

THE UNELECTED

How Do You Move Left From Here?

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution in the Streets—a highly praised and definitive new volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes and is President of the Foundation for Economic and Social Progress. A film writer and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN* OPINION. Gary Allen lectures widely.

■ SINCE LYNDON JOHNSON announced his merciful intention to forego another Presidential term, it is no doubt true that millions of "Conservative" Americans now pray each night for deliverance from the clutches of the Far Left's heir apparent, the hirsute Prince Vicious, and his entourage of flipped-out hippies, schoolboy Lenins, and paramilitary Black Nationalists. While the Far Left is indeed preparing to build a fire under the pot in which it expects to stew America, it is most unwise for us to focus all of our attention on the Far Left's gatherers of revolutionary kindling when the Near Left is already working on us with an acetylene torch.

One hears, of course, great gnashing of teeth among one's militarist-imperialist friends as they imagine Bobby's appointment of Bettina Aptheker as Secretary of State or Stokely Carmichael as Attorney General. It is, however, hardly necessary to search for Ethiopians in the woodpile of hyperbolic horses made of

sticks when revolutionaries are already inside the walls of government and preparing to open the gates of civilization for their torch-bearing brethren.

The Far Left forms a convenient distraction for the public while the Near Left implements the basic tenets of Marxism from within the halls of Congress and the offices of our Chief Executive. After all, it is necessary for every sleight of hand artist to get his audience looking the wrong way while the prestidigitation is accomplished. The street revolution, masking as a mass movement, serves the revolutionary scheme by making demands on Washington for ever more socialism; but, of course, the street revolution could not exist if it did not have sympathizers and supporters in high places.

In the President's Cabinet, for instance.

We know what Bobby, Bettina, and Stokely stand for. But, for the moment, I ask you to look at what we have had serving the Revolution from the Cabinet posts of the Johnson Administration. Let us then review the kind of Cabinet we will continue to have in coming Administrations — Bobby or no Bobby — unless Americans can elect a Chief Executive who will dare to stand up for America. Let us, in fact, examine the Cabinet that is too far to the *Right* for Senators Kennedy and McCarthy.

Department of Defense

After seven years of systematically sabotaging the mightiest defense establishment in the history of the world — to the point where it has been bogged

down in little Vietnam for longer than it took us to win World War II — Robert Strange McNamara has taken his knife and moved on to the World Bank. His recent successor, Clark Clifford, was so ably and thoroughly discussed by Dr. Medford Evans in the April *AMERICAN OPINION* that for data on Clifford I will refer you to that



Clark Clifford
is the new
Secretary of Defense.

analysis and devote this space exclusively to the seven years of "bad luck" we suffered under the Earl of Edsel: "Bad luck" policies, of course, which Clifford is continuing.

U.S. News & World Report of July 25, 1966, revealed that one of Sargent Shriver's advisors as he worked to help the late President Kennedy select his Cabinet was a chap named Adam Yarmolinsky, then employed by the Far Left's Fund for the Republic. Yarmolinsky, son of two rather notorious Marxist revolutionaries, is of course a Harvard man. While a student at that venerable institution, he headed the Harvard Marxist Club and served as editor of the *Yardling*, the campus voice of the Young Communist League. By sheerest coincidence, McNamara was an instructor at Harvard during that same period and their paths were destined to cross. Later, with McNamara at Ford, the Ford Foundation bankrolled establishment of the Fund for the Republic with a \$15 million grant, and Yarmolinsky became its National Secretary. It is no longer questioned that it was Yarmolinsky, sitting at Sargent Shriver's elbow as he helped J.F.K. select the Cabinet of the New Frontier, who made the arrangements which assured McNamara's appointment as Secretary of Defense.

Outside of his generous proclivities for supporting Leftist causes, Robert McNamara had little to recommend him for such a position. He had, in fact, been responsible for the creation of the computer system which analyzed market potential and established the design requirements for the greatest financial disaster in the history of private enterprise — the ludicrous Edsel. Ford blew \$350 million on the infamous Rolling Lemon Sucker, proving that a computer is no better than the information fed into it. The man responsible for such a fiasco, under normal circumstances, would hardly have been a likely candidate for Secretary of Defense.

In order to make his appointment plausible to the public, McNamara was plucked from deep in the ranks of middle management and made President of the Ford Motor Company the day following J.F.K.'s election. Everything was set. Thirty-four days later, Robert Strange McNamara was appointed Secretary of Defense; and, as fate would have it, Adam Yarmolinsky became his top assistant. The appointment of the "Ford President" was even greeted by amusing press agency that J.F.K. had named a hard-headed, cost-conscious, "Republican" businessman to run our nation's defense establishment. Such euphoria, however, was short lived.

America's image-makers — including former Trotskyite Communist James Burnham of *National Review* — have attempted to manufacture the myth that McNamara was a consummate cost-cutter, a responsible "Conservative" clinging to the taxpayers' money as if it were his own. Few noticed that, even as he closed vital military bases and cancelled necessary armament programs, he was a champion bureaucratic empire builder and profligate spender. In 1961 there were fifteen hundred employees reporting directly to him. By the time of his resignation to move on to the

World Bank, there were more than *seventy thousand* employees directly under McNamara and 1,272,500 civilians directly employed by the Department of Defense. Mr. McNamara had turned the Defense Department into a bureaucratic monster employing more civilians than the enormous U.S. Post Office. In pre-McNamara days there were 150 persons in the upper pay brackets of the Department of Defense. When he drove off to the World Bank in his Edsel, there were more than 32,000.

One of McNamara's first moves upon taking office was to institute the infamous Reuther Memorandum, which recommended a total silencing of any criticism of his machinations by the military, keeping "Conservative" officers off active duty, and banning military participation in any educational fight against Communism. The Memorandum, followed by McNamara, even called for investigation of outspokenly anti-Communist generals and admirals, recommending: "These generals and admirals . . . should be warned against political activity in any way, shape or form. This might have the effect of causing the resignation of some of these generals and admirals which would certainly be in the nation's interest."

The Memorandum was duly enforced, with the shabby treatment given to General Edwin A. Walker serving as a warning to other patriotic military officers as to what would happen to their careers if they took a vocal stand against the Communists with whom we are at war.

With the military effectively muzzled, Secretary McNamara now brought in Whiz Kid college professors — in their late twenties and early thirties — to run the Defense Department. Top military decisions were no longer made by the seasoned, professional military, but by civilian Whiz Kids playing with computers. Decision making by computer sounds extremely scientific and

progressive, of course, but any programmer will tell you that the byword in the electronics industry is "G.I.G.O." — *Garbage In, Garbage Out*. The prudent and highly respected former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Nathan F. Twining, warned that control of our military operations was in the hands of "transient non-professionals . . . who will be far removed from the scene when the full impact of their decisions, military or otherwise, becomes apparent."

You will recall that one of Secretary McNamara's first jobs was to convince the public that the "missile gap" of J.F.K.'s campaign rhetoric was, alas, the product of "temporary misinformation." This relieved the Kennedy Administration and the Defense Department of any immediate political need to increase our arsenal of missiles. It also allowed McNamara to fashion a role for himself as Secretary of Surrender, and to begin scrapping America's then awesome military might.

Robert McNamara often revealed a disarming personality, as in a Defense Department press release of May 6, 1964, in which he endorsed a curious scheme proposed by former Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatrick. The plan first appeared publicly in *Foreign Affairs*, official voice of the notorious Council on Foreign Relations. It called for the unilateral scrapping of all U.S. bombers and all U.S. defenses against Soviet bombers — conditioned on the mere hope that such action would show the Soviets our "good intentions." You see, the Leftist Pugwash Conferences and other international disarmament meetings had "revealed" that the Soviet Union considered American offensive weapons to be "provocative." McNamara — as it happens, also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations — explained that it was all right to scrap the bombers and bomber defenses because, after all: "The Soviet Union may

increasingly seek peaceful avenues of endeavor." Soon, as part of this "brilliant new approach" to defense, America began scrapping bombers and closing air and missile bases which ringed the Iron Curtain.

McNamara's concept was, of course, not new at all. Removal of "imperialistic armies" from those lands which the Communists have in their gunsights has been an objective of the International Communist Conspiracy as far back as the 1928 directives of the Sixth International. In fact, the resolutions of the Sixth International also called for the disarmament of everyone — except, of course, the Communists. Pacifism and disarmament were to be promoted in bourgeois countries as the Reds continued to arm.

And, as the Soviet Union made noise about testing one-hundred megaton bombs, McNamara curtailed expansion of our long-range missile forces, scrapped all medium-range missiles, cancelled the *Mobile Minuteman*, killed the *Pluto* nuclear-powered missile, and refused to approve development of multi-megaton bombs to match those claimed by the Soviets. Shortly after they had been installed, Secretary McNamara even removed from Europe all *Thor* and *Jupiter* missiles capable of defending against Soviet I.R.B.M.'s. His excuse that they were "obsolescent" is considered ridiculous by military authorities; and, thanks to McNamara, the U.S. at present has no intermediate-range ballistic missiles whatsoever.

American bombers, as I have noted, were especially "provocative" to the Soviets. When McNamara took control of the Defense Department, bombers of the Strategic Air Command were in the air at all times ensuring that the United States would have the capability to retaliate in the event of a Soviet attack. But, McNamara soon eliminated such use of S.A.C., and present plans call for its elimination entirely by 1972

— despite the proof over North Vietnam (against the best conventional and missile anti-aircraft hardware the Soviets have) that, when allowed to do so, our bombers can and will get through.

He even scrapped the RB-70 Superbomber, developed over a ten-year period at a cost of \$1.5 billion. This plane was three-times faster than the B-52 and was designed with incredibly sophisticated apparatus to deliver nuclear weapons anywhere in the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, the Strange Secretary had reduced our existing strategic bomber force from 2,710 land- and carrier-based aircraft to a mere 680. A further reduction to 250 bombers is scheduled by 1971, including the elimination of all of S.A.C.'s B-58s. The B-58, of course, is our only operational supersonic bomber, and there are now only eighty left. By 1971, thanks to McNamara, the U.S. will no longer have a single long-range strategic bomber to deliver our nuclear deterrent.

But, of course, we have missiles.

To deliver what?

In 1962 the United States had overwhelming nuclear superiority over the Russians. In the succeeding years, as the Soviets concentrated on expanding their



Robert McNamara
greatly weakened
U.S. nuclear defense.

arsenal, our nuclear strength has been steadily reduced until today it is only about one-half what it was at the time McNamara became Secretary of Defense. By 1971, under McNamara's announced plans, America will have lost about ninety percent of its deliverable megatonnage.

Closely related to the phasing out of the Strategic Air Command was the cancellation in early 1963 of the *Skybolt* program. For no conceivable reason con-

nected with the security of the United States, McNamara terminated the development of the *Skybolt* air-to-ground missile, ignoring an *unanimous* vote in favor of it by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The *Skybolt*, launched from a manned bomber, would have enabled our planes to strike enemy targets without flying over enemy soil, or even coming in range of the enemy's anti-aircraft weapons. This brilliant system, upon which huge sums of money had been spent to bring it through development and a successful stage of field testing, would have kept our B-52s and B-58s from becoming obsolete for many years. It would have made the RB-70 the most feared and advanced missile delivery system in the world — virtually unstoppable.

