

MARXMANSHIP IN DALLAS

Revilo P. Oliver, *American Opinion*, Volume VII, No. 2, February 1964, pp. 13–28

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

We all know what happened in Dallas on the twenty-second of November. It is imperative that we understand it.

Lee Harvey Oswald was a young punk who defected to the Soviet, taking with him the operational codes of the Marine Corps and such other secrets as a fledgling traitor had been able to steal while in military service. He not only forfeited his American citizenship by his acts, but also officially repudiated it under oath in the American Embassy in Moscow. He was then trained in sabotage, terrorism, and guerilla warfare (including accurate shooting from ambush) in the well-known school for international criminals near Minsk, and while there he married the daughter of a colonel in the Soviet military espionage system (and possibly also in the Secret Police).^{*} In 1962, after he had been trained for three years in Russia, the Communist agent and his Communist wife were brought to the United States, in open violation of American law, by our Communist-dominated State Department.

On his arrival in this country, Oswald took up his duties as an agent of the Conspiracy, spying on anti-Communist Cuban refugees, serving as an agitator for “Fair Play for Cuba,” and participating in some of the many other forms of subversion that flourish openly in defiance of law through the connivance of the Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy. In April of 1963, he was sent to Dallas, where he tried to murder General Edwin Walker. The failure does not reflect on the assassin’s professional training: General Walker happened to turn his head at the instant the shot was fired. According to a story that has been neither confirmed nor denied officially at the time that I write, Oswald was arrested as a suspect, but was released through the personal intervention of Robert F. Kennedy, and all inquiry into the attempted assassination of a great American was halted.[†]

In November, Oswald was sent back to Dallas, where a job in a suitably located building had been arranged for him. He shot the President of the United States from ambush, left the building undetected, and would have escaped to Mexico but for some mischance. He was stopped for questioning by a vigilant policeman, whom he killed in a moment of panic. Arrested and identified, he, despite his training, was so vain as to pose for photographs while triumphantly giving the Communists’ clenched-fist salute; he asked for a noted Communist attorney, who had been a member of the little Communist cell that included the noted traitor, Alger Hiss; and he began to tell contradictory stories.

^{*} If you missed the detail about Mrs. Oswald’s father, see the *Congressional Record* for December 4, page 22215.

[†] Reprinted in *The Councilor* (228 Oil & Gas Bldg., Shreveport, La.), December 20, 1963.

He was accordingly liquidated before he could make a complete confession.

There are many other significant data, but I have stated the essentials. They are known to you.

The fact that they are known to you should give you—if you are an American—hope and courage. You will need both.

Obviously, something went wrong in Dallas—in our favor, this time. The best laid schemes of mice and men gang aft a-gley—and so do schemes of Communists, sometimes. The identification of the murderer was a near-miracle. If not the result of divine intervention, it was the result of a series of coincidences of the same order as might enable a bum with a dollar in his pocket to enter a casino in Reno and emerge with a thousand.

It is highly significant that, after Oswald was arrested, you learned the facts. That proves that the Communist Conspiracy's control of the United States is not yet complete.

I firmly believe that in our nation as a whole the overwhelming majority of local policemen, whom we shamefully neglect and take for granted, are brave and honorable Americans. But I know nothing of the police in Dallas. It is quite possible that, as is usual in our large cities, they are subject to great pressures from a corrupt municipal government. I shall not be greatly astonished if, in the course of the Conspiracy's frantic efforts to confuse us with irrelevancies, it should be disclosed that pay-offs had been made by Jakob Leon Rubenstein, alias Ruby, and other members of the underworld that pander to human vice and folly. It is by no means impossible that crypto-Communists have been planted in that police force. But paint the picture as dark as you will, it remains indisputably true that, at the very least, there were enough honest and patriotic men on that police force to bring about the arrest of Oswald, to identify him, and to prevent both his escape and his assassination "while trying to escape." It required a gunman from the outside to do the job.

It is quite true that the Communist Conspiracy, through the management of great broadcasting systems and news agencies, through the many criminals lodged in the Press, and through many indirect pressures (such as allocation of advertising and harassment by bureaus of the federal government), has a control over our channels of communication that seems to us, in our moments of discouragement, virtually total. As was to be expected, a few moments after the shot was fired in Dallas, the vermin, probably in obedience to general or specific orders issued in advance of the event, began to screech out their diseased hatred of the American people, and, long after the facts were known to everyone, went on mechanically repeating, like defective phonograph records, the same vicious lies about the "radical right" until fresh orders reached them from headquarters. But the significant fact is that there were enough honest American newsmen, in the United States and abroad, to make it impossible to conceal the Conspiracy's connection with the bungled assassination. That is very encouraging.

The Show And The Sorrow

All that could be done at the moment to obscure the Communists' mischance was to stage an elaborate spectacle with all the technical virtuosity seen in a performance of *Aida* in the Baths of Caracalla or the amphitheater at Verona, supplemented with the cruder devices of Hollywood's expert vulgarians. Every effort was made to incite an orgy of bathos and irrationality. For the most part, the good sense of the American people

frustrated the efforts of the showmen. But we need to consider the facts clearly and objectively.

