

# OUR MILITARY

## The Attack On Duty, Honor, Country

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 volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

■ IT IS now almost impossible to open a newspaper, select a book or magazine from a newsstand, turn on the television, or go to a movie without being subjected to some new form of attack upon the American military. The Line is the same, whether couched in the gliberal cant of the *New York Times*, the alley shrieks of the underground newspapers, or the electronic urbanities of Walter Cronkite. According to this grand coalition of "Liberals" and radicals, the Communists are now deeply divided. They desire peace, but are frustrated in their attempts to end the Cold War by America's cruel military-industrial complex.

"Who is the real enemy of the United States?" asks former Senator Joseph Clark, head of the United World Federalists. "Is it the Russians? Is it the Chinese? Is it the North Vietnamese? Or is it the Pentagon and its industrial allies who are tearing this country apart for no sensible reason affecting our national security?" There can be no doubt whom Senator Clark blames. And such Estab-

lishment "Liberals" are already boasting that if they have their way the hegemony of our military complex will soon be reduced to the relative perimeter of a Boy Scout camp. *Look* magazine cheers:

*For the first time in thirty years, the American defense establishment is on the defensive.*

*Not since the 1930s — before World War II, the cold war, the Korean War, Vietnam — have those who build and manage our military machine been so seriously challenged.*

*Congress, less afraid of being labeled unpatriotic, is asking penetrating questions . . . It is only a step to asking whether we can have sufficient defense at lower cost, and perhaps use the savings for programs with lower priorities, like healing our cities and making poverty an anachronism.*

That gliberal cant about "re-ordering our priorities" has become the media cliché of the year. The disarmament lobby has drowned the airwaves and blackened the newspapers with propaganda that millions of Americans are starving to death in rat-infested hovels because maniac warmongers in the Pentagon insist upon maintaining a garrison state in which generals rattle about with three megaton warheads for every babushka on the Russian steppes and two H-Bombs for every rice farmer in China.

Typical of this frenetic sloganeering is the comment by David M. Shoup, a former Marine Corps general turned high-

ly publicized peacenik, that "America has become a militaristic and aggressive nation . . . Militarism in America is in full bloom and promises a future of vigorous self-pollution." Senator Stephen Young of Ohio, dean emeritus of the Senate's coterie of pink-breasted doves, another of the anti-military propagandists. As he twitters the message:

*Unless the seemingly relentless drive towards militarization is halted, we cannot even begin to make progress toward arms control and reduction or toward establishing healthy national priorities for solving our great social problems — racism, poverty, the decay of our cities, the disillusionment and rage of our youth, environmental pollution, the stagnation of our educational system, our shameful treatment of the mentally ill and other elderly, inflation and a host of others.*

According to such crimson denizens of the disarmament aviary, defense has nothing to do with people. Only Welfare helps people. And if one is to believe the claims of those leading the assault against our servicemen, even their wild rhetoric is made necessary only because brassy generals are so mean and vicious. Consider this purple little comment from *Look*:

*Don't count on the end of the draft when the Selective Service law expires this June. The Pentagon brass and their political allies are ganging up to keep their good old red-white-and-blue draft alive. After 22 years, they are not about to let go. They say they need more draftees for mud-sloughing combat jobs. Uncle Sam still wants you, kid.*

The current excuse for such anti-militarism is the war our politicians arranged to lose in Vietnam. There is not

one consequence of that war, said to have been fought against Communism, that has not supported the Communist drive to consolidate power in a One World government. Massive drug addiction, disillusionment, and disloyalty are all side effects of this no-win war. Every grain of human frailty or war-engendered tragedy has been shot from guns and puffed into ammunition by both the professionals who operate our mass media and the semi-pros who run the underground press. Whether it be the PX scandals or the myths surrounding the alleged My Lai massacre, the American public is told again and again and again that the American military is a brass shell full of sadistic warmongers and greedy profiteers.

The cumulative poisoning which has resulted from this campaign is taking its toll. Columnist Nick Thimmesch discusses the results:

*Today, officers and men are scorned by most of the public and taunted by youth . . . Younger officers and service academy cadets have increased misgivings about the military, and retention of career people is a serious problem . . . cadets on leave sometimes lie about where they go to school; . . . there are no heroes or crusades to inspire cadets and young officers and fewer and fewer decide to become career men.*

*When I was a boy in World War II, Purple Heart veterans came home to respect, compassion, some breaks and free drinks in the bars. Today the wounded veteran feels a rejection worse sometimes than his physical pain. He is surrounded by anti-war movies, literature, pictures and sometimes even by hostile draft-exempted youths.*

As Colonel Robert Heintz Jr., a respected military historian, observed in June to the *Santa Ana Register*: "The

morale, discipline and battleworthiness of the U.S. Armed Forces are, with a few salient exceptions, lower and worse than at any time in this century and possibly in the history of the United States." In May, *U.S. News & World Report* put it this way:

*The military establishment, chiefly the Army, is now beset by cases of mutiny, disobedience, racial strife, desertion and an ever-increasing number of AWOLs . . .*

*The Army in particular is being confronted with a type of draftee hitherto extremely rare in U.S. experience — the man who refuses to pledge allegiance to the United States and who will not swear to fight for the nation.*

Meanwhile *Look* magazine's senior editor Christopher Wren is crowing to his millions of readers:

*Almost imperceptibly, the closely woven fabric of military discipline is unraveling at the edges. Never defeated in war, the armed forces can't quite cope with the peace assault . . .*

*Today, trying to run a war that satisfies nobody, the American military looks to the draft-eligible cynics a little like a hired gun on loan to any regime that will croak "anti-Communist" loudly enough. The Pentagon regulars may never notice, the New Left partisans may never care, but the Vietnam malaise is rotting out the shining heraldry woven by American fighters for two centuries.*

*The Caissons Go Rolling Along sounded lusty in its day, if a little inane. The Army retired the lyrics, then commissioned for itself new words no one can remember. But young men, before they are called for killing, want more assurance*

*than new clichés to the same old tune. Out of uniform or in, more of them are picking up the disquieting cadence of protest singer Phil Ochs: Call it peace or call it treason/ Call it love or call it reason/ But I ain't marching any more.*

In the parlance of the Marxists behind them, such attacks on our Armed Forces are called "revolutionary anti-militarism." According to Dr. Robert Beerstecher, civilian advisor to the Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence:

*For more than half a century, revolutionary anti-militarism has been, and continues to be, the foundation of Soviet strategy for achieving world domination. The power of the state rests upon the military. In order to achieve take-over it is essential to destroy the military establishment and replace it by one of their own manufacture.\**

Of course the Communist strategy of revolutionary anti-militarism predates the Bolshevik Revolution by many years. As the wealthy Friedrich Engels wrote to his co-conspirator and protégé Karl Marx on September 26, 1851: "Surely the fact is evident that a disorganized army and a complete breakdown of discipline has been the condition as well as the result of every victorious revolution. The whole history of humanity proves this simple and indubitable law."

And indeed it has. A key to the success of the Bolshevik Revolution lay in the success of the Communists in spreading pacifism, defeatism, and class hatred among the military forces of the Russian Czar. As the Communist-anarchist Nicholas Bukharin emphasized: "It is necessary,

\*Testimony of Dr. Robert Beerstecher, Senate Armed Services Committee, *Military Cold War Education And Speech Review Policy*, Part 5, Page 1990.

above all things, to undermine and destroy the army in order to overcome the bourgeoisie."

