Dr. Antony C. Sutton, *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*, published by the Hoover Institution Press of Stanford University in three volumes—1968, 1971, and 1973. The first two volumes drew a nearly complete blank in the American news media, with only two reviews in newspapers—the *Phoenix Arizona Republic* and the *Indianapolis News*. Major Jordan's *Diaries* and his earlier forerunning statements in 1949 did excite some Congressional interest, but the testimony of Gen. Leslie R. Groves, who had been in command of the Manhattan Project, tended to throw down Jordan's first appearances on the public scene, simply because General Groves did not himself know about the *large* lend-lease atomic material deliveries to Russia. The General, however, had been thoroughly in sympathy with the idea of preventing the Soviet Union from obtaining the bomb, but by the time he publicly expressed such a view it was much too late. The compartmenting in Washington of knowledge on who was doing what during the war was rather complete.

We learn from the *Diaries* that as early as 1942 the Russians were gathering from the United States the material to build an atomic reactor. Major Jordan gave a list of some of these materials, adding that he had not included it in "the millions of dollars' worth of mining, ore-crushing, and construction equipment" sent to Russia, and that informed readers might also find materials that could be used in the hydrogen bomb in other lists. He gave this itemized list:

Item	Quantity (in pounds)	Cost in dollars
<b>ATOMIC MATERIALS</b>		
Beryllium metals	9,681	10,874
Cadmium alloys	72,535	70,029
Cadmium metals	834,989	781,466
Cobalt & concentrate	33,600	49,782
Cobalt metal & cobalt-bearing scrap	806,941	1,190,774
Uranium metal	2.2	(No price given)
Aluminum tubes	13,766,472	13,041,152
Graphite, natural, flake, lump or chip	7,384,282	812,437
Beryllium salts & compounds	228	775
Cadmium oxide	2,100	3,080
Cadmium salts & compounds n.e.s.	2	19
Cadmium sulphate	2,170	1,374
Cadmium sulphide	16,823	17,380
Cobalt nitrate	51	48
Cobalt oxide	17,800	34,832
Cobalt salts and compounds n.e.s.	11,475	7,112
Cobaltic & cobaltous sulfate	22	25
Deuterium oxide (heavy water)	1,100 grams	—
Thorium salts & compounds	25,352	32,580
Uranium nitrate	500	
Uranium nitrate (UO <sub>2</sub> )	220	
Uranium oxide	500	
Uranium, urano-uranic oxide (U308)	200	
n.e.s. stands for "not especially specified"		

The total weight of the materials in this incomplete list is nearly 23 million pounds, and it must be remembered that Major Jordan was relieved of his post in June of 1944, so that he was not able to disclose to the American people how much the grand total was. Since then the build-up of the Soviet Union has been continuous, with Lend-Lease and the Pipeline going on until 1949, and trading with Russia succeeding that.

Finally fed up with the regular violation of United States immigration and customs laws at Great Falls, Jordan went to Washington with the concurrence of Col. George F. O'Neill, security officer at Gore Field. He had a rude reception, which spelled the beginning of the end

of his assignment at Great Falls, Mont. After being shunted from one office to another he finally arrived at that of John N. Hazard, who was the State Department liaison officer for Lend-Lease. Mr. Hazard sent out a young assistant to see Major Jordan. Here is the ominous insolence with which the young man greeted an officer who was fulfilling his difficult tasks above and beyond the call of duty:

“Major Jordan,” he began, “we know all about you, and why you are here. You might as well understand that officers who get too officious are likely to find themselves on an island somewhere in the South Seas.”

With natural anger, I retorted that I didn't think the State Department had any idea how flagrant abuses were at Great Falls. I said we had virtually no censorship, or immigration or customs inspection. Crowds of Russians were coming in of whom we had no record. Photostats of military reports from American attaches in Moscow were being returned to the Kremlin. Planeloads of suitcases, filled with confidential data, were passing every three weeks without inspection, under the guise of “diplomatic immunity.”

“But my dear Major,” I was admonished with a jaunty wave of the hand, “we know all about that. The Russians can't do anything, or send anything out of this country, without our knowledge and consent. They have to apply to the State Department for everything. I assure you the Department knows exactly what it is doing. Good afternoon.”

That establishes exactly what President Roosevelt had said. If it happens, you can bet it was planned that way. But the tenacious and patriotic Major was not bowled over. He bided his time. When in May, 1949, the nation was in a dither over the loss of an ounce of U-235, lost or stolen from the Argonne Laboratory, he took to the radio with the help of Fulton Lewis Jr., later appeared before a congressional Committee, and then published his *Diaries*. Who will live longer in history and in the hearts of his countrymen, Major Jordan or the men who refused to do anything about the abuses of our country, its hospitality and its laws? The major said he had “been shocked at the efforts of the character assassins and press experts to keep the implications of this story from being brought into proper focus,” but that “clouds of witnesses” had come to his defense. Among those who vouched for his fine character, integrity and loyalty were Col. William



L. Rich, who urged him to publish his diaries; Roscoe Turner, the great flier; Col. Harrison D. Blair, Paul R. Berryman, John Frank Stevens, Col. Theodore S. Watson, and many others.

It never ceases to surprise this writer that a person can be riding the wave of the present beautifully, but suddenly, because he or she refuses to do something that violates every canon of his faith and loyalty, he becomes a virtual outcast until he can rally sufficient support to justify himself. As long as there is freedom there is hope. Major Jordan did not live to enjoy the honors and esteem that are quietly and widely being given to him today.

While no newspapers, radio stations or television newsgatherers sought to check and confirm the Jordan facts and figures in Washington, and thus establish the truth or falsity of this vitally important matter, Dr. Sutton journeyed from California to the national capital for this purpose. In a letter to the writer in 1971,\* he wrote:

“Some years back I started with Jordan’s data and attempted to run down the original Lend-Lease invoices to check out his figures. On the assumption that if he was right on, say, half a dozen figures—i.e., they tallied with the original official invoices—then we could accept Jordan’s material. I had a job to get official Washington to find the invoices. With Congressional help I did it. Later I made a sample check and found that Jordan’s data checks with the originals. *However*, there is still a vast amount of work to be done. Further, the key high-level documents are not declassified.”

What is the stated United States policy in the matter of building up the Soviet Union? Although it had been pursued in the Atomic Age from the beginning, it remained for Walt Whitman Rostow to codify it. He was the chairman of the policy planning staff of the State Department in the Kennedy Administration. He prepared a foreign policy paper for President Kennedy which was revealed and summarized by Willard Edwards of the *Chicago Tribune* in June, 1962, as follows in part:

“Rising tensions or the pleas of our allies or of the American public must be ignored in any crisis with Russia. The temptation must be avoided to prolong or expand any crisis in an effort to degrade or embarrass the Soviets in the eyes of the world.

“Gentle treatment of the satellite nations is advocated. No official attacks should be made against their regimes, whatever the provocation, and even criticism should be softened. Western Europe, at the same time, must be encouraged to closer relationship with the

\* Permission given for the quotation.

satellites and urged to furnish aid to them.

"Above all, no encouragement or support must be given to armed uprisings in eastern Europe."

That would leave the rest of the world fair game for the Communists, while we were—and are—barred from interfering in their internal affairs or doing anything to embarrass them. But Mr. Rostow went even further in the arrogant policy that would ignore "the American public" in any crisis with Russia and tie the hands of the United States (isn't the American public what this nation is all about?); he advocated the end of the United States nationhood, thus:

"It is a legitimate national objective to remove from all nations—including the U.S.—the right to use substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this residual right is the root of national sovereignty and the basis for the existence of an international arena of power, it is, therefore, an American interest to see an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined."

On March 30, 1971, Leonid I. Brezhnev, secretary of the Communist party and actual leader of the Soviet Government, said:

"In recognition of its international duty, the CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union) will continue to pursue a line in international affairs toward promoting the further activation of the world anti-imperialist struggle and the strengthening of the combat unity of all its participants. The total triumph of socialism the world over is inevitable, and for this triumph . . . we will fight unsparing of our strength."

That is fair warning, and nobody can say that Mr. Brezhnev has not been candid in offering a blueprint: "we will fight, unsparing of our strength" and for the "total triumph of socialism the world over," which is "inevitable." There is no word from the Russians about giving up sovereignty and nationhood, about disarming themselves to the point of eliminating "national capacity to make international war." Granted that atomic war could mean the end of the world or serious interruption of its current activities for many, many years, there is no reason to believe that the sacrifice of our nationhood and our manhood would remove the danger of some holocaust after the Moloch had been satisfied. At any rate we would no longer have any voice in our fate, for the idea that unilateral destruction of our ability to make war would make the Russian and/or Chinese Communists deal kindly with us is a dangerous fallacy. Nationhood cannot lightly be abandoned in a world of nations, but most especially in the face of those nations with large atomic bomb power and a disdainful attitude toward rule by laws.

**But, argue as we may, history tells us that a balance of power, tilted against the United States, was sought from the moment the atomic bomb was conceived.**

\* The Bilderbergers are almost totally unknown to the American people. They received their name from the hotel in the Netherlands where they first met in 1954. They are an elite group from the greatest industrial and banking countries. Prince Bernhard of Holland usually chairs the arcane conference. The members shun all publicity. Americans who attended the last gathering in 1974 included the Rockefellers, Nelson and David; Gen. Andrew J. Goodpaster, Commander of NATO FORCES IN Europe; Senators Charles Mathias of Maryland and Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota; other representatives of the Council on Foreign Relations, and Helmut Sonnenfeldt of the U.S. State Department. How much of United States foreign policy is developed by this powerful and completely secretive international gathering has never been made public. The news media make no effort to cover the meetings.

## CHAPTER III

# *Building A Balance Of Power*

*"What is the objective of the conspiracy? I think it is clear from what has occurred and is now occurring: to diminish the United States in world affairs, to weaken us militarily, to confuse our spirit with talk of surrender in the Far East and to impair our will to resist. To what end? To the end that we shall be contained and frustrated and finally fall victim to Soviet intrigue from within and Russian military might from without. Is that far-fetched? There have been many examples in history of rich and powerful states which have been corrupted from within, enfeebled and deceived until they were unable to resist aggression."—Joseph R. McCarthy in America's Retreat From Victory, p. 138. 1951. Devin-Adair and Western Islands.*

*They will swallow it.—Joseph Stalin. Circa 1937.*

*A word to the wise is enough.—Cervantes in Don Quixote.*

*You cannot learn from history if you do not know history in the first place.—H.H.D. 1971.*

*"If we were truly realistic instead of idealistic, as we appear to be, we would not permit any foreign power with which we are not firmly allied and in which we do not have absolute confidence, to make or possess atomic weapons.*

*"If such a country started to make atomic weapons we would destroy its capacity to make them before it had progressed far enough to threaten us."—Lieut. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, who was in command*

of the Manhattan Project which produced the bomb. Circa 1946. Quotation is by R. H. Shackford in the Washington Daily News of March 8, 1972, p. 2.

"Together the two [United States-Soviet arms] agreements provide for a more stable strategic balance in the next several years than would be possible if strategic arms competition continued unchecked."—President Richard M. Nixon in a message to Congress on June 13, 1972.

"In brief, all presidential administrations, from that of Woodrow Wilson to that of Richard Nixon, have followed a bipartisan foreign policy of building up the Soviet Union. This policy is censored. It is a policy of national suicide. The reasons for it are not known."—Antony C. Sutton in his brilliant volume *NATIONAL SUICIDE: Military Aid To The Soviet Union*, p. 63. 1973. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801.

The beginning of the building of a balance of power against the United States went on without the knowledge of the American people, including some of the highest officials. It is interesting that this balance was begun over possession of atomic bombs, and it became known to the public only when the struggle got out into the open. This came about through a statement by Dr. Leo Szilard, published in *The Nation* Dec. 22, 1945, pp. 718-19. Dr. Szilard as one of the sponsors of the creation of the atomic bomb had joined under the leadership of Dr. Albert Einstein in sending a letter and a memorandum to President Roosevelt in 1939. (Actually the letter written to President Roosevelt was composed by Dr. Szilard but signed by Dr. Einstein\*) Szilard was indeed immensely important in bringing about the construction of the bomb. He and Dr. Edward Teller, also a sponsor, were Hungarian *emigre* scientists who eventually came to the parting of the ways in America. Dr. Szilard was quoted in *The Nation* as follows:

"During 1943 and part of 1944 our greatest worry was the possibility that Germany would perfect an atomic bomb before the invasion of Europe. . . . In 1945, when we ceased worrying about what the Germans might do to us, we began to worry about what the Government of the United States might do to other countries."

Coming from Dr. Szilard that was a shocker. For he was saying that

\* EINSTEIN: *The Life and Times* by Ronald W. Clark, p. 555. 1971. World Publishing, New York.

as soon as the menace of Hitlerism and Nazi fury had been removed, and even before the atomic bomb had been tested and used, and considerably before Japan had been defeated, the great danger to the world was the United States. Szilard lost heart in the middle of the movement he had done so much to start but Teller pressed on to become the father of the hydrogen bomb in the '50s. Szilard's words kicked off another movement that did not end until the Russians began exploding atomic bombs, probably some of our own.\*

That is the thesis of Dr. Medford Evans in his remarkable book, *The Secret War For the A-Bomb*, which was published by the Henry Regnery Company of Chicago in 1953 after the work had been weighed by a New York publisher for several months. Dr. Evans, who received his doctorate from Yale University, writes vividly and in a most scholarly way. His work is closely reasoned, and every statement is backed up by strong supporting evidence. But the new morality in our news media asks only, Is this good for the foreign policy that we personally advocate? If we deem it not to be good, then we will not bring it to the attention of the reader, the listener or the viewer. (Let the public take notice, and seek safety in the numbers and variety of its news communications.) So Dr. Evans' great work was not brought to the attention of the public in New York, Boston or Washington, nor throughout the country by the *Saturday Review* or *Time*. But that is all the more reason for considering the findings in this volume. Only the bald will not discover it to be hair-raising.

Dr. Evans was in the early 1950's the security officer of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. When his recommendations in behalf of the protection of the components of American atomic bombs from theft were not accepted, he resigned, and wrote. It is from him that we took the quotation of Dr. Szilard, that in 1945 the United States became the big peril to the world. Freedom is a many-splendored thing outside of Hitlerian Hungary or outside of Soviet Hungary.

But Dr. Szilard carried all before him. He enlisted a great army of followers in the arts, sciences and professions and even some business men.

\* One cannot forbear at this point to note that Einstein, the father of the Atomic Age and the chief sponsor of the atomic bomb, was excluded from official participation in the Manhattan Project because he was a pacifist in the 1920's. In fact, he had renounced pacifism in the 1930's when he came to feel that it was one of the causes of the rise of Hitlerism. Yet he was asked for and he produced during the war a theoretical study of gaseous diffusion, which was an important phase of the Manhattan Project. "As a final irony," writes Ronald W. Clark in *Einstein*, p. 550, "a second memorandum which he tried to bring to Roosevelt's notice in March, 1945, included not only the suggestion that a bomb should not be dropped on Japan, but also the idea that the United States might build up an 'overwhelming superiority' vis-a-vis the Russians." Of course Einstein was advised of the work on the building of the atomic bomb, but he, one of the greatest geniuses in the history of the world, went along with the gratuitous fiction that he did not know what was going on. It is not likely that he had any idea in 1946 of the plan to build up the Soviet Government to be a balance against the United States, or that he had the faintest notion that the United States Government during the war was sending large quantities of atomic-bomb-making materials to the Russians.

Dr. Evans painstakingly, brilliantly and interestingly traces the development of this movement until it ended in the probability that a considerable number of atomic bombs were stolen from Los Alamos and/or Oak Ridge and Hanford, Wash. (There is nothing whatever wrong with *The Secret War For The A-Bomb*. With even a little publicity in the book reviews, this volume might have stirred the country to action.)

The notable dissector of foreign affairs, James Burnham, wrote the Introduction to the book. In a pellucid passage he remarked that he did not believe that either Dean Acheson, David E. Lilienthal or Thomas Finletter was or ever had been a Communist, but that it was a matter of record that all three "feared and distrusted the American monopoly of nuclear weapons, that they considered this monopoly a threat against peace and civilization, and that they wanted the United States to give up its monopoly together with its nuclear factories, its secrets, and whatever weapons were in its possession." And so, in spite of that record, "these three men—precisely these three—" were put in charge of the United States atomic project. Acheson became Secretary of State, Lilienthal chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Finletter Secretary of the Air Force.

It is noticeable that those who embraced the idea of a world in balance, with a distribution of American atomic bombs under an international authority, were generally on the left side of the political spectrum. One American who advocated a complicated world balance of power was DeWitt C. Poole, an American diplomat, former counselor in the United States Embassy in Moscow. He wrote an article, "Balance of Power," which was published in *Life* Sept. 22, 1947, pp. 76-94.\* It is apparent that he had been invited to write the piece to give the counter-view to that of "LIFE publisher Henry Luce, who spoke of an American Century—one of American dominion of world politics."\* The balance that has actually been achieved is far from that which Mr. Poole advocated, but no less unworkable.

Mr. Poole advocated a "world complex balance of power." He stated frankly that the concentration of power "at a single point," meaning in one country, meant "empire and tyranny." He said that a simple balance of power, "like the present one between the U.S. and Russia," did not serve peace. He therefore urged six or eight centers of power, comparable in strength to the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. and independent

\* Reprinted in the book *Balance of Power*, edited by Paul Seabury, p. 117. 1965. Chandler Publishing Co., San Francisco, Calif. 94105

of them. He advised a federated Europe, a strong China under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, a strong, industrialized India, a revived Moslem world, a vigorous Latin American bastion linked with Spain and Portugal, a resurgent Britain, and an African federation. He held that a complex balance of power was "the only basis on which the U.N. could ever work."

Mr. Poole saw clearly that the creation of the atomic bomb made all the difference in the power structure of the world. He said, "The Acheson-Lilienthal-Baruch proposals were nothing less than a scheme for putting the balance of power in action. Our temporary and instinctively uncomfortable monopoly of atomic power was to be shared in such a way that no single power would ever again enjoy a monopoly." And with equal clarity he noted that Russia's refusal to help set up a world atomic authority marked her as the principal enemy of such a balance of power.

Atomic fusion (the hydrogen bomb) had not in 1947 made its further complicating power appearance on the scene, but it only compounded the problems. Mr. Poole made a valiant effort to solve them with his "complex balance of power" solution. But while his suggestions look sharp in some ways in retrospect, they were not accepted because his was not the plan. His recommendation that the United States back Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists in China was eminently sensible then, and in retrospect it seems even more so. He apparently did not understand - as so many of us did not understand - that Gen. George C. Marshall had already arranged the disaster in China in 1945-46.

General Marshall received his instructions for his China Mission in December of 1945 from Alger Hiss, a Soviet agent in the State Department. That information was relayed to the writer by Robert Aura Smith, an expert on the State Department, who at the time was a member of the foreign news desk of the New York Times. He was the author of *Your Foreign Policy*, 1941, Viking, N.Y. It is convenient today to sweep many of these old problems under the rug as no longer germane or relevant to the kind of world balance of power that is being built, but that is being done before the historical truth has been established. If we are to come to our ultimate fate through the clandestine actions of manipulators, the American people are not going to know what went into their undoing. (We will return to the subject of the great disaster of handing China over to the Communists, which has already cost the United States and the other countries involved so dearly in Korea and Vietnam; but we will never understand our problems if we refuse to believe that Communists and those who



successfully used them were not involved in them.)

Mr. Poole felt that somehow the distribution of atomic power around the world might achieve what he called "a peace of freedom - an American peace." In the light of what we know has happened in the last 25 years - that is, since 1947 - that seems to be the height of wishfulness. Giving atomic bombs to ten power centers, instead of the six known to have them - the United States, Britain, the Soviet Union, France, Communist China, and now India - would reassure nobody in the world today. Against his view we must consider the realities as they appeared to other students of foreign affairs and the purposes of nations. The writer of this volume never believed that the Russians would halt their drives to expand if they were encouraged by appeasement or fear or guilt, since Russia has been expanding for more than a thousand years. And it is Russia that is expanding, not Communism, which is merely the front of ancient and modern Russia, and she is expanding through confederates and conspirators in every country in which there is a Communist party and manipulators thereof.

Look at the views of Arthur Koestler, a disillusioned former German Communist and ex-Comintern agent. He wrote in 1943, even while the war in Europe was raging, in his book *The Yogi and the Commissar*, published in 1944 by the Macmillan Company, New York, that Russia was the most vigorous expansive force in the world. He suggested that the most vulnerable points of attack would be the Middle East, the Mediterranean and the continent of Europe. He asserted that the question as to how far Stalin intended to go was "naive and meaningless." He asserted that a great power would enter contiguous and other vacuums until it met growing resistance. He asserted that appeasement would not work in the case of Russia any better than it did in the case of Nazi Germany, for an aggressor who entered a "yielding environment" was bound to bring on war through miscalculation. He warned by implication that it would be a fatal mistake not to resist Soviet expansion, and he advised that the "balance of Europe can only be restored through a revival of the values on which Western civilization is based."\*

That was written before the atomic bomb became known to mankind, but despite that, Koestler predicted the course of events with an uncanny accuracy. The strange thing is that so many thoughtful men still believe that a balance of power will prevent wars, when since the beginning of recorded history we know that a balance has done no

\* See also Virginia Cowles' *The Russian Dagger: Cold War In The Days Of The Czars*. 1969. Harper & Row, New York.

such thing. And again we remark that there is no record in history where a nation gave up enormous amounts of its own essential power in order to set up a balance with an avowed enemy, until that was done by the United States. The hope of mankind today lies in an appeal to all men to live by the precepts of justice and fair play, to respect the rights of men to worship as they please, to have a free and honest press and other mediums of communications to the people, to have fairly conducted elections among an electorate that knows what it is voting for and on, to have unreachable courts dealing justice with an even hand - to have the greatest amount of freedom of every kind commensurate with the public good. Meanwhile aggressors should be checked immediately.

But again to history. Koestler was right on target when he said that appeasement would avail nothing. Soviet Russia annexed parts of Germany, Czechoslovakia, Iran, Finland, and Rumania, all of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, Tanna-Tuva, the Japanese half of Sakhalin Island, and the Kurile Islands of Japan. (A great area of Iran around Tabriz, annexed by the Soviet Government in 1945, was relinquished in 1948.) Russia then brought about the political and physical subjugation of Outer Mongolia, Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and North Korea. Albania broke away to become a partner of Communist China. Turkey rejected a Soviet demand that she cede the provinces of Kars and Ardahan. The Soviet attack upon Greece through a "war of liberation" followed in 1947, with the Greek Communist party presenting a Liberation Front (EAM) and a Liberation Army (ELAS), forms that were followed later in Korea and Vietnam. Entirely undaunted at any time by the United States' sole possession of the atomic bomb, the Russians moved massively to install a Communist regime in China, while the United States cut off help to its natural ally, Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Nationalists. Only the wilfully blind refuse to see what was done to the United States, while the Russians did what seemed natural to them by flowing into every vacuum.

The atomic bomb is not so small a weapon of warfare as to be entirely ignored while following a course of aggression so blatant, though the Communist parties of the various countries were used as fronts and cat's-paws, and when those Communists got out of line with the Russians the penalties were swift and drastic. Since World War II the Communists in Czechoslovakia have been purged at least four times drastically, and continuously in the meantime. When the Chinese Communists failed to see eye to eye with the Russians, it was not so easy

for Leonid I. Brezhnev, Soviet Communist leader, to impose his *doctrine* upon the Chinese Communist regime, or Red China would have been overrun by the Russians long since. (The Brezhnev Doctrine sets forth the right of the Soviet Government to intervene when "Socialist countries" take actions not deemed by the Russians to be in the interest of all of them.)

The reasons for the Russians' belief that they could move without fear of restraint are sure to be found in the ensuing paragraphs in this book.

The great weight of the traditions that impel the Russians forward is graphically described in a book published as this is being written. It is a *Russian History Atlas*, done by Martin Gilbert, a Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, with the aid of Arthur Banks as cartographic consultant, published by The Macmillan Company, New York, in 1972. Once again we are indebted to the English for cultural probity and intellectual courage in the publication of this work. Nothing is omitted because of fear or appeasement or for any other reason. The years from 800 B.C. to the present are covered.

The vicissitudes of the Slavs were great as they were compressed or driven afield or subjugated by Asian nomads, Scythians, Greeks, Sarmatians, Romans, Goths, Huns, Avars, Khazars, Scandinavians and Norsemen, the Golden Horde of Mongols, the Lithuanians, Poles, and Swedes. But all the while the Slavs remained in being and sprang forward after many centuries of vassalage.