There are two basic reasons why the American people were shocked and grieved by the assassination. Neither has anything to do with either the personal character of the victim or the identity of the assassin.

(1) The victim was the President of the United States; he was therefore symbolically representative of the nation, and his assassination was a form of armed attack on our country. The alarm, indignation, and sorrow excited by such an attack should have no relation to either the private life or the public character of the person who was President. To put the matter as clearly as possible, the crime would have been every bit as horrible and shocking, had it (*per impossibile*) been absolutely certain that on the very next day the President would be impeached, tried, convicted, removed from office, and executed for his own crimes. That would be tomorrow, and would not affect today, when he is still legally invested with the dignity of his high office.

All decent men feel instinctively that the order, the stability, the preservation of civilized society requires that the officers whom that society has appointed in conformity with its own constitution be inviolate so long as they are clothed with the dignity of office, however mistaken and unfortunate their appointment may have been. So long as the officer has not outlawed himself by violent usurpation, any misuse of the powers legally bestowed upon him indicates either a defect in the constitution (which may grant excessive powers or provide inadequate checks) or the fatuity of citizens who tolerate abuses for which constitutional remedies are available. In either case, the abuse is primarily evidence that the society must learn to correct legally. And if the society cannot learn from experience, there is no hope for it anyway.

(2) Regardless of office, political violence is always shocking and a warning of impending collapse. The Roman Republic was doomed as soon as it became clear that the wealthy and high-born renegade, Clodius, could send his gangsters into the streets with impunity; when the decent people of Rome tried to protect themselves by hiring gangsters of their own under Milo, that was not an answer: It was a confession of defeat. The assassination of Kennedy, quite apart from consideration of the office that he held, was an act of violence both deplorable and ominous—as ominous as the violence excited by the infamous Martin Luther King and other criminals engaged in inciting race war with the approval and even, it is said, the active co-operation of the White House. It was as deplorable and ominous as the violence of the uniformed goons (protected by reluctant and ashamed soldiers) whom Kennedy, in open violation of the American Constitution, sent into Oxford, Mississippi, to kick into submission American citizens, whom the late Mr. Kennedy had come to regard as his subjects.

Such lawlessness, regardless of the identity of the perpetrators or their professed motives, is as alarming as the outbreak of a fire in a house; and if not speedily extinguished, will destroy the whole social order. That is a fact that all conservatives know, for it is they who read the lessons of human history and understand how hard it is to build and how easy it is to destroy—how perishable and precious are the moral restraints and the habitual observance of them by which civilization shelters itself from the feral barbarism that is latent in all peoples. That is the very fact that “Liberal intellectuals” try to conceal with the contorted sophistries that they are perpetually devising to justify as “social good” or “progress” the murders and massacres that secretly

fascinate and excite them. That is why conservatives try to conserve what “Liberals” seek to destroy.

The foregoing are two good and sufficient reasons why Americans were shocked and grieved by the assassination in Dallas. Let them suffice us. It is imperative that we do not permit ourselves to be confused at this critical time by a twisted proverb and residual superstition.

Taboo

The maxim, *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*, has long been a favorite dictum of Anglo-Saxons (for some reason, it is seldom cited on the continent of Europe). Reference books usually attribute it to one of the Seven Sages, Chilo, who lived in the early part of the Sixth Century B.C.; but that is a mistake. In his precepts for prudent conduct, roughly similar to Benjamin Franklin’s, Chilo urges us not to *malign* the dead (*ton technekota me kakologeîn*). He was interested in our own integrity, not the comfort or reputation of the deceased, and the precept is on a par with his advice that we should not utter idle threats in a quarrel because that is womanish.

Whatever the source of the phrase so glibly quoted these days, the notion that one should speak only good of the departed is compounded of various sentiments. It undoubtedly had its origin in man’s deep-seated and primitive fear of the dead—a fear lest the Manes may somehow hear what we say and, if angered, use their mysterious powers to work harm upon us. That residual awe is supplemented by our infinite pity for the dead, and our hope that after life’s fitful fever they sleep well. Pity is reinforced by the strong impulse toward generosity and kindness that, although biologically inexplicable, is found in all decent men. And that kindness is directed in part toward the living, for even the most odious and despicable beings may be survived by someone who grieves for them. Even Nero had one concubine who loved him. Acte wept for him and saw to it that his body was decently buried. And we honor her for it.

The dictum has become a fixed convention. We all know the story of the old men in a rural community who attend the funeral of one of their contemporaries. Having known the old reprobate all his life, they stand silently in a circle, tongue-tied, uneasily shuffling their feet, eyeing one another and searching their memories, until one is at last able to say, “Well, when Jake was a boy, he was mighty nigh the best speller in the sixth grade.”

As an expression of courtesy and personal kindness, the dictum is unexceptionable. In politics and history it is utter nonsense—and everyone knows that it is. Were the dictum taken seriously, history would be impossible, for no page of it can be written without recording the follies and the crimes of the dead. Not even the sentimental innocents who now, under expert stimulation, weep over the “martyred President” believe in the dictum *de mortuis*—at least, I have yet to hear one of them utter a lament for Adolf Hitler, although Adolf is certainly as defunct as Jack and therefore presumably as much entitled to post-mortem consideration.