This is exactly what the Bolsheviks did. But note that Communist theory did not insist that the army be defeated by revolutionaries in open battle, nor even that it be won over to their side. Demoralization, division, and subversion were enough to neutralize it. After years of indecisive battle in World War I, the Bolsheviks were able to take advantage of the anger and frustrations of the war-weary Russian army and destroy it as a fighting force. In "Under Lenin's Leadership Bolsheviks Win Over The Army," an article which appeared in the *World Marxist Review* for October of 1969, a Soviet historian comments:

*Marxists have always been aware of the importance of winning away the army from the bourgeoisie and thereby depriving the exploiters of their main force and weapon of class domination.*

*It [the Bolshevik Party] made full use of the opportunities created by the war and the revolution — concentration in the army of the most active part of the workers and peasantry, concentration of army units in the towns and industrial centers, and the new relatively broad political freedoms.*

The *World Marxist Review* further observes that "the Bolsheviks considered work in the army a priority task," noting that "the focal point of Bolshevik agitation was the demand for peace." The Communist propaganda linked the struggle for "peace" with the "struggle for Soviet power." The War was called "unjust." Communist leaflets declared: "This is not our war. It is a war of exploiters and murderers."

The Comrades are now applying to the Armed Forces of the United States these very tactics of revolutionary anti-milita-

rism which proved so successful for them in Russia and elsewhere. And, they make no effort to hide that fact. The following is from the directive on "anti-militarism" adopted on May 3, 1961, by the Nineteenth Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A.:

*Emphasis must also be given to the struggle against the militarization of the U.S. — for the recapturing of war profits through federal taxes, for the slashing of the military budget, for abolition of the ABM, for the ending of the draft and the ROTC in our colleges. Of key importance in these struggles is the fight for wiping out of racism in the armed forces and the extension of full civil liberties to all soldiers.*

*Substantial victories can be won in these struggles in the near future if the battle is carried on with renewed determination and the involvement of ever broader forces. The possibilities are all the greater in that the fight against militarism directly relates to the fight for the urgent domestic needs of the people — for relief from inflation and high taxes, for government social welfare programs, for improved living conditions.*

*In general, the struggle against the war-making tendencies of U.S. imperialism, for disarmament and reduced military budgets, for the outlawing and destruction of nuclear weapons and the ending of the menace of nuclear genocide, is still in its earliest stage. The key tasks in this area are the broadening and a unification of the struggle for peace, the increase of its militancy and anti-imperialist consciousness . . .*

While it is obvious that not all those promoting revolutionary anti-militarism in the United States are Communists, it is interesting that the position of many so-called



The campaign to weaken our military includes removal of all references to God in the Army character guidance courses; official approval of a serviceman's union headed by a Communist; approval by the Secretary of the Army of distribution on base of Communist literature; go-go dancers gyrating in mess-halls; a television recruiting campaign that would embarrass the Boy Scouts, with the slogan "Today's Army wants to join you," and costing \$10.6 million or \$7,200 per recruit; approval by the Secretary of the Navy of beer and women in the barracks, "hard rock" clubs, long hair, and slovenly attire.



**Today's Army  
wants to join you.**



radical "Liberals" differs not one iota from the above officially proclaimed position of the Communist Party. It is not unfair to apply the "Stalin Standard" to such "Liberals." According to Comrade Stalin: "Some are members of the Party, and some are not; but that is a formal difference. The important thing is that both serve the same common purpose."\* If Josef Stalin ever read *Look* magazine he must have enjoyed it immensely.

### Sowing Dragon's Teeth

While the Vietnam War has produced a nationwide harvest of revolutionary anti-militarism, the seeds of this disaster were first sown in the early Sixties in the infamous Fulbright Memorandum.

In 1958 the National Security Council had issued a directive encouraging our Armed Forces to conduct educational programs among military personnel concerning the threat and nature of Communism. Early in 1961, Senator J. William Fulbright submitted a Memorandum to the White House which challenged that directive. When the Memorandum was made public the Communists welcomed it and reprinted portions of it in *The Worker* of August 27, 1961. And little wonder. According to Senator Fulbright the principal threat to our nation was not the menace of Communism, but that of the anti-Communism of the American people. His Memorandum declared:

*In the long run, it is quite possible that the principal problem of leadership will be, if it is not already, to restrain the desire of the people to hit the Communists with everything we've got, particularly if there are more Cubas and Laoses. Pride in victory, and frustration in restraint, during the Korean War, led to MacArthur's revolt and McCarthyism.*

The Arkansas Senator went even further. "Fundamentally," he smirked, "it is

believed that the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war." Senator Fulbright was already on record as having proclaimed that any suspicion of Communism and Russia was a "powerful prejudice" which we must abandon. The sophisticated Rhodes Scholar even compared Lenin's revolution in Russia to the American War of Independence, declaring: "...Is it not strange that we should be so harsh toward Russia? Since we have been the most successful revolutionary people in history, why are we so critical of others who follow our example?" He continued: "As I read history, the Russian experiment in socialism is scarcely more radical, under modern conditions, than the Declaration of Independence..."

Are the Communists a threat to the United States? Do they mean to bury us? Again and again Senator Fulbright declares: "I do not believe the Soviets desire to dominate the world..."

Yet, for all of his pretended ignorance, William Fulbright is Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and is highly regarded by "Liberal" intellectuals as a great authority on Communism. He may be exactly that. In December of 1960, representatives of the Communist Parties of eighty-one countries met in Moscow and issued a manifesto which not only acknowledged the existence of efforts to inform the American public about Communism, but ordered the implementation of immediate counter-measures. The manifesto directed:

*To effectively defend the interests of the working people, maintain peace and realize the Socialist ideals of the working class, it is indispensable to wage a resolute struggle against anti-Communism —*

\*The full text of Stalin's speech appears in House Document 169, 80th Congress, 2nd Session, Page 178.

*that poisoned weapon which the bourgeoisie uses to fence off the masses from Socialism . . .*

Chairman Fulbright moved immediately. And the resultant Fulbright Memorandum had an enormous impact. Implementing the Fulbright dictum, Secretary of Defense Robert Strange McNamara quickly put an end to anti-Communist educational programs in the military. Following Senate Hearings on the Muzzling of the Military, Senator Strom Thurmond observed in *Human Events* for January 27, 1962, that the results of the pro-Communist Fulbright Memorandum were as follows:

*(1) Soft-pedaling statements on Communism in speeches and articles;*

*(2) Shelving or de-emphasizing troop-training programs designed to acquaint military personnel with our insidious Cold War enemy and his brainwashing techniques, which worked so well in the Korean War because our troops were ill-prepared; and*

*(3) Discouragement of utilization of military personnel and facilities in Cold War seminars designed to give the public a better appreciation of the enemy, as authorized in a 1958 National Security Council directive.*

The result of the Fulbright Memorandum was that when American soldiers were sent to Vietnam in the latter half of the decade, all they knew about Communism was what they had learned from "Liberal" schoolmarm of both sexes in the high schools and colleges. The cosseted little darlings had been taught that ours is the era of "peaceful coexistence" and assured that this meant the Communists had renounced their goal of world conquest. "The Communists are mellowing," they had learned. "The Cold War is

over," repeated the "Liberal" ladies of the classroom.

Over and over the cliché was repeated that Communism was no longer a monolithic force, but had become divided by a myriad of nationalisms and dependent upon the charisma of as many national leaders. Adult Americans who had lived through the sellout of Eastern Europe, the fall of China, and the Hungarian revolution were well aware that the Communists had not changed, and would never change. But their experience was all ancient history to the young man of twenty who was drafted and sent to Vietnam. All he knew about Communism he had learned from the "Liberal" ladies who oversaw his education in the era of the New Frontier and the Great Society. Little wonder that so many young Americans wondered why we were in Vietnam.

Had our soldiers been told the truth about the Communists they would have been unwilling to fight the sort of no-win war which the *Insiders* had arranged for Vietnam. But they were not told the truth.

Even officers at our various military schools and institutes were no longer instructed in the nature of the Communist enemy but were instead subjected to courses in winning friends and influencing people. Their instructors were now Ivy League professors and prissy fellows from the State Department. Anti-Communist authors were dropped from the Contemporary Military Reading List and were replaced by "Liberals" who cooed of universal disarmament and a new world order.