Then the Russians embarked upon their own campaigns of imperialism, which continue to this day. Communism is just another banner for the Russians—the flag under which they press forward to subjugate other peoples in the name of "Communism" and "liberation." On pages 109-112 of the volume are maps of the slave labor camps in European Russia, 1917-1936 and 1937-1957, and finally a great map of these man-made hells east of the Ural Mountains, 1918-1958. The text says:

"Among the prisoners in the camps were peasants who had resisted collectivization, Soviet citizens who had lived abroad for any length of time (esp. Jews), foreign communists who had sought refuge in Moscow, inhabitants of the border lands (eg. Poles, Koreans, Chinese) [but also Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians], religious groups, state officials suspected of 'sabotage,' artists, writers, university lecturers, and leaders of minority groups (eg. Mongols, Uzbeks, Georgians)."

That is part of the picture that Arthur Koestler said the Russians would try hard to conceal, for these camps are still there, with more than one million slave laborers, possibly two to three million, many of them political prisoners.

Lieut. Gen. Leslie R. Groves was in command of the Manhattan Project from Sept. 17, 1942, to Dec. 31, 1946. He wrote in his memoirs, *NOW IT CAN BE TOLD: The Story of the Manhattan Project* (1962, Harper & Brothers, New York) that many persons now questioned the desirability of our having created the bomb. He stated that some had even asserted the United States was "morally corrupt" for having done so. He said that, while the bomb had brought "death and destruction on a horrifying scale" when it was used on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it had ended the war and thus it had prevented still larger losses among Japanese, the Americans and the British.

Moreover, he stated that it seemed a certainty that atomic power would have been discovered somewhere in the world in the "mid-twentieth century." He believed that if the first developer had been "a power-hungry nation" it would have "dominated the world completely and immediately." Thus General Groves did not believe that any totalitarian nation that developed the atomic bomb alone among the nations of the world would have shown any haste to give it away, but on the contrary would have then and there proceeded to dominate the world "completely and immediately." Precisely. It is only of subsidiary interest that there was no big outcry in the United Kingdom demanding that the British share the atomic secrets with the Soviet Government. The secrets in possession of the French were probably promptly shared with the Russians, since Communists heavily infiltrated the French atomic program—and the truth is they heavily infiltrated the American program, all of that truth not yet known.

The Germans were far advanced toward creating an atomic bomb before World War II ended their efforts. In *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*, Vol. III, published Dec. 28, 1973, Dr. Sutton reports on the German atomic activity in the chapter, *Western Assistance to Soviet Atomic Energy*. He finds that German atomic efforts, from a scientific point of view, were not inferior to those of the United States. Moreover, he reports that the Germans were even then seeking to make a hydrogen bomb, and had conducted a number of experiments on thermonuclear fusion. So far as is publicly known, no work on the hydrogen bomb was done in the United States until after the war.

By the end of 1940 the Germans were producing a ton of uranium

metal a month (maximum). By the time the war ended they had seven isotope separation processes under consideration, two working processes and operating equipment, and they had built several sub-critical piles. The Russians captured virtually all of the German plants, metal and ores, together with related documents and most of the German scientists and technicians who were taken to Russia. Sutton asserts it would be erroneous to believe that the Russians did not obtain important atomic materials, equipment, data, and help from these seizures. He makes the point, however, that there had to be an important, and so far unrevealed, transfer of equipment and technology from the West to the Russians to enable them to create bombs. Because the Germans were not within sight of the creation of a bomb despite their progress in this field, and could not by themselves have given the Russians sufficient materials and technology to make a bomb.

On Nov. 10 to 15, 1945, President Truman met in Washington with Prime Minister Clement Attlee of Great Britain and Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada—"the three countries which possess the essential knowledge of atomic energy"—to discuss the atomic problem. They decided that the responsibility should be put "upon the whole civilized world." They recommended that the United Nations set up an atomic energy commission, where a world program should be devised. And so began the long search for world relief from atomic cares that was to end in the maelstrom of so many hopes—a Soviet veto. Stalin had remarked at about this time, "We will have to have strong nerves," meaning that the Russians would outface the West on the atomic question. He was betting on a sure thing. The arms race is a fixed race, and it has been fixed against the United States.

General Groves makes it altogether clear that a group headed by Dean Acheson, who then (1946) was Under Secretary of State, was instrumental in setting up a panel, headed by David E. Lilienthal, that drew up a plan for sharing our atomic power with the Russians. This plan, which was in fact only a report to the State Department and to the Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, was leaked to the press, thus cutting the ground from under the chief negotiator with the Soviet Union, who was Bernard Baruch. But, as it turned out, the Russians never had any intention of accepting the plan, knowing that they would get what they wanted by other means.

The report released prematurely by the State Department came to be known as the Acheson-Lilienthal Report. Its official name was *A Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy*. Despite its generosity in proposing to build atomic bomb plants in the Soviet

Union and elsewhere, it was rejected by the Russians because they wanted no part of an international system, as Mr. Baruch said. Of course, the report gave away the United States' hand, and left Mr. Baruch powerless to bargain, even if the Russians had been disposed to do so.

Dr. Evans gave a vivid explanation of and commentary on the Report in his *Secret War for the A-Bomb*. Nothing more fantastic in the history of diplomacy is known, and few men were closer to this fantasy than he. He wrote that the Acheson-Lilienthal Plan was "admirably suited to Communist purposes." He noted that it called for the "construction and operation of atomic bomb laboratories all round the world in accordance with a principle of 'strategic balance' " that would bring other nations to a position of atomic power equal to that of the United States.

The Report itself says this:

At present with Hanford, Oak Ridge, and Los Alamos situated in the United States, other nations can find no security against atomic warfare except the security that resides in our own peaceful purposes or the attempt at security that is seen in developing secret atomic enterprises of their own. Other nations which, according to their own outlook, may fear us, can develop a greater sense of security only as the (world) Atomic Development Authority locates similar dangerous operations within their borders. Once such operations and facilities have been established by the Atomic Development Authority and are being operated by that agency within other nations as well as within our own, a balance will have been established. It is not thought that the Atomic Development Authority could protect its plants by military force from the overwhelming power of the nation in which they are situated. Some United Nations military guard may be desirable. But at most it could be little more than a token. The real protection will lie in the fact that if any nation seizes the plants or the stock piles that are situated in its territory, other nations will have similar facilities and materials situated within their own borders so that the act of seizure need not place them at a disadvantage.

Thus, as Dr. Evans pointed out, Russia would be supplied with bomb plants, which she could keep and seize if she wished, while the United States could seize back the plants that it already had. A world

Atomic Development Authority would have superseded national sovereignty in atomic energy matters—obviously an event that could only take place among nations that had shown the most scrupulous regard for treaties and promises. Russia hardly fitted the description. Dr. Evans remarked that when the Russians rejected the plan “many Americans felt silly and ashamed, like a Puritan getting slapped by a demimondaine.”

Only a nation in shock could have ignored this truly brilliant work by Dr. Medford Evans, because he went on to tell of his conclusion that, if you could not give them atomic bomb plants, you could give them some of our atomic bombs. This idea was clearly in his mind before it seemed to get some reinforcement from a man who had just stepped down as President of the United States, and later from an article in *The New York Times*, reported here on an early page.

The refusal of the Russians to accept the more-than-generous American proposals for an Atomic Development Authority was a blow to David E. Lilienthal, who became chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission in 1946. He had become famous throughout the world as the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, a Government enterprise that had been brought into being by President Roosevelt in order to stimulate a great region and make use of the great Muscle Shoals Dams. Since Oak Ridge was virtually a part of the TVA and since the TVA seemed almost as vast as the atomic development, and for whatever political considerations, President Truman chose Mr. Lilienthal to be the chairman of the agency that was to devise some plan for a world merger of the United States atomic development.

Mr. Lilienthal reported in his *Diaries* that Fred Searls, one of the members of the committee that drew up the Acheson-Lilienthal Plan, had recommended that a stockpile of atomic bombs be given to each nation, and that the United Nations should have some “bombs for retaliation.” Mr. Lilienthal called that “one of Searls’ gems.”

Yet it is possible that, clandestinely, *that* may be precisely how the problem was, in part, worked out. Of course, Mr. Lilienthal saw with his own eyes and heard the Soviet representative, Andrei Gromyko, in the United Nations’ commission toy with and make propaganda out of the idea of a world Atomic Development Authority. It was a cruel first lesson in foreign affairs.

In January, 1953, former President Truman, just one week after he left the White House, told an INS reporter in Kansas City:

“I am not convinced the Russians have achieved the know-how to put the complicated mechanism together to make an A-bomb work. I am

not convinced they have the bomb.”

Without doubt President Truman learned a great deal about Russian atomic capability or lack of it after the day when he spoke to Stalin at Potsdam. (At that time, in 1945, he had been President for only three months.) Now, in 1953, Mr. Truman was trying to tell something to the American people. It was he as President who announced to the world the first Russian atomic explosion in 1949. Now in January of 1953, when he could speak more freely, he was in haste to inform his countrymen that he did not believe the Russians were capable of making atomic bombs. But he had been convinced that the Russians had produced atomic explosions or he would not have announced them. Could it be that he was saying that the Russians had exploded atomic materials manufactured in another country—namely, the United States?

That is a supposition that was weighed by Dr. Medford Evans, who joined the United States Atomic Energy Commission at Oak Ridge in 1945 as Organization and Methods Examiner. Later he was transferred to Washington, D.C., and in 1951 he was named Chief of Training, in which post he was specifically requested to devote his time to security education and training. He resigned in March of 1952 when he learned that none of his security recommendations was being followed. (He took his Ph.D at Yale University earlier and became Assistant Professor of English at the University of the South.) He concluded that twenty or more bombs—or the materials to put them together, the component parts—probably had been stolen from Los Alamos and/or Oak Ridge and Hanford, Wash., by 1949.

Dr. Evans cites at least two instances in which United States-made fissionable (atomic bomb) material was taken, and in only one of those cases recovered. Allan Nunn May, British scientist and spy, confessed that he gave the Russians a vial of plutonium. Dr. Sanford Simons, not connected with espionage, took a vial of plutonium from Los Alamos as a “souvenir,” which he buried under his house in Denver, Colorado, because he did not want his children to touch it. His act was not discovered until four years later, when the FBI arrested him. There is no reason at all to believe that these were the only thefts of atomic bomb components. Dr. Evans believes “it is not at all improbable that unknowingly we have given Communists access to our most secret information and to the bins and shelves of our most remote storehouses.”

Confirmation of this view is given by others. Dr. Walter Zinn, who was director of the Argonne National Laboratory, advised the Joint



Committee on Atomic Energy in June, 1949, that "if you cannot have people who you are confident will not do this filching, your inventories cannot control the situation."

The first reported inventory of United States atomic weapons produced a big surprise in 1947. This was revealed with the release of the Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which made an investigation of the atomic energy project. It reported on October 13, 1949. Dr. Robert F. Bacher, who was head of the bomb physics division at Los Alamos when the war-time bombs were devised, made that inventory. He was quoted as follows in the Report, p. 13:

When we took over in January 1947, as a representative of the [U.S. Atomic Energy] Commission, I went to Los Alamos to make an inventory of what we had. I made a rather complete inventory—this is at the end of December in 1946. This was directed primarily at making an inventory of the vital components of weapons, and fissionable material in our stock. This was not something which I or any other members of the Commission took lightly at that time. We took it very seriously.

I spent 2 days as a representative of the Commission going over what we had. I was very deeply shocked to find how few atomic weapons we had at that time. This came as a rather considerable surprise to me in spite of the fact that I had been rather intimately associated with the work of the Los Alamos project—roughly, a year before.

It might be interesting just to tell a word about how we conducted that inventory. I actually went into the vaults where material was kept and selected at random cartons and various containers to be opened. These, I then inspected myself, using suitable counters and other methods to determine to the best of my knowledge and observation that the materials were what they were declared to be.

In addition to that, I was accompanied by Colonel (H.C.) Gee, Dr. (Norris E.) Bradbury, and other representatives of the various departments at Los Alamos, whom I questioned on every piece examined as to whether, to the best of their knowledge and belief, the materials were as represented on the inventory cards which we carried with us.

Judging by the consternation which appeared on some of the faces around there, I concluded that this must have been about the first detailed physical inventory that had been made; and I

think I can say without any doubt, that this was as thorough inventory as could be made without actually tearing things completely to pieces . . .

With weapons, the situation was very bad. We did not have anything like as many weapons as I thought we had, and I was very deeply shocked at what I found when I made an inventory of what we really did have.

Dr. Bacher said about the remedy for that situation:

“Our first attention had to be directed toward the production of atomic weapons . . . . We felt it our first responsibility to do everything in our power to build the Los Alamos Laboratory . . . . I think I can say without being immodest, since most of the credit goes to members of that laboratory who went through that period, that success has been very marked.”

Dr. Evans points out that, in atomic bombs, “whoever controls storage controls everything.”

We cannot know how many bombs may have been stolen, for a number of reasons. Nobody appears to have known how many atomic weapons were made and stored, in the first place. Hence there is no way to check. The presumption, however, is overwhelming in the direction of Dr. Evans' belief that some were stolen—*diverted* is the polite word, but we prefer *stolen* as the right one. When effective security is removed from so sensitive an area as our bomb-making and bomb-assembling plants, the theft of bomb components is not only expectable but a certainty.

In this writer's mind, no question arises that the Russians now do have the capability of making and exploding atomic bombs, but neither is there a question that that capability was generated in more ways than one in the United States and other Western countries, and that the aim was to build up the Soviet Union as a balance and bulwark against the United States. Everything here in this chapter and hereafter in other chapters of this book can only be taken to mean that a balance was built against the United States and is being maintained against it to this day. The Russians, understanding this, know that they have a built-in guarantee against overwhelming defeat in any conflict or contest with the United States.

An addendum to this chapter is the appearance on page 6 of *The New York Times* of November 15, 1972 of a story headed, “More Safeguards on A-Bombs Urged.” It reported that Prof. Mason Wilrich of the University of Virginia had told the American Nuclear Society in

Washington, D.C., on Nov. 14 that the components necessary to make atomic bombs could be "diverted" from the increasing number of nuclear plants around the world. He said that the amount of nuclear material that could be used in explosive devices would reach thousands of kilograms in several countries by 1980 and would increase speedily thereafter.

The story pointed out that an atomic device could be constructed with a few kilograms of plutonium or relatively pure uranium 235.

Professor Wilrich urged greater safeguards in the control of nuclear material to bar the construction of home-made atomic bombs by mentally disturbed persons, ambitious small nations, and by gangsters. He said there was no "final solution for the nuclear control problem." It was an ambitious *large* nation that most probably first exploded "diverted" atomic bomb components.

Thus twice in 1972 *The New York Times*, 19 years after the publication of *The Secret War For The A-Bomb*, published stories warning of the possibility that nuclear materials could be stolen and made into atomic bombs. Had the national news media brought this danger to the attention of the public in 1945 and the years immediately following it, when the danger existed and was becoming apparent to men like Medford Evans, we might have a wholly different world situation today. But, again, that was not the plan. Otherwise Dr. Evans' book would have been reviewed in New York, Boston and Washington in 1953. Now that the balance has been set up, the national news media show some readiness to talk about some of the dangers that still face us.

## CHAPTER IV

# *Russia Minus United States Is Not A Going Concern*

*"Communism is the organized revolt of the mind against reality."—  
The judgment of a Polish physician who fled from the reality of the  
Communism imposed upon his native land. Circa, 1953.*

*Nothing betrays the parasitical growth of the Soviet Union [and the  
bankruptcy of Communism] better than the work of Dr. Antony C.  
Sutton. The Russians are well aware that they are being appeased,  
and that their country is being built up and pushed up as a balance-  
of-power antagonist of the United States by the United States. This  
has been the keystone of Soviet foreign policy since 1945. Could any  
one doubt that the Russians know we follow a no-victory policy?  
They are guaranteed against defeat; they cannot lose. They have  
been given a blank check for permanent blackmail. Only their own  
gross incompetence prevents them from being a greater menace  
than they are, while our own ignorance prevents us from knowing  
how much of a menace they really are.—H. H. D. in an address to  
the National Aviation Club in Washington, D.C., on April 23, 1973.*

*"Further, the distinction must be made between the Soviet system and  
the Russian people. It is easy to confuse an examination of this type  
with adverse reflections on Russian abilities. Such confusion would be  
grossly unfair. The Russian people have as much technical and  
scientific ability as any other people; indeed in certain areas of  
science and mathematics they appear to excel."—Dr. Sutton,  
Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development, Vol. II, p.  
15.*

*"It may be unwise to attempt to read into an historical sequence of events as important as those described [the transfer of vast quantities of Western equipment and technology to the Soviet Union] any rational objective on the part of Western statesmen. Although the policies concerning trade and technical transfers appear vague and often confused, there is one fundamental observation to be made: throughout the period of 53 years from 1917 to 1970 there was a persistent, powerful, and not clearly identifiable force in the West making for the continuance of the transfers. Surely the political power and influence of the Soviets was not sufficient alone to bring about such favorable Western policies. Indeed, in view of the aggressive nature of declared Soviet world objectives, such policies seem incomprehensible if the West's objective is to survive as an alliance of independent, non-communist nations."*—Dr. Sutton in *A Summation: Western Technology In The Soviet Union*, which appeared in the *Washington and Lee Commerce Review*, Vol. I, 1973.

Dr. Medford Evans said of the first two volumes of *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*, "This is possibly the most important book since the Bible."\* He said he had "thought a long time before committing that sentence to type," but he had done so because this great work "tells the truth about the umbilical relationship between Western technology and Soviet economic development." He pointed out that Werner Keller, a German writer had tried to do the same thing in *East Minus West = Zero*, which Sutton declared, "does not meet the methodological standards of the economist." Dr. Evans noted that he himself had sought to convey a similar message in his book, *The Secret War For The A-Bomb*, but the towering achievement in this field belongs to Dr. Sutton, who said:\*\*

"Almost all (of Soviet technology)—perhaps 90-95 per cent—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

\* *American Opinion* magazine, September, 1971, p. 79.

\*\* Address to Platform Committee, Republican Convention, Miami, 1972.

through trade and the sale of plants, equipment and technical assistance."\*

The Sutton work is a breathtaking panorama of Western transfers of machinery, technology and personnel in order to build up the Soviet Union—as it turned out, into a strong enemy.

In describing the methodology of his work, Dr. Sutton reported that each plant was identified "and the origin of its equipment and technical processes traced." "This," he added, "was a complex and time-consuming task, involving a search in sources originating in a dozen countries." The primary sources of data were the U.S. State Department Decimal File and the German Foreign Ministry Archives for 1917 to 1930. (The study now covers the years from 1917 to 1965 and beyond, with vol. III spanning the years from 1945 on.) Another source was the Western news media; a third was Soviet trade representatives in Western countries—"a surprisingly lucrative source;" a fourth source was the Moscow papers *Pravda*, *Izvestia*, and *Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn* (Truth, News and Economic Life), and other Soviet publications, and, finally, miscellaneous material in a number of languages—books, statistical summaries, handbooks, and the like.

He examines first in Vol. I the collapse and restoration of the Caucasus oil fields, noting that in 1900 Russia was the world's largest producer and exporter of crude oil, when nearly 50,000 feet of drilling a month had been necessary to maintain production. By 1920 drilling had fallen to 780 feet. "The Bolsheviks took over the Caucasus in 1920-1," he writes, "and until 1923 oil field drilling almost ceased." During the first year under the Soviets, no new wells were produced, and after two years no new fields had been developed. A Western company, in this case American, came to the rescue, largely typically.

To pay for concessions and agreements where credit was not provided by a foreign company in the 1920's, the Soviet Government needed valuta—that is, dollars, other foreign currency, and gold. Of those only gold could be produced at home. And so the Lena Goldfields, Ltd. (British) concession was signed on April 25, 1925, to run for 30 years in the Lena gold mines and 50 years in the Ural and Altai Mountains. The company lived up to its agreement to produce more than 6,500 kilograms of gold per year.

To accomplish this the company had had to move from San Francisco, Calif., a 17-foot Bucyrus (American) dredge, built in 1916 and

\*Dr. Sutton is a Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University. Earlier he was a professor of economics at California State University at Los Angeles. He has had experience in engineering and mining exploration in several countries.

stored there ever since. The cost merely to move it to Siberia was put at \$1.5 million. It was a massive thing, as high as a six-story building. Dr. Sutton recounts, Vol. I, p. 97:

It was delivered to Lena in 1927 after being moved from South Milwaukee to Baltimore on 75 flat cars, to Murmansk (north of Leningrad) by steamer and to Irkutsk by rail, then 200 miles on a mountain trail by wagon and sledge, and then to Kachuca by barge on the River Lena. At Kachuca it was reloaded on small boats for a 700-mile trip up the River Vitim to Bodaibo, just 11 miles short of its final destination. Delivery and assembly took 18 months.

*Izvestia* reported that Lena Goldfields Ltd. had invested by March 1929 more than 18 million rubles in new equipment and had restored old works. But in 1930 Lena Goldfields was expelled from the Soviet Union minus the dredge and other equipment. The company was accused of using private prospectors and artels composed of former hired laborers. "That this was the arrangement also used by the Aldenzoloto (Soviet Government) trust was not mentioned," Dr. Sutton remarks, adding, p. 99:

"In retrospect, there can be no other conclusion than that the Soviets deliberately enticed Lena into the U.S.S.R. to get the massive dredge installed and also as much else as they could along the way. It is, in the light of history, a clear case of premeditated industrial theft on a massive scale."

Industrially speaking, this is the worst kind of thing that the Soviet Communists could do—expropriate; that is, seize the fruits of other men's labor. But they appear to have sized up each foreign concessionaire and each situation for as much as they could get out of it. In one case they caused a concessionaire to mechanize the production of low-grade deposits of manganese ore, while the Russians worked the high-grade deposits at lower cost.

Leonid Krassin, one of the early Bolsheviks who were far less close-lipped than those who followed, alive, said in 1921:

"Russia cannot without assistance organize her trade. She cannot bring together her resources in a productive manner and she must rely upon capital, the experience and initiative of foreign capitalists." (Vol. I, p. 306)

And that is what Soviet Russia did. The "capitalists" entered the U.S.S.R. like benevolent locusts. *Restoration* was the word. Railroads

were habilitated and rehabilitated. Agriculture was industrialized but only partly, and even then unsatisfactorily, because *there* was the factor of people and private ownership and industry. Even today the Russians cannot with certainty grow enough grain *every* year to feed themselves. But at least the capitalists tried. Had their methods been adopted in entirety, no doubt the success would not have been less than that in free countries, but that was the important difference—the Russian peasants were not to receive the kind of freedom enjoyed by farmers in free countries. In the United States in 1971 one farmer supplied himself and 44 others with food, while the farm population in the nation totaled 5 per cent. In Russia the farmers constitute 50 per cent of the total population. That is probably some measure of the technological gap in agriculture between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. The Russian people spend 50 per cent of their pay for food, the Americans 16.5 (1971).\*

Dr. Sutton notes that the Western governments did not cooperate with each other in the matter of dealing with the Soviet Government, and thus permitted themselves to be played off against one another. However, they did see that the Russian Communists abused the foreign citizens by expropriating them after they had honored their agreements in operating concessions, only to have them seized when they had put the plant or industry into operating condition.

In the second volume of *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*, Dr. Sutton takes up the continued assistance of foreign companies in industrializing the Soviet Union, and the halting ability of the Soviets to digest the enormous infusion of equipment and ultra-modern technology. It has to be remembered that a great number of Russian technologists fled the country or were imprisoned or killed in the twenties, and that others were so greatly distrusted when they remained that they were thwarted in their efforts to do their best, and often were imprisoned or exiled in the Communist society that lived by every kind of physical disorder and mental disturbance, where loyalty of any kind was reviled, and dedication was suspected as a relic of the old regime or a bourgeois hangover. (Loyalty requires an act of freedom and will; it was servility that was wanted. Dedication suggests an unreadiness to meet new and conflicting orders, as they occurred to Stalin.)

The necessity for this great work on technology is pointed up in Vol. II by the author's observation on page 5 that a "State Department publication reviewing 40 years of Soviet economic development between

\* N.C. Brady, *Food and Life Sciences Quarterly*, p. 3. New York State and Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Stations. September, 1971.



1920 and 1960 concluded that the U.S.S.R. has a 'self-developed technology.' " "There is then a problem of credibility," he writes. "A prime requirement, therefore, is to establish acceptability for the data and credibility for the conclusions (of this work). This is particularly necessary because academic assessments, although accurate, have not been based on precise empirical findings but on more or less un-systematic reports and general statements. Further, the writer has used State Department files to establish a thesis apparently refuted by the State Department itself."