Taboos are for barbarians, who indulge in tribal howling and gashing of cheeks and breast whenever a big chief dies or an eclipse portends the end of the world. We are a civilized race.

In memoriam aeternam

Rational men will understand that, far from sobbing over the deceased or lying to

placate his vengeful ghost, it behooves us to speak of him with complete candor and historical objectivity. Jack was not sanctified by a bullet.

The departed Kennedy is the John F. Kennedy who procured his election by peddling boob-bait to the suckers, including a cynical pledge to destroy the Communist base in Cuba. He is the John F. Kennedy with whose blessing and support the Central Intelligence Agency staged a fake “invasion” of Cuba designed to strengthen our mortal enemies there and to disgrace us—disgrace us not merely by ignominious failure, but by the inhuman crime of having lured brave men into a trap and sent them to suffering and death. He is the John F. Kennedy who, in close collaboration with Khrushchev, staged the phoney “embargo” that was improvised both to befuddle the suckers on election day in 1962 and to provide for several months a cover for the steady and rapid transfer of Soviet troops and Soviet weapons to Cuba for eventual use against us. He is the John F. Kennedy who installed and maintained in power the unspeakable Yarmolinsky-McNamara gang in the Pentagon to demoralize and subvert our armed forces and to sabotage our military installations and equipment. He is the John F. Kennedy who, by shameless intimidation, induced weaklings in Congress to approve treasonable acts designed to disarm us and to make us the helpless prey of the affiliated criminals and savages of the “United Nations.”

I have mentioned but a few of the hundred reasons why we shall never forget John F. Kennedy. So long as there are Americans, his memory will be cherished with distaste. If the United States is saved by the desperate exertions of patriots, we may have a future of true greatness and glory—but we shall never forget how near we were to total destruction in the year 1963. And if the international vermin succeed in completing their occupation of our country, Americans will remember Kennedy while they live, and will curse him as they face the firing squads or toil in a brutish degradation that leaves no hope for anything but a speedy death.

Three Explanations

Why was Kennedy murdered by the young Bolshevik? With a little imagination, it is easy to excogitate numerous explanations that are not absolutely impossible: (a) Oswald was a “madman” who acted all alone just to get his name in the papers; (b) Oswald was a poor shot who was really trying to kill Governor Connally or Mrs. Kennedy and hit the President by mistake; (c) the person killed was not Kennedy but a double, and the real Kennedy is now a guest aboard a “flying saucer” on which he is heroically negotiating with Martians or Saturnians to Save the World. With a little time and a fairly wide reading in romantic fiction, anyone can think of sixty or seventy fantasies as good or better than those that I have mentioned.

On the evidence, however, and with consideration of human probabilities, there are only three explanations that are not preposterous, viz.:

(1) That Kennedy was executed by the Communist Conspiracy because he was planning to turn American. For this comforting hypothesis there is no evidence now known. Every since January, 1961, some hopeful Americans have maintained that Jack was a conservative at heart, that he deliberately packed his administration with Schlesingers, Rostows, and Yarmolinskys so that these would bring our nation so near to disaster that even the stupidest “Liberal,” not in the employ of the Conspiracy, could not overlook the obvious, and when an unmistakable crisis at last made it politically feasible,

Kennedy would carry out a sudden and dramatic *volte-face*, sweep the scum out of Washington, and rally the forces of the great majority of loyal and patriotic Americans.

I wish I could believe that. It is true that the late Senator McCarthy praised the young Kennedy, but although the Senator was a great American whose memory we must all revere, he was not preternaturally gifted: He could have been either deceived by a smooth-talking hypocrite (as have been greater men than he in the past) or mistaken in his estimate of a person who, although then sincere in his allegiance to what then seemed to be the winning side, later thought it expedient to change sides. It is also true that Kennedy said some fine things in speeches delivered just before his death, but those statements did not significantly differ from the pro-American flourishes normally used as seasoning in the boob-bait manufactured by Salinger's technicians during the past three years.

If Kennedy did entertain laudable designs, he cannot have kept them entirely *in petto*; he must have disclosed them to a few persons, perhaps including his father, in whom he had confidence. And if he did, the time for those persons to give evidence is now, while there is still a chance to clear the reputation of the deceased.

(2) That the assassination was the result of one of the rifts that infrequently occur within the management of the Communist Conspiracy, whose satraps sometimes liquidate one another without defecting from the Conspiracy, just as Persian satraps, such as Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus, made war on one another without revolting or intending to revolt against the King of Kings.

Now it was generally suspected for some time before the assassination that Khrushchev and Kennedy were planning to stage another show to bamboozle the American suckers just before the election next November. According to this plan, a fake "revolt" against Castro would be enacted by the Communist second team, which has long been kept in reserve for such an eventuality. (Cf. *American Opinion*, March, 1962, p. 33.) The "democratic revolution" was to be headed by a Communist agent who differed from Fidel only in being less hairy and less well known to Americans, so that the *New York Times*, the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, and our other domestic enemies could swear once again that the vicious criminal was an "agrarian reformer," an "anti-Communist," and the "George Washington of Cuba." (It is confidently believed in conspiratorial circles that the dumb brutes in the United States will never learn—until it is much too late.)