Symptomatic of this switch from realistic briefings on the threat of Communism to indoctrination with pro-Communist cant is the attitude revealed by Rear Admiral William Ellis, the Commander of the First Coast Guard District who ordered Simas Kudirka, a Lithuanian seaman, turned back to the Soviets when he sought asylum by leaping aboard a U.S. Coast Guard ship last November. Here,

from the *Congressional Record* of March 25, 1971, is a part of the transcript of the official board of inquiry. Admiral Ellis is speaking:

*... I know I said there was no reason to believe this had actually happened, that they would kill this man and that I am quite sure I said, "Eustis, they are not barbarians."*

*Q. Sir, why do you feel that he had no reason to be afraid?*

*A. ... I didn't and I still don't feel there is [sic] any facts that the Russians go around killing people.*

*Q. Sir, do you recall the Berlin Wall in the early fifties\* with respect to defectors from East Germany?*

*A. This is 1970.*

Told that the Communists were melting, the Admiral had believed it. One can hardly be surprised when ordinary seamen and privates are also duped.

And there has been no lack of revolutionary effort to take advantage of the American serviceman's ignorance of Communism. As *U.S. News & World Report* observed in its issue for May 26, 1969:

*Evidence is accumulating that the so-called New Left and other radical groups are mounting a deliberate assault on morale and discipline in the U.S. armed forces. If it succeeds, defense planners are convinced, the military establishment will amount to little more than an armed rabble ... Immediately at stake is the question of whether the armed forces can continue to enforce the discipline considered vital to survival and success on the battlefield.*

The rise of radical anti-war sentiment among the troops at our military bases has since been the subject of articles by every one of the Establishment slicks,

newsweeklies, and major newspapers. But only *U.S. News* has dared to discuss the Communist influence behind it.

There are at least fourteen anti-war organizations working within the military, sowing seeds of dissension and promoting sabotage and disruption. Most are led by open Communists. The Comrades running this operation are not only members of the Moscow-controlled Communist Party and its youth groups, but also of the Peking-allied Progressive Labor Party, the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and its youth section the Young Socialist Alliance, and the Workers World Party and its Youth Against War and Fascism, as well as several smaller Communist "splinter" organizations. Also active in promoting the growing revolutionary anti-militarism are the two major sections of the Students for a Democratic Society which are now trying to outdo each other in proving their revolutionary zeal.

### Organizing Inside

Mention the idea of unionizing the U.S. Army and many a middle-aged veteran of World War II or Korea will oblige you with a hearty laugh. But the fact is that the American Servicemen's Union, though yet unrecognized as a bargaining agent, is now a highly influential force on our military bases.

The A.S.U. was founded in 1967 for purposes of sabotage and subversion by one Andrew Stapp, an Army private. According to the official Communist newspaper *Daily World* of August 28, 1970: "Stapp, it must be admitted, unlike most G.I.s, joined the Army expressly to subvert it." Within two years his revolutionary union boasted a membership of 8,000 servicemen dedicated to the destruction of the American military.

According to an article by Comrade

\*The ignorance of Communism displayed here is astounding. The Berlin Wall was not built until August of 1961.

Stapp in the radical Communist *Guardian* of September 27, 1969, organizers for the American Servicemen's Union are now "active on 60 bases in the U.S. and 40 abroad." Stapp claims that his union is active in the Pentagon itself. No doubt it is. The Defense Department has already ruled that it is perfectly legal for G.I.s to join the American Servicemen's Union.

Why is that incredible? Because founder Andy Stapp has never made any effort to hide the fact that he is a Communist. He is a member of the Workers World Party, a miniscule Communist splinter spun off from the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party. It looks to Havana and Peking for ideological guidelines. And Comrade Stapp is very clear about the A.S.U. objective. As he puts it: "Just as the Bolshevik Party organized through the Soviets in 1917 against the Czar and the oppression in Russia, the American Servicemen's Union is organizing Soviets within the U.S. imperialist army." The goal of the A.S.U., in Stapp's words, is "building an army within an army, a workers' militia inside the U.S. Army, and along with the [Black] Panthers and others we are going to make revolution."

One of the early draft card burners, Andy Stapp somehow managed to serve two years at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, before his court-martial for distributing Communist literature to recruits on the base, and for urging the use of revolutionary tactics against Fort Sill's commanding officer. Later, however, a "Liberal" federal court ruled that the Army had to award Stapp an honorable discharge on the incredible grounds that he only pursued his subversive activities on off-duty hours. The consequences of this ruling are monumental. The threat of a dishonorable discharge for seditious activities was one of the few protections the military had against revolutionary subversion.

Of course Andy Stapp is not alone in this operation. Another extremely important radical group active among our G.I.s is the United States Servicemen's Fund.

According to the Internal Revenue Service this organization is bankrolled by wealthy "Liberals." Its hierarchy includes such radicals as Fred Gardner, Donald Duncan, Dr. Howard Levy, Mrs. Cora Weiss, the Reverend James Bevel, Noam Chomsky, the Reverend William Sloane Coffin Jr., David Dellinger, and Dr. Benjamin Spock. The Servicemen's Fund is a conduit for pumping funds from rich radicals to organizations working to subvert the military from within.

Among other such subversive groups working within the military are the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee, the Serviceman's Link to Peace, the G.I.-Civilian Alliance for Peace, the Resistance, the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, the Draft Resistance Unions, Negotiate Now, Resisters Inside the Army, and the American Friends Service Committee.

In addition, there are at least six pro-Communist veterans' groups working to influence our servicemen. The largest of these are Vietnam Veterans Against the War and Veterans for Peace in Vietnam (headed by Chicago Communist LeRoy Wolins and Charles Fisher).

While most of the pro-Communist organizations working within the military are aimed at organizing and radicalizing enlisted men, several are now recruiting officers. The most prominent of these is C.O.M., the Concerned Officers Movement. Two of its leaders are Navy Lieutenants (j.g.) Gordon Kerr and James Pahura. Their jobs until June of 1970, according to the *Washington Post* of July 13, 1970, were in the Pentagon. Kerr and Pahura "were members of the team that gave Admiral Moorer\* his morning intelli-

\*Admiral Moorer contributed to the general disintegration of military dignity when on October 25, 1970, he attended a party held by an aide of Henry Kissinger. The *Washington Post* described the Admiral as appearing "resplendent topside in gold braid and artfully attired below in flower-bedecked skivvies trimmed in ruffles."

gence briefing." Admiral Thomas H. Moorer is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the highest ranking military man in uniform.

The *New York Times* reports that C.O.M., which represents about 250 active-duty officers around the world, held a news conference in September 1970 to declare itself "morally and politically" opposed to the war in Vietnam. One of the officers representing C.O.M. was Lt. Louis Font, a 24-year-old honor graduate in the West Point class of 1968, who is now trying to get a discharge on the ground that he is a conscientious objector.

Although many radical opponents of the Vietnam War refused induction in the military, and thousands ran away to Canada or other foreign countries, many hard-core revolutionaries concluded that they could do more harm by joining the service rather than evading it. According to *U.S. News & World Report*:

*The Army in particular is being confronted with a type of draftee hitherto extremely rare in U.S. experience — the man who refuses to pledge allegiance to the United States and will not swear to fight for the nation. What to do about such men, short of clapping them in jail, is a real headache for the Army. Puzzled officers say that if the Army refuses to accept such men, the gates to widespread draft dodging would be opened. On the other hand, if these men are put into uniform they often become vigorous antiwar, anti-military agitators.*

Most such infiltrators are well educated and extremely cagey. They know the law like they know the backs of their hands. *U.S. News* quotes an Army officer recently returned from a training command:

*For a good many years, most of the disciplinary problems have orig-*

*inated with individuals who simply cannot understand what they are supposed to do and the importance of doing it; with people of the near-criminal class to whom all forms of discipline are alien; and with the natural-born 8-balls who are going to get into trouble no matter what.*

*Now we are finding a new breed of man, who thinks he is his own Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense and Attorney General. He considers himself superior to any officer alive. And he is smart enough to go by the book. He walks a real tightrope between the regulations and sedition. How to isolate and deal justly with him is a problem the services and the civilian Government will have to solve with subtlety and finesse.*

The total number of these revolutionary infiltrators is not known, but it is believed to run into the thousands.