Of course, since S.A.C. has since been ordered by Washington to cancel its airborne alert flights in the wake of the recent Greenland crash, in which four hydrogen bombs were *lost*, even if we did have *Skybolts* they would be sitting on the ground — again sabotaged by our own Far Left at the Cabinet level.

Another awesome weapon discarded by McNamara was the *Dyna-Soar*, an orbital spacecraft which was designed to carry nuclear weapons into orbit, deliver them, and then glide back to earth under its pilot's control and be manually landed at any ordinary airport. *Dyna-Soar* was cancelled outright by McNamara in December of 1963 after \$400 million was spent on its development.

The *Pluto* supersonic missile, described by Rear Admiral Chester A. Ward (U.S.N., Ret.) as the "most powerful single weapon yet conceived," was another cancelled by our Leftist Secretary of Defense. Even our *Atlas* missiles, capable of carrying a six-megaton nuclear warhead, were scrapped by McNamara, who replaced them with *Minuteman* missiles carrying warheads of a single megaton. The *Minuteman*

Mobile Missile Bases, which would have put *Minuteman* intercontinental missiles on mobile launching sites so as to make them unchartable by an attacking enemy, were also cancelled.

McNamara, whose favorite song seems to be "I Surrender Dear," also flatly refused to develop vital weapons for striking from space, even though the tremendously expensive *Gemini* program proved that the United States has the capacity to do so. He was even instrumental in the signing and ratification of the Outer Space Treaty which keeps the U.S. from using space for military purposes. The Soviet Union is not so deterred.

As each of our strategic weapons was scrapped, cancelled, phased out, or postponed, McNamara and his Whiz Kids presented Congress with hundreds of pages of doubletalk about "obsolescence," and "cost effectiveness," and "keeping the option," and "assured destruction capability." And, with his military critics muzzled, the Secretary was free to go right on making policy decisions which spelled weakness for America's defenses.

Fortunately, retired military men cannot be muzzled. In July of 1967 a highly important Report entitled *The Changing Strategic Military Balance: USA vs. USSR*, prepared at the request of the House Armed Services Subcommittee by retired General Bernard A. Schriever and thirteen other retired generals and admirals, revealed: "The Soviet Union is succeeding in its massive drive towards strategic military superiority, and the United States is cooperating in this effort by slowing down its side of the arms race." According to the Report, the year 1967 is a "cross-over period" when the nuclear firepower of the U.S.S.R. will "equal or exceed the U.S." nuclear capability. By 1971, the Report stated, "A massive megatonnage gap will have developed" and "the U.S. and the USSR will have reversed their roles

in a ten year period." What with our cancelled and phased-out systems — let's call them "similar" systems — turning up in the Soviet Union, there can be little doubt of it.

The Schriever Report also revealed that the United States no longer has a "superior position in deliverable strategic weapons. There is still time to gain superiority, but time is on the side of the one which uses it. Because of long lead-times for weapons development and production, however, the decision to do so must be made in the year 1967." The decision was, of course, not made.

That Schriever Report so authoritatively discredited everything McNamara had been saying for seven years that he was forced to create a new diversion to confuse the public. The perfect placebo was found in the *M.I.R.V.*, which stands for Multiple Individual Reentry Vehicles, and simply means the application of separate warheads to a single missile. Talk of this enabled McNamara to dazzle the uninformed with misleading numbers.

The opinion-makers gushed forth with the news that the number of our warheads will soon be fantastically increased by *M.I.R.V.* That is simply not true. The truth is that McNamara's *M.I.R.V.* program is a device for reducing U.S. nuclear firepower even further. Having scrapped our twenty-four megaton bomb, having scrapped or scheduled to scrap all of our other multi-megaton missiles, McNamara has already cut our missile firepower down to the one-megaton range. The *M.I.R.V.* is a device to take us down even lower so that our missile warheads will carry only a small fraction of a single megaton. Meanwhile, according to missile expert Chester A. Ward, "The Soviet missiles have warheads [however they got them] ranging from 30 to 100 megatons each. . . ."

There is no *military* reason whatso-

ever for McNamara's scrapping of America's megatonnage capacity. The only conceivable reason for it is surrender — that we are being prepared by *détente* for surrender to nuclear blackmail.

Another McNamara response at public alarm to the Schriever Report was his projected "thin line anti-missile system." As you know, Secretary McNamara had previously killed our *Nike-Zeus* system and delayed the *Nike-X* Anti-Ballistic Missile (A.B.M.) programs. Our experts, of course, were not entirely sure of the capability of the *Nike-X* system anyway, since it could not be fully tested without violating Mr. McNamara's Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

Military and scientific experts were, however, somewhat less than enthralled by Secretary McNamara's announcement that the United States would go ahead with a \$5 billion "thin A.B.M. system." The Anti-Ballistic Missile system McNamara agreed to let us deploy would be effective only against missiles delivered by (ready?) the Red Chinese — *who don't even claim to have an offensive missile system.* It would not be geared towards any long-range Soviet missiles. Disgusted military authorities say privately that it's a wonder McNamara didn't order it designed for deployment to thwart the Italians, or possibly the Mexican Navy.

The Defense Secretary went so far as to say that he desperately hoped that the United States would *never* have an effective anti-ballistic missile system against the Soviets: "The danger in deploying this relatively light and reliable Chinese-oriented ABM system," McNamara stated, "is going to be that pressure will develop for a heavy Soviet-oriented ABM system. We must resist this temptation firmly. . . ." In all fairness, it can be said that, in his seven-year stand as Secretary of Defense, Robert Strange McNamara somehow managed

to resist all temptations to upset the Soviet Union in any way.

Of course, it must be admitted that McNamara did develop one weapon. You've heard of the T.F.X. — the flying Edsel? Now called the F-111, it was supposed to be the miracle weapon, a fighter and long-range bomber combined, which could be employed by both the Airforce and the Navy. This, the Secretary claimed his computers told us, would save the taxpayers barrels of money. And Mr. McNamara forced his "wonder plane" down the throats of the Services despite the virtually unanimous opinion of aviation experts that it was bound to end up as a multi-billion-dollar floperoo. Even a child will recognize that, just as there is a need for both Volkswagens and Mack trucks, more than one type of military airplane is required.

McNamara's assistant, Roswell Gilpatrick, awarded the T.F.X., the largest military contract in history, to General Dynamics — while he was being paid secret fees by the law firm which represented General Dynamics, a firm in which he was a partner both before and after he made the award. An all-Service selection board, given the mission of recommending the prime contract for the T.F.X., had unanimously chosen the Boeing Corporation, whose proposal was judged to be superior in design, performance, cost, and materials — and which was known to have the ability to produce on time and within cost estimates. Its bid was twenty-six percent less than that of General Dynamics. General Dynamics' bid was, in fact, considered by the selection board to be the least acceptable of all received.

On the other hand, the dominant financial power in General Dynamics, Henry Crown, had raised millions for L.B.J.'s political campaigns, and General Dynamics was in financial trouble, having produced its own Edsel — the Convair 880, all-time money loser in

the aircraft industry. You *might* say the fix was in when the largest single contract in defense history was awarded to the high bidder with the poorest design.

Compared to the T.F.X., the Edsel was a bigger hit than the hoola-hoop. The Navy version turned out to be over 8.5 tons heavier than anticipated, and 15.5 tons heavier than the Navy had originally requested. It could not land on any aircraft carrier in the world without crashing through the deck. The Airforce version, because of the increased tonnage, did not have the range to be used as a long-distance bomber. The plane, as former S.A.C. commander Curtis LeMay put it, "is too small and slow for the job."

Score another for Yarmolinsky and the Whiz Kids. McNamara's one and only contribution to America's weapons systems turned out to be a \$13 billion bust. *Tsk! Tsk!*, says McNamara as he leaves for the World Bank, *that's show biz*. And, he left just in time. In early April of 1968, six of the T.F.X. were sent to Vietnam. Within four days, two crashed mysteriously and the rest were withdrawn from service for ten days. As we go to press, news comes of yet another mysterious T.F.X. crash and yet another withdrawal from service. It must be admitted however, that the T.F.X., which cost \$6 million apiece, haven't "provoked" the Soviet Union.

McNamara's gross misconduct of the War in Vietnam has been another matter of serious concern. Surely even James Burnham, Mr. Buckley's C.I.A., will not argue that it will qualify him for admission to the military strategists' Hall of Fame. While billions were being wasted on cancelled projects, the bare necessities of fighting a war, in which twenty thousand Americans have been killed, were nearly ignored. There have been thousands of examples of inadequate equipment and materiel shortages throughout Vietnam, in spite of the

billions upon billions which we spend for defense. A recent investigation by the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee uncovered shortages in all sorts of vital supplies, including automatic weapons, machine-guns, recoilless rifles, heavy mortars and artillery pieces, trucks, and field carriers. Serious shortages of ammunition, gasoline, and medical supplies were also reported, and American soldiers have often been forced to use outdated and obsolete military equipment.

McNamara's M-16 rifle, of course, proved unreliable in combat. And, an official inspection team led by Representative Richard Ichord, who went to Vietnam to investigate the M-16, was told by Marines that they were ordered to lie about the rifle's performance.

A fifty-six page Report, issued by a Special House Armed Services Subcommittee in November 1967, shows conclusively that under Robert McNamara the Defense Department *deliberately* issued faulty equipment to our troops in Vietnam. The Committee's account of the Army's troubles with the M-16 rifle, forced upon our men in Vietnam, is full of terms like "criminal negligence" and "unethical conduct."

Our troop commitments in Vietnam have escalated from 23,000 in 1964 to over half a million, yet we are not winning and are preparing to negotiate a truce from weakness.

Okay. Why *aren't* we winning? The answer is simple. President Johnson has made it clear over and over again that we have no intention of winning a military victory in Vietnam. The President explained on September 29, 1967: "We recognize and have always recognized that there can be no military 'solution' to the problems of Southeast Asia." The Airforce has dropped more bombs on North Vietnam than we dropped on Germany in World War II; but, while Germany was bombed to a cinder incapable of defending itself,

there was talk until recently that the War in Vietnam might continue for another fifteen years. The reason is that eighty percent of North Vietnam's war-making potential is still intact. Under orders from the Department of Defense, forty-eight percent of North Vietnam's facilities have been off limits to our bombers, and sixty percent of its transportation complex — land, sea, and air — was proscribed from attack.

McNamara and the Johnson Administration have so handcuffed American pilots that only about thirty percent of the strategic targets in North Vietnam have ever been hit by a bomb. Our pilots are given seven pages of instructions on what they *cannot* hit in Vietnam. It is easy to understand what General John P. McConnell, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Airforce, meant when he said that the War in Vietnam could be won "virtually overnight" if the President would permit the Airforce to do its job. The Navy has also promised victory if it can be allowed to put a Naval quarantine on Haiphong Harbor — through which seventy percent of the war materiel of the Communists is shipped. There are only two chances that our military will be allowed by the Leftist civilians controlling the Defense Department to win this war: slim and none.

While American airmen are concerned about bombing bridges in North Vietnam, Secretary McNamara believes in *building* bridges to the Communists. As he puts it: "Communism is not our enemy." For once, we believe he meant what he said. One would suppose that we have put five hundred thousand men into Vietnam to carry on some form of war on poverty. After all, the millionaire McNamara, who annually gives a sizeable cash gift to the Far Left's Fund for the Republic, has often said that wars are caused by poverty, frustration, discrimination, and "social" diseases. It could very well be that Mr. McNamara's

mind has been affected by a "social" disease.