What is not certain is the script for the third act of the comedy. Most (but not all) informed observers believe that this performance in Cuba was to accomplish two things: (a) the reelection of Kennedy and most of his stooges in Congress, which would, of course, be impossible without some seasonably contrived and major "crisis"; and (b) the endlessly repeated and trite device of making the tax-paying serfs in the United States, who have financed every important Communist conquest since 1917, work to provision and fortify another conquest under the pretext that by so doing they in some mysterious way "fight Communism."

Now, if those observers are correct in their projections, the scenario called for the "success" of the "democratic revolution." And that would involve, if the play was to be convincing, the liquidation of Fidel and a few of his more notorious accomplices. And that, as is well known to everyone who has made even the slightest study of Communism, would be merely commonplace and normal.

The rabid rats of Bolshevism devour one another—and no one knows that better than the rats themselves. Almost all of the Conspiracy's most famous murderers—Trotsky, Zinoviev (Apfelbaum), Kirov (Kostrikov), Kamenev (Rosenfeld), Yezhov, Beria, and a hundred others, possibly including Stalin—were murdered by their insatiably blood-thirsty confederates. Indeed, it is a general rule that only accident or disease can save a Communist “leader” from assassination or execution by other Communists as soon as his usefulness to the Conspiracy is ended or his liquidation will provide an opportunity for useful propaganda.

Cornered rats will fight for their lives. Castro, of course, knew of the planned “revolution,” and if the dénouement was correctly foreseen by American observers, he also knew that, whatever solemn pledges may have been given him by his superiors, he would not survive. It is possible, therefore, that Fidel arranged the assassination of Jack in the hope of averting, or at least postponing, his own. Now that Oswald is silenced and superiors who gave him his orders are unidentified, it may never be possible completely to disprove that hypothesis, although there are a number of considerations that weigh against it.

We should note, also, that a few American observers believed that the Communist scenario had a different third act. According to their forecast, the Communist second team was to stage an indecisive “revolt” against the first team. Jack, pretending to carry out after four years the pledge that he made to get himself elected, would commit the United States to support the second team. At the scheduled moment on the eve of elections Nick would “intervene” and yell about a “nuclear holocaust,” thus producing a “crisis” which would call for a “bipartisan” cancellation of the election. The gang in the Pentagon, hypocritically wringing its greasy hands, would claim that we were even weaker then its concerted sabotage of our defenses had in fact made us by that time. That would suffice to set craven “intellectuals” and neurotic females to running through our streets howling for “peace” and the “United Nations.” After much tension, a great “statesmanlike solution” would be found: surrender of our sovereignty and weapons to an “international” body, with the Russians agreeing to do likewise. Then the savages in the “international police force” would move in, and long-awaited butchery of the American boobs would get under way.

Those who make this prognosis support it by pointing out that the Conspiracy has already fallen far behind its schedule for the United States, and that the slow but ever increasing awakening of the American people from their hypnotic lethargy makes it necessary for the Conspiracy to adopt drastic and precipitate measures now, if it is not to fail utterly. If those observers are right, then interference by Castro is excluded, for the plan itself would guarantee his safety until the United States had been abolished.

(3) That the Conspiracy ordered the assassination as part of systematic preparation for a domestic take-over. If so, the plan, of course, was to place the blame on “right-wing extremists” (if I may use the Bolsheviks’ code-word for informed and loyal Americans), and “clues” had been planted to lead or point in that direction as soon as Oswald was safe in Mexico. These preparations were rendered useless when Oswald was, through some mischance, arrested—probably in consequence of some slip-up of which we as yet know nothing. He may, for example, have missed connections with some agent of the Conspiracy who was to transport him to the airport, and it may be significant that, when observed on the street, he was walking directly toward the apartment of the Jakob

Rubenstein (alias Jack Ruby) who later silenced him.

Two objections to this explanation are commonly raised, but neither is cogent.

The first is the assumption that, if the International Conspiracy had planned the assassination, there would have been no slip-up. That is absurd. The degenerates are not Supermen. Their agents make blunders all the time—blunders that could destroy whole segments of the apparatus, if the conspiracy did not have so many criminals planted in communications and politics to cover up the blunders and to paralyze the normal reactions of a healthy society. It would take pages even to list the mistakes that the Conspiracy's agents, including their branch manager, Castro, have made in the course of the Cuban operation. For that matter, a potentially serious and quite unnecessary mistake was made when the Communist Party's *official* publication, *The Worker*, yelled for the appointment of Earl Warren to "investigate" the assassination *before* the appointment was made—or at least, before the appointment was disclosed to the public. Nothing was gained by that mistake in timing, which serves only to give away the whole show.

The second argument is that the Conspiracy could not have wanted to eliminate Kennedy, who was doing so much for it. But that is a miscalculation. For one thing, the job was not being done on schedule. A few measures had been forced through Congress, but not, for example, what is called "Civil Rights," a very vital part of the vermin's preparations for the final take-over. Virtually nothing was done to speed up national bankruptcy and the total economic collapse that is doubtless scheduled to accompany the subjugation of the American people. The Congress was, on the whole, the most American Congress that we have had for many years, and it blocked the measures most cunningly designed to destroy the nation. It was not the fault of any one man, to be sure, but the record for 1963 was, for all practical purposes, a stalemate. Our "Liberals," always impatient for open dictatorship and terrorism, were beginning to feel frustrated; some of them were screeching in our more prominent daily, weekly, and monthly liepapers about the "standpatism" of Congress and hinting that that nasty relic of the Constitution must be abolished in the interests of "effective democracy." Others were beginning to lose confidence.