So in describing his methodology and data sources for this volume, Dr. Sutton writes:

Details were obtained from several sources to determine both the technology used in Soviet manufacture and plant construction and its place of origin in the period 1930-45. For example, the Soviet standard blast furnace of 930 cubic meters has been identified as a Freyn Company, Inc., design. The turbines at the Baku Power Plant were built and installed by Metropolitan Vickers, Ltd., of the United Kingdom. The merchant rolling mills at Kuznetzk were made and installed by Demag A-G of Germany. The coke ovens at the same plant and at Ketch were built and installed by Diticoque S.A. of France. The Karakliss cynamide plant was built by Superfosfat A/B of Sweden. These and thousands of similar facts are precisely recorded and verifiable; the sources are always stated. Consequently those who wish to challenge the arguments have the initial burden of disproving recorded statements of fact.

. . . No significant new plant built before 1933 without some major Western technical and construction effort has been identified. Indeed, as Josef Stalin himself stated, two-thirds of all large enterprises built (in the U.S.S.R.) before 1944 were built with U.S. assistance.

By far the most important source of data is section 861.5 of the U.S. State Department Decimal File, from 1928 to 1946.

Interestingly and indeed significantly, Sutton reports (Vol. II, p. 4) that the foreign technological impact upon the Soviet Union was not investigated by the State Department, "although such an investigation would clearly come within the province of the Intelligence and Research Office of that Department." (As stated in an earlier work by the writer, The truth is indeed often hard to grasp, but it is never so elusive

as when it is not wanted.) That Sutton leaned over backward to be fair and truthful is implicit in this statement, Vol. II, p. 8:

A consistent policy of positive identification of foreign technology is retained throughout this volume. In other words, a unit, process, or technology must be clearly identified from acceptable sources as being of Western origin before it is so named. In cases in which this cannot be done, the assumption is that the technology is Soviet. For example, the Pengu-Gurevitch process used in construction of a small lubricating oil unit at Baku in 1931-2 has not yet been identified as Western, although, given the nonexistence of Soviet developments in petroleum refining, it is unlikely that the process was purely Soviet; it was probably "copied." However, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, it is noted as a Soviet development. (Sometimes, as in the Ufa refinery complex, it is part Soviet and part Western in origin.)

"Technical extravaganzas, such as Sputnik and Lunik, involving heavy investment in a narrow sector, are periodic stimuli intended to remind us that Soviet science and technique are, of course, far ahead of that of decadent capitalism," Dr. Sutton writes. "Those readers who have not forgotten the fallacy of composition might, however, ponder on the alleged quip from one Muscovite to another: 'Why, if things are so good, are they always so bad?' "

As these lines were being written the Soviet Union was receiving regular shipments of grain on a \$1 billion order in the United States in 1972. American farmers are always glad to sell their grain, and Americans as a nation never gloat over the misfortunes of other nations. One can hardly blink the fact that inability to raise sufficient grain while allegedly building the largest navy, the heaviest nuclear weaponry, and supporting wars and threats of war in a number of regions of the earth is not necessarily a sign of the highest technological capability.

Joh Dornberg in his excellent book *The New Tsars: Russia Under Stalin's Heirs* (1972, Doubleday) reports of contemporary Russia:

"It is a country where flower shops have no flowers and butcher shops usually no meat, where queues and shortages are the rule. It is a land where portraits of Lenin and Brezhnev and yards of red bunting substitute for merchandise in shop windows, where stores either have nothing worth buying or are closed—'for repair,' 'for inventory,' 'for lunch,' 'for sanitation' or 'for the day' simply because the staff has

already overfulfilled its trade quota and sees no reason for continuing to work.

"Their restaurants display little signs in their windows that read 'closed' on one side and 'No Seats Left' on the other, but never one reading 'Welcome.' It is a country whose economy produces envelopes without gum, elevators that don't elevate, locks that don't lock, doors that don't close, windows that don't open, refrigerators that don't refrigerate and new apartment houses that are instant slums before the first tenants move in."

That is Socialism? State capitalism? Sovietism? Certainly it is a combination of things. Every nation has its own distinguishing characteristics. The application of the terroristic political and economic philosophies of Marxism and Leninism to the country that was Russia did not then—or now—erase the Russian and other national features from that land. Dr. Sutton discovered this as he peered deeper and deeper into the industrial structure. John Dornberg makes this revealing statement:

"A disillusioned member of the Soviet establishment once told me with considerable rancor: 'It is a tribute to the greatness of the Russian people, almost a Russian miracle, that this country exists at all and that its economy functions, no matter how badly, despite fifty years of Communism. Russia was well beyond the takeoff point before the Revolution. Without this system we would be the richest, most affluent country in the world today.' "

That could be an exaggeration, but the tribute to the great strength and endurance of the Russian people is deserved. Dornberg reports that Stalin's "regime of terror took the lives, by conservative estimate, of 20 million"—no doubt not counting the hundreds of thousands of Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, and other East Europeans, like the Hungarians, Bulgarians, Czechoslovaks and Rumanians. He also reported that a thousand concentration camps continued to exist and that there were approximately a million prisoners, of whom tens of thousands were political prisoners. Others put the number of political prisoners in the millions.\* Despite the vast bath of materialism in which the country has been immersed for 55 years, belief in God and in religion persists, and is boasted of by the ablest writers and thinkers. One writer said, "Russia's only salvation lies in a return to God."

Dr. Sutton argues with impeccable logic that the transfer of technological capability to the Soviet Union was primarily responsible

\* U.S.S.R. LABOR CAMPS. Hearings before U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security Laws. Feb. 1-2, 1973. U.S. Government Printing Office.

for the growth recorded. In other words, no amount of investment would be able to make an automobile before it had been invented, but, conversely, a later model automobile or airplane or steel plant could be built in a relatively backward country with equipment and engineers and freshly trained workers, and that is precisely what was done in the Soviet Union. There is there, he argues, no enigma.

The true nature of the buildup of the Soviet Union by the West cannot be conveyed in a chapter of this book. Many phases of Soviet industry have not even been touched upon here. Military matters have hardly been mentioned. For instance, Dr. Sutton informed the writer that the Soviet Russians could not have built an atomic bomb without certain machine tools that could be obtained only from the United States, the United Kingdom, or Switzerland. We print here, therefore, the relevant parts of a speech made by Dr. Sutton to the Platform Committee of the Republican National Convention at Miami Beach, Fla., in August 1972. The author has given permission for the reproduction here. It follows:

#### THE CASE AGAINST RED TRADE\*

By Antony C. Sutton

I am here because I believe—and Congressman (John M.) Ashbrook believes—that the American public should have these facts.

I have spent ten years in research on Soviet technology. What it is & what it can do—and particularly where it came from. I have published three books and several articles summarizing the work.

It was privately financed. But the results have been available to the Government. On the other hand, I have had major difficulties with U.S. Government censorship.

Almost all [of Soviet technology]—perhaps 90-95 per cent—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.

Listening to Administration spokesmen—or some newspaper pundits—you get the impression that trade with the Soviet Union is some new miracle cure for the world's problems.

That is not quite accurate.

The idea that trade with the Soviets might bring peace goes back to

\* This address was published in the Congressional Record.

1917. The earliest proposal is dated December 1917—just a few weeks after the start of the Bolshevik Revolution. It was implemented in 1920 while the Bolsheviks were still trying to consolidate their hold on Russia. The result was to guarantee that the Bolsheviks held power; they needed foreign supplies to survive.

The history of our construction of the Soviet Union has been blacked out—much of the key information is still classified—along with the other mistakes of the Washington bureaucracy.

Why has the history been blacked out?

Because 50 years of dealings with the Soviets has been an economic success for the U.S.S.R. and a political failure for the United States. It has not stopped war, it has not given us peace.

The United States is spending \$80 billion a year on defense against an enemy built by the United States and West Europe.

Even stranger, the U.S. apparently wants to make sure this enemy remains in the business of being an enemy.

Now at this point I've probably lost some of you. What I have said is contrary to everything you've heard from the intellectual elite, the Administration, and the business world, and numerous well regarded Senators—just about everyone.

First an authentic statement. It's authentic because it was part of a conversation between Stalin and W. Averell Harriman. Ambassador Harriman has been prominent in Soviet trade since the 1930's and is an outspoken supporter of yet more trade. This is what Ambassador Harriman reported back to the State Department at the end of World War II:

“Stalin paid tribute to the assistance rendered by the United States to Soviet industry before and during the War. He said that about two-thirds of all the large industrial enterprises in the Soviet Union had been built with the United States' help or technical assistance.”

Stalin could have said that the other one-third of large industrial enterprises were built by firms from Germany, France, Britain and Italy.

Stalin could have said also that the (Soviet) tank plants, the aircraft plants, the explosive and ammunition plants originated in the U.S.

That was June 1944. The massive technical assistance continues right down to the present day.

Now the ability of the Soviet Union to create any kind of military machine, to ship missiles to Cuba, to supply arms to North Vietnam, to supply arms for use against Israel—all this depends on its domestic industry.

In the Soviet Union about three-quarters of the military budget goes on purchases from Soviet factories.

This expenditure in Soviet industry makes sense. No army has a machine that churns out tanks. Tanks are made from alloy steel, plastics, rubber and so forth. The alloy steel, plastics and rubber are made in Soviet factories to military specification—just as in the United States.

Missiles are not produced on missile-making machines. Missiles are fabricated from aluminum alloys, stainless steel, electrical wiring, pumps and so forth. The aluminum, steel, copper wire and pumps are also made in Soviet factories.

In other words, the Soviet military gets its parts and materials from Soviet industry. There is a Soviet military-industrial complex just as there is an American military-industrial complex.

This kind of reasoning makes sense to the man in the street. The farmer in Kansas knows what I mean. The salesman in California knows what I mean. The taxi driver in New York knows what I mean. But the policy makers in Washington do not accept this kind of common sense reasoning, and never have.

So let's take a look at the Soviet industry that provides the parts and the materials for Soviet armaments:the guns, tanks, aircraft.

The Soviets have the largest iron and steel plant in the world. It was built by McKee Corporation. It is a copy of the U.S. Steel plant in Gary, Indiana.

All Soviet iron and steel technology comes from the U.S. and its allies. The Soviets use open hearth, American electric furnaces, American wide-strip mills, Sendzimir mills and so on—all developed in the West and shipped in as peaceful trade.

The Soviets have the largest tube mill in Europe—one million tons a year. The equipment is Fretz-Moon, Salem, Aetna Standard, Mannesman, etc. Those are not Russian names.

All Soviet tube and pipe-making technology comes from the U.S. and its allies. If you know anyone in the space business, ask them how many miles of tubes and pipes go into a missile.

The Soviets have the largest merchant marine in the world—about 6,000 ships. I have the specifications for each ship. About two-thirds were built outside the Soviet Union.

About four-fifths of the engines for these ships were also built outside the Soviet Union.

There are no ship engines of Soviet design. Those built *inside* the U.S.S.R. are built with foreign technical assistance. The Bryansk plant

makes the largest marine diesels (engines). In 1959, the Bryansk plant made a technical assistance agreement with Burmeister & Wain of Copenhagen, Denmark (a NATO ally), approved as peaceful trade by the State Department. The ships that carried Soviet missiles to Cuba ten years ago used these same Burmeister & Wain engines. The ships were in the Poltava class. Some have Danish engines made in Denmark, and some have Danish engines made at Bryansk in the Soviet Union.

About 100 Soviet ships are used on the Haiphong run to carry Soviet weapons and supplies for Hanoi's annual aggression. I was able to identify 84 of these ships. None of the main engines in these ships was designed and manufactured inside the U.S.S.R.

All shipbuilding technology in the U.S.S.R. comes directly or indirectly from the U.S. or its NATO allies.

Let's take one industry in more detail: motor vehicles.

All Soviet automobile, truck and engine technology comes from the West, chiefly the United States. In my books I have listed each Soviet plant, its equipment and who supplied the equipment. The Soviet military has over 300,000 trucks—all from these U.S.-built plants.

Up to 1968 the largest motor vehicle plant in the U.S.S.R. was at Gorki. Gorki produces many of the trucks American pilots see on the Ho Chi Minh trail. Gorki produces the chassis for the GAZ-69 rocket launcher used against Israel. Gorki produces the Soviet jeep and half a dozen other military vehicles.

And Gorki was built by the Ford Motor Company and the Austin Company—as peaceful trade.

In 1968, while Gorki was building vehicles to be used in Vietnam and Israel, further equipment for Gorki was ordered and shipped from the U.S.

Also in 1968 we had the so-called Fiat deal to build a plant at Volgograd three times bigger than Gorki. Dean Rusk [former Secretary of State] and Walt Rostow told Congress and the American public this was peaceful trade—the Fiat plant could not produce military vehicles.

Any automobile manufacturing plant can produce military vehicles. I can show any one who is interested the technical specification of a proven military vehicle (with cross-country capability) using the same capacity engine as the Russian Fiat plant produces.

The term "Fiat deal" is misleading. Fiat in Italy doesn't make automobile manufacturing equipment—Fiat plants in Italy have U.S. equipment. Fiat did send 1,000 men to Russia for erection of the plant, but over half—perhaps well over half—of the equipment came from the

United States: from Gleason, TRW of Cleveland and New Britain Machine Co.

So in the middle of a war that has killed 46,000 Americans (so far) and countless Vietnamese with Soviet weapons and supplies, the Johnson Administration doubled Soviet auto output.

And supplied false information to Congress and the American public.

Finally, we get to 1972 under President Nixon.

The Soviets are receiving now—today—equipment and technology for the largest heavy-truck plant in the world: known as the Kama plant. It will produce 100,000 heavy ten-ton trucks per year—that's more than ALL U.S. manufacturers put together.

This will also be the largest plant in the world. It will occupy 36 square miles.

Will the Kama plant have military potential?

The Soviets themselves have answered this one. The Kama truck will be 50 per cent more productive than the ZIL-130 truck. Well, that's nice, because the ZIL series trucks are standard Soviet army trucks used in Vietnam and the Middle East.

Who built the ZIL plant? It was built by Arthur J. Brandt Company of Detroit, Michigan.

Who's building the Kama truck plant? That's classified "secret" by the Washington policy-makers. I don't have to tell you why.

The Soviet T-54 tank is in Vietnam. It was in operation at Kontum, An Loc, and Hue a few weeks ago. It is in use today in Vietnam. It has been used against Israel.

According to the tank handbooks, the T-54 has a Christie type suspension. Christie was an American inventor.

Where did the Soviets get a Christie suspension? Did they steal it? No, sir! They bought it. They bought it from the U.S. Wheel Track Layer Corporation.

However, this Administration is apparently slightly more honest than the previous Administration.

Last December I asked Assistant Secretary Kenneth Davis of the Commerce Department (who is a mechanical engineer by training) whether the Kama trucks would have military capability. In fact, I quoted one of the Government's own inter-agency reports. Mr. Davis didn't bother to answer but I did get a letter from the Department, and it was right to the point. Yes! we know the Kama truck plant has military capability; we take this into account when we issue export licenses.



I passed these letters on to the press and Congress. They were published.

Unfortunately for my research project, I also had pending with the Department of Defense an application for declassification of certain files about our military assistance to the Soviets. This application was then abruptly denied by DOD.

It will supply military technology to the Soviets but gets a little uptight about the public finding out.

I can understand that.

Of course, it takes a great deal of self-confidence to admit you are sending factories to produce weapons and supplies to a country providing weapons and supplies to kill Americans, Israelis and Vietnamese. In writing. In an election year yet.

More to the point—by what authority does this Administration undertake such policies.

Many people—as individuals—have protested our suicidal policies. What happens? Well, if you are in Congress you probably get the strong arm put on you. The Congressman who inserted my research findings into the Congressional Record suddenly found himself with primary opposition. He won't be in Congress next year.

If you are in the academic world you soon find it's OK to protest U.S. assistance to the South Vietnamese, but never, never protest U.S. assistance to the Soviets. Forget about the Russian academics being persecuted—we musn't say unkind things about the Soviets.

If you press for an explanation what do they tell you?

First, you get the Fulbright line. This is peaceful trade. The Soviets are powerful. They have their own technology. It's a way to build friendship. It's a way to a new world order.

This is demonstrably false. The Soviet tanks in An Loc are not refugees from the Pasadena Rose Bowl Parade.

The "Soviet" ships that carry arms to Haiphong are not peaceful. They have weapons on board, not flower children of Russian tourists.

Second, if you don't buy that line, you are told, "The Soviets are mellowing." This is equally false.

The killing in Israel and Vietnam with Soviet weapons doesn't suggest mellowing, it suggests premeditated genocide. Today—now—the Soviets are readying more arms to go to Syria. For what purpose? To put in a museum?

No one has ever presented evidence, hard evidence, that trade leads to peace. Why not? Because there *is* no such evidence. It's an illusion.

It is true that peace leads to trade. But that's not the same thing.

You first need peace, then you trade. That does not mean if you trade you will get peace.

But that's too logical for the Washington policy makers, and it's not what the politicians and their backers want anyway.

Trade with Germany doubled before World War II. Did it stop World War II?

Trade with Japan increased before World War II. Did it stop World War II?

What was in this German and Japanese trade? The same means for war that we are now supplying the Soviets. The Japanese Air Force after 1934 depended on U.S. technology. And much of the pushing for Soviet trade today comes from the same groups that were pushing for trade with Hitler and Tojo 35 years ago.

The Russian Communist Party is not mellowing. Concentration camps are still there. The mental hospitals take the overload. Persecution of the Baptists continues. Harrassment of Jews continues, as it did under the Czars.

The only mellowing is when a Harriman and a Rockefeller get together with the bosses in the Kremlin. That's good for business, but it's not much help if you are a G.I. at the other end of a Soviet rocket in Vietnam.

I've learned something about our military assistance to the Soviets.

It's just not enough to have the facts—these are ignored by the policy-makers.

It's just not enough to make a common-sense case—the answers you get defy reason.

Only one institution has been clear-sighted on this question. From the early 1920's to the present day only one institution has spoken out. That is the AFL-CIO.

From Samuel Gompers in 1920 down to George Meany today, the major unions have consistently protested the trade policies that built the Soviet Union.

Because union members in Russia lost their freedom and union members in the United States have died in Korea and Vietnam.

The unions know—and apparently care.

No one else cares. Not Washington. Not big business. Not the Republican Party.

And 100,000 Americans have been killed in Korea and Vietnam—by our own technology.

The only response from Washington and the Nixon Administration is the effort to hush up the scandal.

These are things not to be talked about. And the professional smokescreen about peaceful trade continues.

The plain fact—if you want it—is that irresponsible policies have built us an enemy and maintain that enemy in the business of totalitarian rule and world conquest.

And the tragedy is that intelligent people have bought that political double-talk about world peace, a new world order and mellowing Soviets.

I suggest that the man in the street, the average taxpayer-voter, thinks more or less as I do. You do not subsidize an enemy.

And when this story gets out and about in the United States, it's going to translate into a shift of votes. I haven't met one man in the street so far (from New York to California) who goes along with a policy of subsidizing the killing of his fellow Americans. People are usually stunned and disgusted.

It requires a peculiar kind of intellectual myopia to ship supplies and technology to the Soviets when they are instrumental in killing fellow citizens.

What about the argument that trade will lead to peace? Well, we've had U.S.-Soviet trade for 52 years. The first and second Five-Year Plans were built by American companies. To continue a policy that is a total failure is to gamble with the lives of several million Americans and countless allies.

You can't stoke up the Soviet military machine at one end and then complain that the other end came back and bit you. Unfortunately, the human price for our immoral policies is not paid by the policy-maker in Washington. The human price is paid by the farmers, the students and working and middle classes of America.

The citizen who pays the piper is not calling the tune—he doesn't even know the name of the tune.

Let me summarize my conclusions:

1. Trade with the U.S.S.R. was started over 50 years ago under President Woodrow Wilson with the declared intention of mellowing the Bolsheviks. The policy has been a total and costly failure. It has proven to be impractical—this is what I would expect from an immoral policy.

2. We have built ourselves an enemy. We keep the self-declared enemy in business. This information has been blacked out by successive Administrations. Misleading and untruthful statements have been made by the Executive Branch to Congress and the American people.

3. Our policy of subsidizing self-declared enemies is neither rational

nor moral. I have drawn attention to the intellectual myopia of the group that influences and draws up foreign policy. I suggest these policies have no authority.

4. The annual attacks in Vietnam and the war in the Middle East were made possible only by Russian armaments and our past assistance to the Soviets.

5. This worldwide Soviet activity is consistent with Communist theory. Mikhail Suslov, the party theoretician, recently stated that the current detent with the United States is temporary. The purpose of the detente, according to Suslov, is to give the Soviets sufficient strength for a renewed assault on the West. In other words, when you've finished building the Kama plant and the trucks come rolling off—watch out for another Vietnam.

6. Internal Soviet repression continues—against Baptists, against Jews, against national groups, and against dissident academics, like myself.

7. Soviet technical dependence is a powerful instrument for world peace if we want to use it.

So far it has been used as an aid-to-dependent-Soviets welfare program. With about as much success as the domestic welfare program.

Why should they stop supplying Hanoi? The more they stoke up the war the more they get from the United States.

One final thought:

Why has the war in Vietnam continued for four long years under this Administration? With 15,000 killed under the Nixon Administration?

We can stop the Soviets and their friends in Hanoi anytime we want to—without using a single gun or anything more dangerous than a piece of paper or a telephone call.

We have Soviet technical dependence as an instrument of world peace. The most humane weapon that can be conceived.

We have always had that option. We have never used it.

That is the most eloquent, reasoned and impassioned speech the writer has ever read in behalf of a humane policy toward the Soviet Government in order to bring it around to a peaceful attitude, if that ever can be done. Yet that address was ignored after it had been made available to the American press and other daily news media, including AP and UPI. It was later printed in *The Review of the News* and *Human Events*, alert weeklies.

Dr. Sutton mentioned but did not stress that a peaceful Russian attitude cannot have been the aim of the United States Government because such an attitude was not sought—pleas in behalf of it were ignored in Washington. *If it happens, you can be sure it was planned that way.* This great student of technology emphasized the role of the politicians and of the best that we can offer as statesmen, but he is in a better position than most Americans to know that the communications media play a strong supporting role.

In spite of the magnificent reach of his mind, his vast grasp of the subject, and the marvellous originality and clarity of his work, *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*, only two newspapers in the United States felt it ought to be made known to their readers. Is it of any significance that the *Phoenix Arizona Republic* and the *Indianapolis News* are published in inland cities? Then why not reviews in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Milwaukee Journal*, and the Dallas newspapers? And why *is* it that not a single newspaper on the East Coast or the West Coast reviewed it?

The fact is, however, that Dr. Sutton is becoming a famous man throughout the country in the face of this journalistic opposition to the presentation of his findings.

## CHAPTER V

# *The Cliché Era: Mental Warfare Against The People*

*"We find the communications media being used to undermine the credibility of everyone who represents authority, whether it be the government official, the business leader, the police, the school teacher, or the mere parent. In turn, the credibility of the media is called into question, and the public regards with increasing skepticism what they are told by the press and the broadcasters. . . ."*

*"It is shocking that in a society that has more motor cars, television sets, air conditioners, etc., per capita than any country in the world, the cry is going up that we cannot afford to spend the money required to provide ourselves with an adequate defense against our potential enemies. . . . This is not just the cry of some 'lunatic fringe.' It is a theme that is put forward by serious contenders for high political office. It is supported by influential newspapers and by some of the most influential voices heard on that powerful medium, network television." -J.L. Robertson, vice chairman of the Federal Reserve System's Board of Governors in a speech at Bal Harbour, Fla., March 15, 1972.*

*"The point is that left-liberal ideology is now being insinuated even in service magazines. Hardly anything escapes these days." -Bulletin of the Conservative Book Club under And Rightly So, May, 1972.*

*"Most living Americans have grown up in the most powerful nation on earth. Under the cover of that strength we have enjoyed an affluence*

*hardly equalled in the history of any nation. This era ended in 1971. Today, we are a second-class power and we will have to accept that role for at least four years, perhaps longer; possibly forever. . . .*

*"The individual citizen has not yet felt the impact of this basic change from strength to weakness, from leadership to compromise. Each of us will feel it as the world market for our goods and services shrinks; as we find ourselves increasingly alone; as we are forced to abandon the noble projects we have devised for the health, education, and welfare of every living American.*

*"Instead, we shall have to learn once again the harsh lessons of weakness, of being trampled upon, and how it is to tighten our belts in privation and gird ourselves for nearly hopeless conflicts.*

*"We face, today, either defeat or years of national tragedy." —General Lewis W. Walt, U.S.M.C. Ret. in his book *America Faces Defeat*, 1972. Apollo Books, Woodbridge, Conn.*

*"It is clear that the decline of a language must ultimately have political and economic causes." —George Orwell in *Politics And The English Language*, an essay.*

*It is the nature of Communism to bleed us forever. And, quite obviously, it is the nature of some Americans to help Communism to do this. We must not permit it. What we are witnessing in our news media is a veritable effort to create an artificial world in order to set up concepts that would govern the inner impulses and orderly actions of the people.—H.H.D. Schenectady, N.Y., Dec. 6, 1971.*

*"All of us who have had the duty of listening in the United Nations to the Soviet representatives are under no misapprehension. It is clear that the Soviet representative's recent speech abounds in examples of this difference in the use of words. All you have to do is to know the language, what I may call the 'upside down' language, of Soviet diplomacy." —Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin of Great Britain in the United Nations General Assembly on September 26, 1949.*

Corruption of the language is one of the legacies of the Soviet Union to the West. Having subjugated the people of Russia, the Communists were left with the stubborn difficulty of words. They would not bend or yield. Hence it was necessary to change their meaning. If the West hit the Soviets with damaging words, the Russian Communists would fight by turning words to their favor. The meanings of words were changed generally to imply the opposite of their accepted definitions. In the Soviet Government's dealings with the rest of the world the Russian Communist leaders introduced virtually a new dictionary. They revised the definitions of old words and introduced some novel concepts with new ones. The aims were to sow a sense of allegiance deep into the minds of Communists in other lands and to confuse other foreigners.