### Grounds And Undergrounds

Two of the most attractive nuisances used by the anti-military revolutionaries to promote sedition within the military are coffee houses and underground newspapers. The idea for the G.I. Coffee Houses is credited by the New Left to Fred Gardner, a Harvard-trained Marxist who is president of the previously mentioned United States Servicemen's Fund. There are now some twenty-six such off-base anti-war Coffee Houses attracting G.I.s with rock music and coffee in order to push anti-war literature and how-to-do-it courses in desertion.\* The Coffee Houses are staffed by the wildest sort of radicals, and advertise for volunteers in the various Communist publications. Among such volunteers are co-eds and

\**Newsweek* for February 15, 1971, reported that there were more than 89,000 desertions from the U.S. Armed Forces in 1970 alone.

# These Key Members Of The COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS managed the American defeat in Vietnam



**Walt Rostow**  
*Top Policy Planner*



**Robert McNamara**  
*Secretary of Defense*



**Dean Rusk**  
*Secretary of State*



**McGeorge Bundy**  
*Presidential Assistant*



**Wm. Westmoreland**  
*Army Chief of Staff*



**Stanley Resor**  
*Secretary of Army*



**Paul Nitze**  
*Dep. Sec. of Defense*



**Henry Kissinger**  
*Top Policy Planner*



**Henry Cabot Lodge**  
*Amb. to Vietnam*



**Maxwell Taylor**  
*Amb. to Vietnam*



**Ellsworth Bunker**  
*Amb. to Vietnam*



**George Ball**  
*Undersec. of State*



**A. Yarmolinsky**  
*Dep. Sec. of Defense*



**David Bruce**  
*Negotiator at Paris*



**Averell Harriman**  
*Asst. Sec. of State*



**Edward Lansdale**  
*C.I.A. Specialist*

The Council on Foreign Relations is a corps of elitist *Insiders* who manipulate the American government to such an extent that they were able to set the radical no-win policies which insured America's defeat in Vietnam. There are only 1,400 members of this powerful and secretive Establishment operation — all *Insiders* of enormous wealth or internationalists in key positions like those above.

female dropouts who agree to mix sex with subversion.

Virtually all of the G.I. Coffee Houses are, or have been, supported by the U.S. Servicemen's Fund. Until May of 1970 the Fund was recognized as a tax-exempt "charitable corporation," a determination which was altered when I.R.S. agents found that its main function was promoting dissension among G.I.s and that it was a satellite of the notorious "New Mobilization Committee." New Mobe, cited euphemistically by the House Internal Security Subcommittee as "Communist dominated," has been chief organizer of the major demonstrations against the war in Vietnam.

Also supported by the ubiquitous Servicemen's Fund is "Entertainment Industry for Peace and Justice," the anti-war "show biz" front organized by Jane Fonda, Dick Gregory, and Communist Dalton Trumbo. It now claims over eight hundred movie, television, and recording personalities as supporters. This organization is producing Miss Fonda's anti-military road show, scripted by Jules Pfeiffer and billed as a radical alternative to Bob Hope. Miss Fonda recently told an audience that if Americans really understood what Communism is they would get down on their knees and pray for its establishment here.

Even more influential than the Coffee Houses and dramatic troupes are the some 144 underground newspapers published on, or aimed at, U.S. military bases in this country and overseas. Since 1970, the number of such sheets has increased fully forty percent (up from 103 last fall). The anti-military undergrounders even have their own press syndicate, the Washington-based G.I. Press Service, which calls itself the Associated Press of military underground newspapers. It is a satellite of the "Communist dominated" New Mobe and is headed by radical Marxist Robert Wilkinson.

Reading the underground papers aimed at our servicemen one thinks of

such ludicrous sheets as *The Soldiers' Pravda* and *Worker And Soldier* and *The Trench Pravda* — all published by Lenin and the Bolsheviks in 1917 as part of their successful effort to destroy the Russian army. The content of the current anti-military undergrounders is correctly described by the Communist *Daily World* of December 16, 1969, as follows:

*These newspapers contain accounts of anti-war activities at various posts, letters critical of the war from troops in Vietnam and elsewhere, allegations of excesses of military justice and of racial discrimination and articles and cartoons ridiculing political and military leaders.*

Such papers not only feature the centuries-old gripes of soldiers about food, marching, and inspections, but also promote such themes as: "Don't desert. Go to Vietnam and kill your commanding officer." That line, from a West Coast tabloid, has already become a cliché among the anti-military tabloids.

One such undergrounder which has attracted considerable attention is *OM*, the semi-literary offspring of A.S.U. organizer Roger Priest. Seaman Priest wrote copy for *OM* while stationed in the Pentagon where, according to *Life* magazine, "his duty was to answer public queries about the Navy." Writing in *OM*, Roger Priest urged servicemen to desert. "Be free — go to Canada," he declared. He urged G.I. readers to "shoot a pig," by which he meant to kill a military officer, and to "bomb America."

When Navy authorities charged Priest with sedition, he chose as his attorney one David Rein, identified under oath as a member of the Communist Party, who maintains that Seaman Priest was only exercising his Constitutional rights of free speech. Priest's little love sheet, which has advocated the assassination of President Nixon, has been financed by an \$8,500

grant from the Philip Stern Family Foundation (the Sears Roebuck fortune) which also bankrolled the early bally-hooing of the alleged atrocities at My Lai.

One would assume that distributing these seditious undergrounders would produce a quick trip to the brig for any serviceman found to be involved. Such is not the case. In May of 1969, Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor, a holdover from the Johnson Administration, released a memorandum to all military commanders entitled "Guidance On Dissent." According to this memorandum, commanding officers may no longer prohibit the purchase, possession, or distribution of Communist literature on or off base; they must allow the men under their command to gather at the pro-Communist Coffee Houses or work on anti-war underground newspapers; and, Resor strongly emphasized that membership in a serviceman's "union" is acceptable under Army regulations.

Even so, according to the Secretary of the Army, while it is all right to distribute Communist literature, military officers are prohibited from conducting anti-Communist classes on American military bases.

### The Legal Snarl

There are now at least three well-established lawyer fronts which specialize in making sure that no radicalized G.I. is punished for acts of sedition. Two of these, the G.I. Civil Liberties Defense Committee, and the New York Draft and Military Law Panel, operate openly. A third is a network of lawyers which can only be contacted through the G.I. Alliance, a front in Washington, D.C.,

\*The Leftwardly omnipresent A.C.L.U. recently complained to the Army that lectures, intended to instill a sense of moral responsibility in soldiers, were being used as religious indoctrination. The Army responded by eliminating references to God and religious philosophy in character guidance courses given to our soldiers.

working to coordinate anti-military activities throughout the country.

The *New York Times* of August 17, 1970, names some of the lawyers involved in providing legal services for military dissenters through Alliance and the Lawyers Military Defense Committee. Sponsors include former Attorney General Ramsey Clark; Abraham S. Goldstein, dean of the Yale Law School; Louis Jaffe, professor of law at Harvard; and, John Pemberton, who recently resigned as executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union.\*

A common reaction when Americans learn of the extent and intensity of subversion within the military is to ask whether such subversive activities cannot be prohibited by the passage of tougher laws. The answer is that at present federal law (18 U.S.C. 2387) forbids incitement, counseling, distribution, or preparation of literature and related conspiracies intended to subvert the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the Armed Services. But, despite this tough statute, on the books for many years, neither the Johnson nor Nixon Administration has brought a single criminal prosecution against any of the wide range of individuals and groups whose openly avowed aims are to attack the discipline and destroy the allegiance of the men who serve our Armed Forces. According to military historian Robert Heintz:

*Government lawyers (who ask not to be named) suggested two reasons for failure to prosecute. Under President Johnson, two "liberal" attorneys general, Ramsey Clark and Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, were reportedly unsympathetic to military pleas for help and failed in general to prosecute for sedition of any kind.*

*Besides, the lawyers said, the courts have now gone so far in extending First Amendment shelter to any form of utterance, that there*

is doubt whether cases brought under this law would hold.