That is what the Conspiracy cannot afford. It is already sadly behind schedule. Of course, its secret plans, like the identity of its master strategists, are undisclosed, but at the end of 1958 some competent observers, after the most careful and painstaking study of all available indications, concluded that 1963 was the year scheduled for the effective capture of the United States. And those analysts—without exception, so far as I know—still believe that they were right; they believe that the Communist schedule was retarded and partly disrupted by the awakening of the American people and their growing awareness of the Communist Conspiracy and its designs. It is known from past operations that the Conspiracy's plans always call for constantly *accelerated* subversion in the final phase of a conquest, and so even a stalemate is, from the standpoint of our enemies, an alarming tactical failure. They cannot afford many more without suffering total defeat.

The Conspiracy, we must remember, does not have the resilience of a nation at war, which, unless thoroughly rotted, can rely on the powerful cohesive force of patriotism. To be sure, a frenzied hatred of mankind and human civilization is an even more powerful cohesive force among the born Bolsheviks who direct and manage the Conspiracy, and it has been able to excite race hatred among certain "minorities" and so acquire some fanatical shock-troops; but for a very large part of the work of subversion it must rely on

low-grade criminals, opportunistic collaborators, and stupid employees. And its power of discipline over those groups largely depends on their complete confidence that the Conspiracy's triumph is inevitable.

Careful observers were aware of the feeling of crisis in conspiratorial circles before the assassination. In June of 1963, an experienced American military man made a careful analysis of the situation at that time, and in his highly confidential report concluded, on the basis of indications in Communist and crypto-Communist sources, that the Conspiracy's schedule called for a major incident to create national shock *before Thanksgiving*. Taylor Caldwell, who combines feminine sensitivity with artistic perception, sensed in the tone of Communist and "Liberal" publications a direction that made the assassination of Kennedy "very probable"—and she said so in an explicit warning published on October thirty-first and written about a week earlier. Other observers, who saw that Communist plans called for some sensational act of violence in the United States naturally considered the assassination of Kennedy (possibly in a crash of his airplane so arranged as to show unmistakable sabotage) as one of the expedients that the Conspiracy might adopt, although they did not, so far as I know, regard it as the *most* likely at the present juncture.

But, aside from the Conspiracy's obvious need for some drastic means of checking the growth of American patriotism, there is the consideration that Kennedy was rapidly becoming a political liability. Despite the best efforts of the lie-machines, it was clear that his popularity was diminishing so rapidly that some observers doubted whether even the most cunningly contrived and timed "crisis" could procure his re-election. His conduct was exciting ever-increasing disgust even among the credulous; and what was worse, the vast cesspool in Washington was beginning to leak badly.

The bandits of the New Frontier, of whom Billie Sol Estes was but a puny specimen, had operated a little too openly. It had not been possible entirely to conceal the theft of wheat worth \$32 million in a single raid or the probable "disappearance" of another \$109 million in the same way. It had not been possible completely to suppress the TFX scandal, which would incense the entire nation if it were really exposed; it had not been possible to prevent the public from finding out *something* about little Bobby Baker; and a hundred other boils of corruption (including, it is rumored, some murders thus far successfully disguised as "accidental deaths") are ready to burst at the slightest pressure. Only the most desperate exertions, involving the *personal* intervention of two of the most prominent members of the Administration have kept the lid—precariously and temporarily—on the modernized badger game that is operated (at the taxpayers' expense and partly on government property) to entrap and subject to blackmail members of Congress not responsive to bribery and other routine pressures from the Administration. There are rumors that an even more filthy scandal, involving both sadistic sexual perversions and the use of government powers for the importation and distribution of hallucinatory narcotics, is simmering dangerously near to the surface. I am told that documentary evidence of secret shipments of secret munitions of war to the Soviet by the Administration in treasonable defiance of law is available in a place in which it is secure from both burglary and bribery. Even so minor a matter as the recent exposure of "scientists" in the employ of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare as having forged spectrographic data for use in a smear-job on an American physician disquieted some theretofore complacent and somnolent citizens. For aught I know to the contrary,

the assassination of Kennedy may have been necessary as the *only* means of avoiding, or even long deferring, national scandals so flagrant as to shock the whole of our brainwashed and hypnotized populace back to sanity.

In summary, then there is not a single indication that the Conspiracy did not plan and carry out the assassination of Kennedy. On the other hand, there is evidence which very strongly suggests that it did.