First of all, it was taught that Russia was the home and citadel of Socialism and Moscow the Mecca of a new faith. Communists in other countries were told that they were holding on to "outposts." Until a country had been captured by the Soviet Government and proper leaders had been installed, fresh from the Soviet capital or duly accredited, that country did not belong to the Soviet circle. In the meantime a lexicon made in Moscow was imposed upon the Communists to bind them and make them effective instruments. Since some Communists were to be found in every stratum of life in foreign countries the new Soviet definitions were expected to seep into general usage, and that is what happened.

Communists in other countries, especially in the United States, got the idea, and pursued their own perversion of words, which are the warp and woof of communications—of news and views, of broadcasts and telecasts. The fact that the American communications media rarely mentions Communists of the United States does not mean that they do not exist. On the contrary, it was obvious to the cognoscenti that Communists had a hand in the transformation of the American Democratic party into a suicidal political organization in 1972.

There is now a "coalition" of Soviet word practices; some are used chiefly by the Russian Communists and some are features of our own daily news media. This is a kind of preview of the merger that the makers of the world's destiny have in mind for us. A list of the upside-down words is given here as an illustration of the practice, rather than as a complete lexicon, since other words will occur to the reader instantly. Here is a list:

**ACTIVIST:** Often a Communist but never so called by any of the



media. "Activists" shut down universities, help to burn sections of cities, do what they can to destroy the morale of the U.S. Armed Forces, and aid the Russians or the Chinese Communists or both, in addition to other wrecking activities, but activists are never called Communists by the media, nor is any effort made to identify Communist activists if they choose to hide their party connection.

**ADVOCACY JOURNALISM:** The deliberate distortion, suppression or fabrication of news and editorials to push a point of view upon readers while denying them the facts on which to base reasoned opinions and judgments. It usually disregards the interests of the United States but presses for a clandestine world purpose that often coincides with the interests of Communist China and the Soviet Government.

**AGRARIAN REFORM:** A Trojan Horse expression designed to conceal the Communist hand and aim; used to describe Communist plans to take over the peasantry wherever the Reds were working; specifically it is an expression that covered the Communists' purposes in China, and was used freely by Americans in all stations, including the high officials who handed over China to the Communists by disarming Nationalist China. *Agrarian reform* was in fact Communist revolution. Estimates of the number of Chinese killed by the Communists run as high as 65 million.

**BLOC:** A union or alliance of nations, such as the Western Bloc, always used derogatively by the Soviets, but never as a term of opprobrium against the Soviet Government, though the cement of the Soviet "bloc" is different from the ties that bind the "Western" nations together, including countries as far apart as South Korea, the Republic of China, South Vietnam, Japan, Malaysia, Indonesia, Great Britain, France, West Germany, Greece and Turkey, to mention only a few.

**CAPITALIST:** One who engages in private trade or business; an owner of any business or farm employing one person or more. One who shares in such a business. Also, one who believes in freedom of enterprise as a form of freedom. ("Capitalist" is an old word that

once had a respectable meaning. It was in use long before Karl Marx wrote *Das Kapital*. Few persons nowadays wish to be called capitalists, even though they are.)

**CHURCHILLIZE:** A word coined by Leftists, probably Communists, in Britain to stigmatize one of the greatest of her Prime Ministers. The effort fell completely flat, and this attack word was abandoned.

**COLONIALIST:** One who advocates or participates in the affairs of a Commonwealth, such as Puerto Rico, or any land that still has national ties with a mother country. The attitude of Moscow to the countries of Eastern Europe and far less, the annexed lands of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania is never called colonialist. (Again and again we come to see that there is one rule for the Russian Communists and another for all other nations.) The word *colonialist* is reminiscent of the days of the harsh treatment of colonies and possessions, and is designed to call up those days.

**COMMUNIST:** A member of the Communist party whose first allegiance is to the Soviet Government and Union; one who undertakes to further the interests of Russia through political and other means, such as strikes, sabotage and revolts in ordinary times and active treason in others, as designated by the Soviet leaders.

**CONFRONTATION:** Any national opposition to Communist states, their satellites or partners. Unless Communist governments are permitted to have their way, the danger is *confrontation*, a nebulous condition that could be anything ranging from a dispute to a war. The use of *confrontation* mental warfare against the people is now a well-established practice.

**DEGASPERIZE:** This is another word that was coined by the Communists in Italy after World War II, and was designed to do for Premier de Gasperi what was done in the United States for Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, but it did not work. When the Communists denounced the "degasperization" of Italy the people there did not

know what the Reds were talking about, and another intended smear word died aborning.

**DEMOCRACY** (also known as the **NEW DEMOCRACY** and the **PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY**): A system of government under which the leaders are imposed by Moscow; involves single-list "elections" in which 90 (or more) per cent of the vote is given to the sole ticket; most of the freedoms set forth in the United States Constitution are lacking; former "bourgeois" leaders are silenced or vanish into concentration camps or across the frontiers.

**ESCALATE**: When a free country fights back against Communist depredations it *escalates* the situation. It is not possible for Communist invaders to escalate, since invidious words are not used against them; that would embarrass them. The United States was frequently accused in the American news media of *escalating* the war in Indochina by fighting back against very real escalations of that conflict by the Communists, but that is the way the one-sided upside-down language works.

**FRATERNAL ASSISTANCE**: Soviet military invasion to enforce dependence.

**GENERATION GAP**: An effort to drive a wedge between older persons and the younger by creating an imaginary "gap" between them. That the generations do not see eye to eye on all things has been noted by historians and observers from the beginning of recorded time, but that you have to "kill your parents" in order to progress is the sheerest, cruelest, most demeaning and degrading rot. This is one more effort to confuse the people and to introduce chaos. The cliché *generation gap* is a wishful expression of the trouble-makers.\*

\* To show how little a part the so-called generation gap played in the American Revolution it is interesting to recall the ages of seven of the Founding Fathers on July 4, 1776: Benjamin Franklin, 70; George Washington, 44; John Adams, 40; Thomas Jefferson, 33; John Jay, 30; James Madison, 25, and Alexander Hamilton, 19. See *Seven Who Shaped Our Destiny*, by Richard B. Morris. 1973. Harper, New York, N.Y.

**IMPERIALISM:** Any effort by a non-Soviet nation vis-a-vis another to aid it, trade with it, seek payment from it, enter into a military compact with it, join with it in preventing the imposition of a Communist government upon it. (Any or all of these definitions may be used as the occasion requires. Every form of colonialism except that which is practised by the Soviet Government. Annexation of territory by any nation other than the U.S.S.R.

**KULAK:** A peasant or farmer who makes a living for himself and his family through his own husbandry, management, foresight and individual planning. Such a man and his family are dangerous to the State since private farming cannot be coordinated into the totalitarian system. Only the most poverty-stricken farmers are to be considered non-kulaks.—The word *kulak* is seldom seen or heard nowadays, perhaps because the Communists do not want to call attention to the fact that the Soviet and Chinese Communist farm systems regularly do not produce enough grain for those nations.

**LIBERATION:** Enslavement of a nation by the imposition of Communism upon it. The process consists of infiltration, assassination, sabotage and the setting up of phoney shadow governments and armies that may or may not contain traitors from the invaded country. The Russians, Chinese Communists and North Vietnamese Communists are seeking to “liberate” South Vietnam.

**McCARTHYISM:** Any attack on Communists or Communism; attacks or disagreements with liberals or pro-Communists; a fog word used to becloud issues concerning the Soviet Government, Communism, liberalism, or nearly any matter close to Communist or liberal thinking.—*The Freeman* magazine reported in 1953 that the word *McCarthyism* was “first used by Owen Lattimore on May 4, 1950 in his testimony before the Tydings Committee (of the United States Senate).” Lattimore was close to the Soviet Government, the Chinese Communists and Communists in the United States. *The Freeman* article continued:

“The following day, May 5, 1950, an article appeared in the *Daily Worker* (Communist newspaper, now defunct) by Adam Lapin, political editor, using ‘McCarthyism’ in the headline and text.

Whether the *Daily Worker* got it from Lattimore or Lattimore from the *Daily Worker*, or whether both were suddenly and coincidentally inspired on the same day, we do not pretend to know."

It was precisely because Joseph R. McCarthy was right on target that he was victimized by the predominantly left-wing press and pro-Soviet politicians, other office holders, and the manipulators of world affairs. *Churchillize* and *degasperize* were failures, but *McCarthyism* in America was a success. Nearly the entire news media personnel seized upon it. It was backed up by books and articles. Yet few among intelligent persons in the country today do not believe that McCarthy sought answers to the pressing question of why the United States of America, the strongest nation in history, was constantly losing ground to the Russian Communists. McCarthy threw such a bolt of fear into the Communists and those who use them that they continue to attack him today as if he were still about to expose them.

Senator McCarthy's book, *America's Retreat From Victory*, giving his reflections upon the decisions of Gen. George C. Marshall, contains much solid and unanswerable thinking. Surely one of the greatest mistakes ever made by the United States was carried out by General Marshall—namely, the creation of Communist China. McCarthy ran into a hurricane of helicopter blades; he was cut down, and his body is still being riddled, but his strength, his belief in America, his unwavering faith keep marching on. He will long be remembered by his countrymen, and his fight will go on.

He defined Communism as "a drive for power by a disciplined minority with welfare as its cloak." He declared that "Nazism was an enterprise of gutter intellectuals to gain the power of a great state and then of Europe." Now that McCarthy is dead, "McCarthyism" is used to smear others who would expose Communists and those who use them.

**PATRIOT:** A Communist. Also one who helps a Communist in party activities (invidiously dubbed "fellow traveler" in foreign countries). The word is out of style in America, where it might be construed as designed to embarrass the Communists. Also it might be construed as an "incitement" to Americans, believe it or not. The word *patriot* will have to be protected in the homes, most of the churches and schools, and in the hearts of Americans who believe in freedom; that would include the Armed Services—in brief, most of the millions of

Americans.

**PEACE:** Abstention from interference with Communists as they make war. Also, the absence of resistance to Communists as they take over a country. The word has no reference to peace as we understand it.

**PEOPLE AND PEOPLE'S:** Communists and Communist. These words are used to describe governments — the People's Republic of China, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the People's Republic of Congo, the Hungarian People's Republic, etc. Actually the people are very much out of the picture in People's Republics.

**PICKETING:** A parading or demonstration by workers or other citizens; not permitted in Russia but insisted upon by Communists elsewhere as an indispensable basis of democracy. Often resorted to by American Communists before the White House for sure-fire publicity; unheard of as a method of pressuring the Kremlin.— Actually, one hears very little about what the Communists *are* doing in the United States today.

**REACTIONARY:** An intransigent non-Communist or anti-Communist; one who disagrees with Soviet methods, plans or purposes; a capitalist; also a liberal, Fascist or individualist.

**RED-BAITER:** One who attacks Communists; one who questions them or wishes to discuss Communism openly; one who believes the Soviet Government should abide by the same rules as other governments; one who feels that Communists should avow their creed openly; one who writes an unfavorable novel, play or tract about Russians or Communists. (A prominent New York book critic condemned a novel by Mark Aldanov as "Red-baiting.")

**SOVEREIGNTY:** The independence, right to self-government and territorial integrity of a country not conquered by Russia; also Russia's sovereignty. The word is not applicable to Russian-

dominated countries, such as Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia.

**STRIKE:** A work stoppage in capitalist countries for the purpose of bringing about increases in wages and/or improvements in working conditions; a way of demonstrating any labor grievance. Not permitted in the Soviet Union but regularly used outside of Russia by Communists for political purposes.

**TRADE UNIONS:** In the Soviet Union, organizations set up by the Government to channel off labor complaints; dues are compulsory; no action not sanctioned by the government is permitted. In capitalist countries, trade unions must be kept free of any government control or regulation since they offer a fertile field for Communist infiltration for agitation, indoctrination and funds.

**TRAITOR:** One who is disloyal to the Soviet Union. Over the years the word has been used to describe persons who were loyal to and worked for some especially undesired goal of the free world.

**TREASON:** An act of perfidy against one's own country. (This is the customary definition of treason, but "treason" is what Communist instructions from Moscow called for in the event of a conflict involving Russia. The aim was and is to introduce a sense of guilt or crime in order to bring about complete subservience.)

**VALUE JUDGMENT:** An opinion, preconception or prejudice; often used in contemporary journalism.

**WARMONGER:** One who discusses Soviet aggression and considers any means to halt it.

**WAR HYSTERIA:** The mention of Soviet aggression and conquest.

Measures taken by non-Soviet countries to protect themselves against such capture.

**WORLD OPINION:** A nonexistent, imaginary condition of global thought; the word is used almost entirely in the free world, and there as a tool to agitate and frighten the people against some move that might prove embarrassing to the Communists; *world opinion* is another weapon or device in the arsenal of the enemy in the Cold War, the existence of which is often denied by the users of this instrument of mental warfare.

The use of slogans is an age-old political device, but the seizure and perversion of words on a wholesale scale is something new in international policy. The writer was once cautioned against using the word "progressive" loosely; he was told that the Communists had "captured" the word. On the other hand, the word "conspiracy" in world affairs is banned as a plague-carrier by the Establishment media.

Edward Hunter, author of the famous brainwashing books, comments in his magazine *Tactics* of June 20, 1972, on the non-use of words, thus:

Use of the words "conspiracy" and "treason" in reference to Communist and Communist-type attacks on the United States and U.S. interests has been practically banned because of an evasatory tactic that exploits prestige values. *This* has been especially effective in intellectual circles. You are a "low-brow" and called stupid if you talk about conspiracy and treason, no matter how obvious and proven they are.

This prestige tactic has been particularly effective in so-called intellectual circles that operate through the press, schools and churches . . .

This has been a success in psychological warfare second only to the use of the term *McCarthyism* to prevent any criticism of Communism, no matter how mild or accurate. . . .

There is a conspiracy to confuse, weaken, paralyze and destroy the United States on behalf of the enemy. Participation in this is treason, for we are in a state of war. . . .

What has been allowed to develop is an area of privileged treason.



This chapter's excursion into planned confusion through the misuse and non-use of words would not be complete without mention of Gary Allen's observation, "Communism, or more accurately, socialism, is not a movement of the downtrodden masses, but of the economic elite." It is that group which controls and operates the communications media. It is not the people but the Communists and their supporters, lackeys, flunkies and hangers-on who run the "People's Republics", which are the usual Communist dictatorships.

Major Gen. J.F.C. Fuller of the United Kingdom in a pamphlet, *Russia Is Not Invincible*, remarks upon the vitiation of words by the Soviet Communists, and continues:

Why has this policy of confounding the meaning of words been adopted? The answer is, that the nations "may not understand one another's speech." It is the story of the Tower of Babel bolshevized.

The very name the Russian Empire now bears—namely, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—is a lie; for the U.S.S.R. is not a union of republics as it is proclaimed to be; instead it is the compulsory serfdom of nearly two hundred subjugated peoples (national groups), speaking different languages and stemming from different cultures, each one trampled upon and held in leash by terror. Yet in this there is nothing new, for as the Pan-Slavism of Czarist Russia was but a catchword for Russian Imperialism, so today Communism is but the catchword for Bolshevik Imperialism—the most ruthless the world has ever known.

Therefore, Communism is also a lie; it is but Marxian grease paint superimposed on a fundamentally unchanged historic Russian physiognomy. Though it is true that, in 1917, Lenin attempted to impose Marxian Communism on Russia, by 1921 it had produced such confusion that to save himself he introduced his New Economic Policy. It was out of his failure and not out of his success that, under Stalin, there emerged a mixture of state capitalism and Asiatic despotism which, depending as it did on slave labor, was so inefficient that it could not compete with the so-called "Capitalist" world—that is, with free enterprise. Therefore, in order that Bolshevism may survive, free enterprise must be destroyed. Today Marxist Communism is solely for export, because it is the solvent of free enterprise, and its precipitate is chaos, the prerequisite for the establishment of a pistol-ruled (Bolshevik) world.

\* *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, p. 33.

Although that is what Dr. Sutton would call a general statement, it is nonetheless a keen observation and of interest, and it came long before the belated but useful confirmation by Alexander Solzhenitsyn. It fits in with the findings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in its Report for the fiscal year ended February 29, 1972. That Report lists the program of the international Communists as follows:

(1) They seek to isolate America, to destroy our alliances, and to drive a wedge between us and our most important friends, West Germany and Japan in particular.

(2) They seek to disarm America, calling for a 75 per cent reduction in the military budget, the abstention from new military technologies, the curtailment of military research, the abolition of ROTC (Reserve Officers Trainign Crops), the liquidation of the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency).

(3) They seek to divide America by exploiting and exacerbating racial differences and minority grievances. Many of the grievances they seek to exploit are legitimate, and call for corrective action. But that the Communists are not interested in corrective action is apparent from their violent attacks on moderate leaders of our major ethnic minorities. Through the so-called "Black Liberation Movement," they fan the flames of racial differences and seek to utilize the ethnic minorities as instruments of revolution. [This is an old Bolshevik custom. It might be summed up in the slogan, "Use and abuse national minorities," since, when the Communists take over, every one is submerged in the same melting pot of serfdom.]

(4) They seek to further divide America along class lines and to undermine our economy by encouraging the most exorbitant demands by trade unions in which they have influence; by initiating wildcat strikes; and by an unremitting attack on the authority of responsible trade union leaders, mounted through movements like the National Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy, Miners for Democracy, and the National Rank and File Action Conference.

(5) They seek to undermine our entire structure of laws and law enforcement—our courts, our grand jury system, the FBI and the local police. Among other things, they call for community control of the police for "People's Tribunals" and for Citizens Committees of Inquiry.

(6) They seek to further weaken the authority of government and to give their immediate followers and allied extremists access

to power, by agitating for community control of the schools, social centers, day care centers, etc.

(7) They seek to neutralize and destroy the two-party system by encouraging centrifugal tendencies within both parties.

(8) Operating primarily through the agency of Castro Cuba, the Tricontinental Organization, and the Venceremos Brigade, the world Communist movement seeks to sow chaos in America by encouraging, training and supporting the various American extremist organizations which are committed to a policy of urban terrorism, including the assassination of policemen and the bombing of public buildings.

(9) By attacking on all of these fronts simultaneously, the CPUSA (Communist Party of the United States) and the world Communist movement hope to bring about the destruction of "American imperialism," which they have proclaimed the "No. 1 enemy of mankind" for the obvious reason that only American power stands between them and their goal of worldwide dominion.

Findings like these should give pause to Americans. The warning should be taken seriously. We like to think it could never happen here, but so much has happened within our country and around the world that it should be a case of, Ten times burned, twenty times shy. Mental warfare is being waged in our country and everywhere else around the world. A balance of power imposed against the United States from within the country has consequences far beyond the pitting of physical strength against our nation. The balance is pursued within our country.

The effect is to downgrade the United States, its Armed Forces, and its people. It results in playing Communists against conservatives, totalitarians against Democrats or Republicans, Negroes against whites, Northerners against Southerners, criminals against law-abiding persons, draft-dodgers against loyal Americans, youths against their elders, intellectuals against ordinary folk, West Europeans against East Europeans, the Soviet Government against the United States, the United Nations against useful alliances and the free world, North Vietnam against South Vietnam, Communist Cuba against the Americas, Nigeria against Biafra, now vanquished, and the Congo against Tshombe, now dead. The balance of power does not *seek* a solution; it does not *want* one. It is a kind of world Donnybrook. Women's Liberation seeks to play women off against men. Thus the division is complete. Men and women have always made it; they face no

great barrier. Some of the other divisions, however, have had tragic results.

A number of persons who have sought to play criminals off against the law-abiding persons have been hoisted by their own petard. They have been the victims of the very criminals they sought to use but could not. Others may well be the victims of the world balance of power that they sought but could not control. There too they are trying to use terrorist nations against the peace-seeking.

When the people come to know what has been done and is being done to them, they will know how to deal with the situation. Much has been done by deception—deception practised by Americans against fellow-Americans. Deceivers believe that deception succeeds only by multiplication. They must understand by now that they have reached the outer limit. The people's right to know enters at this point.



## CHAPTER IV

# War:

# The Bleeding Of America

*PRESIDENT NIXON: "We are not going to bomb civilian targets in the North. We are not using the great power that could finish off North Vietnam in an afternoon, and we will not. But it would be the height of immorality for the United States at this point to leave Vietnam and in leaving, to turn over to the North Vietnamese the fate of 17 million South Vietnamese who do not want a Communist government, to turn it over to them."—Spoken in a news conference at the White House, Washington, July 27, 1972.*

*Senator J.W. FULBRIGHT: "Fundamentally, it is believed that the American people have little if any need to be alerted to the menace of the Cold War."—In his infamous Memorandum in 1951 that has set the policy in opposition to any military instruction drawing upon "talks from persons who stress the Communist menace in this country."*

*GEORGE W. BALL as Under Secretary of State in the Kennedy Administration: "Nothing must be done to endanger communications between this country and the Communists. No reference must be made to Communism as the enemy. Furthermore this country is not striving for victory in the Cold War. The United States should not under any circumstances refer to Communist tactics as 'brutal,' nor should the word 'slavery' be used in referring to Communist takeovers of captive people."*

*PRESIDENT NIXON: "On the home front, you are under attack from those who question the need for a strong national defense and indeed*

*see a danger in the power of the defenders.*"—In a commencement address at the United States Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs on June 4, 1969.

M. STANTON EVANS: "The peculiar notion of weakening ourselves while beefing up the enemy got started back in the days of Robert S. McNamara as an offshoot of more general theories about detente with the Soviet Union. Under the patronage of the Kennedy-McNamara regime, a group of left-wing intellectuals began cranking out studies which argued that we should build a 'structure' of mutual trust with the Communists, reassure the Kremlin by pulling back on our forward defenses, and approach the goal of global disarmament by sustaining a 'balance of terror' in which pervasive fear of nuclear holocaust would make the idea of scrapping military hardware seem attractive by comparison.

"As set forth in a volume called *The Liberal Papers* and various documents produced by the tax-supported Institute for Defense Analyses, these theories converged in a bizarre doctrine of 'mutual assured destruction' in which it was considered desirable that the Soviet Union be able to obliterate our cities, just as we were capable of obliterating theirs.

"As Liberal Papers author Walter Millis put it, the end-product of such reasoning was the notion that a 'genuinely deterrent policy would require the United States to cooperate with the Soviet Union in insuring that their retaliatory force was as invulnerable as ours and that our population was equally exposed to attack with theirs.'

"Though the idea was considered far-out at the time by Millis himself, it rapidly became converted into official policy through the efforts of McNamara and Kennedy disarmament guru Jerome B. Wiesner. In relatively short order the Kennedy strategists set about to build 'structure' and reassure the Communists by signing the Moscow test ban treaty, cutting back manned bombers ['provocative' to the Soviets] and holding up work on anti-missile defenses. The thrust of our policy became to insure that our defenses were downgraded to signal our pacific intentions to the Kremlin, and led to such chilling furbelows as that reported by defense expert Donald Brennan, in which McNamara ordered that the Sentinel ABM have 'some specific weaknesses introduced to make the system more easily penetrable by the Soviets.' (Emphasis added.)

"Opposition to anti-missile defenses is the most characteristic gambit of the disarmament lobby, and as will be seen from the above

*it has little to do with various technical and economic objections usually stressed in public debate. The real reason for combatting ABMs is that by defending Americans from nuclear evaporation they would 'destabilize' the balance and interfere with imagined progress toward disarmament. The goal is a 'stable balance of terror,' with the American people perpetually exposed as nuclear hostages."* — From Mr. Evans' article "The Greatest Story Never Told" in the magazine *Human Events* of July 28, 1973.