*Whatever the reason — and it appears mainly to be disinclination to prosecute or even test existing law — the services are today being denied legal protection they previously enjoyed without question, and at a time when they need it worse than ever before.*

Our military men are caught in a vise with pressure from above and below. So vulnerable have our officers become that some are now being hauled into court by dissident soldiers on nuisance suits designed to harass and annul normal discipline and administrative procedures in the services.

### Now It's Drugs

Yet another spearhead in the war against our military is the massive proliferation of drugs. The hippy ethic, long promoted by both the "Liberal" Establishment and the radical streetbunders, romanced the use of drugs to teenagers who in turn carried drug habits into the services. Now the problem has become even more complex, as use of drugs in Vietnam becomes epidemic.

What is happening is that the Red Chinese are waging drug warfare against us in Southeast Asia. Detailed research conducted by the Republic of China\* indicates that Communist China now produces and sells between 10,000 and 30,000 tons of opium a year. You get some idea of what this means when you note that the world needs no more than

400 tons for legitimate medical use. It is estimated that Red China earns as much as \$2.5 billion annually from its exports of opium and heroin. The use of opium by citizens of Red China is, of course, a capital offense. The total crop is exported.

Meanwhile, the United States is paying Turkey to restrict greatly its production of opium poppies, thus increasing the worldwide demand for Red Chinese heroin. As the editors of the authoritative *Free China Weekly* observed in that journal for February 14, 1971:

*Formerly the mainland exported only opium. Recently some 30 processing plants have been established. Narcotics are now moved out in the less bulky, more profitable form of heroin, morphine and other opium derivatives.*

What is happening is quite clear. The Nixon Administration wishes to open "trade" with Communist China. But Red China has no dollars with which to buy American products, and no prospects for getting any except from the sale of the narcotics on which she is being given a near monopoly. At present, she is busy developing a vast new market — aiming her needle at the American soldier.

According to *Newsweek* of January 11, 1971, great caches of heroin turned up all over Vietnam almost simultaneously last fall. At first G.I.s were told that the drug was cocaine, says *Newsweek*. But it was ninety percent pure heroin — quite something when you realize that most heroin sold in the United States is only five to ten percent pure. *Newsweek* continues:

*The "scag," as the soldiers call it, is at least 90 percent pure. "This H is so strong that a guy can get completely hooked in only two or three days," says a medic who works with addicts. "The first time some G.I.s*

\*It might be charged that it is in the self-interest of Nationalist China to accuse Red China of exporting heroin. However, the extensive reports concerning poppy production in Red China, which the author was allowed to read, indicate that the Nationalist Chinese know very well where the poppies are being grown. They also have extensive intelligence on how Red Chinese opium and heroin are distributed throughout the world and who is doing the distributing.

*buy it, they are told it is a non-addictive form of cocaine."*

The fact that cheap heroin of such richness showed up simultaneously all over Vietnam and was everywhere introduced as cocaine indicated that it was part of a new Communist drug offensive against the U.S. military. This has since been confirmed by military intelligence, which estimates that as a result there are up to 35,000 heroin addicts in South Vietnam. Before returning to the States, our G.I.s are now required to provide specimens for a urine analysis machine which detects recent use of opiates.

According to the *Los Angeles Times*, "The hottest topic of conversation before shipping out [of Vietnam] has quickly become 'the machine' — and how a heroin using soldier can beat it." If an addict-soldier can stay off "the stuff" for three or four days before taking the examination, he can pass the test. And, thousands upon thousands of future customers for Red China's heroin exports are as a result being sent home to America from Vietnam.

With the coming recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations, America will be flooded with heroin brought into the country in diplomatic pouches — the Administration's way of giving the economy of Red China a shot in the arm.

#### **Abolish The Officers**

While the Communists continue needlepoint warfare in Vietnam, their Kiddie Corps at home continues to make direct attacks upon the military. One of the main targets of our teenage Trotskys and schoolboy Lenins is the Reserve Officers Training Corps. There were 511 R.O.T.C. campus units in the 1969-1970 academic year. They trained over 23,000 officers. By contrast, the service academies — West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy — produced only about 2,300 officers, one-tenth the num-

ber. The message is clear. Hit R.O.T.C. and you hit the ability of the United States to defend itself.

Naturally the Communist Party and its factions and splinters have been pursuing an "operation abolition" aimed at R.O.T.C. The platform of the Trotskyite-Communists' Young Socialist Alliance, for instance, lists these priorities:

*Abolish ROTC, end all ties between the university and the military. No military recruiters on campus. End cooperation with the Selective Service System, abolish the draft.*

In the F.B.I. Annual Report for 1969, Director J. Edgar Hoover pointed out that during the 1969-1970 school year, "330 violent demonstrations have been held against the ROTC program and damage thus far attributed to the demonstrations has amounted to millions." As a result, according to Cadet Colonel John Hoffman of Georgetown, "the seniors coming out of high school today hear so much about the anti-ROTC sentiment on the campus that it is no longer stylish to be in ROTC . . ."

Adding fuel to anti-R.O.T.C. incendi- arism are the "Liberals" of university faculties and administrations. A typical surrender to campus revolutionaries occurred at Stanford University where students did \$200,000 in damage in the course of their anti-R.O.T.C. demonstrations. University President Richard W. Lyman then agreed to abolish the program, commenting: "ROTC is costing Stanford too much." While Stanford abolishes R.O.T.C., it retains on its faculty Professor Robert Bruce Franklin, an avowed Peking-oriented Communist who heads the Peninsula Red Guards. Peacenik Franklin and his cadre of young Maoists have already assembled a list of key individuals to be assassinated as soon as the revolution begins. When not leading demonstrations, Professor Franklin

teaches English. Apparently, he is not "costing Stanford too much."

Twenty-four major colleges and universities have already dropped, or decided to drop, their R.O.T.C. programs. Included are Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Dartmouth, Columbia, Brown, Tufts, Stanford, Bowdoin, Boston University, N.Y.U., and Colgate. As a result, about 4,500 officers will be lost to the Armed Services each year. As *U.S. News & World Report* recently noted: "The Pentagon is starting for the first time to worry openly about its future supply of officers." The R.O.T.C. enrollment reached its peak in 1961, with 303,693. By 1970 it had plummeted to 109,598, reflecting not only the general anti-militarism being promoted in the land, but the direct attacks upon R.O.T.C. by Communist and pro-Communist radicals.

#### Attack At The Top

While our Armed Forces stagger and reel from the well-coordinated blows of the rabble at the bottom, the most telling attacks are coming from above. Although our military is almost universally blamed for the mess in Vietnam, all of the key decisions — from commitment, through limited "escalation," to the current withdrawal — have been made by Establishment civilians. The military does not dispute the principle of civilian control; that is American tradition. But our professional soldiers are well aware that it was their civilian bosses in the Pentagon who refused to let them win in Vietnam and then left them holding the bloody bag.

"You've had a lot of 32-year-olds interfering with strategy and even tactics," a general officer with long experience in Vietnam complained to the *New York Times*. "Then, when things fouled up, they got out and wrote books explaining they'd never been involved. Camelot running for cover."

One such attack on the military is contained in the now infamous Pentagon

Papers. These consist of thousands of pages of official documents originating in the State Department, Defense Department, and Central Intelligence Agency. The analysis alone runs to three thousand pages, indicating that the very term Pentagon Papers is a propaganda misnomer. You may be certain that term was carefully chosen. The word Pentagon is associated in the public mind with the military, even though it is controlled by civilians. And while the Papers do reveal some of the deceit and duplicity of the civilians in control, our military officers are portrayed there as bumbling idiots.