First of all, there is the suspicious celerity with which the broadcasting agency sardonically called Voice of America, Tass in Moscow, Earl Warren, and many publicists and politicians noted for their services to the Conspiracy in the past, began to screech that the murder was the work of “right-wing extremists” almost as soon as the shot was fired. One is justified in asking whether the leaders of this chorus went into action as soon as they received news *that they were expecting*. Or, if they did not know the precise moment, were they not prepared in advance for news of that kind? Is it conceivable that the same story would have occurred independently to so many different persons, however intense their hatred of the American people, or that they would have dared to announce *as fact* a malicious conjecture, if they had no assurance that their statements would be confirmed by “evidence” to be discovered subsequently? Not even the most addle-pated emulator of Sherlock Holmes would pretend to identify a murderer without a single clue. But the screechers went much farther than that: What they said was the precise *opposite* of what was suggested by the first indications available (the arrest of a Negro, reported on the radio while the Presidential automobile was starting for the hospital)—an indication which, although it later proved to be wrong, no prudent person could have disregarded at the time, unless he had assurance, from some source that he trusted, that contrary indications would soon be produced.

Persons whose business it is to tamper with the news are naturally accustomed to lying, but even they do not lightly take the risk of being caught promptly in a particularly improbable and offensive lie. The case of Earl Warren is even more puzzling. No one would suspect him of concern for truth, but surely the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court must be shrewd enough not to make allegations without some reason to believe that he will be able to produce some shreds of “evidence” to support them.

It seems that preparations had been made for rioting and murder throughout the country. Americans known to be opponents of the Conspiracy, including General Walker, prominent members of the John Birch Society, and leaders of other conservative organizations, began to receive threats of death by telephone from creatures who somehow knew that Kennedy was dead *before* he reached the hospital. In many communities, mobs composed of the dregs of humanity and openly proposing to burn the homes and murder the families of known conservatives, began to form in the evening, as though in obedience to orders that had not been countermanded to all sectors. I do not suggest that the local vermin were entrusted with a fore-knowledge of precisely what was to happen in Dallas, but it seems very likely that they had been prepared to respond to a signal and told what to do when the signal came.

It is easy to see what could have happened, had everything gone smoothly in Dallas. There could have been a complete break-down of law and order everywhere. The numerous vermin that have been living for years in ill-concealed anticipation of the glorious day when they will be able to hack Americans to pieces and drag bodies through the streets, could have “spontaneously” started looting, burning, and murdering. In many

places they could have mustered strength beyond the control of the police, and even if checked and arrested, they could have claimed, like Rubenstein, that they had been “crazed” by “sorrow” for martyred Jack, and, of course, unlimited funds would have been available for legal defense. What is more, the great nest of traitors in Washington could have begun a pseudo-legal reign of terror, for which the infamous “Sedition Trial” in Washington in 1944 was obviously a small-scale and premature pilot-study. In an atmosphere of hysteria, maintained by the anti-American television, radio, and Press, all the leading American patriots could have been dragged in chains to Washington. The “Federal Marshals,” fresh from Alcatraz and the like, whom the juvenile Czar had used for his invasion of Mississippi, could have been counted on to beat some of them to death or murder them while “trying to escape.” The sadists whom we have imported as “mental health experts” could have tortured others into fake “confessions” or have destroyed their minds with drugs. There could have been a national Saturnalia of *legalized* violence under cover of which the International Conspiracy could have gained control of the whole nation that could not subsequently have been broken.

You, who read these lines, may owe your life or at least your liberty to the vigilance and sagacity of Officer J.D. Tippit, the policeman who stopped Oswald on the street and was murdered by the Conspiracy’s well-trained but not infallible agent.

There is other evidence, including definite indications that certain persons, whom observers have long regarded as members or at least auxiliaries of the Conspiracy, knew days in advance that *something* was going to happen to Kennedy in Dallas. But when one considers the enormous gains that the Conspiracy would have reaped from the assassination, had it been carried out without mishap, and when one remembers that the Conspiracy had an urgent and even desperate need of precisely such an event, one cannot avoid the conclusion that the weight of probability lies overwhelmingly on the side of the view that the murder was arranged by the Conspiracy as a strategic operation.

Be Ye Not Comforted

Many Americans, while giving thanks for their deliverance, strangely assume that the Communists’ mishap in Dallas will give us a respite from danger of at least several months. On the contrary, the danger is greater than ever, for the partial failure merely augments the criminals’ need for some signal victory over Americans to preserve enthusiasm in their own ranks. As I write, shortly before Christmas, it does not seem that that victory can be attained before the New Year, but we may be sure that every effort will be made to attain it as soon as possible thereafter.

The first expedient was primarily defensive. In a hasty and thus far successful attempt to thwart an investigation by legally constituted authorities, i.e., the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and the Attorney General of the State of Texas, both of whom had already announced their determination to conduct an impartial inquiry, an illegal and un-Constitutional “special commission” was improvised with the obvious hope that it could be turned into a soviet-style kangaroo court. The best-known members of this packed “commission” are:

(1) Earl Warren, so notorious as the chief of the quasi-judicial gang engaged in subverting the Constitution of the United States that many thousands of the finest and most prominent American citizens have for two years been demanding with increasing insistence his impeachment and trial. A favorite subject of speculation and debate among

some informed observers is whether Warren, if brought to trial, would try to dodge behind the Fifth Amendment or would take it on the lam and disappear behind the Iron Curtain. Warren, who spends his vacations with Little Comrade Tito in Yugoslavia or with Big Comrade Khrushchev in the Crimea, began to traduce and defame loyal and informed Americans minutes after the murder in Dallas; and it is easy to see why the Communist Party, through some indiscretion or mis-timing, officially nominated him as head of the “special commission” two days before his appointment was announced in Washington.