Disarmament, Secretary McNamara, has consistently contended, is the best way to end the war: "I think it would be a tremendous opportunity for us, economically and socially, to eliminate defense entirely. It would be a social good." And Mr. McNamara is now getting a chance to prove what he says — that economic development is a more effective "path to peace" than military preparedness. Having paralyzed our military, he is now assuming duties as head of the World Bank, an outgrowth of the Bretton Woods Conference of 1944, where America's chief negotiator was Soviet spy Harry Dexter White.

The Press is reporting that our former Secretary of Defense will infuse fresh money into the World Bank. The idea is that U.S. aid should increasingly be channeled through this "international agency." Aid as administered by the U.S. directly, you see, "stirs resentment and distrust among the recipients" — and, besides, the native taxpayers at home are getting restless about foreign aid. Now the money will go out the back door so that the bantu can build Edsels in Tanzania. Come to think of it, considering what McNamara has done to our national defense, Ford's plants might be safer there.

Department of State

My dictionary defines a *rusk* as a soft, sweet, twisted bun. No definition could more appropriately describe the policies of America's Secretary of State. Dean Rusk may look like a *maitre d'* in a gay restaurant, but he is among the most important Leftists in the world.

In the 1930s Mr. Rusk became a member of the Institute of Pacific Relations (I.P.R.), breeding ground for many of today's top Marxists. As the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee noted: "The IPR has been considered by the American Communist Party and by

Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence." The work of the Institute of Pacific Relations was, of course, largely responsible for the sell-out of Chiang Kai-shek to the Chinese Reds, and Dean Rusk was one of the "China hands" who played an important role in that disaster.

When Rusk was appointed Secretary of State by the Kennedy Administration, the usual "Liberal" opinion-makers began chanting that he was a "hard line anti-Communist." Nothing could be more absurd. When Alger Hiss was exposed as a Communist spy, and forced out of the State Department, Dean Rusk assumed his place as Director of Special Political Affairs. Hiss had recommended a long list of Communists for employment at the U.N., and Rusk continued the Hiss policy until the Senate Internal



Dean Rusk
belonged to
Communist I.P.R.

Security Subcommittee exposed the practice. The Senate investigation revealed that at least twenty-six American Communists had thus received key jobs at the United Nations — a number of them top Soviet agents.

But, just as Secretary of State Dean Acheson "refused to turn his back" on Alger Hiss, he insisted on protecting Rusk also. In March of 1950, Dean Acheson named Rusk Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. While holding that position he delivered a speech in praise of the Chinese Communists in which he described the Peking Reds as revolutionaries comparable to the American patriots of 1776, and declared that the course of their agrarian reform was "not Russian in essence." Rusk's knowledge that Mao was a latter day Patrick Henry had

come from his experiences in China during World War II, in which he served with Marxist security-risks John Paton Davies, John Stewart Service, and John K. Emmerson, as advisor to the psychotic General "Vinegar" Joe Stilwell.

In his position as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. Rusk was instrumental in shaping those policies of the Korean War which General Douglas MacArthur described as "a catastrophic blow to the hopes of the free world" — including the policy of giving the Communist Chinese a privileged sanctuary north and west of the Yalu River.

On November 6, 1950, MacArthur was ready to send a bombing mission to destroy a key bridge connecting Korea and Manchuria — over which the Chinese were pouring thousands of troops to kill American soldiers. Former President Truman tells in his memoirs of his emergency conference to discuss the proposed mission. Truman revealed: "Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk pointed out that we had a commitment with the British not to take action which might involve attacks on the Manchurian side of the river without consultation." Rusk, Truman continued, added that the State Department was trying to get a "resolution" from the United Nations condemning the flood of Communist forces sweeping across the river from China.

Oh, peachy!

That vital bombing mission was cancelled an hour and twenty minutes before the planes were scheduled to take off. Thus the fatal "privileged sanctuary" policy was established and remains inviolate to this day.

It was Dean Rusk, finally, who recommended the dismissal of General Douglas MacArthur when he insisted on winning the war in Korea, even writing out the dismissal order for the President to sign. Following the dis-

graceful armistice in Korea — a solution to surrender also recommended by Rusk — our "soft, sweet, twisted bun" was shuffled out of the State Department to become President of the Rockefeller Foundation. It will be remembered that Alger Hiss had been similarly rewarded by being made President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace following his hurried departure from the Department.

In his capacity with the Rockefeller Foundation, Dean Rusk continued to support the Communists by recommending a \$2 million grant to the Communist Institute for Pacific Relations. He also attempted to influence the Ford Foundation to make a similar grant to the I.P.R., and waged constant war on the Congressional Committees investigating Communists in government.

With the election of John F. Kennedy, Rusk bounced back into federal service to lead the core of the Administration's accommodationists, holding that Communism is mellowing. Since he thought the Red Chinese of 1950 were as mellow as the Founders of our Republic, it is hardly a surprising development. And, of course, it was not at all surprising when Rusk joined Adam Yarmolinsky, George Ball, and Robert McNamara in engineering the muzzling of the American military by setting up a censor board inside the State Department to examine the now required "advance texts" of all speeches by military men — to delete references unfavorable to the Soviet Union.

While working to stop criticism of the Communists by responsible American soldiers, Secretary of State Dean Rusk again set to work to bring men with highly dangerous Leftist backgrounds into the State Department — waiving security clearance. When Otto F. Otepka, Chief of Evaluations in the State Department's office of security, testified under oath before a Senate Committee that he had angered his

superiors by questioning their security procedures, Rusk moved to fire Otepka.

Security Evaluator Otepka had explained that he was approached in 1960 by Bobby Kennedy and Dean Rusk to



Otto F. Otepka
refused to clear
security risks.

try to get him to approve the employment, in a highly sensitive national security project, of Walt W. Rostow — who had previously been turned down by the State Department as a security risk. Rostow was one of a number of Kennedy appointees whom the honorable Otepka refused to clear. Eventually, Secretary Rusk *waived* full field security checks for over 150 employees. For revealing this critical information while under oath before a Senate Committee, Otto F. Otepka was viciously harassed by the Secretary of State and finally removed from his position, to be replaced by a more pliable security officer.

While Dean Rusk was purging the Department's security division of anti-Communists like Otto Otepka, he was also clearing men like William Arthur Wieland — the State Department official chiefly responsible for masking Castro's Communist background. While an American Vice Consul in Bogota, Colombia, Wieland had become well acquainted with Castro, then in that country as a leader of the Communists' 1948 insurrection there. After investigating William Arthur Wieland, and hearing evidence which fills several volumes, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee declared:

Wieland regularly disregarded, side-tracked or denounced FBI, State Department, and military intelligence sources which branded Castro as a Communist and showed

that his associates were Moscow trained. In August 1959, Wieland "wrecked" an intelligence briefing given to Dr. Milton Eisenhower by the American Embassy staff in Mexico City when it became obvious they were going to prove that Castro was a Communist. For this action, Wieland was denounced to his face, with Eisenhower present, as "either a damn fool or a Communist." Milton Eisenhower chose to ignore the incident.

William Arthur Wieland, according to the volumes of sworn testimony, knowingly aided a Communist takeover of Cuba from his desk as chief of the State Department's Caribbean division. He was and had been a security risk. But, even after the Senate Committee's revelations, he was "cleared" *on Rusk's signature* and promoted to a key diplomatic position in Australia at a salary of \$24,000 a year.

Secretary Rusk's record of providing support for the Communists is nearly incredible. For example, on March 17, 1961, at the encouragement of Secretary Dean Rusk, President John F. Kennedy lifted a ban on importation and distribution of Communist propaganda into the United States. In just the first nine months after lifting the ban against distribution through the U.S. mail of Communist propaganda (a prohibition which had been imposed by President Truman), an estimated 8 million packages of Communist propaganda materials from Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Red China were imported into the United States. What is worse, American taxpayers paid the postage for delivering this Red propaganda to schools, churches, homes, and libraries all over the nation.

Dean Rusk has, of course, often declared himself strongly in favor of disarmament. It was under Rusk, in fact, that the infamous State Department

Document 7277 was issued. That call for "general and complete disarmament" of the United States was a nearly verbatim plagiarism of a speech delivered by Nikita Khrushchev in 1959. The document, entitled *Freedom from War: United States Program for Complete and General Disarmament in a Peaceful World*, calls for a three-stage disarmament plan including the banning of nuclear tests and halting the production of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. Existing stocks of weapons and atomic warheads would be transferred to the U.N., and the development of anti-missile missiles and similar defensive weapons would be abandoned.

This official State Department document further advocates transferring control over U.S. and other troops to the United Nations so that "no state [including the U.S.] would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened UN peace force." Even shotguns and hunting rifles owned by private citizens would be affected by Secretary Rusk's official plan.

Rusk was also one of the primary hucksters of the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, among the key proposals of his Document 7277. It was sold to Congress on the claim that such a Treaty "would prevent the spread of nuclear weapons." No one has yet explained how an agreement among the U.S., the U.S.S.R., and Britain, can stop other nations from acquiring such weapons. And, of course, the Treaty made no provisions for inspection, and has often been violated by the Soviets — even as we have been handcuffed by living up to its provisions.

Since Mr. Rusk is such a strong advocate of disarmament, it is not surprising that he was one of those primarily responsible for disarming anti-Castro Cubans. He was, in fact, among those who most effectively opposed supplying air cover for the Bay of Pigs Invasion.

Pressure by Rusk also led to the cancellation of plans for the U.S. Navy to escort the fourteen-hundred-man invasion force ashore.

President Kennedy used Secretary of State Dean Rusk as intermediary between himself and Charles Murphy, C.I.A. director of the operation. The C.I.A. warned repeatedly that if the changes in orders prohibiting the use of air cover remained in force, the invasion would fail. Murphy described the meeting between the C.I.A. and Rusk in *Fortune* magazine:

[General] Cabell was greatly worried over the vulnerability to air attacks, first of the ships and then of the troops on the beach. Rusk was not impressed. . . . [He maintained that an] air attack could be more of a nuisance than a danger. One fact he made absolutely clear . . . political considerations were taking over.

Thanks to those "political considerations," Cubans trying to free their country from the Communists were, of course, slaughtered on the beach. It was a catastrophe for which our sweet Dean shares a primary responsibility.

The Rusk-arranged Laos Agreement in 1962 was equally catastrophic. So ghastly in fact that it was later admitted to be a failure by the Secretary of State himself. Laos, a nation to which we had been supplying arms to defeat the Communists, was supposed to have been "neutralized" by arrangement. It was, instead, made a staging base for Communist aggression. As Rusk has admitted: "At no time since that agreement was signed have either the Pathet Lao or the North Vietnamese authorities complied with it. The North Vietnamese left several thousand troops there—the backbone of almost every Pathet Lao battalion. The use of the corridor through Laos to South Vietnam continued, and the Communists

barred the areas under their control both to the Government of Laos and the International Control Commission" set up to maintain neutrality.*

Another of Secretary of State Rusk's "accomplishments" was the passage by the Senate of the Consular Treaty, which allowed the Soviets to set up "diplomatic" headquarters in various American cities. J. Edgar Hoover testified before the House Appropriations Committee concerning the Consular Treaty that such an agreement is "a cherished goal of Soviet intelligence services." Ratification by the Senate of such a Treaty, said Mr. Hoover, would make the F.B.I.'s counter-intelligence work far more difficult.