The *New York Times* and other newspapers which have reprinted parts of the Pentagon Papers have done their best to view mere contingency plans as dark plottings. Congressman John Schmitz has suggested:

*If the matter were not so serious, perhaps the best solution to the declassification controversy would be to take the tons and tons of paper on which various contingency plans, threat assessments, and policy studies concerning the Vietnam War are written and dump the entire mass into Haiphong Harbor. By the time North Vietnam is able to clear their major port they will have run out of supplies and the war will be over.*

Of course the whole affair is another anti-military propaganda show. The impression is given, for instance, that we tried bombing the North and it failed. Nothing is said of the fact that of the 242 top targets named by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as their priority selections in 1966, only 91 were cleared for bombing by the President.

During 1966, American pilots flew a total of 106,000 combat sorties against the Hanoi regime. Virtually every mission received widespread publicity in this country's "Liberal" news media.

Defense Department officials pointed to the more than two thousand sorties being flown every week against North Vietnam as evidence of a new determination to "hurt the enemy." And, many Americans got up out of their complacency, convinced that at last we were moving to win. It was a fraud. *Less than one percent* of those sorties were flown against the targets designated as vital by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. By the end of the year, on orders from Washington, only 22 of the 242 key strategic installations had been destroyed in North Vietnam. More than 220 of those targets — more than 220 of the major installations which enabled the Communists to continue killing American soldiers in the field — remained in operation, immune from attack on direct orders from the civilian Administration.

Little tidbits like this are ignored by the *Times* and the *Post* and the others — they are apparently not included in the public's "right to know." It is also never mentioned that the two key targets in North Vietnam — Haiphong Harbor and the dikes of the Red River — were never touched.

Haiphong Harbor, through which better than eighty percent of enemy war matériel still passes, contains the perfect target for shutting off military supplies to the North Vietnamese army. The harbor requires a dredge to keep it open by removing the silt which constantly flows into the channel. This dredge could have been put out of action by bombs from a single plane, with the result that ships would not have been able to move in or out of the harbor. You see that dredge was not readily replaceable, and any

replacement would have been equally vulnerable.

More interesting, the thing could have been destroyed without even touching foreign shipping — the excuse most often given for not bombing Haiphong Harbor. Military necessity *required* destruction of that dredge. Both the Johnson and Nixon Administrations have refused to let our military destroy it. For some reason, however, such matters were not a part of the Pentagon Papers.

Actually the Pentagon Papers were misnamed. They should have been called the C.F.R. Papers.\* Although no major newspaper has yet to mention the fact, almost every key figure involved with those Papers is a member of the Establishment *Insiders'* Council on Foreign Relations. All are "Liberals." The men making the policy decisions for the Vietnam War have been the very same men responsible for enforcing the devastating Fulbright Memorandum.

To anyone who has paid close attention to developments in Southeast Asia, nothing substantially new was revealed by the C.F.R. Papers. But an enormous amount was omitted. Unmentioned is the fact that military policies which the United States has followed over the last decade are based on a Top Secret directive prepared in 1961 by Walt Whitman Rostow, an important member of the C.F.R., when he served as Chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Council. A recent report by Paul Scott, Washington's most reliable and energetic reporter, reveals that "After its approval by President Kennedy, the top secret Rostow paper became the basis for the contingency plans and most of the decisions on Vietnam [covered in the *Pentagon Papers*]."

Walt Rostow, the effects of whose policies are now widely being blamed on the military, is further identified as follows by author William J. Gill in his authoritative book *The Ordeal Of Otto Otepka*:

\*The C.F.R. is the Council on Foreign Relations, a New York based organization of 1,400 elite members of the American Establishment who are often referred to as the "Invisible Government" or the "Rockefeller Foreign Office." See my *American Opinion* reprint, "The C.F.R. — Conspiracy To Rule The World," five copies for one dollar.

[Rostow] had a long history of close association with a number of individuals who are known to be members of the Communist Party. Several of these people had been identified as active Soviet espionage agents.

... [Rostow's] aunts were definitely identified, by reliable informants and undercover agents, as members of the Communist Party in the late 1940s. So as far as Otepka knew they were still members in 1955. These aunts were by no means remote relatives. They had been intimately close to the man's family, and the family had never repudiated them.

... [Rostow's] father, a native of Russia, had been an active Socialist revolutionary in his homeland just before the Socialist split into the Bolshevik and Menshevik factions. He had continued, ostensibly, as a Socialist activist after migrating to the United States in 1905, the year of the abortive leftist [Communist] revolt in Russia.... Air Force intelligence, which had investigated him thoroughly in connection with another contract he was to have been involved in for the Air Force, flatly declared the man a security risk — a term not used lightly anywhere in the Intelligence community.

Rostow himself made a mysterious trip to Moscow to confer secretly with Soviet leaders, after which he wrote on Page 549 of his book, *The United States In The World Arena*:

*It is a legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations — including the United States — the right to use substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this residual right is the right of national*

*sovereignty and is the basis for the existence of an international arena of power, it is therefore an American interest to see an end of nationhood as historically defined.*

This is the man who was publicized as a "super-hawk" when he served as presidential advisor for national security affairs under both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. And it was Walt Whitman Rostow, an identified security risk totally committed to disarmament of his own country and the end of its nationhood, who set down the guidelines for fighting, and losing, the war in Vietnam.

Paul Scott further reports that the Rostow policy "has governed U.S. diplomatic negotiations in Paris with the North Vietnamese and our relations with the North's chief arms suppliers, Russia and Communist China. Significantly, one key part of the policy still in effect prohibits the U.S. from making diplomatic or military moves that might humiliate those Communist nations and also ruled out all military measures that might destroy the Communist government in North Vietnam. The American Air Force and Navy were barred from mining Haiphong Harbor although 85 percent of all North Vietnam's war materials come from that port because of the policy to limit the conflict."

Had it not been for the Rostow policy of "limited war," as set down in the "Rostow papers," the United States could have effectively employed its tremendous military power and ended the conflict quickly — saving some 45,000 American lives.

Even so, Paul Scott has now revealed that both the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, which published the purloined Pentagon Papers on the basis of the "public's right to know," supported the "suppression of the 'Rostow papers' when the *Chicago Tribune* and this [Scott's] column tried to lift the document's secrecy lid." At that time Senator

Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, joined the *Times* and the *Post* in their suppression of the damning Rostow directive. All too often the attitude of the *Times* and *Post* on whether something should be published depends upon whether it helps or hurts their friends the Communists.

Columnist Scott suggests that "advance public disclosure and debate on the strict limitations to be imposed on American fighting men under the Rostow policy probably would have caused Congress to bar or seriously question U.S. combat involvement in North Vietnam." Nonetheless, Rostow's "limited war" is still official U.S. policy, and columnist Scott suggests that it is well past time that Congress decided if this policy is to be continued. He states that a Congressional inquiry should "go into the impact that the adoption of the Rostow policy had on over-all U.S. military strength, U.S. strategic weapons systems, the morale of the armed forces, and the will of this country to oppose aggression in the future."\*

### The C.F.R. Runs Things

We have already noted that practically every major figure in the Pentagon Papers caper has been a member of the *Insiders'* Council on Foreign Relations. Our last four Ambassadors to Vietnam — Frederick Nolting, General Maxwell Taylor, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Ellsworth Bunker — are all members of that umbratile organization. Other top members of the Council on Foreign Relations who according to the Pentagon Papers played important roles in creating or carrying out our disastrous policies in Vietnam include Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitze, Undersecretary of State George Ball, Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor, special assistant for national security affairs McGeorge Bundy, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Amazingly, even the commander of our Army for most of the war in Vietnam, General William Westmoreland, is a member of the subversive C.F.R. As is Daniel Ellsberg, the man who stole the Pentagon Papers and gave them to the *New York Times*.