(2) T. Hale Boggs, the loud-mouthed agitator who disgraces the State of Louisiana in Congress. *The Councilor* has reproduced a press photograph which shows young Boggs in the act of giving the Communist clenched-fist salute while he was head of the Communist-front “American Student Union” in Tulane University, ridiculing our Army, and urging young men not to fight for their country. The same publication reports that it has indisputable evidence that Boggs “served three years before entering Congress” as chairman of a Communist-front “Peace Drive,” and reports that he is a member of the “Interparliamentary Union,” a sinister gang which meets annually in some city abroad to plot the liquidation of the United States. As promptly as Warren, Boggs began to yell that the “right-wing” (as he and his kind call Americans who don’t want to be liquidated) was guilty of having shot Mister Jack.

(3) Allen W. Dulles, one of the founders of the malodorous Council on Foreign Relations and currently its Director. Dulles was the head of an American spy ring in Switzerland during the Second World War and is said to have done a fairly good job, although it was believed at the time that this organization was infested with double agents who were really in the employ of the Soviet—and even more serious implications can be drawn from the testimony given in Karlsruhe last July by Heinz Felfe, a Soviet agent who had been Mr. Dulles’ German counterpart and supposed competitor in Switzerland.

Our Central Intelligence Agency, although it was infected from the very beginning by the incorporation of scum from the notorious O.S.S., was still an American agency while it was under the command of Admiral Hillenkoetter. Under Mr. Dulles it was transformed into the bizarre gang of seventeen thousand or more secret and faceless agents, some of them expert assassins so recently imported into the United States that they cannot speak good English. Mr. Dulles’ C.I.A. is also the gang that helped Castro attain power in Cuba, recently carried out (in close cooperation with the Soviet Secret Police) the murders in South Vietnam as a prelude to complete and open Communist occupation, and is known to have served the Soviet in many other ways, while, so far as is known, it has never done anything at all for the United States, whose taxpayers provide the gang with unlimited funds. Some perhaps frenetic observers believe—based upon this and other “coincidences”—that the C.I.A. is now the major branch of the Soviet Secret Police in the United States.

It was to Mr. Dulles personally that the late Bang-Jensen trustingly confided evidence that very important members of the C.I.A. were officers in the Soviet Secret Police, and Mr. Dulles did nothing at all about it—unless, indeed, it was the C.I.A. that murdered Bang-Jensen to prevent him from ever giving testimony.

One writer has recently suggested that it was the C.I.A. that arranged the assassination of Kennedy; I know of no evidence to support that opinion, but obviously Mr. Dulles’ creation is open to suspicion. Perhaps that is why he is a member of the “special

commission.”

(4) John J. McCloy, of the Council On Foreign Relations, the Ford Foundation, the World Brotherhood, and other mysteriously powerful organizations whose un-American or anti-American activities should have been investigated by Congress long ago. McCloy is reputed to be the principal author of the present plan to disarm the United States and prepare it for occupation by Soviet troops and associated savages of the “United Nations,” which he, as an assistant of Alger Hiss, helped to design and foist on the American people.

Well, these four form a majority of the “fact-finding commission” and their records offer a guarantee of the kind of “facts” they will find or devise. Two of the other members are self-styled “Liberals” of little political experience, and it is obviously idle to speculate concerning what Senator Russell may be able to do alone in such company.

It should be noted that the very creation of this Soviet-style “commission” in violation of our Constitution and for the express purpose of superseding legal and constitutional procedures represents in itself a victory for which the Communists have been willing to pay almost any price, since it accelerates the disintegration of legality and accustoms Americans to dictatorial acts that subvert the authority of Congress.

The functions of a “commission” so constituted are obvious. It will:

(1) Cover up for the Communist Conspiracy as much as possible by claiming that Comrade Oswald was a poor, lone critter who done it all alone. Probably “psychiatrists” will be produced to prove that he done it ’cause, at the age of six months, he had to wait an extra five minutes for his bottle. That will establish the need for more Welfare and Civil Rights.

(2) Suppress permanently the report of the F.B.I, which has already acted to conceal from the American people, and, if permanent suppression proves impossible, to have the report watered down or at least kept secret until a “crisis” can be arranged that will make its publication pass almost unnoticed.

(3) Smother and suppress the evidence of close contacts between Oswald and Rubenstein in both Waco and Dallas during the period immediately preceding the assassination of Kennedy, and other evidence connecting both of them with mysteriously prosperous persons of unknown antecedents in the vicinity of New York City. Every effort will be made to conceal Rubenstein’s connections with Communist Cuba, including such items as a clandestine visit to Havana about a year ago, when he stayed with a long-time and close associate of Castro’s named Praskin, who operates as a cover for his other activities, a “novelty store” on the Prado opposite the Seville Hotel.* It may even be possible to prevent the public from learning definitely whether or not the “Jack” Rubenstein who executed Oswald is the person of the same name who has a published record of Communist associations and activities in this country going back for many years.