The Treaty, promoted by Rusk during the Kennedy Administration and approved during the Johnson Administration, will, according to the Secretary of State, assist in getting U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations "on a more normal basis." But, according to Hoover, there is nothing "normal" about the activities of Soviet diplomatic personnel in our country. The Director explained: "FBI experience is that official personnel form the backbone of Soviet bloc espionage in the United States. The Soviet defectors estimate that from seventy to eighty percent of the Soviet officials in the U.S. have some type of intelligence assignment."

Secretary Rusk's Leftist commitment, however, prevailed over Hoover's warnings, and in spite of the fact that the Soviets constantly declare themselves to be our mortal enemy, he has deliberately permitted expansion of their espionage system in the United States.

Being a great believer in sharing the wealth, Rusk is naturally a strong devotee of foreign aid — particularly to

Communists. In 1965, for example, Secretary of State Dean Rusk recommended that more military aid be given to Communist Indonesia — including atomic fuel for a "research reactor." Rusk made these recommendations despite Communist Achmed S. Sukarno's personal commitment to Communism and his long series of deliberate provocations and offenses — including his internationally publicized repudiation of U.S. aid (he told us to take it and go to hell). Sukarno had received aid totaling more than \$900 million — despite the burning and sacking of the U.S. Information Agency and our Libraries there, his constant denunciation of U.S. foreign policy, his threatened confiscation of American owned oil properties, his armed attacks against anti-Communist Malaysia, and his close ties with Red China.

Rusk is also a vigorous advocate of American trade for Communist nations. As American boys in Vietnam were being killed by armaments from Communist Poland, for example, he released the Poles from a \$26 million U.S. debt, and moved to increase trade with all Communist European nations supplying the Vietcong. "Peaceful trade," as Rusk refers to our commercial subsidy of the Communist Bloc, "may erode gradually the concept that the conflict between us is inevitable and replace it with some recognition of the mutual advantage of closer economic relations." Rusk went so far as to advocate that the U.S. finance the construction of a Fiat automobile plant in the Soviet Union even as the Soviets and their satellites supply eighty percent of the war materiel being used to kill our soldiers in Vietnam. Mr. Rusk recognizes that twenty thousand dead American soldiers is quite a lot to lose to Soviet armaments. But, he says, "There is an impetus toward stability and peace in the growing consumer demands of the Soviet Union."

*Another American champion of the Laos Agreement was W. Averell Harriman, who was "our" negotiator for the Test-Ban Treaty and numerous other catastrophies, and who has been selected by L.B.J. to represent the United States in peace talks with North Vietnam.

It is indeed ludicrous that Dean Rusk, the very embodiment of a pink dove, should be booed and picketed by students because of his comedy role as a Vietnam "hawk." While masquerading as a "hawk," Rusk has cooed continuously for bombing pauses, claiming they would avert further escalation. Speaking before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, he has even asserted that the U.S. is determined to meet aggression with "a measured response," which would avoid "sliding down the slippery slope" of further escalation. Translated into English that means he supports a "no-win" policy in Vietnam — sellout by negotiation, as in Laos.

Rusk, the phony "hawk," has himself dealt personally with the Russians to make sure that American pilots would not destroy key strategic targets in North Vietnam. The authoritative *Allen-Scott Report* has revealed, for example, that there is a compelling diplomatic reason why U.S. flyers have not been permitted to bomb the strategic North Vietnamese airfield at Phuc Yen, thirteen miles from Hanoi in an area free of civilians. The airbase is "off limits" to U.S. bombers because of a secret U.S.-Soviet understanding. The unannounced accord was made by Rusk and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko shortly after the U.S. began bombing North Vietnam in February 1965.

According to information obtained from members of the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee, Mr. Rusk's unannounced agreement was behind the refusal of Secretary Robert McNamara to supply a reason to U.S. Admiral Ulysses S. Grant Sharp, Commander in Chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific, for turning down his repeated request to destroy key airfields in North Vietnam.

The theme of the Rusk diplomacy on Vietnam has been: (1) send U.S. aid and trade to the arsenal of the Viet-

cong; (2) assure by international agreement a Communist sanctuary in Laos; (3) arrange with the Soviets to preserve key North Vietnamese military installations; (4) prevent the "escalation" necessary to win; (5) provide bombing pauses whenever the enemy wears; and, (6) negotiate a surrender to the Communists like that in Laos as soon as U.S. public opinion can be made to accept it.

It is hardly surprising that Secretary of State Dean Rusk this fall broke longstanding rules to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Communists' seizure of power in Russia. Mr. Rusk said he decided to break precedent on November 7, 1967, to take part in the festivities at the Russian Embassy, because: "Well, for the fiftieth anniversary I make an exception." There was no word of toasts to the tens of millions starved, butchered, and enslaved by the Communists in those fifty years — nor even of toasts to the Soviet-supplied Vietcong.

All was quite chummy.

Department of the Treasury

Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler has had wide experience as a federal bureaucrat under four Democrat Presidents. While most members of the Cabinet now belong to either the Council on Foreign Relations or the Americans for Democratic Action, Fowler's credentials as a Leftist are so good that he is a member of both. Although he is neither a banker, an economist, nor a businessman, *Time* magazine commented upon his appointment as Secretary of the Treasury:

His credentials nevertheless are outstanding. He is a faithful Democrat who . . . last year organized the Businessmen for Johnson-Humphrey group. . . . He is well acquainted with business problems. . . . He is respected in the business community for his sound, generally conservative, views.

Fowler had the credentials all right, but "conservative views" were not among them. He had been chairman in Virginia for the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, cited by both House and Senate Committees as the premier Communist Front in the South. Testimony before the Senate Internal Subcommittee also revealed that Henry Fowler was instrumental in getting Communist spy Harry Magdoff assigned to a special position to deal with post-war Germany. Magdoff, as you know, was a member of the Perlo Cell, a Communist spy ring. Fowler was also mentioned prominently in the testimony of Fifth-Amendment Communist Charles Flato.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee asked Communist spy Irving Kaplan about his relationship with Henry Fowler:

Mr. Sourwine: When did you know Henry Fowler?

Mr. Kaplan: You are talking about the man who is now head of the National Production Authority?

Mr. Sourwine: I am talking about the man who was chairman of the [Communist] Southern Conference for Human Welfare in 1946.

Mr. Kaplan: I refuse to answer on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

Kaplan, like Magdoff, was a member of the Communists' Perlo spy ring, and according to the sworn testimony of Elizabeth Bentley was associated with both the Silvermaster and Perlo Cells. His association with our present Secretary of the Treasury is therefore a matter of some interest — particularly when Kaplan testified that it was he who would be incriminated by his relationship with Fowler.

Henry Fowler has of course continued the job of his predecessor, C. Douglas Dillon, in overseeing the liquidation of

America's gold and silver. In 1960, the United States had 2 billion ounces of silver in the Treasury. It is difficult to estimate how much, if any, silver is left since virtually every statement made by Fowler and the Treasury Department has in retrospect turned out to be a lie. The most moderate experts estimate, however, that the amount remaining is about 280 million ounces, or approximately one-seventh of the supply in 1960. Of these 280 million ounces, 80 million are radioactive (having been loaned to the Atomic Energy Commission for tests), and 170 million ounces are needed as a strategic reserve for defense purposes.

In order to pay off the silver certificate claims, Fowler arranged to melt all obtainable U.S. coins which are ninety percent silver, i.e. those minted prior to 1965, and replace them with sandwich slugs. Some professionals, who watch the silver market closely, believe that Secretary Fowler may have already eliminated even the strategic reserve required for our nation's defense. Silver, of course, is a necessity for electronics, sophisticated weaponry, and missiles.

What the Leftist Dillon-Fowler team did for silver it has also done for gold. In 1960 the United States had \$19.5 billion in gold (fifty percent of the world's monetary supply), with \$19.4 billion in potential foreign claims against it. Year by year our gold has been drained out of the Treasury as



Henry Fowler
was chairman of
top Communist Front.

foreign aid has permitted potential debts to arise against it. Today, America has only about \$7 billion in gold (not counting the \$3 billion owned by the International Monetary Fund), with some \$35 billion in potential dollar claims

against the remaining supply. In short, there are foreign claims outstanding for five times as much gold as we have.

No major nation in the world has ever survived without a currency backed by gold. Even the Communist countries mine and use gold in foreign exchange. If the outflow of gold is not stopped, it will throw our nation into the worst economic crisis in history.

The disastrous gold drain is a result of our adverse balance of payments, which is caused primarily by foreign aid giveaways and domestic inflation — Leftist insanities now pricing American products out of the world markets while making imports more attractive. Fowler has promised every year to bring an end to this adverse balance of payments. Yet, the fourth quarter of 1967 was the worst on record. At the current rate, the adverse balance for the year will run over \$4 billion — more than half of our remaining gold supply.

We are in deep trouble!

A monetary crisis accompanied by devaluation has possibly been postponed for the present through the acceptance of so-called S.D.R.s (Special Drawing Rights) by key members of the International Monetary Fund. The effect of the S.D.R. is primarily psychological since they cannot come into being for nearly a year, and will even then be insufficient to stem the tide of our adverse balance. The S.D.R.s are merely paper credits. The situation is analogous to running out of poker chips in a card game and then starting to play with I.O.U.s.

In the end, of course, everything has to be redeemed with real money. And, when that time comes, God help us!

Lenin maintained that the way to destroy a capitalist nation was to debase its currency. Fowler has been running our Treasury through the greatest financial debauchery in the nation's history. Now, with the twenty-

five percent gold cover removed from our dollar, the bureaucrats can print money to infinity. The result of such activity, of course, is massive and ruinous inflation — just as Lenin promised.

Secretary Fowler's answer to inflation is higher taxes on private citizens. Nothing could be more absurd. What he is saying is that spending is not inflationary if a government bureaucrat seizes your money and doles it out to some black revolutionary in the War on Poverty, but it *is* inflationary if you want to improve your own standard of living by improving your own health care or providing better education for your own children.

Fowler has asked for a twenty percent surtax and will probably get at least ten percent. Meanwhile, he and the rest of the Johnson Administration will continue to follow Lenin's dictum and debauch our currency into worthlessness.

The situation is already so serious that William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has warned that the American economy is in greater danger than in any year since 1931. He's perfectly right, of course. And, with Fowler in charge, you can bet that it was planned that way.

Department of Labor

W. Willard Wirtz succeeded Arthur Goldberg as Secretary of Labor in



Arthur Goldberg
was president of
top Communist Front.

1962, recommended for that job by his predecessor. Goldberg had been President of the Chicago chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "the legal bulwark of the

Communist Party." While in Chicago he had worked closely with Willard's brother, Robert. When Willard Wirtz entered government service during the New Deal, brother Robert* went on to bigger and better things as Organizer for the Communist Party in the State of Illinois, and was so identified by the *Daily Worker* of January 30, 1944.

On January 9, 1967, Ed Montgomery, featured columnist of the *San Francisco Examiner*, noted that Robert Wirtz:

... was for seven years chief organizer for the Communist Party, U.S.A., State of Illinois. For three years Robert Wirtz was Secretary of the Communist Party, State of Illinois.