*REV. DANIEL LYONS, S.J.: President Johnson defended South Vietnam, but he fought nothing but a holding action, remarking year after year, 'Someday the leaders in Hanoi will meet with us,' as though that would solve everything.*"—In *Twin Circle* April 30, 1972.

*Prime Minister WINSTON S. CHURCHILL of Great Britain: "Sometimes in the past we have committed the folly of throwing away our arms. Under the mercy of Providence, and at great cost and sacrifice, we have been able to recreate them when the need arose. But if we abandon our nuclear deterrent, there will be no second chance. To abandon it now would be to abandon it forever."*

*Major Gen. THOMAS A. LANE, A.U.S. Ret.: "In the present world conflict, there is no fall back position for the free world. If the United States is defeated, the whole world will be submerged in a dark night of Communist tyranny. That is why the prevalence of these errors about war in the minds of our leaders is so portentous for the fall of Western civilization. The prospect is that when our people awaken to their danger, the battle will have been lost. There will be no second chance."*—Spoken on the *Manion Forum* in May, 1972.

A cease-fire in the Vietnam War was formally proclaimed at 8 A.M. January 28, 1973. By February 17 the Associated Press reported that South Vietnamese and North Vietnamese had suffered nearly 15,000 casualties since the "cease-fire." Some of the fighting was called the fiercest of the war. Fighting continued also in Laos and Cambodia at that time. The United States withdrew the last of its forces from South Vietnam on March 29, 1973. By one year after the so-called cease-fire the two sides in Vietnam had inflicted casualties upon each other that totaled as many as the number suffered by Americans in the entire war—more than 350,000.



Fighting after a cease-fire is normal procedure for the Communists. Nor would the conclusion of one war with them mean that another would not break out elsewhere soon thereafter. (The Russian Communists instigated the war in the Middle East in October of 1973.) We are concerned here with history and the matter of getting it straight. We are specifically concerned here with the bleeding of America in two great wars in Korea and Indochina. The two Vietnams, South and North, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand figure in the second war. A cease-fire was declared in Laos on Feb. 22, 1973, but the fighting there continued. It went on also in Cambodia, where no cease-fire had been reached by mid-1974.

The Korean War was the second great post-World War II disaster in Asia, the first having been the handing over of China to the Communists. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, a former Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, reported in 1966 that there were 3.5 million military casualties on both sides in three years in Korea, "where we also pulled our Sunday punch. Over a million civilians were killed and other millions left homeless in this protracted land struggle," he added. "I can't believe that this is the most humane way to fight a war." Indeed it was not, but that, as it turned out, was not the object. The object was not to irritate or embarrass or, in fact, "involve" the Soviet Government and the Chinese Communist Government in the war and to get out of it without victory. The Soviet Government, through its Premier, Joseph Stalin, planned the Korean War and, most probably, jointly with Mao Tse-Tung, who was in Moscow conferring with Stalin from December, 1949, to February 14, 1950. The war started on June 25, 1950. The Truman Administration maintained the fiction that the war was begun and carried on by the North Korean Government, a satellite of the Soviet, and that the Chinese Communists were "volunteers," who were led by General Lin Piao, a top Communist officer. He became the Defense Minister in Peking, and was killed in 1970 when he allegedly tried to flee from China to the Soviet Union. On February 1, 1951, the United Nations General Assembly named Communist China the aggressor, omitting both the Soviet Government and the North Korean Government.

That was in line with the way the war was managed on the United Nations side—with a minimum regard for the rational, not to say obvious. The Soviet Government, the author of this great tragedy, was allowed to continue its membership in the United Nations, and even to make the New York headquarters a base for relaying the messages and plans of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the United Nations commander, to

Moscow, and thence to the Russian (enemy) side of the battlefield! General MacArthur, one of the greatest military leaders ever produced by the United States, was dismissed by President Truman because the General wanted to win the war. MacArthur bitterly charged that "Washington planning was not directed toward methods of counterattack, but rather toward the best way to run." It was the beginning of the post-World War II physical bleeding of America; it was, alas, only a curtain-raiser for the Vietnam War, which was to be managed far worse on the Allied side, with more than twice as many American casualties.

A total of 5,764,143 Americans served in the United States Armed Forces in the Korean War—nearly 3 million in the Army, and nearly a half million in the Marine Corps, with 1,285,000 in the Air Force, 1,177,000 in the Navy, and 44,143 in the Coast Guard. Battle deaths totalled 33,629, with 20,617 other deaths, and 103,284 wounded. United States combat casualties in Vietnam at this writing (Jan. 25, 1973) totalled 45,958 killed, 10,303 dead from non-hostile causes (accidents and illness), 303,622 wounded, and 1,900 missing or prisoners, 560 of whom were released early in 1973. More than 2.5 million Americans served in Southeast Asia. The South Vietnamese battle deaths through Jan. 13, 1973, were put at 183,528 and the Communist dead were estimated at 924,048. If there were four wounded for each Vietnamese death (a much lower hypothetical ratio than actually occurred among Americans) the total of North and South Vietnamese casualties (dead and wounded) would be more than 5 million.

The Korean so-called peace talks lasted for two years (July, 1951-July, 1953), and the Americans suffered more than 70,000 casualties while they continued. The so-called peace talks at Paris on the Vietnam War began on May 10, 1968. By February, 1972, the Americans had suffered more than 181,000 casualties (22,000 dead)\*, while the North Vietnamese launched offensive after offensive, and caused vast battle and civilian casualties. Peace talks are strictly a bleeding operation with the Communists, who have no intention of reaching any kind of compromise, even though in Vietnam a measure of compromise appeared to have been forced upon them in the final event. In spite of the protestations of Communists that their aims are benevolent, they show not the slightest regard for human lives. If there is any of the milk of human kindness in them, it was not revealed in any action recorded in either of these wars.

\* *U.S. News & World Report*, Feb. 7, 1972.

Conversely, the great sacrifices made by the nations of the West are the ultimate measure of the build-up of the Communist leader lands—the Soviet Union and Communist China. It cannot be said that the national news media as a whole showed great concern over the carnage. Newspapers over the country printed pictures of Americans who gave their lives, but the news media in New York, notably excepting the *Daily News*, treated the conflict as if they were on the enemy's side, and indeed, that is the view that many United States military officers in Vietnam held in regard to those papers and other communications agencies. There was never any doubt in the highest military quarters that the Americans alone could have won the war in a few weeks if the leadership had permitted them to do so. President Nixon himself said on July 27, 1972: "We are not using the great power that could finish off North Vietnam in an afternoon, and we will not." But he said the United States was acting as humanely as possible.

The American communications media found every excuse to throw obstacles in the way of winning the war. Broadly speaking, they were guilty of the following acts:

1. Undermining every government of South Vietnam, from the Diem Administration in the early 1960's to the Thieu Government in 1972. Problems in South Vietnam were usually attributed to the Saigon Government, not to the North Vietnamese invaders.
2. Smearing the South Vietnamese armies and people.
3. Holding back Americans and Allies, so that entire battalions of North Vietnamese were allowed to escape and fight again, causing thousands of unnecessary casualties. The use of any kind of gas to flush the enemy out of tunnels was opposed. Search-and-destroy operations were condemned. Defoliation as a means of exposing the enemy was denounced. The enemy's flagrant use of Cambodia for years was denied, and President Nixon's drive into Cambodia, one of the most sensible military moves ever undertaken by the Allies in Southeast Asia, was hysterically denounced, though it eventually saved many American and other lives. Rain-making was attacked as an alteration of the environment (and never mind that it may have saved lives on both sides, as well as providing a propaganda lever for the enemy, wherever he may be). Bombing of North Vietnam was opposed even when it was done improperly—that is, targets chosen by the military were in most cases barred by the Defense Department when it was headed by Robert S. McNamara. When the North was being effectively bombed in 1972, a propaganda campaign in the United States was

undertaken to stop it by calling it "dike bombing," though no dikes were targets. It was entirely possible that such damage as was done to dikes was the result of North Vietnamese anti-aircraft shells falling back upon the dikes and exploding there. Also some dikes were damaged by floods. Later, in December, 1972, very heavy strategic bombing by the United States was denounced as directed against civilians and hospitals, though, strangely, dikes were not mentioned.

4. Vast publicity was given to the My Lai cases involving Americans accused of killing more than 100 South Vietnamese civilians, while hundreds of similar actions, cold-bloodedly ordered by the North Vietnamese Government, were ignored entirely or played down. *The New York Times* at first gave little space to the gruesome murders of 4,000 to 5,800 South Vietnamese at Hue in 1968, while that newspaper devoted entire pages to the My Lai cases, in which Americans were likened by Times writers to Nazis who killed millions.

5. Mutinies of Americans on the battlefield were reported and played up as victories; desertions of South Vietnamese soldiers were cited as proofs of weakness.

The aim was to blame the United States, to shame it, to prevent any victory, and to reduce its power, while the real culprits, the North Vietnamese Communist invaders and their Russian and Chinese Communist suppliers and instigators, were ignored. President Lyndon B. Johnson paid with his political life for refusing to win the war, as President Kennedy paid with his life for failing to wipe the Communists out of Cuba. The American people always wanted to win the war and get it over with as quickly as possible, thus saving lives on both sides. They wanted to follow the most humane, the most honorable and the most sensible way, since any other would damage our own country as well as our strength, ties and influence around the world. Even the American with the least knowledge of foreign affairs understood that.

President Nixon in the spring of 1972 mined rivers, harbors and canals of North Vietnam and bombed industrial and military targets there in retaliation for the massive invasion of South Vietnam, begun on March 31, 1972. About 11,000 mines were dropped into North Vietnamese waters, coastal and inland, and strategic targets were bombed totally in 1972 and early 1973. The President's action was in defiance of the often-expressed idea in American news media that such a move might bring on general war with Russia and Communist China. (Earlier in the year the President had visited Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai in Peking, and a few months later he went to Moscow to sign a

number of military and civil agreements, while the bombing of North Vietnam continued, and the rivers and harbors were still mined.) Thus in spite of the fact that the entire Vietnam War had been fought on the basis of fear, or alleged fear, that the mining of Haiphong harbor and the bombing of Hanoi's industrial and military installations would cause general war, nothing of the sort happened.

It was on that fallacy, then, that more than 360,000 Americans had been killed, wounded or died of illness or accidents, along with more than 5 million South and North Vietnamese battle casualties, in addition to countless civilian dead and injured.

What the news media in the United States had been saying, in effect, was that the Russians and Chinese Communists would not make it a general war, no matter how many casualties we piled up on both sides, but that the moment we sought to win the war the Russians and Chinese would enter the conflict and make it a wide-open war. Actually, the United States as well as South and North Vietnam were being bled. The lesson was clear: wars must be fought to quick victory or not at all. The East Europeans who know the Russians best feel that there was never any likelihood that the Russians would take on the United States in a war over Indochina. It is far more likely that the Soviet manipulators viewed the Vietnam War strictly as an enervating operation. They knew that the United States would never seek a clearcut victory, and so they sought to prolong the conflict for its great nuisance effects in America and around the world. In this Moscow had successes aplenty.

## CHAPTER VII

# *Revolt Against War Without Patriotism*

*JEFFREY HART, a professor at Dartmouth College, a Yale Ph.D., who writes a column for King Features Syndicate, made a memorable contribution to understanding in the spring of 1973. He observed that the United States had, "in effect," two governments. There was the regular government elected by the people, and there was a "kind of counter-government."*

*The counter-government did not recognize the legality of the regular government, but on the contrary used every means, "legal and illegal," to counteract its policies. Mr. Hart noted that the counter-government assumed the right to declassify secret documents, as was done by Daniel Ellsberg, and that Tom Wicker, left-wing columnist, viewed Ellsberg and his colleague, Anthony J. Russo Jr., as heroes. Mr. Hart added that the counter-government within the official government steadily leaked information of all kinds to the press. For instance, Mr. Hart remarked that Dr. Kissinger could advise President Nixon of some foreign policy situation one day and read about it the next morning in Jack Anderson's column.*

*Mr. Hart pointed out that the counter-government had its own journalists, its own clergy [the Berrigans, Groppi, etc.], and its own lawyers [Ramsey Clark, Boudin, Kunstler, among others]. He noted that the counter-government was linked with the counter-culture, and that the counter-culture rejected the usual standards "of American behavior and style."*

*He felt that the McGovern "movement" registered the highest point of the counter-culture and counter-government, so that it was not without reason that "the Watergate operatives perceived the*

*McGovernites as alien and hostile, as enemies."*

*Mr. Hart said that since Ellsberg looked upon the regular government as "criminal," and was lionized for his attitude and actions, the Liddys and McCords were bound to be "just around the corner."*

A reasonable view of the thousands of youths who did not want to give their lives lightly in a war that the United States Government did not intend to win does not mean that the writer condones draft-dodging, or looks with indifference upon the great deviations that the "counterculture" produced. Contrarily, the great eruptions of treason to America were sad to witness, and horrible to contemplate. Yet there is the fact that many fine thoughtful and patriotic youths across the country confided to the writer that they were not happy about the prospect of fighting in a no-victory Indochina conflict in which the Government (any Administration) showed an almost frivolous attitude toward the loss of life, squandering the lives of Americans and their Allies by the hundreds of thousands.

One veteran of World War I said today's youth were "afraid to face the bullet." He failed to take into consideration that today's young Americans were being told to go to war and offer themselves as targets, while the newspapers and other communications media condemned the fighting as unnecessary and even wrong. Thus the psychological base that had been provided to American fighters in every other war, even in Korea, was pulled from under the young men and their officers in Indochina. The support for the fighters was also divided in the Government, so much so much so that targets chosen by the Chiefs of Staff for aerial attack in North Vietnam were in most cases rejected by Robert S. McNamara when he was Defense Secretary.

Even so, some millions of Americans in the Armed Forces as volunteers or draftees served in Indochina, chiefly Vietnam. They fought against as ruthless a foe as had ever faced American soldiers (Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps) and the people surrounding them; and they were as brave and competent as their fathers in previous wars—without having the great moral support of a united country behind them. The divisions that were tearing the country apart at home had repercussions in Vietnam; the young men in a very strange land were subjected to every conceivable pressure to defect, to become drug addicts, to mutiny, to fight each other in color conflicts and other

disputes. That the defeatist news media magnified the problems does not erase the fact that they existed, including the fact that the manner in which the war was fought made inevitable many unnecessary casualties among soldiers and civilians.

Men in the ranks in other wars could turn to their officers, commissioned and noncommissioned, for a sensible explanation of what was going on. No such explanation could be given in the Vietnam War since even the highest officers in Washington were kept in the dark in regard to the underlying policies. For the first time in American history the United States Armed Forces were treated as the enemy by the leading newspaper in the United States, *The New York Times*, which kept up its attack even after President Nixon had withdrawn all of the American fighting men from South Vietnam. In this *The Times* had the concurrence of many other newspapers, radio stations and television networks in positive or tacit backing of the balance-of-power policy designed to hold the United States in check while the Communist world was being built up for the eventual world coalition government.

The "freedom marches" in the South of the United States started in 1961, the first year in which American casualties were recorded in Vietnam. As the war continued, and American casualties mounted, the widest disequilibrium in the lives of American youths and young adults in the history of the republic took place. The connection was obvious. The human being is at his best in his youth and young manhood. The greatest ideas are hatched or conceived in that period. The young human mind is a delicate, complicated and highly explosive mechanism and spirit. It reflects the problems, the machinations, the hidden contretemps of the times. It reacts in mysterious ways. Some thousands of youths fled from the country to Canada and other lands. (A *New York Times* reporter said a conservative estimate of this number was 50,000) About 235 deserted from the Armed Forces and took refuge in Sweden, which made a profession of denouncing the United States over the Vietnam War, though Sweden's contributions to maintaining the freedom of the free world have not been notable.\*

The nonconformity of American youths in this unparalleled situation gave rise to a whole new set of customs—mustachios, fuzzy sideburns, beards, and long flowing hair, making it difficult at times

\* The Canadian Consulate in New York would say only that in recent years about 25,000 Americans (of all ages) had migrated annually to Canada to settle there. From the office of the Assistant United States Secretary of Defense, Lt. Col. Audrey E. Thomas, USAF, informed the writer that "approximately 1,600 U.S. military personnel administratively classified as deserters are listed as being in Canada" as of Dec. 7, 1972.



from the rear view to distinguish young men from young women, many of whom joined in the new dress by wearing identical-looking blue jeans or Levys, long flowing hair, no makeup, and girls participated in many rebellious activities carried on by the young men. Che Guevara, a romantic Argentine rebel who helped to take over Communist Cuba and afterward was slain in Bolivia, became the archetype and model for many young Americans, so that it was often possible on certain streets of New York city to see as many as three Che Guevaras in one block. The real Che Guevara and Castro were early admirers of Adolf Hitler. Hippiedom, offshoot of the basic nonconformity and revolt against the no-victory war, spawned a hundred thousand full-time, non-working drug users and or narcotic addicts and about one million part-time, or "plastic," hippies.\* They spurned religion, philosophy, or any kind of ethics toward their environment or one another. The young men often induced the young women to become prostitutes to provide "bread" for the commune. Although in the main they were not Communists, they could be—and were—used by the leftists because of great vulnerability. The hippies represent the most extreme descent into know-nothingism and do-nothingism, stemming from the impact of the Atomic Age with its vast dangers and from the unaccustomed behavior of the United States in refusing to win wars while offering up its sons in what in the 1960's appeared to be an endless war. Suzanne Labin in her perceptive and engaging work, *Hippies, Drugs and Promiscuity* (1972, Arlington House) p. 46, wrote that hippies are "worshippers at the altar of indolence."

Essentially this is the most debased area of a bleeding America—the debasement and debauchment of scores of thousands of youths unable to cope with national and international maladjustments. They too are casualties. Many of them have died from overdoses of drugs or as beggars in faraway lands—Afghanistan, India, Nepal. Hippiedom is an ugly pustulation on the face of America and the world. It is not a threat to the nation because the hippies are aimless, mindless, feckless, and filled with a death wish; but neither are they a credit or a help to the country, and insofar as they do not assist it they hurt it.

While sometimes lawless, the hippies do not offer a record of widespread violence and bloodshed. Theirs was a wistful, introverted revolt. Not so the rebellions and insurrections of college students and Negroes. (Blacks is the word preferred by the Left Wing in designating *colored people*, an expression that is greatly derided by the Leftists.

\* *Hippies, Drugs and Promiscuity* by Suzanne Labin. 1972. Arlington House.

Nonetheless, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has not changed its name, and polls taken among Negroes revealed that they did not prefer *blacks* but would accept Negroes or colored people where the designation was felt to be necessary at all. *Blacks* is a polarizing word with invidious possibilities; it is precisely the kind of designation that would be designed to widen the separation of the peoples—the idea of two wholly distinct *races* of man is repugnant to reason and common sense and is without scientific basis. Color, whether black, brown, yellowish or tan, was the basis for the enslavement of and discrimination against Negroes. After the performances of Stalin and Hitler in this century, nobody can claim that white leadership alone is a guarantee against excesses undreamed of since those of Genghis Khan in the thirteenth century. Unfortunately, the invidious words *race* and *racial* are so deeply imbedded in the language that it is impossible to escape them and their harmful effects. Persons on all sides of the political fences use them, most often innocently, but the Communists seem most acutely aware of the semantically evil uses of words.)

The decade 1961-1970 saw the greatest outbreaking of riots, violence, looting, and the burning and seizure of buildings in the history of the United States. Insurrectionary behavior on the part of some Negroes preceded upheavals by students in colleges across the country. Eugene H. Methvin summed up the situation and its causes brilliantly in his work *The Riot Makers* (1970, Arlington House, New York, N.Y.). He recalled that in the summer of 1964 Harlem in New York erupted in a blazing riot and that outbreaks followed in six other cities. Within ten days after the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King in 1968 fiery riots occurred at one time in 125 cities. Methvin saw a number of possible causes of the disorders, but he concluded that they "came about because there were those who wanted them to come about" and "did everything in their power to cause them."

Of the 11,261 persons arrested in riots in Watts (Los Angeles), Newark, Detroit and Toledo, 56 per cent \* had previously served jail sentences of 90 days or more. That is to say, the criminal element was enlisted in the events that were made to happen. "You gotta stop looting and start shooting!" counseled H. Rap Brown, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which might better have been called the Non-Student Violent Coordinating Committee. "We have to move from Molotov cocktails to dynamite,"

\* *The Riot Makers*, p. 77.

Stokely Carmichael told a group in Harlem.\* In 1967 Carmichael advised an audience in Cincinnati to "stop fighting each other and go out and fight the police," as the police stood by. Methvin concluded that a "whole new generation of radicals has adopted the Leninist methodology of planned violence."

The long smoldering dissatisfaction of Negroes and the readiness of lawless people among them to join in action were the tinder that the Communist "movement" used to spread havoc in every part of the country. The links to the Communists were everywhere in evidence, but blatantly so as the leaders visited Havana, where Castro provides schools for guerrillas in urban warfare and national revolution.

It is not the function of this work to ascertain all the underlying and latent causes of the riots, or to tabulate the total losses in lives and property—totals that may *never* be arrived at. The great injury to America was to slow her in foreign and domestic policies, with the country torn up and distraught, offering a spectacle of helplessness to a world in need of United States leadership and support, so that some Europeans began speaking of America as "the muscle-bound giant," and Sicco Mansholt of the Common Market predicted that the United States was already so far down the drain that nothing could save it and that it was not qualified to be the leader of the world anyhow—a view which this writer does not share in any way and which he feels to be thoroughly unmerited in view of the vast contributions that the United States has made to the world, contributions unmatched by any other nation in all history. Distracting America from her work of advancing freedom in the world is precisely what one would expect the Russian Communists and their allies in misery to be doing.

Dr. Albert Einstein once said that "only strong characters can resist the temptation of superficial analysis."\*\* The writer hopes that the brevity of this chapter will not cause him to suffer from that charge, for he feels that the matters discussed here are of great importance. He therefore counsels that the reader go to Methvin's *The Riot Makers* for a more complete and profoundly interesting study of this great upheaval in American life. It is not possible to overreact to this phenomenal period—that is to say, one cannot learn too much about it, for it turns a page in our history. Moreover, it is of great importance that Americans should know what happened to them.

The demolition artists burrow deeper and deeper into American

\* *Ibid.* p. 75.

\*\* EINSTEIN by Ronald W. Clark, p. 51. 1971. World Publishing, New York, Cleveland.

public and private life. They do not harangue the people about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; they do not extol the "correctness" of trial by jury and of courts beyond the reach of corruption; they don't harp on personal probity and the ennoblement of working, of owning a home, of sustaining religion as a fundamental freedom, of upholding freedom of enterprise as a cardinal tenet of liberty, and opposing Government operation of businesses, along with the constant expansion of taxes to meet newly devised expenditures, accompanied by ever-rising deficits in domestic budgets and unfavorable foreign balances. The demolitionists are more concerned with the control of welfare budgets and Government handouts of all kinds, and above all with working to gain control of the whole government, whence they would stifle the liberties, the guarantees, the prosperity, and the hopes now available for an orderly world.

The revolt of the students in America was one of the most extraordinary and farreaching developments in the history of the country. Its effects are still being felt, while its fury is dying, if not dead. At its apex it resulted in the seizure and destruction of buildings on university campuses the length and breadth of the nation. Eight students—four at Kent State in Ohio, two at Jackson State in Mississippi, and two at Southern University in Louisiana—were killed. A graduate student, the father of three small children, was killed at the University of Wisconsin when a bomb placed by revolutionaries exploded. Three young persons were arrested in connection with a bank holdup in which a policeman was slain in Washington, D.C. The young couple were planning to set up a "commune" in Virginia. A number of persons including a policeman were grievously wounded in a riot at Columbia University in New York city. A bank building at the University of California at Santa Barbara was burned to the ground.

## CHAPTER VIII

# *Death Of The Monroe Doctrine*

*HUMAN EVENTS: "It was censored last week by CBS [Columbia Broadcasting System], but Lyndon Johnson [the former President] has severe doubts about the Warren Commission he himself set up. Johnson told CBS interviewers—in the deleted portion—that the commission made a major error in ruling out a Communist conspiracy [in the assassination of President Kennedy]. Johnson expressed serious reservations about the 'motivations and connections' of Lee Harvey Oswald, specifically his ties to the Soviet Union, Communist Cuba and the Fair Play for Cuba Committee."—In the Washington Weekly May 9, 1970.*

*BENJAMIN DISRAELI, EARL OF BEACONSFIELD: "The world is governed by different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes."*

The fall of Cuba to the Communists, bringing about the death of the Monroe Doctrine, is comprehensible only as a deliberate action of the United States Government while Dwight D. Eisenhower was President and Christian A. Herter was Secretary of State. No one can assume that the United States did not have the power to prevent this critical loss to the security of the United States and the whole hemisphere. Nor can any one believe that the United States Government did not know the political nature of Fidel Castro and the Soviet Force that was behind him.