We are told that Ellsberg, once a McNamara "Whiz Kid," is a former "raging hawk" turned "outraged dove." Well, it makes a good cover story. But there were no "raging hawks" around McNamara, and Ellsberg is reported to have received his appointment at the recommendation of the notorious Adam Yarmolinsky, a member of the C.F.R. and himself a serious security risk. State Department Chief Security Officer Raymond A. Laughton resigned his position when he was overruled by higher authority concerning his refusal on security grounds to clear Yarmolinsky. Laughton had reviewed the F.B.I. report, Army intelligence reports, and other data concerning Yarmolinsky — and had refused to issue a security clearance. Adam Yarmolinsky, Daniel Ellsberg's benefactor, was then "cleared" topside by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara himself, and went on to be a major behind-the-scenes policymaker in the Kennedy Administration.

In 1961, when Ellsberg was supposed to be a militant anti-Communist, he attended a conference of the subversive War Resisters International at Haverford

\*Rostow's carefully arranged, if thoroughly phony, reputation as a militant hawk so alienated his colleagues at M.I.T. that he was unable to return to his teaching position there. As Paul Scott observes: "Dr. Rostow teaches at the University of Texas. He also continues to serve as an advisor to former President Johnson. Under arrangements made with President Nixon, Rostow receives regular secret policy briefings on foreign and domestic affairs and has access to some of the most sensitive information in government." Rostow got into government only because his security clearance, which he failed to pass, was waived by the Kennedy Administration. Security procedures are obviously no better under the Nixon Administration.

College. He was no more a hawk than I am a two-toed nuthatch.

Much of the "credibility" concerning Ellsberg being a hawk turned dove is based on the fact that he once served in Vietnam. His service in Vietnam was as a member of the staff of Major General Edward Lansdale, another member of the C.F.R. and an important C.I.A. operator. For many years Lansdale worked effectively in Vietnam destroying anti-Communist opposition to his friend Ho Chi Minh. At the time of the release of the Pentagon Papers, Ellsberg was a senior research fellow at the C.I.A.-financed Center for International Studies at M.I.T.

Needless to say, release of the Pentagon Papers was arranged by the Establishment *Insiders*. If Ellsberg is actually convicted and sent to jail for stealing classified military documents,\* it will only be because a George Wallace has become President of the United States. In the meantime, these papers are geared to shaming America into making further concessions to the Communists, even as they are used to damn the military and provide a smokescreen for further sellout.

The fact is that our military is not only being attacked at the top, it is being taken over at the top. Over the years the Council on Foreign Relations has initiated into its lodge a number of top military-politicians who are willing to play games with the international Left in return for advancement to the top. You doubt it? Consider a report in the *Boston Globe* of May 14, 1971, which concerns itself with a Nixon meeting with important advisors to discuss American policy in Europe. Twelve of the seventeen top advisors gathered at the White House

\*Ellsberg's attorney, by the way, is Leonard Boudin — a registered agent of Fidel Castro, and longtime defender of Communists. Another Boudin client is Father Philip Berrigan, under indictment for the alleged conspiracy to kidnap Presidential aide Henry Kissinger. Boudin's daughter Kathy is wanted on an F.B.I. warrant in connection with the investigation of the Weatherman faction of the S.D.S.

were members of the C.F.R. They included five Army generals: General Andrew J. Goodpaster, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe; General Lucius Clay, former commander of U.S. forces in Europe; and three former N.A.T.O. commanders, Generals Alfred M. Gruenther, Lauris Norstad, and Lyman Lemnitzer.

In 1962, the Council on Foreign Relations even initiated a Military Fellows program in which selected senior officers from our Armed Forces now spend a year *on active duty* in "special studies" at C.F.R. headquarters in New York. Since that time, thirteen high-ranking officers have been schooled at the C.F.R. headquarters.

The C.F.R. operators are very interested in the education of our military leaders. The *New York Herald Tribune* of April 6, 1962, reported as follows:

*Dr. James Phinney Baxter III, former president of Williams College, was named yesterday as the first long-term civilian educational consultant to the academic board of the U.S. Military Academy [at West Point] . . . . Since September he has been senior fellow of the Council on Foreign Relations in New York.*

It was apparently important to make certain that no reactionary professor at West Point attempted to evade the Fulbright Memorandum, infecting our future officers with an informed anti-Communism. The boys at the C.F.R. know what they are doing.

And control of our military is a very important part of the game. In the Arms and Security section of the Annual Report of the Council on Foreign Relations for 1969, the C.F.R. leadership openly declares:

*The Council also set up a discussion group on Non-Nuclear Military Force in a Nuclear Age. Profes-*

sors Ernest R. May and Adam Yarmolinsky were co-chairmen of the group . . . . The general aim of the meeting was to try to determine what conventional military forces the United States should maintain for which uses in what circumstances . . . .

Can there be any doubt that the C.F.R. means to set American military policy? What that portends becomes obvious when we remember that the co-chairman of the above group, Professor Adam Yarmolinsky, admitted under questioning that as early as his student days at Harvard, "I was inclined to believe, that a so-called Communist government was a desirable end." We know of nothing in Yarmolinsky's career since that day to indicate that his inclinations have changed one iota.

#### Morale And Discipline

Already the revolutionary anti-militarism attacking our services both from above and below has wreaked a fearsome toll in morale. This is reflected in re-enlistment rates for all services — which are now about thirty percent, down from fifty percent in 1966, and at the lowest level in fifteen years. The problem is most acute among men in highly technical jobs, and in the combat arms of infantry, artillery, and armor.

The Navy, which would like to retain forty-five percent of its young surface-fleet officers, is keeping only thirteen percent; the Army isn't doing much better in holding its young reserve officers now on active duty. For volunteer enlisted men serving their first tour — the prime targets of retention efforts — the re-enlistment rate last fiscal year fell to less than fourteen percent, compared with twenty-three percent in 1966. And these rates would probably be worse except for a tough civilian job market in a sluggish economy.

Morale in Vietnam is incredibly bad.

Our soldiers know we are pulling out, and none wants to be the last man killed in a meaningless no-win war. According to Holger Jensen of Associated Press:

*Everywhere in Vietnam you can find signs of insubordination in the line units, hopelessness in the rear and general disgust with the war — the way it's being fought, the way it isn't being fought, the reasons for its being fought at all.*

*Isolated pockets of high morale still exist in some elite combat outfits . . . . But their "gung ho" seems overshadowed by a general malaise among 335,000 U.S. troops who know they're going home and want to do it now. Washington says they can't, so they take their rage out on officers, non-commissioned officers, and sometimes themselves.*

Every war has seen its attacks on officers by enlisted men under their command, but these previously rare instances have reached an extremely high level in Vietnam. "Fragging" — involving the throwing of fragmentation hand-grenades at unpopular noncoms or lieutenants — has become common. Bounties, raised by common subscription among privates and Spec. 4s in amounts running anywhere from \$50 to \$1,000, have been widely reported. Sergeant Gene Tingley describes the situation as he saw it in Vietnam:

*If I stood at the bottom of a hill and just picked 10 soldiers at random, and had 15 enemy on top of that hill, I could say "We're going to take that hill," and I'd have 10 heads go up and say, "F\*\*\* You, Sergeant." That's exactly what I'd get. Our military is strictly going downhill as far as discipline is concerned.*

Writing from Vietnam, another American soldier is quoted in the *New York*

*Times*: "They have set up separate companies for men who refuse to go out into the field. It is no big thing to refuse to go to such and such a place, he no longer goes through the hassle of refusing; he just packs his shirt and goes to visit some buddies at another base camp . . ."