In the Subversive Detail File of the Chicago Police Department there is a report of Robert Wirtz' activities in 1943 when he headed up a detail of six men assigned to the Chicago loop area. They were getting signatures on petitions to qualify the Communist Party for the ballot in the State of Illinois.

On this detail was a brother, William W. Wirtz. William is no longer known by that name. Today he is better known as W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor of the United States.

Ed Montgomery commented later that W. Willard Wirtz might have changed loyalties since then. After all, before his appointment as Undersecretary of Labor, Wirtz was a law partner and close friend of Adlai Stevenson.

A devoted promoter of the hand-out,

*Robert Wirtz now resides in Carmel, California, where he is a neighbor of another prominent organizer, Saul Alinsky. His son Stephen was one of the leading organizers of the Communist-led Berkeley Rebellion, and was arrested by Oakland police in the student riots at Sproul Hall in December of 1964. Stephen Wirtz was also the campus coordinator for the students' strike on the Berkeley campus in December 1966.

some of Willard Wirtz' rulings would be amusing if they were but farce written for *The Worker*. For example, under a new Department of Labor regulation a convict, solely as a result of his labors while serving a prison sentence, can establish his eligibility for unemployment insurance and qualify



**Willard Wirtz
sought aid for
Communist Party.**

for Social Security — even if he's never done another honest day's work in his life. Wirtz has decreed that work done in a federal penitentiary will now be considered "federal service." Maybe prison is good preparation for the Great Society.

Willard Wirtz was the Administration's chief spokesman in its attempts to obtain Congressional repeal of Section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Under 14 (b), individual states can assure their citizens of the Right to Work without forced union membership. The policy to let the states do as they choose is based on the idea that men should be allowed to work where they will, without paying compulsory tribute to a private organization. A poll conducted by Opinion Research Corporation of America has revealed that sixty-seven percent of the American people believes that no citizen should be forced to belong to a union in order to hold a job. However, that sixty-seven percent does not include the labor bosses to whom Wirtz and the Administration are beholden.

After the defeat by Congress of efforts to scuttle 14 (b), William W. Wirtz sent around his Labor Department boys to engage in a nationwide snooping expedition, scouring the country for "evidence" against members of state Right To Work Committees. As one

Committee member put it: "If this is allowed to continue, this country is rapidly on its way to becoming a police state."

The termination of the so-called *bracero* program, however, has been Wirtz' major contribution to the establishment of monopoly unionism in America. Farm workers comprise the largest non-union segment of American labor. With the unionization of farm labor, union control over the American economy would be nearly complete. However, as long as *bracero* labor was readily available from Mexico the unionization of farm workers in California and the Greater Southwest was largely impracticable.

Wirtz has argued that the vacuum created by the absence of Mexican agricultural workers would provide jobs for the American unemployed — harvesting crops. The supposition, of course, was absurd. No self-respecting Welfare recipient is about to leave his cushy deal in the big city and go out and do stoop labor in the hot sun.

Until 1965, some 200,000 farm workers annually entered this country from Mexico to work in the fields at harvest time, and the program was of considerable benefit to both the American and Mexican economies. Now that program has been ended by the Secretary of Labor. In August of 1965, Senator George Murphy termed Wirtz "incredibly stubborn" for adopting a farm worker program which brought "catastrophe . . . upon our nation's farmers." By ending the *bracero* program, Murphy said, Wirtz caused losses of \$21.5 million to California tomato growers and \$10 million to asparagus growers in the state. The total loss is inestimable!

Confronted by disaster caused by his policies, Wirtz merely lies. He even claimed that domestic farm employment was up by more than twenty thousand, thanks to cancellation of the *bracero*

program. Senator Murphy replied that Wirtz was playing fast and loose with the facts, adding that the total agricultural employment in California, alone, was down by 41,000. Murphy charged: "He has purposely overlooked the serious losses of crops suffered by our farmers and thousands of acres of vegetables never planted, the increase in production cost, the exodus of many farmers seeking new locations in Mexico and the increase of wholesale and retail prices."

Wirtz has caused similar dislocations in agriculture all over the country, and the result has been higher prices in the supermarkets — you ladies know all about it. Of course, Secretary Wirtz tried to blame higher food prices on the ubiquitous "middleman" and bad weather. Disgruntled growers may agree that for them it has been the Wirtz weather in years.

Besides wreaking havoc on the nation's farmers, the Wirtz program has begun to accomplish what it was intended to do. Marxist union organizers such as Cesar Chavez are now using brutality and violence to force farm workers to join Leftist unions. Chavez, incidentally, was trained for this task by Robert Wirtz' neighbor, Saul Alinsky. According to the 1966 Report of the California State Senate's Committee on Un-American Activities, Chavez has worked hand-in-hand with the Communists.

By the way, next time you see William W. Wirtz, ask him about brother Bob. Washington reporters have been too timid to broach the subject. You might even ask him about his own efforts for the Party in Chicago — no doubt he has a nifty answer for that one.

Department of Commerce

The office of Secretary of Commerce has since 1960 resembled nothing so much as Grand Central Station — with Luther Hodges being succeeded by

John T. Connor, who in turn gave way to Alexander Trowbridge, who was recently replaced by C. R. Smith. While the faces have changed, the policies have remained the same — and we go right on building bridges to Communism.

John Connor, generally described by the Press as a "Conservative," was Co-chairman in 1964 of the national Independent Committee for Lyndon Johnson and Vice President Humphrey, and enlisted the support of business and industrial leaders for the Democrat ticket. He described himself as a "Liberal businessman" and an "unreconstructed New Dealer," and proved to be an ardent promoter of trade with the Communists.

On November 11, 1966, Secretary of Commerce Connor declared that the Administration is moving "deliberately" toward separating trade from politics in dealing with the Communist countries. "We have hopes of building some very strong bridges as time goes on," he said. A month earlier he had announced that restrictions on the export of more than four hundred "non-strategic" commodities to the Communist Bloc had been removed. As a result, during the first quarter of 1967, the Commerce Department reported that U.S. exports to the Soviet Union and its European satellites totaled \$71.8 million. We'll discuss the nature of some of these "non-strategic" goods in just a moment.

Alexander Trowbridge, like his predecessor a member of the Far Left's ubiquitous Council on Foreign Relations and a strong supporter of trade with the Communists, was President of the Puerto Rican subsidiary of the Standard Oil Company before joining the Administration. Trowbridge has explained that the East-West conflict is somewhat of a myth and offered a bevy of rationalizations for supplying materials to the Soviet Bloc while American soldiers continue to die in Vietnam — killed by armaments provided

by those to whom we send trade. As he noted:

We have adopted what I describe as a "dual track" policy which with one hand we can confront such aggression where it must be resisted and our resolve is firm, but anytime pressure increases on one front we need pressure relief valves on other fronts. Hence, the desire to keep channels of communication open. . . .

If someone had thought of that brilliant strategy during World War II we might have tried to end our war with Italy by trading with Hitler.

Why fight the Reds in Vietnam and help them everywhere else?

The road to peace, according to Trowbridge, is: "Two-way trade in peaceful goods." Among the "peaceful goods" that the Commerce Department now allows to be shipped to the Communists are industrial chemicals, heavy machinery, the latest I.B.M. computers,



Alex Trowbridge
promoted trade to
arsenal of Vietcong.

electrical equipment, rubber, food, scrap metal, communications equipment, petroleum products, tools, hydraulic jacks, diesel engines, radar, jet engines, gear-grinding machines, machine tools, ball and roller bearings, motor vehicles, railway cars, electrical-chemical and radioactive devices for the conversion of chemical energy into electrical energy (hmm!), and electron tubes. All of these commodities are, of course, used in the manufacture of baby carriages.

Trowbridge recently suffered a debilitating heart attack (perhaps as he viewed our Vietnam casualty lists) and has been replaced by Cyrus R. Smith, who until recently was President and

Chairman of the Board of American Airlines. As with most of his predecessors there is the usual gabble from the mass media that Smith is a hard-nosed "Conservative" businessman. If such were true he would hardly have accepted a position requiring him to implement the Johnson Administration's commercial aid to the arsenal of the Vietcong.

Business Week says that Smith is "a voice that won't quaver at asking 'business to do its part.'" When "its part" is supplying the raw materials for killing American soldiers in the field — as we are now doing under pressure from the Johnson Administration's Commerce Department — it takes a mighty strong dedication to *something* not to quaver. Hodges couldn't take it; neither could Connor and Trowbridge. Maybe Smith has the heart for it.

Department of Agriculture

The Minnesota Machiavelli who heads this Department is so far to the Left that in 1948 he campaigned for Henry Wallace and his Communist-dominated Progressive Party. He is not even a farmer and has never been a farmer. Except for a few brief absences he had spent his entire career in downtown Minneapolis, where he was a lawyer, social worker, assistant to Hubert Humphrey, political worker for the Leftist Democratic Farm Labor Party, and then Governor — before being defeated for re-election and running off to Washington. He evidently derives his rural connections from his membership in the Izaak Walton League.

Every year since becoming Secretary of Agriculture in 1961, Orville Freeman has promised lower costs and higher farm income. It never happens. What happens is that the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture increases in direct ratio to the decline in farm population. While our farm popu-

lation is down twenty percent since 1960, the number of employees of the U.S.D.A. is up twenty percent. This is the equivalent of a forty percent increase in farm bureaucrats, giving the Department of Agriculture a grand total of 125,000. There is now a U.S.D.A. overseer for every thirty-two farmers in the United States.

Dr. Don Paarlberg, Purdue University economist, has noted that after thirty years and the expenditure of \$25 billion, those commodities which have enjoyed the most federal manipulation (wheat, cotton, and tobacco) are precisely the ones still in the greatest price and "surplus" difficulty. At the same time, he noted, markets had expanded for those livestock products, fruits, and vegetables produced and marketed by farmers' own decisions. No wonder that farmers who have been "helped" for thirty years by the federal government have been leaving their farms at the rate of 800,000 a year for the past five years.

Although it has not yet been approved by Congress, Orville Freeman has now advocated a supply-management system in which committees of farmers under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture would regulate all production and income of farmers. This scheme would create a system similar to the agricultural system in Communist countries where such committees are known as Soviets. It would give the Secretary of Agriculture power to allot nearly all acreage, telling every farmer how many acres to plant and how many to leave idle or put to other uses; and, it would allow the Department of Agriculture to force high prices for "authorized" crops while paying farmers for not planting idle acres.

This way, the farmer becomes a serf on his own land and the rest of us subsidize the action.

Freeman admitted that the new scheme means in effect the granting of a federal franchise to farm. The value

of a man's farm would depend not on the quality of his land nor on the labor and investment he puts into improvements, but on the kind of federal franchise he has. Henry A. Wallace called the Freeman Farm Program so radical that it would probably require "stricter control than they have in Communist countries."

Another of Orville Freeman's proposals would impose jail sentences on dairy farmers failing to keep records acceptable to the government, and would allow the Department of Agriculture to buy up farm land at Freeman's discretion — a blank check for a bureaucratic exercise in eminent domain.

In order to get farmers to submit to his totalitarian schemes, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has advocated dumping government stockpiles on the market to artificially drive prices down — forcing farmers into line. In 1963, he even used U.S.D.A. employees as a sort of goon squad to intimidate farmers into supporting the Kennedy Administration's Wheat Referendum. It was, nonetheless, soundly defeated.