For readers who would be refreshed as to the essence of the Monroe Doctrine we quote from the International Encyclopedia:

"The term applied to the policy of the United States regarding foreign interference in American affairs. It takes its name from President Monroe, who in his message to Congress in 1823 first gave it formal announcement. . . . In modern conception it is the policy of the United States to regard any attempt on the part of a European power to gain a foothold in this hemisphere by conquest, or to acquire any new establishment in North or South America by whatever means, as an act hostile to the United States."

As a result of the installation of Castro and his Communist regime in Cuba, the Soviet Government now has a military foothold and stronghold in the American hemisphere. Premier Nikita Khrushchev declared the Monroe Doctrine dead—he killed it. The Russians are well aware that they are being appeased by the United States. Their only problem is to know the outer limit of their expansion.

That the national news media are not greatly concerned over whether the American people learn the truth about Russia's rising strength was shown again in August 1971. News Perspective International, headed by William J. Gill, in Washington, reported then to its customers:

Two nights before Congress adjourned for its summer recess eighty-six members of the House of Representatives joined in issuing one of the most ominous warnings in the history of the republic.

One by one, Congressmen from both parties rose on the floor of the House and laid it on the line: If the United States continues to fall behind the Soviet Union in nuclear, naval and all other armaments, the survival of the nation—and the lives of every man, woman and child in the country—will soon be in jeopardy.

In short, America will cease to exist.

Yet not one national television news show featured this story; not a line of it appeared in *The New York Times* nor the *Washington Post*, and so far as the Congressman could immediately determine neither the Associated Press nor United Press International carried it on their natural wires.

The national news media decided these Congressmen have no right to be heard. As one disgusted House member from Illinois put it, "If Bella Abzug had dropped her bra on the Capitol steps it would have hit every TV screen and every front page in the country. But we get blanked completely on something like this."

The question that must be posed at this point is this: Why have

the news media imposed a virtual Iron Curtain of Censorship on this, the most important story of our time?

One may question whether that was the most important story of our time, and one may criticize the anxiety of the 86 members of the House of Representatives over the growing strength of the Soviet Union, but there can be no question of the right of the public to know what these 86 members of the House were saying, and there can be no denying the duty of the news media to present those views to the people. It is entirely possible that the actions of the 86 Congressmen in 1971 foretold the journey to Moscow by President Nixon in 1972.

The background in the United States Government showing a long-range plan to wreck the non-Communist government of Cuba and hand it over to the Communists is outlined in a number of revelations in the years since the end of World War II and, especially, more recently. Seymour Freidin and George Bailey, authors of *The Experts*, published in 1968, remarked, p. 135, that "the Communist conspiracy that flourished [in the United States Government] during the late thirties and early forties was largely obscured and has remained so."

They said that Harry Dexter White was the most important member of that conspiracy "because he was the most effective agent of the Soviet Union." They said that he had been recruited by the OGPU, later the KGB, Soviet Secret Police, in the early 1920's while he was a student at Stanford University. They asserted that he "was not an agent of influence, but a regularly recruited, trained Soviet agent who was groomed and managed by his Soviet case officers for his career." He rose in the 1930's to become Assistant Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and he brought into the department "his fellow Communists in such numbers and into such positions as to make the Treasury Department and most of its branches a Communist stronghold in American government." The authors of *The Experts* said that because of White's great influence at policy-making levels he was able to effect "far-reaching changes in our government."

White is asserted to have been responsible for the transfer to the Soviet Government of the plates and other equipment for printing German occupation marks at the end of World War II. That operation cost the United States Government more than \$200 million before Washington put a stop to the bleeding operation. White was also "credited" with having engineered the runaway inflation of the Chinese yuan, a maneuver that helped to bring on economic chaos and the collapse of the Government of Chiang Kai-shek on the Chinese

mainland. The hand of Harry Dexter White was also seen in the Italian peace treaty, which gave \$360 million in reparations to the Soviet Government, Yugoslavia, Greece, Ethiopia, and Albania, "all billed to the American taxpayers since the war left Italy destitute." The Russians also received nearly half of the Italian merchant marine and more than half of the Italian Navy.

Far from being discredited immediately after he left the Treasury Department, White was appointed United States representative on the executive board of the World Bank. He died suddenly in 1946 after he had testified before a committee of the House of Representatives.

The interlocking nature of the Communist apparatus in the United States Government and the consistent pattern of Harry Dexter White's Communist wrecking activities around the world are also met in *Diplomats and Demagogues: The Memoirs of Spruille Braden*, who was one of the ablest American diplomats in Latin America. As United States Ambassador to Cuba in the early 1940's, Mr. Braden said that the first thing he did in Cuba was "to defeat a Communist plot involving both our State and Treasury Departments." He stated that Harry Dexter White had visited Cuba and recommended that the island country should have its own currency and a central bank and a series of subsidiary banks. The United States envoy said he immediately foresaw the possibility of galloping inflation, which would no doubt have been followed by economic chaos, the Communist formula for conquest. For his pains in saving Cuba from fiscal ruination, Mr. Braden was attacked in a message from the State Department which said that "Cuba had a sovereign right to its own bank and currency" and that he "was apparently a tool of the American banking interests in Cuba." Mr. Braden said it "was a few years before Harry Dexter White, who ran Secretary Morgenthau, and Lawrence Duggan, who ran our Latin American relations, were exposed as members of the Soviet spy apparatus."

Thus an effort to debase the currency of Cuba was scotched, though the attempt in China succeeded. The Communists win some, and lose some, but they never give up trying, and in Cuba they succeeded on the next time around by a new route but again with yeoman help from within the United States Government. Obviously the United States currency itself is now under the most violent and sustained attack in its history. Why should the currency of the richest country in the world be weak, and buffeted in all the financial capitals of the world? We know the technical answers, but why should the vast deficits in our accounts at home and abroad have been rolled up in the first place? If it is not a



conspiracy, what is it?

The weakening of the United States has been consistent since the end of World War II. The course may zig and zag, but it is not decorated with any great victories. Indeed, a victory would be counted as a defeat, and the manipulators of our fate would simply seek a new defeat to undo or downgrade anything that might be construed as a victory. On the other hand, Communists individually almost always end up bitterly and badly. Spruille Braden recounts that on December 20, 1947, "Duggan jumped, or he was thrown, from the window of his office in midtown Manhattan."

Braden gives some piercing glimpses into the State Department in Washington, which suggest the great strength of the Communist penetration of that and other departments. He said that an FBI report circulated among top officials identified a number of government employes, including Harry Dexter White and Alger Hiss, as Communists. He also said that, in spite of many efforts, he was never able to get "any real discussion of the Communist peril while in the State Department." He recounted that memos on this matter were met "with evasion" and that he constantly had the feeling that he was "shut up in a dark room vainly trying to catch a black cat." Yet, he recalled, things happened that he found hard to explain except through "a communist hand acting in the shadows."

He tells how dispatches between the United States Embassy in Argentina and Washington as well as a memorandum from an Argentine Ambassador in Uruguay, sent to Washington, had found their way into Peron's newspaper in Buenos Aires. This was at a time of cooperation between Communists and Peronists. He said it was not likely that Peronists had infiltrated the State Department but that Communists had, and that it was probable that they had photostated the letters and sent them to Argentina. Also, a long memorandum on Communism that Ambassador Braden sent from Cuba disappeared from the files in Washington and from the files of the U.S. Embassy in Havana. Eight hundred documents containing the names, aliases, and addresses of Communist agents all over the American hemisphere disappeared from the State Department. They had been photostated in Rio de Janeiro by U.S. Ambassador Hugh Gibson and sent to Washington.

Eight hundred documents listing the names and addresses of Communist agents all over the hemisphere vanish!

But the State Department somehow always escapes a house-cleaning. In 1952 the people turned out the Democrats and voted in Gen. Dwight

D. Eisenhower partly because of "popular concern over the Communist infiltration of the State Department that had been exposed by Congressional investigations and the two Hiss trials." But the new Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, "rushed around the world at such a pace that the hoped-for purge of Communists never took place." We cannot accept Mr. Braden's explanation, for the promised purge never does take place. Sixteen years later Richard M. Nixon when running for the Presidency for the first time said in Dallas, Texas, that if he were elected he would undertake a complete housecleaning of the State Department. On the contrary, exactly the opposite is reported to have happened—a purge of pro-Nixon people in the department was said to be under way soon after Mr. Nixon entered the White House in 1969. At any rate, there had been no purge of the State Department under President Nixon by the end of his first term. He said things looked different from inside the White House—an ominous statement that has never had an explanation or amplification.

The Braden memoirs throw much light upon the activities of Alger Hiss in the State Department and of the apparent close connection between Hiss and others in State work. That Hiss sought in 1946 to deprive the United States of sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone is one of the charges made by the man who was then Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American affairs.

The feeling of distrust that the writer has always had in regard to the judgment of Dean Acheson is not diminished by Braden's *Memoirs*. Obviously Braden never expected to find Acheson on his side in any difference with Hiss. After Hiss was accused of perfidy, Acheson said he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss. \* Why? Why was Hiss more important than getting the truth about him to the country? Why did Acheson lend his high position to confusing the nation? Why did Braden find it impossible to discuss the Communist peril while in the State Department? Why did he have the feeling that he was shut up "in a dark room vainly trying to catch a black cat"? Both Acheson and Braden were Yale graduates but worlds apart in their thinking. Braden was forced out of the State Department. Why? He was one of the ablest and most rigidly loyal men in it, but he did not ride with the left-wing "wave of the future." That was his undoing. And that included his refusal to lend himself to a policy of confusing the American people.

Now security has been completely smashed in the State Department,

\* Note how different was the behavior of Chancellor Willy Brandt of West Germany in 1974 when his top aide, Guenther Guillaume, was exposed as an East German spy in the West German Government. Herr Brandt did not say, "I will not turn my back on Guenther Guillaume." On the contrary, Herr Brandt resigned.

and the public has not the faintest idea what kind of mix is to be found there. The brain of the Government in international affairs can be as addled as a bad egg for all we know. At any rate Dr. Henry A. Kissinger in the first Nixon Administration undertook most of the negotiations in foreign affairs, while the role of the Secretary of State was cast into the shadows. The United States State Department was deliberately deprived of security with the removal of Otto Otepka and others.

Let us now scan briefly the right of the United States to be in the Panama Canal zone, and the fall of Cuba to the Communists.

Now the United States is negotiating new treaties with Panama in regard to the Canal, and a special Presidential commission has recommended that the United States build a new, sea-level canal across the isthmus of Panama just west of the present non-sea-level canal. The new canal would provide the wedge for yielding sovereignty over the present Canal Zone by duplicating the existing facility at an initial cost of nearly \$3 billion. The sea-level job would be a vast boondoggle that would waste the taxpayers' money, introduce ecological hazards of potentially great size, and possibly result in a new Suez Canal situation—that is, a shutdown of one of the world's vital waterways. The ingredients for such a disaster are present on both sides of the proposed new treaties. The present canal offers the ability to handle future increases in traffic through improvements already proposed in Congress—improvements that could be accomplished at a small fraction of the cost of an unnecessary sea-level canal.

Many members of Congress, Senators as well as Representatives, felt concern in 1972—and still more in 1974—when the United States Government revealed it was planning the cession of its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone to Panama, then dominated by what Prof. Donald M. Dozer called the “saber-rattling demagoguery of Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos, Supreme Leader of the Revolutionary Government of Panama.” \* That Communists had infiltrated that government and that the Soviets were active in promoting troublemaking and disorders in Panama was reported from many sources, none of them in the United States Government or in the major news media. Yet three United States ambassadors—Robert B. Anderson, John C. Mundt, and David H. Ward—for more than a year had been negotiating new treaties with Panama concerning the Canal Zone. As in virtually all negotiations with Leftists, no rights of theirs

\* *Human Events*, Nov. 4, 1972, p. 12.

were under negotiation—only the rights of the United States: “What’s mine is mine; what’s yours is negotiable.”

From 1904 through June 30, 1971, the United States had put the net amount of \$5,695,745,000 into the canal, including defense. Every bit of the land in the Canal Zone had been purchased, parcel by parcel, from the owners. The territory was granted to the United States—not leased—in perpetuity for a cash payment to the Panama Government of \$10 million and annual compensation of \$250,000 for Panama’s loss of revenue from the Panama Railroad. The latter figure had been increased by 1955 to \$1.9 million annually. This was never a rental payment. Panama declared its independence of Colombia on Nov. 4, 1903. The Hay-Bunau Varilla Treaty between the United States and Panama followed, and was ratified in 1904.

The Russians make no reports to the United Nations on any of their vast domains; nor are they pressed to yield sovereignty over any of the lands they have annexed or that they dominate by force and violence. Nor is there any party or group working night and day for the interests of the United States in the Soviet Union or in the Soviet Government. The one-sided nature of the American situation vis-a-vis the USSR is surely the most incredible phenomenon in the history of the world.

Robert Morris, eminent Constitutional lawyer, contributed a remarkable editorial to the Catholic weekly *Twin Circle* of March 22, 1974, which is so corroborative of the position described in this work that it is reproduced here in entirety:

Perspective is so important. It enables one to see clearly. That is why the sly but successful propagandists are always throwing dust in our eyes.

For seemingly inexplicable reasons the U.S. State Department has been trying to take the Panama Canal from the United States and turn it over to the Panamanian Government which is run by political bandits allied to Fidel Castro and Colonel Qaddafi and other enemies of the United States.

They have no legal authority to do so since sovereignty over the canal was formally ceded to the United States in perpetuity in 1903. The ceding was wrought by treaty which under our Constitution becomes the law of the land, equal to the Constitution.

No President, much less the State Department, has the power or authority to change this deeply ingrained constitutional enactment by executive agreement.

To amend or to annul this treaty which is what Dr. Henry

Kissinger, through Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, is trying to do, legislative action must be taken by a two-thirds vote in the Senate and possibly even a two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives.

But Kissinger and Bunker are acting as if they and not the Congress have the authority to take this step which a clear perspective would show to be suicidal and self-destructive.

If Panamanian dictator Torrijos is given sovereignty and authority over the Canal, he and his allies will see to it that we will not use the Canal at all or else we will be blackmailed into outrageous payments and conditions. That is the booming lesson of contemporary history. To try to safeguard our interest by agreement after surrendering sovereignty is fanciful.

All of which points up the folly of our present policy of detente. The Communists and their allies (of which Torrijos is one) are driving ahead toward their goal of Sovietizing the world. We are peacefully and unilaterally co-existing with them, even to the extent of foregoing any educational implementation of our posture.

We sent troops into Vietnam to stem the Communists but we could not indoctrinate them that Communism was an evil force of aggression. When soldiers know not for what they fight, they lose their morale. And when parents know not for what their sons fight and die, they do more than lose morale.

How can we possibly survive in a world with aggressive Soviet power when all our agencies of government are precluded, by authority on high, to educate our people on the true nature of Communism?

Every Soviet bureaucrat is imbued with a sense of dedication to Communist advancement. Every bureaucrat of ours must be neutral to Communism (or worse) to be eligible for service.

It necessarily follows that our present policy will take us into one retreat after another. The enemy can implement its aggressions with propaganda and demonstrations. We can only implement our position with abstract, often inane and now thoroughly incredible protests and pretensions.

Let there be thorough hearings in the Senate and even the House of Representatives on the issue of the Panama Canal. Then let the Congress make its decision. Let us not engage in the secret diplomacy that has led us into one disaster after another.

Well spoken for the United States of America, Mr. Morris! It is too rare that so logical a position in regard to American policy is heard in the land.

The fall of Cuba to the Communists under Castro in January, 1959, removed any shadow of doubt that may have remained in this writer's mind that the United States was in serious danger at home and abroad from Communist machinations. True, hindsight has 20-20 vision, which is a sight better than none. Some among us do not have hindsight. Some are Communists. A great fog about *McCarthyists, reactionaries and imperialists* was thrown up to cover the United States' placing of the Castro regime in power. When the massive Castro Cuban massacres (more than 20,000 executions of innocent persons in a few years) left some gnawing doubts about the Frankenstein that had been created for Americans and for the Americas, a new device was resorted to. The word "anti-Communist" was made invidious—that is, only a vulgar, uneducated boor would be an anti-Communist. It was not proper even to make a big to-do about the Cuban Communist seizures of about \$3 billion worth of United States citizens property. *The New York Times* was the leader in the movement to heave Castro into power and keep him there at all costs. It had yeoman help in this from other newspapers and from the electronic media, but above all it had the help of the United States Government, which was, after all, essential to the Cuban Communists and to the killing of the Monroe Doctrine. It is too much to believe that the United States Government was too stupid or too incompetent to know what it was doing.

Sources of information about Cuba are many and varied. Two that are outstanding are Mario Lazo's *American Policy Failures in Cuba* (1970, Twin Circle edition) and Paul D. Bethel's *The Losers* (1969, Arlington House). Both are works by honest and brilliant men, who are thoroughly familiar with Cuba. Both were witnesses of the events they describe. Dr. Lazo nearly lost his life in the reckless and merciless killings of Castro and Guevara. ("More than twice as many people had been killed in a single year than during the seventeen years Batista had held power, and thousands had been imprisoned," wrote Lazo, p. 215.) Guevara, popularly portrayed as a romantic revolutionary who stole from the rich to help the poor, was in fact a compulsive killer who did away with Cuban peasants as readily as he death with the "bourgeoisie."

The question always arises, Why would Americans, newspapers with good reputations, and even controlling persons in the United States

Government, want to lend any aid to such scoundrels? Persons act for different reasons, but the overriding cause must be the aim to drive the United States into a position where it must form a "coalition world government" with the Russian Communists and others.

Everything indicates that the Cuban "revolution" was a highly engineered operation calculated cold-bloodedly to transfer power from the not-perfect Batista regime to a wholly imperfect Communist regime, because it was not necessary that a new regime different from Batista's had to be a Communist one, since Batista had already agreed to a change that would keep a republic in Cuba.

The American national news media embraced Castro and cast him or miscast him for the role of deliverer of the Cubans. Castro delivered but not in the manner that he had promised. There were no elections. The "coalition" soon dissolved into the basic solution, Communism. The Russians were invited in, and all dissident Cubans were invited out—about 800,000—that is, those dissidents who were not killed by firing squads after drumhead trials that were no trials. The Russians said that they were amazed at the ease with which they were permitted to penetrate Cuba.

Readers of this volume would be well advised to read at least the two volumes on Cuba mentioned here, Dr. Lazo's and Paul Bethel's. Bethel makes it clear that Cuba is now completely controlled by the Russians. Dr. Lazo makes it painfully apparent that the Cubans never had a chance of gaining their freedom once Castro was put into power. The Bay of Pigs was a disaster but far more than we might have thought, because it was a clumsy and tragic farce in 1961 that encouraged the Russians to put missiles into Cuba in 1962 and risk a nuclear war (if, indeed, that was what the great contretemps was all about).

*The Bleeding of America* has dealt with the highest or lowest principles as well as the practices in the weakening of the United States in relation to the Soviet Union, Communism, its domains and its expansionism. One can agree with one phase of Gary Allen's definition of Communism—that it is run more from New York, Washington, Paris and London than from Moscow and Peking—without doubting that Moscow and Peking are pressing the spreading of violence and confusion throughout the Western world, most especially the United States. Now, while we begin to understand the principles (or lack of them, morally speaking) that guide our national and individual destinies, we begin to learn some specific things in regard to the strange activities around us. For instance, we learn that Moscow may have a hand in more occurrences in the United States than even the most anti-

Communist American ever charged. Communist infiltration into political parties, the news media, book and magazine publishing, the teaching profession, the arts, sciences and other professions is deliberate and may be much greater than is imagined. Conversely, the most outspoken anti-Soviet speaker may well deserve a second look—he could be a subverter and master subverter at that.

J. Bernard Hutton, a former member of the central committee of the Czech Communist party, who later served as foreign editor of the newspaper *Vechernyaya Moskva* (Evening Moscow), became disillusioned with the Communism that he found in Russia. After London during World War II he returned to Prague but left again when the Communists took over in 1948. Again residing in England, he devotes his life to exposing the great fraud that Communism is. His latest work is *The Subverters*, published by Arlington House in the United States—an eye-opener in revealing what the Russians and Chinese Communists are doing to upset the West through murder, air hijacking, fueling the war in Northern Ireland, strikes, sabotage, kidnapping, the entrapment of soldiers into becoming traitors through the use of women; and other crimes. But Moscow and Peking have their differences (never doubt it).

These concern whether to use civil disruption or gelignite to chaotize the Western world. Peking got the jump on Moscow in the matter of air hijacking and air terrorism. It trained men and women in the techniques of attacking aircraft with machine guns and incendiary bombs, and the smuggling of plastic hand-grenades through airport checks. Moscow then set up its own schools of air terrorists. It cannot be denied that Soviet Russia and Communist China have their differences, but they are between *them*, and they concern how to make the lives of non-Communists more difficult.

*The Subverters* is a fascinating compendium of information, often given in the form of stories of the lives of subverters, about activities that are rarely presented "in depth" in the news media. It was never likely that the book would be reviewed in New York or Washington or in any of the leading book review magazines or other non-anti-Communist or pro-Communist publications; nor will Mr. Hutton hear the familiar words on television, "Would you welcome, please, Mr. J. Bernard Hutton, author of *The Subverters*." The great newspapers, the television networks, and most of the radio networks do what they can to drive book publishers over to the left. They and the foundations put a crushing burden upon conservative, or simply truth-seeking, writers and thinkers.



***Postscript—  
Pearl Harbor:  
“A Date Which Will  
Live In Infamy.”***

*“A Date Which Will Live In Infamy.”*—Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President.

*The Bleeding of America* would not be complete without mention of Pearl Harbor—December 7, 1941. Indeed, that is where the normal moral processes of government on the part of the United States were fouled, no doubt with the idea of unifying the country for war. There is no reason whatever for believing that this nation would not have been unified (as it already was) without the unnecessary sacrifice of 3,077 lives among our Navy and Marine Corps men, with 876 wounded, and 226 lives of Army and Army Air Corps men, with 396 wounded. The Japanese were deliberately drawn in to make that attack—drawn in by President Roosevelt, who afterward declared that December 7, 1941 was a “date which will live in infamy.”

The idea that a President of the United States would do such a thing was revolting and repugnant to this writer, and he scornfully rejected the thought when it was first posed to him in New York in December of 1941. Naivete? Yes, there was some of that. But in extenuation for not believing the worst about a President of the United States, the writer offers this much in explanation:

He was then an assistant foreign editor of *The New York Times*, a position in which he was required to read virtually all the foreign news that came in to that newspaper—the voluminous *Times’s* own file of its correspondents around the world, the Associated Press, United Press, Reuters, Jewish News Agency, Religious News Agency, and a scattering of other contributions just in case one’s eyes were still holding up at the end of the evening.

With this knowledge of current foreign affairs, the writer was able to predict on the night before Pearl Harbor—that is, on December 6, 1941—that the United States would be at war with Japan before the month was out. This prediction was based upon a dispatch written by Otto D. Tolischus for *The New York Times* from Tokyo on December 6. The substance of the dispatch was read over WQXR, the radio station of *The Times*, that evening. It said the Japanese Government had issued a statement to the Japanese people that, *if war should come*, the public should feel sure that Japan was capable of fighting to victory. The statement then listed the number of war planes and warships that the Japanese had, and gave some other particulars about Japanese fighting strength.

The writer based his remark upon the knowledge that every government without exception prepares its people for a great operation, such as a war. The writer said that the *Times* dispatch clearly showed that Japan was preparing its people for war with the United States, and he said that the outbreak would come within the month of December, 1941. This did not seem especially clairvoyant at that moment, though the prompt fulfillment of the prophecy the next day was stunning.

Now this writer felt that his sources of information, while extraordinarily large and timely, were not greater than those of the United States Government (and, of course, they were not), and, therefore, that it was just plain unaccountability on the part of the commanders at Pearl Harbor not to have been ready, prepared and waiting for the Japanese. But those commanders—Admiral Husband E. Kimmel of the United States Navy, and General Walter C. Short of the United States Army—depended upon their superiors in Washington to keep them advised, and not only had they every right to do that but it was their duty to do that.

There is now a wealth of evidence that the Japanese were drawn in to make the attack, with the risk of the great loss of American lives and American fighting capability—eight battleships knocked out of action, three cruisers likewise, four destroyers damaged, two beyond repair, a seaplane tender and a repair ship badly damaged, a target ship sunk, and 177 American planes destroyed. The Japanese lost 48 planes and three worthless midget submarines. And the Japanese were lured to Pearl Harbor while the American commanders there were kept in ignorance of the strategy. That is a fact now established beyond question. But the public as a whole still does not know it.