The services are also having trouble with a generation gap compounded by subversive propaganda. Spec. 4 Glenn Gahrman, twenty-two, put it succinctly: "There are two wars in Vietnam. The one against Charlie and the one against the lifers. 'Lifers' are career N.C.O.s and officers, many of them veterans of World War II and Korea. They're not used to having orders questioned by 18 to 20-year-old draftees. They can't understand distaste for military life. They think the draftees are unpatriotic. The draftees hate the lifers and show it with F.T.A. [F\*\*\* The Army] signs, peace symbols, and obscene jeers." As Colonel Robert Heintl Jr. observes:

*By every conceivable indicator, our Army that now remains in Vietnam is in a state approaching collapse, with individuals and units avoiding or having refused combat, murdering their officers and non-commissioned officers, drug-ridden, and dispirited where not near-mutinous.*

Meanwhile, the military tries to meet the challenge of the Age of Aquarius. And some would rather switch than fight. The result is that many other professional soldiers would rather quit than switch. On many bases strict discipline is out. As the *Los Angeles Times* describes it: "What it all boils down to is the effort of the military to produce a training system that reflects the society from which trainees spring." In other words, the Army is trying to accommodate itself to the hippy ethic.

The U.S. Army has recently completed a thirteen-week advertising campaign on

radio and television at a cost of \$10.6 million. The theme of the campaign was: "Today's Army wants to join you." In a typical ad, the voice of a U.S. Army recruiter, backed by a throbbing rock guitar, makes a pitch for life in the "mod" Army. The Army now figures the cost per recruit of this TV drive at \$7,200 each.

Is there really a new "mod" Army? Colonel Heintl describes the situation at Fort Carson, Colorado:

*In the 4th Mechanized Division at Fort Carson, Spec. 4 David Gyongyos, on his second year in the Army, enjoys an office across the hall from the division commander, a full-time secretary, and staff car and driver also assigned full-time. He has the home phone numbers of the general and chief of staff and doesn't hesitate to use them out of working hours when he feels it is necessary.*

Gyongyos (with a bachelor's degree in theology and two years' law school) is chairman of the division's enlisted men's councils, a system of elected representatives made up of privates and Spec. 4s (NCOs aren't allowed) which sits at the elbow of every unit commander down to the companies.

"I represent, electively," Gyongyos expansively told this reporter, "the 17,000 men on this post."

The division sergeant major, with a quarter-century in the Army, who is supposed to be the division's first soldier and — non-electively — father, and ombudsman of every soldier, has an office which is not even on the same floor with the general (or Spec. 4 Gyongyos either). He gets his transportation, as needed, from the motor pool. He does not "rap" freely over the phone to the general's quarters.

This "experiment," and similar ones at other military bases, is not looked upon with great favor by career N.C.O.s. But most major units of the Army, Navy, and Air Force now have some form of enlisted men's councils, as well as junior officers' councils. Shades of the Army of the Czar! Even the trainee companies at Fort Ord, California, have councils, made up of recruits, who take questions and complaints past their Drill Instructors to company commanders.

In some outfits, old-line sergeants are put through "sensitivity training" to help them relate better to their young charges, and some commanding officers insist that senior noncoms will have to bend still further. "Those who can't adjust," one colonel told me, "will simply have to leave the Army."

Certainly all of this has the approval of the C.F.R.'s General Westmoreland, now Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army.

For his part the Navy's Chief of Staff, Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, seems bent on turning the fleet into a seagoing Woodstock. He is allowing long hair, beards, beer in the barracks, "hard rock" clubs on the bases, and a general relaxation of discipline.

Back on June 2, 1965, Zumwalt had become the nation's youngest Rear Admiral at forty-four. According to the Navy's *All Hands* of July 1970, "his selection to the rank came while he was serving as executive assistant and naval aide to Paul H. Nitze, then Secretary of the Navy." Nitze, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, has for many years been a certified member of the disarmament lobby. In 1958 he was head of a five-man committee of the National Council of Churches which opposed development of U.S. military strength, except under U.N. control; opposed retaliation by the United States even if our country were attacked; advocated handing over our Strategic Air Command to the U.N.; and, called for delivering Quemoy and Matsu to the

Chinese Communists. Congressman Joe D. Waggoner remarked that the Nitze Committee's document was "a running theme of appeasement, coexistence, and surrender, the likes of which probably cannot be found in any other document this side of the Iron Curtain."

How much Nitze and his C.F.R. comrades have had to do with Zumwalt being named to run the Navy is conjectural. However he got the job, Zumwalt's Russian wife thinks he is doing just fine.

Only the Marine Corps is declining the new ride. "We will continue to take the hard line," says one Marine general. "We think we can get 200,000 volunteers, cut their hair and shave their faces. It will be a challenge, but maybe it's the only one left." Marines are laughing openly at both the Army and Navy. Their recruiting posters announce that they are "looking for a few good men." They warn: "We don't promise you a rose garden."

History says that the Marine Corps approach is right. After all, it has all happened before. In 1947, the Army implemented many of the recommendations of the Doolittle Commission, which for that day were as radical as what Westmoreland and Zumwalt are doing today. Many N.C.O.s quit the Army in disgust. Major John Alger, writing in the February 1970 issue of *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, comments on what happened when the "new" Army of the post-War era found itself on the battlefields of Korea:

*Ejected suddenly from the soft life of the occupation army in Japan the troops had not been adequately prepared mentally or physically for war in Korea or anywhere else. They were not to blame when they did not live up to the combat tradition of the Regular Army. As one skeptic remarked, "They were trained for everything but war." There were many instances of individual bravery which*

were played up by the press, with less frequent references to a new term, "bug out."

While the Army had been experimenting with troop information lectures and the new psychological approach to disciplinary problems, the Marines continued to maintain their traditional standards based on strict discipline and rigorous combat training.

The contrast in fighting quality was embarrassing.

Alarmed at the "new" soft trends in our military, Congressman Edward Herbert of the House Armed Services Committee comments:

*Those in charge in the military who are going to go around and allow themselves to be sucked in by permissiveness had better pause and wait and watch and look and listen and see what's happened to this country. I'm afraid they're trying to make it a country club. The little things like haircuts and beards . . . are not as important as an individual would place on them but they are important in the area of discipline. There's the thing that counts.*

And there can be no doubt of it. As far back as 1933, General Douglas MacArthur observed in his annual report as Chief of Staff of the United States Army:

*The unfailing formula for production of morale is patriotism, self-respect, discipline, and self-confidence within a military unit, joined with fair treatment and merited appreciation from without. It cannot be produced by pampering*

*or coddling an army, and it is not necessarily destroyed by hardship, danger, or even calamity . . . It will quickly wither and die if soldiers come to believe themselves the victims of indifference or injustice on the part of their government, or of ignorance, personal ambition, or ineptitude on the part of their leaders.*

Yet, as if morale and discipline weren't bad enough, the Nixon Administration has now caused introduction of a bill which would allow officers and enlisted men from our military services to be given special assignments in the domestic programs of other civilian bureaus as part of the President's bureaucrat reorganization program. Henry Kissinger, virtually a proxy-President, wants to give the military a new civic-action mission. He says the program is a way to create a "new military man" who sees the real enemies of the United States not as Communism but as hunger, racism, pollution, and over-population.

It would seem almost redundant at this point to mention that Henry A. Kissinger came to his position in the Nixon Administration from the staff of the Council on Foreign Relations.

The overwhelming majority of our professional military men are dedicated patriots. They deserve our support. The best way we can support them is to get the unilateral disarmers, the one-worlders, and the rest of the Leftist clique off the backs of our admirals and generals. This means sending the C.F.R. stooges back to shuffling papers in international banks, sending William Fulbright back to the University of Arkansas, Henry Kissinger back to Hollywood, and Richard Nixon back to his New York law firm. ■ ■

## CRACKER BARREL

■ What the country needs is not New Deals, Fair Deals, or Chou Deals . . . but old-fashioned Ideals.

■ Taxpayers are gradually being lulled into believing that there is little difference between a million and a billion dollars.