In order to keep tabs on his serfs and entice them into further government programs, Freeman has created the Rural Community Development Service. Its function is to set up field offices throughout the country where people in small towns and rural communities can go to find out how to tap the federal till for such things as housing, water systems, conservation practices, small business loans, job training, Medicare, Social Security, and a whole array of welfare schemes involved in the Department's Rural Areas Development Program.

Farmers, of course, don't need a *new* office to tell them where to go for farm subsidies. The Agriculture Department already has an office of its Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service in almost every country in the land, disbursing about \$4 billion a year in direct

subsidies for such things as not growing food.

When asked by a Democrat Congressional candidate how to handle questions about the increased cost of food, Freeman replied recently: "I've been trying to figure out an answer to that question for six years. Slip, slide and duck any questions on higher consumer prices if you possibly can." On the contention of the Johnson Administration that the percentage of each paycheck that now goes for food is lower than in 1960, Freeman remarked: "You can tell [the housewives] that, but we know they wouldn't buy it."

One of the reasons for escalating food prices is our program of giving away food around the world. About two-thirds of American wheat goes abroad, more than one-half of our rice, nearly one-half of grain sorghums, two-fifths of soybeans, one-third of our corn, one-quarter of barley and tobacco, and one-



Orville Freeman
promotes aid for
arsenal of Vietcong.

fifth of our cotton. Taxpayers underwrite these exports. Some go as outright gifts to foreign nations, some are sold for the recipient nation's "soft currency" (which is non-convertible and amounts to giving it away), and some are sold to foreigners at below cost. That is, American taxpayers are bled white to pay export subsidies which make it possible for foreigners to buy our food for less than we pay for it.

The so-called Food for Peace Program is used to subsidize such nations as socialist India, Communist Yugoslavia, Communist Algeria, and Communist Egypt — which then spend their own money on grandiose projects and armaments instead of increasing food production. Why should they, as long

as they can get enough food from America to prevent their deprived people from rebelling? The more we feed such nations, the less they will make serious efforts to feed themselves. This is harsh, but true.

The Food for Peace Program is now spending over \$3 billion annually to subsidize collectivist regimes abroad. These "sales" are made on forty-year payment schedules with 2.5 percent interest, and a ten-year "grace" period at only one percent. This Program is also used to provide aid to Communist countries in a number of ways. For example, in 1965 Brazil received \$61 million in U.S. grain and other foods. At the very time the U.S. was donating such aid, Brazil was sending eight-thousand tons of corn to Cuba by Russian ships. Egypt and Greece have also sold large amounts of our food to Russia, even though this is specifically banned by the Food for Peace Pact. Nasser, who has received a billion dollars in food products, in the year 1964 alone sold or bartered 314,000 tons of agricultural commodities to Communist Cuba, Red China, Russia, East Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania.

Freeman, however, has the solution to this problem. Give the food to the Communist countries directly. This idea occurred to him after his tour of the Soviet Union in 1963. Several months after he had returned to announce the marvelous progress that was being made under the Soviet agricultural system, it turned out that the Soviet Union faced a famine and needed wheat. Since agriculture is one of the Soviets' Achilles heels, America, of course, had to move decisively to solve their problem. Ignoring the ancient adage that an army travels on its stomach, Freeman told the House Appropriations Subcommittee he advocated sending to the Communist Bloc "anything they can eat, smoke or drink."

This allows the Communists to allocate fewer men to farming so that more can work in war production to produce weapons for use in killing American soldiers in Vietnam.

Since 1964, for example, we have sent Communist Poland \$26 million in U.S. agricultural goods, primarily wheat. Our food arrives in the same harbors from which the Poles send arms to the Vietcong — arms and wheat pass one-another on the docks. As the *Chicago Tribune* recently noted: "The Poles receive the wheat on credit and they in turn ship their weapons to Vietnam on credit." Nonetheless, Secretary Freeman has regularly gone before Committees of the U.S. Senate seeking "most-favored nation" trade status for Communist Poland and other Communist countries.

Mr. Freeman has even gone to the extent of selling vast quantities of soybeans and tallow to the Soviet Bloc — knowing that both commodities are important ingredients in the production of ammunition. In the first half of 1965, \$29 million of these products were sold to the Communist arsenal of an enemy which has killed twenty-thousand American soldiers in Vietnam. We wonder, Mr. Secretary, how many of the boys on these casualty lists were from farms where supplies for their killers were grown. Perhaps you have the statistics.

Department of the Interior

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall is one of the great empire builders and land barons of all time. More than one-third of the entire continental United States is now owned by the federal government in spite of the fact there is no grant of power in the United States Constitution for it to own property other than for defense. At the insistence of Secretary Udall, the federal government has acquired literally millions of acres of land in the process of carrying out both Point One ("Aboli-

tion of private property and land and application of all rents of land to public purposes") and Point Nine ("Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of distinction between town and country by more equitable distribution of population over the country") of the *Communist Manifesto*.

The area of land now owned by the federal government within the United States is greater than the combined land area of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, Portugal and Spain, France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Germany, Iceland, Denmark, Poland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Italy, Monaco, Albania, Greece, Yugoslavia, Romania, and Bulgaria. Quite a fiefdom for our Secretary of the Interior.

These 722 million acres are now off the tax rolls and an expense to the taxpayer. Communities surrounded by such federal lands are unable to expand and industry is thus driven from the area. Yet, the federal hunger for land grows with every new tract seized from private owners and added to the public domain. The Wilderness Bill of 1964, for example, authorized future acquisition of an additional 52.1 million acres.

Much of this land, grabbed from private ownership, is used for the production of public electricity. In doing so the empire builders have made a virtual blackmailer out of the federal government. Already producing electric power in competition with private, tax-paying power companies, it uses its land holdings (held without Constitutional authority) as a club with which to harass its legal competitors.

A typical Udall power grab occurred in June of 1965, when the Secretary of the Interior filed with the Federal Power Commission one of the most remarkable petitions for intervention ever received by that body. His object was to prevent the Duke Power Company from

investing its money to build its own dams on its own property in South Carolina. His idea was to compel the company to rely instead on a federal power project on the Savannah River—a project that had not yet even been



Stewart Udall calls private property outmoded mythology.

authorized by Congress. Mr. Udall later had to back off on this, but he continued to seek Congressional approval for the federal power project at Trotter's Shoals, even though he had himself made it plain that the Duke enterprise would render the Trotter's Shoals project unnecessary. As Congressman William Dorn commented:

If the Secretary of the Interior can control the Savannah and make connections with other government power projects, then he can control water, power, industry and people. The Southeast would be at the mercy of the federal bureaucracy and a stark federal monopoly. . . . The real goal is national socialism.

Well, it could be. The 1960 platform of the Democrat Party had advocated the "development [by the federal government] of efficient regional power systems from all sources . . ." and Secretary Udall has carried out plans to place the whole power industry under tight control and eventual ownership of the federal government. Perhaps he tipped his hand when, upon arrival in the Soviet Union to study Communist electrical power installations in 1962, he declared: "We are here to learn as much as we can. . . . We have so much to learn from your Soviet specialists in this field."

You think I'm being a little tough on Stewart Udall? Try this quotation from

the Secretary's speech in Hershey, Pennsylvania, on September 13, 1966, in which he criticized America on the ground that:

We have continued . . . to nurture ourselves on outmoded mythologies of . . . free enterprise, private property rights. . . . We have continued to hold to the twin idols of free enterprise and rugged individualism.

What sort of "idols" and "mythologies" does the Secretary of the Interior favor? Well, he awarded the Department of Interior Conservation Service Award for 1966 to Communist Woody Guthrie, late columnist of the *People's World* and *Daily Worker*. Udall said he liked Guthrie's "folksongs" so much that he was naming a federal power substation the "Woody Guthrie Substation" in the Communist's honor. Another Udall idol is apparently Eugene V. Debs, whose home in Terre Haute, Indiana, was dedicated recently as a "national historic landmark" by our Secretary of the Interior. Debs was a Socialist revolutionary, tried and convicted of sedition, who heralded the Communist revolution in Russia, defended Lenin's execution of countless White Russians, and bitterly attacked those "mythologies" of free enterprise and private property rights which Udall finds so tiresome.

One almost expects to hear next that Stewart Udall has just renamed Hoover Dam after Gus Hall and declared the birthplace of Alger Hiss a national shrine.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

This Department is the most rapidly expanding of all the government bureaus, and is presently employing more than ninety thousand people and annually spending some \$35 billion. It includes six sprawling agencies: the Food

and Drug, Social Security, Public Health, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Welfare Administrations — as well as the U.S. Office of Education.

John W. Gardner, yet another member of the Council on Foreign Relations, gave up a \$70,000 a year job with the Carnegie Corporation to become L.B.J.'s Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. The President has called Gard-



John Gardner
is "the real power
in . . . education . . ."

ner, "the real power in American education today." And, Secretary Gardner was the chief architect of the federal government's role in the rapidly expanding field of aid to — and control over — education. Don't waste your time stumbling around through the Constitution looking for the part which authorizes the federal government to become involved in education. It's not there.

Mr. Gardner served as Chairman of the President's Special Task Force on Education where, Mr. Johnson claimed, he "helped to plant the seed bed of the education harvest that has been produced by the 89th Congress" — a \$1.3 billion federal aid to education law. This was necessary because America's schools, according to Gardner, must take the lead in being "instruments of social change" rather than merely instruments of education.

Since the neighborhood school stands in the way of "social change," it must go. Gardner has been a leader in using federal funds to force an end to the neighborhood school system in order to create the bureaucratic ideal of "racial balance" throughout the nation's primary and secondary schools. He even supported a recommendation by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission that no public

school in the nation have an enrollment that is more than fifty percent Negro — even if that means shuffling children about the countryside like bean bags. It is federal racism, pure and simple.

In the two Congressional sessions of Mr. Gardner's tenure, he asked for and got such socialized Health programs as: (1) Medicare, (2) Medicaid, (3) federal immunization shots for all migratory workers, (4) federal staffing of community "mental health" centers, (5) regulated labeling of cigarettes, (6) federal planning of local public health services, and a score of other programs to increase the role of government in American medicine.

Although the Great Society had expanded government spending in nearly every field of Welfare, John Gardner was not satisfied. He wanted a promise that funds equal to those being spent on the War in Vietnam would be diverted into domestic Welfare programs. And, when even Lyndon couldn't promise that, he resigned his Cabinet position to accept the Chairmanship of the National Urban Coalition.* He is now working in that group with A. Philip Randolph, Time Incorporated, David Rockefeller, George Meany, and John Lindsay. The Coalition will lobby for federal funds to be used to completely "renovate" our cities.

Gardner was replaced by Wilbur J. Cohen, a backroom operator regarded by many as one of the most dangerous men in the United States. While Gardner was impatient and wanted to collectivize America in a single stroke, Cohen's philosophy throughout his more than thirty years as a federal bureaucrat has been: "Do it by small bits and pieces." He has always been willing, if necessary, to sacrifice legislative objectives so long as he can get a small

piece of what he wants. Each morsel, Cohen believes, can be fattened a little, year by year, until eventually the legislation resembles what he wanted in the first place. One of his aides calls this technique "salami slicing" — one slice doesn't amount to much, but eventually there is enough for a sandwich.