Dr. Anthony C. Kubek, mentioned earlier herein as the author of *How The Far East Was Lost*, wrote in that work, p. 18:

At noon on November 25 [1941], Secretaries [Henry L.] Stimson [War] and [Frank] Knox [Navy] met at the White House together with General [George C.] Marshall [Army Chief of Staff] and Admiral [Harold R.] Stark [Chief of Naval Operations]. The discussion dealt mainly with the Japanese situation concerning the intercepted message fixing the November 29 deadline. [A secret Japanese deadline which the United States—that is, Washington—learned about by intercepting a Tokyo message to its embassy in Washington. The United States had broken the Japanese code.] The President brought up the event that we were likely to be attacked perhaps (as soon as) next Monday, for the Japanese are notorious for making an attack without warning. The main question was how we should maneuver them into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves. It was a difficult proposition.

But the difficulty was overcome, and the Japanese were enabled to make their attack without being warned off either by American planes or even so much as a message from General Marshall to General Short (in time to meet the attack) or from Admiral Stark to Admiral Kimmel. General Marshall incredibly explained his attitude thus (*FDR* by Finis Farr, 1972 p. 373, Arlington House):

“That morning [Dec. 7, 1941] in Washington, General Marshall had sent a message to General Short in Honolulu, instructing him to be on the alert. Marshall did not use the scrambler telephone that would have put him in direct touch with General Short. Instead, he sent the warning by commercial cable [!], and it arrived too late [hours later than the attack]. Explaining his activities of that morning, Marshall said that he did not use the telephone because the Japanese might take the alerting of American garrisons in Hawaii as a hostile act [!]. He said, ‘The Japanese would have grasped at almost any straw to bring to such portions of our public that doubted our integrity of action that we were committing an act that forced action on their part.’ In other words, Marshall was saying, never mind about American men who may be killed by surprise without a chance to fight, so long as we don’t lay ourselves open to criticism by isolationists. Marshall’s statement made little sense, for he *had* alerted Short, but by a roundabout method that turned out to be ineffectual under the pressure of events. After sending the telegram, Marshall went out for a [horseback] ride in Rock Creek Park.”

The Japanese were already on their way to attack Pearl Harbor and did so without fail and without worrying whether or not we accused them of provocation. Such an action would have had to be prepared many days in advance. Marshall's explanation in this affair makes as little sense as many other of his moves as a statesman, which were so often disastrous. But, coincidentally and strangely but tellingly, Admiral Stark also refused to notify Admiral Kimmel in time.

The method by which the United States decoded the all-important messages between Tokyo and the Japanese Embassy in Washington was called Magic. They foretold the great interest of the Japanese in the positions of United States warships in Pearl Harbor, and they foretold the beginning of the war. Rear Admiral Robert A. Theobald, U.S.N., ret., was Commander, Destroyers, Battle Force, and was in Pearl Harbor port when the Japanese struck. He wrote a book, *The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor*, published in 1954 by Devin-Adair, which is the definitive statement for Navy men of the attack. It is a moving one too, with corroborative forewords by Admiral Kimmel and Fleet Admiral William F. Halsey. Admiral Halsey's position is succinctly stated in his final paragraph:

"I have always considered Admiral Kimmel and General Short to be splendid officers who were thrown to the wolves as scapegoats for something over which they had no control. They had to work with what they were given, both in equipment and information. They are our outstanding military martyrs."

Admiral Halsey pinpoints the situation in this paragraph:

At that time [the day of the attack] I was one of the three senior commanders of the Pacific Fleet, serving under Admiral Kimmel. I am sure he kept me informed of all the intelligence he possessed. Certainly I did not know then of any of the pertinent Magic Messages. All our intelligence pointed to an attack by Japan against the Philippines or the southern areas in Malaya or the Dutch East Indies. While Pearl Harbor was considered and not ruled out, the mass of the evidence made available to us pointed in another direction. Had we known of Japan's minute and continued interest in the exact location and movement of our ships in Pearl Harbor, as indicated in the Magic Messages, it is only logical that we would have concentrated our thought on meeting the practical certainty of an attack on Pearl Harbor.

Admiral Halsey advised "every American who believes in fair play"

to read Admiral Theobald's book. That is the right way and the fair way to all concerned. Meanwhile read these paragraphs from that book, *The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor*:

Everything that happened in Washington on Saturday and Sunday, December 6 and 7, supports the belief that President Roosevelt had directed that no message be sent to the Hawaiian Commanders before noon on Sunday, Washington time.

General Marshall apparently appreciated that failure to act on the Declaration of War message [by Japan on Dec. 6] and its timed delivery [to the United States on Dec. 7] was going to be very difficult to explain on the witness stand when the future inevitable investigation into the incidents of those days took place. His avoidance of contact with the messages after the Pilot message until 11:25 on Sunday morning [Dec. 7] was unquestionably prompted by these thoughts. Otherwise, he would undoubtedly have been in his office at 8 A.M. on that fateful day.

Admiral Stark, on the other hand, did arrive in his office at 9:25 A.M. on Sunday, and at once accepted delivery of the full [Japanese] Declaration of War message. Against the advice of his assistants, he refused to inform Admiral Kimmel of its receipt. Forty minutes later, he knew that the 14-part message was to be delivered to the U.S. Government at 1:00 P.M., Washington time, which was 7:30 A.M., Hawaiian time, as was pointed out to him at once. Again, despite the urging of certain of his aides, he refused to send word to Admiral Kimmel.

Never before in recorded history had a field commander been deried information that his country would be at war in a matter of hours, and that everything pointed to a surprise attack upon his forces shortly after sunrise. No Naval officer, on his own initiative, would ever make such a decision as Admiral Stark thus did.

That fact and Admiral Stark's decisions on that Sunday morning, even if they had not been supported by the wealth of earlier evidence, would reveal, beyond question, the basic truth of the Pearl Harbor story, namely that these Sunday messages and so many earlier ones, of vital import to Admiral Kimmel's exercise of his command, were not sent because Admiral Stark had orders from the President, which prohibited that action.

This deduction is fully supported by the Admiral's statement to the press in August, 1945, that all he did during the pre-Pearl

Harbor days was done on order of higher authority, which can only mean President Roosevelt. The most arresting thing he did, during that time, was to withhold information from Admiral Kimmel.

Thus, by holding a weak Pacific Fleet in Hawaii as an invitation to a surprise attack, and by denying the Commander of that Fleet the information which might cause him to render that attack impossible, President Roosevelt brought war to the United States on December 7, 1941. He took a fully aroused nation into the fight because none of its people suspected how the Japanese surprise attack fitted into their President's plans.

That last sentence could be misleading on two counts. Some Americans did suspect how the Japanese attack fitted into President Roosevelt's plans and said so in the most vigorous language, to this writer. Also, the nation was well aroused, and could have been taken into the war without the unnecessary sacrifice of men, ships and planes. December 7, 1941, is indeed "a date which will live in infamy." Because, "If it happens, you can bet it was planned that way."

# Epilogue

There are many phases of the bleeding of America that have not been touched upon in this work. The interaction between the United States and other nations will immediately come to mind. How much has the holding back of the United States and the building up of the Soviet Union interfered with normal relations between the United States and its allies around the world? No one will ever know. But the matter is not entirely beyond the range of study. Some Europeans by 1970 were calling the United States the muscle-bound giant, and one European leader sneered that the United States was not politically capable of leading the world.

The Laocoon posture of the United States *invited* attacks by its enemies, so that with the increasing loss of blood and strength, and the never-ending refusal to stand up for its rights in the world, America became a forbidding figure to its friends. All the nations that might have worked with our country for a better world were advised to make the best terms they could find. Japan, Thailand, Australia and West Germany are examples. It became a *sauve qui peut*, while the country that had led the world to victory against the greatest threat ever posed by a totalitarian nation found itself being shorn of its strength but at the same time urged to give succor to every nation that asked for it.

This work has only brushed against the massive area of news distortion, omission and fabrication by the mediums of communication to the people. Their aim, practically speaking, has been to make the Russians and the Chinese Communists look different from what they are—stronger or weaker to suit the particular felt need. The great misdeeds of the Russian Communists in their subjugated lands, especially in Eastern Europe, have been almost entirely ignored by the press, or painted in brighter colors. A new ethic has evolved. It calls for any kind of inhumanity to mankind so long as we can stay on our knees and do nothing to give our Communist enemies, at home and abroad, the slightest impression that we will ever refuse to yield to any of their demands that the American public can be made to swallow. This is a great area of study that should be undertaken.

The weakening of the United States in relation to the Soviet Union

has brought a train of security abuses with it. These have taken many forms, some of them described in this work, but numerous others not followed up, though they will be apparent to the reader. Indeed, many will be able to fathom problems unsolved by this writer. Once a fundamental bleeding of America was started, stanching of the wound became as impossible as it was unwanted. The rejection of security in the State Department was indicated. The loss of Cuba to Communism was a foregone "happening." The great inflationary grain sale to the Russians in 1972 was inevitable. Turning the minds of the people to riotous sex, drugs, marijuana and heroin, was predictably certain. The one desperate fear of our esoteric policy-makers is that the United States might ever become overwhelmingly strong and orderly.

It must be noted that this historical work has not sought to place the blame for our troubles on a spiritual decline within the country. The problem is viewed as quite a material one, from which the spiritual decline has stemmed. Without denying that a great moral deterioration has taken place, since it has, this assessment finds that such deterioration has followed normally and not unnaturally from policies designed at the top. The balance of power tilted against the United States abroad was equally loaded against it at home. The giveaway programs pushed by the Communists and other radicals as roads to inflation and chaos were put into effect by those who intended to maintain the balance. Since any number could play the game, the use of multiple greenbacks was fun for most of the people, at first. But when the inevitable devaluation and depreciation of the currency became devastating at home and abroad, the game was no longer amusing.

There are, indeed, phases of the bleeding, both internally and externally, that must be investigated. It is perhaps too early to ask scholars in our universities to undertake this work, since they are more often concerned with the past than with contemporary historical actions. Others can and should pitch in and do the job. Some phases of the ecological movement are deserving of study. For instance, why in fact was the Alaska oil pipeline delayed for more than four years on the grounds that certain fauna and flora might be unfavorably affected? Precisely why was Cuba handed over to the Communists? What role or roles does the Communist party play in the United States, including the political parties and the Government? How much is pornography deliberately designed to bleed America? It is a large, unworked field. This writer claims only to have begun some preliminary digging.



# *Selected*

## *Bibliography*

- America On Trial* by Major Gen. Thomas A. Lane, A.U.S. Ret. 1972. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- American Policy Failures in Cuba: Dagger in the Heart* by Mario Lazo. 1970. Twin Circle, New York, N.Y.
- America's Retreat From Victory* by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. 1951. Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Conn. Also, Western Islands, Belmont, Mass
- And The Mountains Will Move* by Capt. Miles P. DuVal Jr., U.S.N. Ret. 1947. Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn.
- The Arrogance of Power* by Senator J.W. Fulbright. 1966. Random House, N.Y.
- Background to Betrayal: The Tragedy of Vietnam* by Hilaire du Berrier. 1965. Western Islands, Belmont, Mass.
- Balance of Power*, edited by Paul Seabury. 1965. Chandler, San Francisco, Calif.
- The Captive Nations* by Bernadine Bailey. 1969. Charles Halberg & Co., Chicago, Illinois.
- Behind the U.N. Front* by Alice Widener. 1955. Bookmailer.
- The CFR: America's Unelected Rulers* by Phoebe Courtney. 1968. Free Men Speak Inc., New Orleans, La. 70118.
- Cadiz to Cathay* by Capt. Miles P. DuVal Jr., U.S.N. Ret. 1940. Stanford University Press. Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn.
- Conditions of World Order*, edited by Stanley Hoffman. 1966. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, Mass.
- The Consent of the Governed* by Arthur Krock. 1971. Little, Brown & Co., Boston, Mass.
- Conversations With Stalin* by Milovan Djilas. 1962. Harcourt, Brace & Co. New York, N.Y.
- Contra Marcuse* by Eliseo Vivas. 1971 Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- The Cuban Dilemma* by R. Hart Phillips, Obolensky, 1962.
- Deceitful Peace* by Gerhart Niemeyer. 1971. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- Diplomats and Demagogues: Memoirs of Spruille Braden*. 1971. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.

- The Disaster Lobby: Prophets of Ecological Doom and Other Absurdities.* by Melvin J. Grayson and Thomas R. Shepard Jr. 1973. Follett Publishing Co., Chicago.
- Destroy or Die* by Martin Gershen. 1971. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- The Doom Pussy* by Elaine Shepard. 1962. Trident Press, New York, N.Y.
- The East Came West* by Peter J. Huxley-Blythe. 1968. Caxton Printers, Caldwell, Idaho.
- Einstein: The Life and Times* by Robert W. Clark. 1971. World Publishing, New York, N.Y.
- Essay on Liberation* by Herbert Marcuse. 1969. Beacon Press, Boston, Mass.
- The Experts* by Seymour Freidin and George Bailey. 1968. Macmillan, New York.
- The Fearful Master* by G. Edward Griffin. 1964. Western Islands, Belmont, Mass.
- F.D.R.: My Exploited Father-In-Law* by Curtis B. Dall. Revised, 1970. Liberty Lobby, Washington, D.C.
- FDR* by Finis Farr. 1972. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- Fifty Years: USSR vs. USA* by Suzanne Labin and Daniel Lyons, S.J. 1968. Twin Circle, New York, N.Y.
- The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor* by Rear Admiral Robert A. Theobald. 1954. Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Conn.
- Five Lectures* by Herbert Marcuse. 1970. Beacon Press, Boston, Mass.
- Forgive Us Our Press Passes* by Elaine Shepard. 1962. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Good Men Die* by Philippa Schuyler. 1969. Twin Circle, New York, N.Y.
- The Greening of America* by Charles A. Reich. 1970. Random House, New York, N.Y.
- Hippies, Drugs and Promiscuity* by Suzanne Labin. 1972. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- How The Far East Was Lost* by Anthony Kubek. 1963. Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, Ill.
- I Saw Poland Betrayed* by Arthur Bliss Lane. 1948. Bobbs-Merrill. Also Western Islands, Belmont, Mass.
- The Lattimore Story* by John T. Flynn. 1953. Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Conn.
- The Lessons Of History* by Will and Ariel Durant. 1968. Simon and Schuster, New York, N.Y.
- The Losers* by Paul D. Bethel. 1969. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- Magazines:* U.S. News & World Report, The National Educator, Science News, Human Events, Twin Circle, Food & Life, The Review of the News, American Opinion, Forbes, National Review, Reader's Digest.
- Marshall in China* by John Robinson Beal. 1970. Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y.
- Memoirs* by Harry S. Truman, Vols. I and II. 1956. Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y.
- Memoirs* by Arthur Krock. 1968. Funk & Wagnalls, New York, N.Y.
- The Naked Capitalist, A Review and Commentary on Dr. Carroll Quigley's book Tragedy and Hope—A History of the World in Our Time;* reviewed by W. Cleon Skousen. 1970. Published privately, Salt Lake City, Utah.

- National Suicide: Military Aid to the Soviet Union* by Anthony C. Sutton. 1973. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- The New Russian Tragedy* by Anatol Shub. 1969. W.W. Norton & Co., New York, N.Y.
- The New Tsars* by John Dornberg. 1972. Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y.
- The Nine Lies About America* by Arnold Beichman. 1972. Library Press.
- None Dare Call It Conspiracy* by Gary Allen. 1972. Concord Press, Rossmore, Ca.
- On Borrowed Time* by Leonard Mosley. 1969. Random House. New York, N.Y.
- The Ordeal of Otto Otepka* by William J. McGill. 1969. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- The Panama Canal* by Jon P. Speller. 1972. Robert Speller & Sons, New York, N.Y.
- Peking's Red Guards* by Stephen Pan and Raymond J. de Jaeger. 1968. Twin Circle, New York, N.Y.
- The Phoenix Papers* by Dr. James Bales. 1966. Christian Crusade, Tulsa, Okla.
- Present at the Creation* by Dean Acheson. 1969. W.W. Norton & Co. New York, N.Y.
- Retreat From Victory* by Drew Middleton. 1973. Hawthorn Books, New York, N.Y.
- Red Spies in U.N.* by Pierre Huss and George Carpozi Jr. 1965. Coward-McCann, New York, N.Y.
- The Riot Makers* by Eugene H. Methvin. 1970. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- Russian History Atlas* by Martin Gilbert. 1972. Macmillan Co., New York, N.Y.
- The Secret War for the A-Bomb* by Medford Evans. 1953. Henry Regnery, Chicago.
- The Strategy of Deception: A Study in World-Wide Communist Tactics*, edited by Jeane J. Kirkpatrick. 1963. Farrar, Straus & Co., New York, N.Y.
- Speaking Frankly* by James F. Byrnes. 1947. Harper & Co., New York, N.Y.
- The Subverters* by Bernard Hutton. 1972. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- Vietnam Crisis* by Stephen Pan and Daniel Lyons, S.J. 1966. Twin Circle, New York, N.Y.
- The War for the World* by Major Gen. Thomas A. Lane. 1968. Viewpoint Books, San Diego, Ca.
- Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*, Vols. I, II, III, by Anthony C. Sutton, 1968, 1970, 1973. Hoover Institution Press, Stanford, Ca.
- While You Slept* by John T. Flynn. 1951. Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Conn. Also Western Islands, Belmont, Mass.
- Witness To History* by Charles E. Bohlen. 1973. W.W. Norton & Co., New York, N.Y.
- Soviet Conquest from Space* by Peter N. James. 1974. Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y.

# Index

- Abzug, Bella, 90  
Accuracy In Media, Inc. (AIM), 8  
Acheson, Dean, a Secretary of State, 26, 27, 32, 94  
Acheson-Lilienthal Report (A Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy), 32, a U.S. proposal to build atomic bomb plants in the Soviet Union, 33  
activist, 59  
Adams, John, 62f  
Adriatic, 9  
advocacy journalism, 60  
Aetna Standard, 49  
AFL-CIO, 53  
Afghanistan, 84  
Africa, 5, 27  
agrarian reform, 60  
agriculture, 43, 45  
air terrorism by hijacking, 100  
Alamogordo, 3  
Alaska, 15  
Albania, 29, 92  
Aldanov, Mark, 65  
Aldenzoloto trust, 42  
Allen, Gary, writer and thinker, 68, 99  
American casualties in Vietnam, 51, 80, 83  
American Nuclear Society, 37  
*American Opinion*, magazine, 40f  
American-people, Americans, 2, 3, 5, 6, 6, 11, 24, 27, 35, 52, 86  
American Revolution, 62  
Anderson, Robert B., 95  
anti-Communist, 98, 99  
An-Loc, South Vietnam, 51  
appeasement, 1, 12  
Ardahan, Turkey, 29  
Argentina, 84, 93  
Argonne Laboratory, 18, 35  
*Arizona Republic*, Phoenix news-  
paper, 16, 56  
Army and Navy Club, Washington, D.C., 2  
Asia, 5, 9, 12, 30  
Asiatic war, 9  
Ashbrook, Representative John M., 47  
Associated Press, 7, 55, 90, 101  
Atlantic Charter, 10  
Attlee, Clement, a British Prime Minister, 3, 32  
Atomic Age, 1, 4, 19, 84  
atomic bombs, 3, 5, 21, 27, 28; first inventory, 36; the depleted cup-board, 37, 46  
Atomic Development Authority, for world, 33, 34  
Atomic Energy Commission, U.S., 2, 25  
atomic warfare threatened, 5  
automobiles, 50  
Avars, 30  
  
Bacher, Dr. Robert F., 36, 37  
Bailey, George, 91  
Baku, Russia, 44, 45  
balance of power, also balance of terror, 4, 9, 11, 14, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 37, 38, 70, 74, 75  
Ball, George W., 73  
Baltimore, Maryland, 42  
*Baltimore Sun*, 8f  
bankers, 9  
Baptists, 53, 55  
Baruch, Bernard, U.S. representative in U.N. Atomic Energy Commission, 27, 32, 33  
Batista, Col. Fulgencio, a Cuban leader, 98, 99  
Bay of Pigs, 99  
Bernhard, Prince of the Netherlands, 12, 21

- Berrigans, 81  
 Berryman, Paul R., 19  
 Bethel, Paul D., author of *The Losers*, 98, 99  
 Bevin, Ernest, a British Foreign Secretary, 58  
 Biafra, 70  
 Bilderbergers, 9, 12, 21  
 blacks, 85  
 blackmail, 7, 39  
 Blair, Col. Harrison D., 19  
 bloc, 60  
 Bohlen, Charles E., U.S. diplomat, 4  
 Bodaibo, on Vitim River, Russia, 42  
 Bolivia, 84  
 Bolshevik Revolution, 48  
 book and magazine publishing, 100  
 Boston, 2  
 Boudin, 81  
 Bradbury, Dr. Norris E., 36  
 Braden, Spruille, 92, 93, 94  
 A.J. Brandt Co. of Detroit, Mich., 51  
 Brandt, Willy, former German Chancellor, 94f  
 Brennan, Donald, 74  
 Brezhnev, Leonid I., 9, Soviet Leader, 20; (offers a blueprint), 30  
 Breznev Doctrine, 30, 45  
 Britain (also United Kingdom, England, British, 1, 27, 28, 48, 100  
 Brown, H. Rap, 85  
 Bryansk, Russia, 49, 50  
 Bucyrus, 41, dredge; 42  
 Bulgaria, Bulgarians, 9, 29, 46, 66  
 Bunker, Ambassador Ellsworth, 97  
 Burmeister & Wain, Denmark, 50  
 Burnham, James, 26  
 Byrnes, James F., a U.S. Secretary of State, 3, 5, 32  
  
 California, 49  
 Cambodia, 75, 76  
 Canada, 83  
 Canadian Consulate in New York, 83f  
 capitalist, 60  
 Carmichael, Stokely, 86  
 Castro, Fidel, 84, 86, 89, 96, 98  
 casualties, 13  
 Caucasus oil fields, 41  
 Cervantes, 23  
 Chamberlain, Neville, a British Prime Minister, 1  
 Chiang Kai-shek, leader of Nationalist China, 27, 91  
 Chicago, 2  
 Chicago Tribune, 19, 56  
 Chile, 5  
 China, also Communist China, 6, 9, 13, 15, 27, 28, 29, 30, 76  
 Chinese, 10, 30  
 Chinese Communists, 29, 60  
 Chinese Nationalists, also Republic of China, 10, 60  
 Chou En-lai, 79  
 Christie suspension, 51  
 Churchill, Winston S. British Prime Minister, 3, 75  
 churchillize, 61  
 Clark, Ramsey, 81  
 Clark, Ronald W., 24f  
 classified documents, 5  
 Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, ii  
 colonialist, 61  
 Colombia, 96  
 Columbia University, 87  
 Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS), 89  
 communications media, 5  
 Communism, 28, 30; defined, 39, 46, 58; 68, what it is; 73, 97, 99, 100  
 Communist China, 6  
 Communists, 6, 13, 19, 29, 31, 35, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65; 69, program for U.S.; 70, 76, 85, 86, 89, 92, 94, 95, 97, 97, 108  
 Communist Party of Soviet Union, 20  
 confrontation, 61.  
 Congo, 70  
 Conservative Book Club, 57  
 conspiracy, 9, 23, 67, 91, 93  
 Council on Foreign Relations, 12  
 counter-government, 81  
 Cowles, Virginia, author of *The Russian Dagger*, 28f  
 Copenhagen, Denmark, 50