Cohen helped draft the original Social Security laws in 1935. From that time on he has been in the midst of what the newspapers refer to as "progressive social legislation." Roughly half of the major legislation put through Congress in the Johnson Administration has come out of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare — and virtually every piece of it has borne the imprint of Wilbur Cohen. He has been called the Father of Medicare and has worked for over thirty years to bring socialized medicine to the United States by increments.

Rudy Abrahamson, a member of the *Los Angeles Times* Washington Bureau, has reported that: "It would be difficult if not impossible to find a public official who enjoys the confidence and respect accorded Cohen by his Washington colleagues."

It is not exactly true that everybody in Washington loves and admires Wilbur Cohen. Marjorie Shearon, a former colleague of Cohen's and long-time legislative analyst, says in her carefully documented book, *Wilbur J. Cohen: The Pursuit of Power*:

He had built on a broad foundation of Socialist-Communist organizations, having collaborated with their members as well as with organized labor and the lobbies to nationalize medicine. His areas of influence extended to many federal agencies, to members of Congress, and to professional groups such as nurses and social workers. They also extended into the AFL-CIO and to other unions, some of which were Communist controlled.

*Curiously, no politician has yet spoken of diverting the dollar costs of war back into the pocketbooks of the people who earned the money.

In the middle Fifties, Cohen's then twenty years of working hand-in-glove with the Communists began to close in on him. As Dr. Shearon reports:

Those investigating in Congress and the FBI were getting very close. Men like Pressman, Stern and Kramer were confessing, or being proven, to have been Communists. These were the men Cohen had worked with and who had helped him in his legislative achievements.

As Wilbur Cohen had operated in government, he formally affiliated himself with the Washington Committee for Aid to China, cited in the federal government's *Guide to Subversive Organizations* as "Communist controlled"; the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, also cited as "subversive and Communist"; and, the Washington Bookshop Association, cited as "subver-



Wilbur Cohen
served in
top Communist Fronts.

sive and Communist." He refused to repudiate his Communist associates and the Soviet Fronts to which he belonged, even after they were exposed. Yes, the investigators *were* "getting very close."

In 1956, Cohen fled to the safe environs of the University of Michigan where he became Professor of Public Welfare Administration. But, when the New Frontier took over, security checks were forgotten and Wilbur was brought back into the government so that the New Frontier could take advantage of his well-deserved reputation on the Far Left as a manipulator, schemer, and fixer. Cohen, canopied by a net of subversion, had his feet firmly planted in the Socialist and Communist foundations of the Welfare State. The fact that

he was a member of at least three key Communist Fronts, as cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, is a small matter compared to his personal relationship over the years with top Communists.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is now the second largest government bureau and will continue to grow rapidly. Wilbur Cohen will use every excuse to promote ever more rapid growth of government Welfare legislation and spending. A member of the radical Americans for Democratic Action, Cohen — like so many other Cabinet members — is the very antithesis of the American philosophy of private initiative.

Department of Transportation

The post of Secretary of Transportation, a newly created Cabinet position, is held by Alan S. Boyd, former Undersecretary of Commerce and Transportation, and former Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Boyd has been a career bureaucrat who knows which backs to scratch. In September 1967, he called a meeting of corporate executives involved in shipping, trucking, and airlines at a private club in Washington, where he "urged" them to support President Johnson for another term. Then the executives were "asked" to buy \$1,000-a-couple tickets to a Democratic fund raising dinner to be held in Washington on October seventh. Boyd simply used his bureaucratic muscle on government-regulated corporations who were in no position to say No. He is that kind of man.

Like any dynasty-building bureaucrat, Alan Boyd has constantly called for more legislation to increase his power and authority. He cavalierly refers to what he calls our "hodge-podge transportation system," and claims to have two answers for the hodge-podge: federal money and control. Like other planners, Boyd wants to make sure that

all local governments will have to submit their own programs for Washington's approval. "Under the new highway law," he says, "the federal government requires all cities of more than 50,000 population to have a transportation plan in order to qualify for federal highway funds. . . ."

With regard to new transportation, his position is this: "It has become a fairly well-developed principle that the government will finance most of the research and development projects that are too costly for private enterprise to handle alone." He cites as an example the supersonic transport plane and high-speed railroad service, but does not state why private enterprise would not be willing to develop such apparently profitable innovations.

Boyd also believes that: "Future transportation programs must be geared more to meeting the needs of the cities." And he goes on to say: "I'm not certain at all that private ownership can provide the type of transportation that's going to be necessary in an urban society." With tens of millions of customers, the only reason private enterprise can't make a profit providing transportation in urban centers is that bureaucrats like Boyd won't even let it try.

Karl Marx' Ten Commandments of Communism, as stated in the *Communist Manifesto*, call for "Centralization of the means of . . . transportation in the hands of the state." Boyd is working inexorably toward that Marxist goal.

The U.S. Post Office

Lawrence O'Brien, one of J.F.K.'s original Irish Mafia, succeeded John Gronouski as Postmaster General when the latter was made Ambassador to Communist Poland. O'Brien, a member of the Leftist A.D.A., has been described by *Time* magazine as one of the Kennedys' "most valued advisors." He resigned in mid-April to join the Bobby for President Team. If Bobby is elected,

O'Brien will undoubtedly be back in the Cabinet — where both can more effectively promote their protective feelings for the Vietcong. On March 25, 1968, Postmaster O'Brien declared that he would quit the Cabinet if he thought we were seeking a military victory in Vietnam, stating:

Some people suggest [the President] wants to pin the coonskin on the wall — that he wants total military victory. If I believed this I wouldn't be sitting here. If the day comes when I do believe it, I will have no personal problem in leaving. I would walk out of here with my head high.

O'Brien made no bones about the fact that the Post Office Department is in an incredible mess, and even recommended the establishment of a semi-private non-profit corporation to run the Department. While the opinion-makers have referred to this as a return to private enterprise, it is not. Private enterprise pays taxes and must operate at a profit or go out of business. O'Brien said he forces a "T.V.A.-type operation." T.V.A. is hardly private enterprise, and loses millions each year.

Larry O'Brien, considered a "back-room pol," spent most of his time lobbying for passage of Kennedy-Johnson legislation. Regarded as an artful campaign manager and an arm-twister par excellence, *Time* magazine credits him with having "shouldered the bigger burden of pushing Johnson's mighty legislative raft through Congress." The raft is, of course, taking America over the falls.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

As head of the newly created Cabinet post of Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Robert Weaver is one of the most photographed men in Wash-

ington. He is the first Negro to achieve Cabinet rank, and the White House considers it good politics to have him standing in the background as flash bulbs pop and TV cameras purr. Weaver received the appointment after Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young — heads, respectively, of the powerful N.A.A.C.P. and National Urban League — strongly suggested that Negroes were counting heavily upon Weaver's appointment to that position, and that failure to name him would be considered a personal affront to Negro voters.

Nowhere does the U.S. Constitution give the federal government any control over urban affairs, but the Urban Affairs Department is being turned into a giant federal City Hall — a dramatic example of the new centralization of power — as Mr. Weaver and his 15,400 bureaucrats work to become virtual czars over the cities of the United States. Within a few years, when cities throughout the country are well hooked on the narcotic of federal aid, local codes governing everything from building and zoning to law enforcement and sidewalk construction will have to conform with federal standards as a condition of continued federal aid.

Weaver has nothing but typical bureaucratic contempt for what he sarcastically refers to as "local fiefdoms" wanting to conduct their own affairs. He now has under his supervision the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Community Facilities Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Rent Supplement Program, Urban Renewal, and the Model Cities Program.

Using the Communist-led insurrections in our cities as an excuse, Weaver's programs will doubtless be greatly expanded in the face of the Far Left's claims that the only way to stop the burning and looting of our cities is to

rebuild urban areas. This completely ignores the fact that public housing and similar programs have in the past themselves been turned into slums within a few years after completion, and that *sniper fire* from new federal housing projects has not been an entirely irregular occurrence.

Since Mr. Weaver may be spending up to \$100 billion of our money, the public has a right to know a little about his background and ideological commitment.

After graduation from Harvard, Robert Weaver was brought to Washington in 1933 as an economic advisor to Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. Ickes was responsible for bringing quite a number of Communists into the federal government. According to Louis



Robert Weaver
served in
top Communist Fronts.

Budenz, former Editor of the Communists' *Daily Worker*: "To his dying day Mr. Ickes defended the 'rights' of the Communist conspiracy and assailed the prosecution of Red leaders under the Smith Act." Ickes himself declared: "... I suspect either the motives or the intelligence of those who would have us marshal our forces against a barely imaginary danger of Communism. . . ."

Weaver, of course, wasted little time in getting involved with the Communists. He was, for example, a key leader at the Second National Negro Congress in 1937. The National Negro Congress, as you know, was cited as "subversive and Communist" by the Attorney General of the United States, and was described by the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1939 as "the Communist front movement in the United States among Negroes." Weaver

(Continued on Page 112.)

continued as an active participant through at least 1940 (see *Daily Worker*, April 24, 1940).

The *Daily Worker* of February 8, 1939, listed Robert Weaver as a supporter of the Negro Peoples Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. The House Special Committee, in its Report for 1944, cited the Negro Peoples Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist Front. In fact, our Secretary of H.U.D. even contributed financially to *Social Work Today*, officially cited as a Communist magazine by another Investigating Committee of the U.S. Congress. In 1941 Weaver was a member of the Washington Book Shop Association, cited as "subversive and Communist" by the Attorney General of the United States. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities revealed in 1944 that: "The Washington Bookshop . . . was so obviously an enterprise of the Communist Party that it would have been impossible for any politically informed person to walk into it without perceiving its Communist character." The shop, it seems, specialized in the volumes of Marx, Lenin, Engels, and the latest Communist pamphlets.

Weaver also served on the executive board of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. The House Special Committee on Un-American Activities states concerning C.P.A.C.: "Eighty-three percent have records of affiliation with Communists and Communist front organizations. . . . The National Citizens Political Action Committee taken as a whole includes a formidable list of confirmed fellow travelers and the frontiers for Communist organizations."

In 1944, Mr. Weaver sponsored a testimonial dinner in honor of Ferdinand C. Smith, cited in the federal government's *Guide to Subversive Organizations* as "high in the circles of the Communist Party." He was also Chairman of the Negro Labor Victory Com-

mittee, cited as "subversive and Communist" by the Attorney General. In 1945, Weaver was an endorser of the Council of African Affairs, cited by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as a Communist Front "formed to provoke racial friction." It too was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General.

After leaving Ickes' office, Mr. Weaver became an administrative assistant to Sidney Hillman of the National Defense Advisory Committee. Hillman was one of the best known early Communists, having been active in the I.W.W. and the Russian Revolution. Following World War II, Weaver became a member of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which was used as a pipeline for funneling funds into the Communist Parties of Central and Eastern Europe. He was then allowed to serve as Deputy Chief of the Administration's Mission to the Soviet Ukraine — a very sensitive area for the Communists — at a time when only those "politically" acceptable to the Reds were even allowed to enter the Soviet Union.

Following his stint in the Workers Fatherland, Robert Weaver became a Professor of Economics at the Marxist-oriented New School for Social Research in New York City, and was also a member of the Fellowship Committee of the Rosenwald Fund, a foundation criticized in Congressional investigation of tax-exempt organizations for having made grants to Communist revolutionaries. Making certain that the Comrades still knew where he stood, Weaver wrote a book in 1948, called *The Negro Ghetto*, which was so wildly received by the Communists that Herbert Aptheker himself reviewed it for the April issue of the Reds' *Masses and Mainstream*, and the Communist Workers Book Shop listed it among "Books of Lasting Value" — right there with *Das Kapital*.