- Cuba, 5, 6, 48, 70, 89, 91, 92, 98, 99 (800,000 driven into exile by Castro), 108  
 current history, 5  
 Czarist Russia, 68  
 Czechoslovakia, 29, 46, 66
- Daily Worker, 63, 64  
 Dallas Texas, 56, 94  
 Dartmouth College, 81  
 Davis, Kenneth, 51  
 Deane, Gen. John R., Chief of U.S. Military Mission in Moscow, 14  
 dedication, 43  
 Defense Department, U.S. 52  
 degasperize, 61  
 Demag, A.-G., 44  
 democracy, 62  
 Democratic party, 59  
 Democrats, 70, 93  
 Denver, Colorado, 35  
 Detroit, 85  
*Diaries of Major Jordan*, 15, 16  
 Diem Administration of South Vietnam, 78  
 "dike bombing," 79  
 Dinsmore, Herman H., 23, 39, 101, 109  
 Disraeli, Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield, 11, 89  
 Disticoque S.A., 44  
 domino theory, 13  
 Donnybrook, world, 70  
 Dornberg, John, author of *The New Tsars*, 45, 46  
 Dozer, Prof. Donald M., 95  
 Duggan, Lawrence, 92, 93  
 Dulles, John Foster, a Secretary of State, 94  
 Dutch East Indies, 104
- EAM, Greek Liberation Front, 29  
 East Europe, also East Europeans, 6, 13, 19, 46, 61, 70, 80  
 East Germany, 29  
 Edwards, Willard, of *Chicago Tribune*, 19  
 Einstein, Dr. Albert, scientist, 24, 25f, 86  
 Eisenhower, Gen. Dwight D., a President, 89, 94
- Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn, Soviet publication, 41  
 ELAS, 29  
 Elbe, 9  
 electricity, 2  
 Ellsberg, Daniel, 81, 82  
 enemy, 41  
 English, the, 30  
 escalate, 62  
 Estonia, Estonians, 29, 46, 61  
 Ethiopia, 92  
 Europe, 9, 12, 24, 27  
 Europeans, 6  
 Evans, Dr. Medford, author of *The Secret War for the A-Bomb*, 2, 25, 26, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 109  
 Evans, M. Stanton, editor and author, 74  
*The Experts*, a study of world affairs by Seymour Freidin and George Bailey, 91  
 Fair Play for Cuba Committee, 89  
 Far East, 23  
 Farm output in U.S. and Russia, 43  
 Farr, Finis, author of *FDR*, 103  
 fear, ii  
 F.B.I., Federal Bureau of Investigation, 35, 69  
 Fiat, 50  
 Finletter, Thomas, 26  
 Finland, 29  
 France, also French, 28, 31, 48, 60  
 Frankenstein, 98  
 Franklin, Benjamin, 62f  
 fraternal assistance, 62  
 freedom, 6  
*Freeman, The*, magazine, 63  
 Freidin, Seymour, author, 91  
 Fretz-Moon, 49  
 Freyn Co., 44  
 Fulbright, Senator J.W., 4, 52; 73, the Memorandum.  
 Fuller, Maj. Gen. J.F.C., of Britain, 68
- Gary, Indiana, 49  
 Gee, Col. H.C., 36  
 generation gap, 62  
 Genghis Khan, 85  
 Georgians, 30  
 German Foreign Ministry, 41

- Germany, 24, 29, 31, 32 (atomic progress), 48, 53  
 Gibson, Hugh, U.S. diplomat, 93  
 Gilbert, Martin, author of *Russian History Atlas*, 30  
 Gill, William J., author of *The Ordeal of Otto Otepka*, 90  
 Gleason Co., 50  
 God, 46  
 Golden Horde, 30  
 Gompers, Samuel, late AFL leader, 53  
 Gore Field, Great Falls, Mont., 17  
 Gorki, Russia, 50  
 Goodpaster, Gen. Andrew J., 21f  
 Goths, 30  
 grain, 45  
 Great Britain (see United Kingdom)  
 Great Falls, Montana, 15, 17, 18  
 Greece, 29, 60, 92  
 Greek Communist Party, 29  
 Gromyko, Andrei, Soviet Foreign Minister, 34  
 Groppi, 81  
 Groves, Gen. Leslie R., commanded Manhattan Project, which made the atomic bomb, 5, 16, 23, 31, 32  
 Guevara, Ernesto (Che), Argentine Communist revolutionary, 84, 98  
 Guillaume, Gunther, East Germany spy, 94f
- Haiphong, North Vietnam, 50, 52, 80  
 Halsey, Fleet Admiral William F., 104  
 Hamilton, Alexander, 62f  
 Hanford, Wash., 2, 26, 33  
 Hanoi, North Vietnam, 50, 55, 75, 80  
 Harlem, in New York City, 85  
 Harriman, W. Averell, U.S. diplomat, 48, 53  
 Hart, Jeffrey, 81  
 Havana, Cuba, 86, 93  
 Hawaii, 103  
 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty on Panama Canal (1903), 96  
 hippiedom, 84  
 Hiss, Alger, 14, 27, 94  
 history, v  
 Hitler, Adolf, 53, 84, 85  
 Ho Chi Minh Trail, 50  
 Hopkins, Harry, 4, 14, 16
- House of Representatives, 91, 92  
 Hue, South Vietnam, 51, 79  
*Human Events*, magazine, 55, 89, 95f  
 Hungary, Hungarians, 29, 46, 66  
 Huns, 30  
 Hunter, Edward, who introduced "brainwashing" into our language, w 67  
 Hutton, J. Bernard, author of *The Subverters*, 100  
 hydrogen bomb, 27, 31
- ignorance, ii  
 imperialism, 63  
 India, Indians, 27, 28, 84  
 Indianapolis News, 16, 56  
 Indochina, v, 62, 76, 82  
 Indonesia, 60  
 industrialists, 9  
 INS (International News Service), 34  
 Iran, 29  
 Israel, 48, 50, 52  
 Italy, 48, 92  
 Izvestia, Moscow newspaper, 41, 42
- Jackson State College, 87  
*Jane's Fighting Ships*, 8  
 Japan, 10, 25, 29, 53, 60  
 Japanese, 102, 104  
 Jay, John, 62f  
 Jefferson, Thomas, 62f  
 Jewish News Agency, 101  
 Jews, 30, 53, 55  
 Johnson, Lyndon B., a President of the United States, 75, 79, 89  
 Johnson Administration, 51  
 Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 36  
 Jordan, Major George Racey, author of *From Major Jordan's Diaries*, 2, 3, 5, 15, 16, 17, 18
- Kachuca, on Lena River, U.S.S.R., 42  
 Kama truck plant, Russia, 51, 55  
 Kansas, 49  
 Karakliss, 44  
 Kars, Turkey, 29  
 Keller, Werner, author of *East Minus West = Zero*, 40

- Kennedy, John F., a President of the United States, 19, 79, 89  
 Kennedy Administration, 19, 74  
 Kent State College, Ohio, 87  
 Ketch, 44  
 KGB, Soviet secret police, 91  
 Khazars, 30  
 Khrushchev, Nikita, a Soviet Premier, 90  
 Kimmel, Admiral Husband E., 102, 104  
 King, Martin Luther, 85  
 King, William Lyon Mackenzie, a Canadian Prime Minister, 32  
 King Features Syndicate, 81  
 Kissinger, Dr. Henry A., 81, 95, 97  
 Knox, Frank, a U.S. Secretary of the Navy, 102  
 Koestler, Arthur, author of *The Yogi and The Commissar*, 28, 29, 31  
 Kontum, South Vietnam, 51  
 Korea, 5, 9, 27, 29  
 Korean War, 13, 53, 76, 77, 82  
 Koreans, 30  
 Krassin, Leonid, 42  
 Kremlin, 65, 74  
 Kubek, Dr. Anthony, author of *How The Far East Was Lost*, 14, 15, 102  
 kulak, 63  
 Kunstler, William, 81  
 Kurile Islands, 29  
 Kuznetzk, industrial complex, 44  
  
 Labin, Suzanne, author of *Hippies, Drugs and Promiscuity*, 84  
 Lane, Maj. Gen. Thomas A., 75  
 Laocoon, cover figure, iii, 107  
 Laos, 75, 76  
 Latin America, 6, 27  
 Lattimore, Owen, 63, 64  
 Latvia, Latvians, 29, 46, 61  
 Lazo, Mario, author of *American Policy Failures in Cuba*, 98, 99  
 Leland Stanford University, 41f  
 LeMay, Gen. Curtis E., 76  
 Lena Goldfields, Ltd., 41, 42  
 Lend-Lease, U.S. aid program in World War II, 14, 17, 19, (greatest "mail-order catalogue in history")  
 Lenin, V.I., 45, 68  
 Leningrad, 42  
 Lewis, Fulton, Jr., 18  
 Liberal Papers, 74  
 liberation, 63  
 Liddy, G. Gordon, 82  
*Life*, magazine, 26  
 Lilienthal, David E., chairman of U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, 26, 27, 32, 34  
 Lin Piao, Chinese Communist General, 76  
 Lithuania, also Lithuanians, 29, 30, 46, 61  
 London, 7, 8f, 99, 100  
 Long Island University, 15  
 Los Alamos, New Mexico, 1, 33, 35, 36  
 Los Angeles, Calif, 85  
 loyalty, 43  
 Luce, Henry, 26  
 Lunik, Soviet satellite, 45  
 Lyons, Rev. Daniel, S.J., 75  
  
 MacArthur, Gen. Douglas, 76, 77  
 Madison, James, 62f  
 Madison Square Garden, Russian aid rally, 16  
 Magic, decoder, 104  
 Malaysia, 60, 104  
 Manchuria, 9  
 Manhattan Project, which made first atomic bomb, 5, 15, 24  
 Manion Forum, 75  
 Mannesman, 49  
 Mao Tse-tung  
 Mansholt, Sicco, Common Market executive, 86  
 marine diesel engines, 50  
 Marshall, Gen. George C., a Chief of Staff, 9, 10, 27, 64, 103, 104, 105  
 Marxism, 46  
 Marx, Karl, 61  
 Mathias, U.S. Senator Charles, of Maryland, 21f  
 May, Allan Nunn, British spy, 35  
 McCarthy, Joseph R., author of *America's Retreat From Victory*, 23, 61, 64  
 McCarthyism, also "McCarthy Era," 4, 63, 64, 67, 98  
 McCord, James W., Jr., 82  
 McGovern, Senator George, 81



- McKee Corp., 49  
 McNamara, Robert S., a U.S. Secretary of Defense, 74, 78, 82  
 Meany, George, AFL-CIO leader, 53  
 mellowing, 54  
 Mediterranean, 28  
 mental warfare, 57-71  
 Merton College, Oxford, 30  
 Methvin, Eugene h., author of *The Riot Makers*, 85, 86  
 Metropolitan-Vickers, Ltd., 44  
 Middle East, 28, 51, 55, 76  
 Military Order of the World Wars, D.C. Chapter, 2  
 Millis, Walter, 74  
*Milwaukee Journal*, 56  
 Moloch, 20  
 Mondale, U.S. Senator Walter F. of Minnesota, 21f  
 Mongols, Golden Horde, 30  
 Monroe Doctrine, 89, 90, 98  
 moon, 7  
 Morgenthau, Henry, a Secretary of the Treasury, 92  
 Morris, Richard B., 62f  
 Morris, Robert, Editor of *Twin Circle*, 96, 97, 98  
 Moslem world, 27  
 Moscow, 12, 18, 30, 59, 61, 66, 77, 79, 80, 91, 99, 100  
 Mundt, John G., 95  
 Murmansk, Soviet port, 42  
 Muscle Shoals, 34  
 mutinies, 79  
 My Lai, South Vietnam, 79  
  
 The *Nation*, magazine, 24  
 National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 85  
 National Aviation Club, 39  
 "national liberation," 6  
 nationhood, a question is raised about it, 19, 20  
 NATO, 40, 47, 50  
 Nazi-Soviet Pact,  
 Nazis, 1, 28, 79  
 Negroes, 70, 84, 85, 86  
 Nepal, 84  
 Netherlands, 21  
 New Britain Machine Co., 51  
 Newark, N.J., 15, 16, 85  
  
 New York, 2, 7, 41, 84, 100  
 New York *Daily News*,  
 New York *Times*, 2, 8f, 27, 34, 37, 38, 79, 83, 90, 98, 101, 102  
 news media, also national news media and communications media, 7, 21f, 41, 57, 58, 59, 64, 78-79, what they did in Vietnam; 80, 82, 90, 91, 100  
 News Perspective International, 90  
 newspapers, 2, 4, (newspaper men)  
 Nigeria, 70  
 Nixon, President Richard M., 24, 51, 73, 78; 79 (mined Haiphong and other North Vietnam harbors); 83, 91, 94  
 Nixon Administration, 2, 53  
 no-win war, v, 13  
 North Korea, v, 48, 70, 7, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82  
 Norsemen, 30  
 Northern Ireland, 10  
 Northern Ireland, 100  
 Northerners, 70  
 nuclear breeder reactor, 2  
  
 Oak Ridge, Tenn., 2, 26, 33, 35  
 objectivity discarded, 4  
 OGPU, Soviet secret police, 91  
 oil, 41, 45  
 O'Neill, Col. George F., 17  
 Orwell, George, 58  
 Oswald, Lee Harvey, 89  
 Otepka, Otto F., 95  
 Outer Mongolia, 29  
 Overseas Press Club of America, 15  
  
 Panama, 95, 96  
 Panama Canal, also Canal Zone, 6, 94, 95; 96, cost of canal; 97  
 Panama Railroad, 96  
 Panslavism, 68  
 Paris, 99  
 patriot, 64  
 Pavlov, V.N., 4  
 peace, 65  
 Pearl Harbor, 101, 102, 103, 104  
 Peking, 76, 100  
 Pengu-Gurevitch process, 45  
 People, also People's, 65  
 Peron, Juan, late Argentine Premier, 93  
 Peronists, 93

- Philippines, 104  
 picketing, 65  
 Poland, 6, 9, 29, 66  
 Poles, 30, 46  
 George Polk Memorial Award, 15  
 politics, v, 11  
 political prisoners, 46  
 Poltava class, Soviet warships, 50  
 Poole, DeWitt C., a U.S. diplomat,  
   26, 27, 28  
 Portugal, 27  
 Prague, 100  
 Pravda, Moscow newspaper, 41  
 Potsdam Conference (1945), 3, 4, 35  
 power, transference of, 1  
 professors, 2  
 Puerto Rico, 61  
 Pugwash conferences, 9  
 Pulitzer Prize, 15
- el-Qaddafi, Colonel Muammar, Lib-  
   yan leader, 96
- radio commentators, 4  
 reactionary, 65  
 reactor, nuclear breeder, 2  
 Red-baiter, 65  
 Religious News Agency, 101  
 Republican National Convention of  
   1972, 40f, 47  
 Republican Party, 53  
 Republicans, 70  
 Reuters, news agency, 101  
*Review of the News*, magazine, 55  
 Rich, Col. William L., 18  
 Rio de Janeiro, 93  
 Robertson, J.L., 57  
 Rockefeller, David, banker, 21f, 53  
 Rockefeller, Governor Nelson A., of  
   New York, 21f  
 rockets, 7  
 Romans, 30  
 Roosevelt, President Franklin Dela-  
   no, 4, 5, 11, 14, 16, 18, 34, 101, 103,  
   105, 106  
 Roosevelt (FDR) Administration, 3  
 Rostow, Walt Whitman, 19, 20, 50  
 ROTC (Reserve Officers Training  
   Corps), 69  
 Rumania, also Rumanians, 9, 29, 46,  
   66
- Rusk, Dean, a Secretary of State, 50  
 Russia, 30  
*Russian History Atlas*, by Martin  
   Gilbert, 30  
 Russians, 1, free run of United States;  
   39, 46  
 Russian Revolution, 40, 46, 47  
 Russo, Anthony J. Jr., 81
- St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, 56  
 Sakhalin Island, 29  
 Salem, 49  
 San Francisco, Calif., 41  
 Santa Barbara, U. of California at, 87  
 Santayana, George, ii  
*Saturday Review*, magazine, 25  
 Scandinavians, 30  
 Schenectady, N.Y., 58  
 scholars, 4  
 Scythians, 30  
 Seabury, Paul, editor of *Balance of  
   Power*, 26f  
*The Secret War For The A-Bomb*,  
   by Dr. Medford Evans, 2  
 Senate Internal Security Subcom-  
   mittee, 69  
 Sendzimir mills, 49  
 Sentinel anti-ballistic missile, 74  
 Shackford, R.H., newspaper colum-  
   nist, 24  
 shipments to the Russians, 5, 14  
 Short, Gen. Walter C., 102, 103, 104  
 Siberia, 42  
 Simons, Dr. Sanford, 35  
 slave labor camps, 30, 46  
 slave laborers, 30  
 Slavs, 30  
 Smith, Robert Aura, 27  
 Socialism, 46  
 Solzhenitsyn, Alexander, 69  
 Sonnenfeldt, Helmut, of U.S. State  
   Department, 21f  
 South, The, 83  
 South America, 90  
 South Korea, 60  
 South Milwaukee, 42  
 South Vietnam, 60, 70, 73, 75, 79, 80  
 Southern University, 87  
 Southerners, 70  
 sovereignty, 65

- Soviet atomic work, 4, 31, 32  
 Soviet military-industrial complex, 49  
 Soviet Union, also U.S.S.R., Soviet Government, Soviets, and Russia, mentioned on nearly every page  
 Soviet Navy, called the most powerful, 8  
 Sovietism, 46  
 Soviet spy apparatus in U.S. Government, 92  
 space engineer, Soviet defector, 7  
 Spain, 27  
 Sputnik, 6, 45  
 Spykman, Nicholas J., author of *America's Strategy in World Politics: The United States and the Balance of Power*, 14  
 Stalin, Joseph, Soviet dictator, 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 12, 23, 28, 32, 35, 44 (acknowledges U.S. aid given before 1944); 46, 48, 85  
 Stanford University, 16, 91  
 Stark, Admiral Harold R., 103, 105  
 state capitalism, 46  
 State Department, United States, 12, 19, 41 (Decimal File) 43, 44, 48, 50, 92, 93 (no discussion of Communists); 94 (never gets a house-cleaning); 95  
 Stevens, John Frank, 19  
 Stimson, Henry L., a Secretary of War, 103  
 "strategic balance," 24, 33  
 strike, 66  
 Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, 85  
 Suez Canal, 95  
 Suslov, Mikhail, 55  
 Sutton, Antony C., author of *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*, in three volumes, 8, 16, 19, 24, 31, 32, 39-56  
 Sweden, 83  
 Sweded, 30  
 Switzerland, 47  
 Syria, 52  
 Szilard, Dr. Leo, atomic scientist, 24, 25  
 Tabriz, Iran, 29  
 Tanna-Tuva, USSR, 29  
 television commentators, 4  
 Teller, Dr. Edward, atomic scientist, 24, 25  
 Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), 34  
 Thailand, 76  
 Theobald, Rear Admiral Robert A., 104, 105  
 Thieu, President Nguyen Van, of South Vietnam, 78  
 Thomas, Lieut. Col. Audrey E., USAF, 83f  
*Time*, magazine, 25  
 Tojo, late Japanese leader, 53  
 Tokyo, 102, 103  
 Toledo, Ohio, 85  
 Tolischus, Otto D., 102  
 Torrijos, Brig. Gen. Omar, of Panama, 95, 97  
 trade unions, 53, 66  
 traitor, 66  
 treason, 66, 82  
 Treasury Department, U.S., 91 (Communist stronghold); 92  
 Trohan, Walter, of *Chicago Tribune*, 15  
 truck plant, world's largest being built in Russia, 12, 51  
 Truman, President Harry S., 3, 4, 5, 14, 32, 34 (doubted Soviet atomic bombs); 35, 77  
 Truman Administration, 3  
 Truman Doctrine, 13  
 TRW of Cleveland, 51  
 Turkey, also Turks, 29, 60  
 Turner, Roscoe, great flier, 18  
 Tshombe, Moïse, 70  
 Twin Circle, periodical, 75, 96  
  
 Ufa, Russia, 45  
 Ukrainians, 30  
 United Kingdom, 31, 44, 47, 60, 75  
 United Nations, 6, 13, 14, 32, 33, 58, 70, 76  
 United National Atomic Energy Commission, 2  
 United Press, 101  
 United States, also America, mentioned on nearly every page  
 Uruguay, 93  
 United States constitution, 62  
 U.S. Air Force Academy, 74

- U.S. Armed Forces, 60, 83, treated as enemy by leading newspapers
- U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, 2, 25, 34, 35, 36
- U.S. Congress, 90, 97
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, iii
- U.S. Steel Plant, 49
- U.S. Wheel Track Layer Corp, 51
- UPI, United Press International, 55, 90, 101
- Universal, El*, of Mexico City, 8f
- "upside-down" language, 58
- Urals, 14
- U-235, uranium isotope, 18, 38
- Uzbeks, 30
- value judgment, 66
- Vechernaya Moskva (Evening Moscow)*, newspaper, 100
- Venezuela, 6
- Vietnam, 5, 13, 27, 29, 51, 52, 53, 55, 97
- Vietnam War, 53, 55, 75 (casualties); 77, 80, an enervating operation; 83
- Virginia, river in Siberia, 42
- Vladimirov, Leonid, Soviet space engineer who defected, 7
- Volgograd, Russia, 50
- Voskhod, Soviet spacecraft, 7
- Vostok, Soviet spacecraft, 8
- Walt, Gen. Lewis W., 58
- war hysteria, 66
- war monger, 66
- Ward, David H., 95
- Washington, D.C., 2, 5, 19, 35, 49, 87, 99, 100, 103
- Washington Daily News*, 24
- Washington, George, 62f
- Washington Post*, 90
- Washington and Lee Commerce Review, 40
- Watergate, 81
- Watson, Col. Theodore S., 19
- Watts, Los Angeles, 85
- West, also Western, 7, 8, 12, 40, 49, 100
- West Europeans, 19, 70
- West Germany, 60
- White, Harry Dexter, an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury who was a Soviet agent, 14, 91, 92
- White House, 65, 73, 94
- White Russia (Byelo-Russia), whites, 70
- Wicker, Tom, 81
- Wiesner, Dr. Jerome B., 74
- Wilrich, Prof. Mason of U. of Va., 37, 38
- Wilson, Woodrow, a President of the United States, 24, 54
- Wisconsin, University of, 87
- Witness to History*, by Charles E. Bohlen, 4
- Women's Liberation Movement, 70
- World Bank, 92
- world coalition plan, 12
- world opinion, 66
- World War I, 82
- World War II, 1, 6, 11, 12, 14, 31, 91, 93, 100
- WQXR, *New York Times'* radio station, 102
- Yale University, 35, 94
- Yugoslavia, 92
- Zhukov, Marshal Georgi K., 4
- Zinn, Dr. Walter, director of Argonne National Laboratory, 35
- Zill-130, Soviet truck, 51

**What Readers Say About  
THE BLEEDING OF AMERICA**

A "classic." The product of "genius." "Your name will live with those of Tacitus, Parkman, Josephus, Bede, Raleigh, and Aristotle."—Connecticut.

"Brilliant and magnificent."—New York.

"A fine book, well worth publishing."—Virginia.

"May the whole nation come to know it." "It is like no other book I have ever read."—Connecticut.

"Well written." "It reads well—and like a labor of love."—Massachusetts.

"A marvelous piece of writing and documentation. Your courage is great, indeed."—Maryland.

"I have read your book, 'The Bleeding of America,' with great interest and complete approbation. Thanks be to God there are patriots like you to work with in our struggle against the powers and principalities and evil in high places."—Maryland.

"Thank you for writing the book. It's too bad every one in the country can't be *made* to read it."—New York, N. Y.

"Thank you for your work in bringing it to the American people. I hope that at least 6 million copies are sold and read. In these dark days of privileged treason, our nation needs men who, like yourself, have the guts to stand up and dare call it what it is."—New Mexico.

"Grateful indeed for your excellent book. You have brought the various occurrences and statements together in a systematic way that would lead any fair-minded reader to agree with the basic thesis."—Indiana.

***Exercise your right to know!***

## THE BOOK THAT BRINGS THE INSIDE OUT

### THE BLEEDING OF AMERICA

By Herman H. Dinsmore

Mr. Dinsmore knows the story. He pulls no punches. He shows why U.S. falters. He served for 34 years on The New York Times, nine years as editor of the International Edition. He saw what happened during and after the Second World War. He tells.

Do you know why the United States has built up, propped up and buttered up the Soviet Government over the last 30 years and more? Would you guess that components of atomic bombs had been stolen from American bomb-making plants? And did you know that it was the plan of the United States Government to build atomic-bomb-making plants in Russia and other countries in order to set up a balance of power *against* the United States?

Do you know why the United States has fought two no-win wars, in Korea and Vietnam, with a loss of more than 100,000 American lives?

Did you know that even the English language was being perverted to serve the aim of setting up a "world coalition government"?

Did you know that turbulence within the United States is *planned* from within and without?

Did you know that the Japanese "surprise" attack on Pearl Harbor was not a surprise at all but that the Japanese had been lured in with a sacrifice of more than 3,300 American lives and over 1,200 wounded?

Do you know that the Russian Communists and Chinese Communists have schools where men and women are trained to hijack airplanes in the West?

Did you know that security had been seriously compromised in the United States?

### *The Book That Gets The Inside Out Is A Labor of Love For The Country*

Mr. Dinsmore is the author of *All The News That Fits*. He was born in Baltimore, Md. He received an A.B. degree from The Johns Hopkins University. He taught journalism at Columbia, Long Island and Seton Hall universities. He has distilled 50 years of attention to foreign and domestic affairs in this book. It is a best buy.