Yes, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Robert Weaver is a key man in a key position who will see that billions of dollars in tax funds go to the "right people." Sadly, the fact that he is a Negro virtually exempts him from popular criticism; but, of course, legitimate criticism of Weaver has nothing to do with his race, but with his serious Communist background. It would indeed be difficult for even Robert Kennedy to find a man more experienced and better able to serve the International Communist Conspiracy than Mr. Weaver.

Department of Justice

The current Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, is a forty-year-old "Liberal" who is somewhat less than a tiger when it comes to law enforcement. He declares himself a staunch opponent of capital punishment, looks at criminals as a misunderstood minority, and believes in cracking down with the full force of the law on businessmen, the real predators of our society.

Clark succeeded Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, who ascribed to the theory that justice should not be blind, but should be used to reshape society. As he explained: "One can use the law creatively to achieve social and political objectives. The law doesn't have to be neutral."



Nicholas Katzenbach
maintained law
shouldn't be neutral.

Of course, when the law isn't neutral you have a police state; but then, *police state* is a harsh phrase and not nearly so euphonious as *Great Society*. Sadly, Clark is proving to be even more "Liberal" than Katzenbach, who has now moved over to the State Department — a position from which he told the National Association of Manufacturers on

December 9, 1967: Trade with the Communist arsenal of the Vietcong is "good business, good policy, and good sense."

Ramsey Clark's view of crime is that the Justice Department has just been too ghastly to criminals in the past, ignoring the *sociological* concerns which cause crime. The Attorney General even has a good word for the Supreme Court. When interviewed on a recent N.B.C. television program dedicated to "Law Day-USA," Clark contended that the Supreme Court's strictures on police interrogations and confessions had not hampered law enforcement — even though nearly every Sheriff, Police Chief, District Attorney, and Judge in the nation has declared otherwise. Baltimore State's Attorney Charles E. Moylan, for example, recently testified that he knows of at least seventy-two self-confessed felons — including murderers and rapists — who are now free because of the High Court's Miranda decision, a decision that Clark praised vigorously on N.B.C.

In the seven years between 1960 and 1966, crime in America has grown by sixty-two percent. The preliminary figures for the first nine months of 1967 show a rise of another sixteen percent. This skyrocketing crime rate is irrefutable evidence that the permissive attitude towards law breakers promoted by Attorneys General Kennedy, Katzenbach, and Clark have promoted crime in America. But, according to Clark, society as a whole is to blame for crime, and only sociological solutions can be proposed. Pleas by J. Edgar Hoover for a "get tough" enforcement program and less leniency from the courts go unheeded, even though F.B.I. officials have made public the results of lengthy investigation disclosing incontrovertible evidence that "legal technicalities" and soft "theories of rehabilitation" are swelling the nation's crime rate. The F.B.I. has also cited a three-year computerized study of 167,000 offenders, to

prove that the present judicial and penal attitudes "favor the guilty 'getting away with it.'"

Clark was even instrumental in persuading President Johnson to veto the 1966 Washington, D.C., Omnibus Crime Bill. Although this legislation was aimed at holding down the exploding crime rate in the District of Columbia, and passed both the Senate and the House by overwhelming margins, Ramsey Clark thought it dealt too harshly with suspected criminals.

While doing everything he can to hamper real law enforcement, the Attorney General supports the establishment of a FedCop Program to provide himself with strong controls over our local police. As he was interrogated by the McClellan Subcommittee on Criminal Laws concerning L.B.J.'s Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967,



Ramsey Clark
refuses to prosecute
Communist activists.

Clark even inferred that he might cut off federal funds to Southern states unless they achieved a certain racial balance in their police forces. And, there's a lot of money at stake. The bill proposed spending \$50 million for the first fiscal year, and Clark admitted that the cost might reach \$1 billion a year in the not-too-distant future.

The aim is to put local police forces under the dictation of the U.S. Attorney General, who could make sure that local law units don't receive a penny unless they conform to special "criteria" laid down in Washington. Critics point out that this must eventually lead to a national police force run by the Attorney General, a political appointee. Such forces have always been destructive of liberty: as, for example, in the case of the national police force established by

the National Socialists in Germany — known as the *Gestapo*. Many are very concerned when the President says of Ramsey Clark: "He is Mr. Big, and I want that understood. . . ." Herr Hitler couldn't have put it better.

Domestic Communists and insurrectionists certainly have nothing to fear from Clark. In 1966 our pussycat Attorney General determinedly fought enactment of the Pool Bill to make it a federal crime for groups in the United States to send supplies to the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong. He lightly brushed off Communist activities in behalf of the Vietcong as "eccentric behavior." Congressman Edward Hebert, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, has complained that the Justice Department not only claims it cannot stop such Communist activities, but that it has no interest or inclination in helping write legislation which would.

There are already two laws which would curtail American succor to the Vietcong. One is the Trading with the Enemy Act and the other the Export-Import Control Act. However, the Attorney General says he regards these laws as inefficient and ineffective, though to date he has not attempted a single prosecution nor a single indictment to even *test* their efficiency and effectiveness.

At the present time any Communist in the United States can go out and solicit money, supplies, ammunition, or anything else to send to the Vietcong, and he will not have committed a criminal offense in the eyes of the Attorney General — who opposes the passage of any law, such as the Pool Bill, that would *force* him to prosecute such acts.

Clark says he can't even find reasons to move against the Marxist Stokely Carmichael. The Justice Department has claimed that it would be a violation of Carmichael's "free speech" to prosecute him for urging defiance of the Selective

Service Act. Dean Joseph O'Meara of the Notre Dame Law School noted the Department's assertion that Carmichael has committed no offense, and commented sarcastically: "I venture to suggest that what is lacking is not a violation of law, but the will to prosecute."



**Attorney General
has protected
Stokely Carmichael.**

Dean O'Meara said that Carmichael and the late Martin Luther King were actively violating two sections of the U.S. Code. Both sections, he said, have been upheld by the Supreme Court. One section spells out penalties for any person "who knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse or evade registration for service in the Armed Services."

The contemporary insurrections in our cities, in the Attorney General's opinion, are caused by those selfish Americans who work for a living but refuse to give away to loafers, looters, and other assorted parasites what remains after taxes. He is on record for an even greater outpouring of tax money to black racists as the only means of keeping them from rioting, mewing: "The real cause of riots is the explosive frustration and impatience of those who suffer from slum housing, unemployment, inadequate education and training programs and all the other deprivations which are so characteristic of the ghetto."

Clark is as reluctant as his predecessors, Katzenbach and Kennedy, to prosecute insurrectionists and those who finance, organize, and incite them. Stokely Carmichael, "Rap" Brown, Floyd McKissick, and others inciting rebellion and insurrection, urging Negroes to kill whites, advocating the overthrow of the government by force

and violence, interfering with the operation of the armed services, and causing evasion of the Selective Service Act, have yet to be prosecuted to conviction by the federal government. By looking the other way while city after city is put to the torch, Clark is serving the Communist cause.

By letting the revolutionaries organize, incite, and destroy with impunity, their ranks continue to grow. This dereliction of duty by the Attorney General may even give impetus to the reaction which the Communists want most — the taking of the law into their own hands by frustrated whites. Only in this way can the Reds achieve the all-out, no-holds-barred, race war they have been after from the beginning. The by-products of such a tragedy would be the destruction by fire and sabotage of large segments of American utilities, communications facilities, and productive capacity — and the loss of perhaps hundreds of thousands of lives. Such an insurrection would then force the bringing home of American troops from all over the world, creating a vacuum which would be filled by Communist armies.

The F.B.I. knows who the criminal conspirators are, and its investigations have produced evidence that would ensure their conviction and thereby thwart the national insurrection before it starts. But, the F.B.I. is an investigatory body, not an enforcement body. The results of its investigations are turned over to the Justice Department where the information is buried: Buried at the order of our Leftist Attorney General — Ramsey Clark.

Yes, where the Communists are concerned, Ramsey Clark is always most accommodating. As Andrew Tully noted on January 3, 1968:

A Justice Department source said today the White House is suppressing a secret FBI report, which calls the

anti-war protest at the Pentagon last Oct. 21 "Communist-directed," because Attorney General Ramsey Clark has persuaded President Johnson its release would not be "in the public interest."

Clark's argument, it was said, is that release of the report would "in-flame" the American public against the Communist enemy in Vietnam. . . .

There has been a vigorous tug-of-war within high Administration councils, it was learned, ever since House Republican leader Gerald Ford of Michigan told the House on Nov. 21 that Johnson had read to Republican leaders portions of the report. The report, said Ford, asserted that the march was organized and directed by international Communism, through the Red leadership in Hanoi.

At that time, Ford urged the President to make "a full report to the American people," but the White House was silent on his remarks. However, Ford said Clark paid him a visit and told him the report was being withheld because of the danger of triggering a fresh wave of "McCarthyism." . . .

We musn't have "McCarthyism" you know — even when the Reds burn and

loot in 168 American cities within a single week, and surround the Pentagon with thousands of Leftists bearing the flag of the Vietcong, and direct student demonstrations from coast to coast, and make major infiltration into our Government itself. After all, Americans might become "inflamed" and stop the Reds before it's too late. Americans might demand leaders who will stand up for America!

* * *

WELL, there you have it — the men who formed the Cabinet during the bulk of the L.B.J. Era. You'll have to admit they are an incredible crew. Certainly you wouldn't want your daughter to marry one. Yet, these humanitarians with the lash, these power-mad collectivists who spend billions yet give America no protection from predators, foreign or domestic, sit at the left hand of the Caesar who thinks he is Abraham Lincoln. The Marxists in America — the really important ones — are on the inside looking out. The question, for those who think America will be in trouble if Bobby Kennedy and his post-pubescent Bolsheviks come to power, is this: How can we possibly move Left from here?

On second thought, please don't answer that question. ■ ■

CRACKER BARREL

■ EAGLE ROCK—What happened to the *Man for All Seasons* after they cut his head off? Quite a bit. Following his decapitation in 1535, the head of Sir Thomas More was reclaimed by his loyal daughter, Margaret Roper. She caused it to be placed in a lead box behind the vaults of St. Dunstan's Church, Canterbury. There it still may be seen. His smiling shade has been seen there. But it doesn't scare anyone. It's the pleasant specter of a serene man. For several centuries, the ghost of Sir Thomas (complete with head) was said to drive (every other year) from his country house at Baynards in Surrey to Loseley near Guildford. The trip was made in a spectral coach drawn by phantom horses. On alternate years, a Loseley ghost (no one seems to know who he was) returned the visit. But there have been no reports of the spooks calling on each other in recent years. Maybe the traffic is too much for them.

■ EAGLE ROCK—You keep wondering why your kids won't turn out the lights—until they get to be teenagers and you start wondering why they do.

■ EAGLE ROCK—I picked a great horse at Santa Anita the other day. It took ten other horses to beat him.

■ EAGLE ROCK—Women who know all the answers seldom get asked.

■ EAGLE ROCK—We're going to stay home this vacation. We took a "pay later" vacation last year.

—JACK MOFFITT