(4) Harass the Dallas police as much as possible. This will convey to police forces everywhere an understanding of the inadvisability of interfering with Communists engaged in the discharge of their duties. I doubt that the “commission” will go farther than this, although I confess that I am disturbed by the persistence with which the

* I understand that a full report on this and other known activities of Rubenstein will probably appear in a future issue of *The Herald of Freedom* (Box 333, Staten Island 1, N.Y.).

“Liberal” columnists around the world, from France to Australia, insist that poor Oswald, an innocent little Communist, was “framed” by the “Fascist” police of Dallas.

(5) Try to smear and intimidate loyal Americans in every way possible. Much can be accomplished in this direction if the Congress can be pressured into voting un-Constitutional powers of subpoena to an un-Constitutional “commission” dominated by persons who should themselves be on trial for their efforts to subvert and destroy the Constitution. Since no American cow is wealthy after having been milked by the Income-Tax collectors, and since the majority of conspicuously loyal Americans are persons of very modest means, just one item, the cost of employing attorneys, could give the gang the power to inhibit and even paralyze most of the opposition to treason in the crucial year of 1964. It is possible, of course, that the “commission” may simply assume such powers. If so, Congress will probably object; but, if it should be necessary, the august Chief Justice could dash over to the Supreme Court Building, put on his black robe, and rule that Congress, like God, is un-Constitutional. It’s just a ten-minute trip by cab.

(6) To go as much further as may be feasible. It is reported in the Press that the “commission” has requested the power to “extort” testimony from “unwilling witnesses.” At the time at which I write, it seems unlikely that any such un-Constitutional power will be un-Constitutionally granted. Of course, the original plan, to have been carried out *eventually*, if everything went according to schedule in Dallas, called for nice, rubber-lined torture chambers (such as you may glimpse in that excellent film, *My Latvia*) in which the hated Americans could be scientifically tortured into “confession,” and the remains of those who proved “uncooperative” could be efficiently washed down the drains.

(7) To create propaganda for other Communist projects to facilitate the final conquest of the United States. A number are likely, but the most obvious is the one that was contemplated when Comrade Oswald was careful to provide evidence that the rifle used in the assassination had been purchased by mail. It is eminently desirable that firearms now in the possession of Americans be confiscated, partly to convince the Conspiracy’s serfs how helpless they are, and especially to reduce the occupational hazards to the Balubas, Outer Mongolians, or other beasts who may form the “international police force” that is to occupy the United States and butcher its white inhabitants.

(8) To co-operate when the Conspiracy arranges for further violence. We may be sure that such will occur at the earliest feasible moment, and that every precaution will be taken to avoid a slip-up such as occurred in Dallas. It is impossible to predict at this moment when such an incident will occur or what form it will take—except, of course, that the blame will fall on “right-wing extremists.” The assassination of other high government officials is an obvious possibility—perhaps too obvious, despite the sudden yapping of “Liberals” that something must be done quick to prevent the succession of John McCormack, as now provided by law. (*Newsweek*, THE WEEKLY LIEPAPER published by the *Washington Post*, had the effrontery to state the cause for alarm: McCormack is suspected of “anti-Communism”!) The Conspiracy, however, might go so far as to arrange the assassination of some Justice. That could, perhaps, be made to seem plausible after the Warren Court has maltreated a number of Americans in its latest usurpation of un-Constitutional powers, and it is, further more, the only *sure* way of preventing an impeachment and trial by Congress.

But another assassination would seem a bit monotonous, unless preceded by several

other incidents of a different pattern. A hundred varieties of incidents are possible, such as first-class race riots, an “accidental” nuclear explosion to pep up agitation for “*disarmament*,” or a well planned series of *almost* convincing suicides of American “rightists.” A properly timed “crisis” in Latin America, preferably near to our borders, would be a suitable intermezzo during the performance. We cannot not predict precisely what arrangements the unknown Directorate of the Conspiracy will deem most expedient, for it is likely that their choice of both time and events will be made after they have seen how much advantage they will have been able to extract from the Kennedy assassination.

One thing is certain, however: The bungle in Dallas, far from justifying the slightest relaxation, should summon us to the utmost vigilance. It should warn us that we have come to the year of decision, and that only our most devoted and united efforts can prevail against a gang of international murderers rendered desperate by the awareness that their time is running out. (*End of Part One.*)

[PART II]

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

The assassination and its aftermath must have given to many Americans the shock that each of us must somehow feel in his own being before he can understand what Communists really are and why they are seeking to kill or enslave him. That understanding does not automatically come from mere information. We all carry in our minds a great accumulation of items of information, such as that a continent lies under the ice of Antarctica or that the natives of the Andaman Islands are pygmies, which have no effect on our thinking because such facts seem irrelevant to our own lives. By this time, every literate American has in his own mind a good deal of information about Communists, although often as detached and unrelated items that seem remote from his quotidian concerns. Even copious and systematic information may remain, so to speak, inert in the mind until illumined by a perception that carries conviction.

The Moment of Truth

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

When I was a youngster, I knew a man of substance who told me that he had almost been enlisted in a Communist-front operation to release from prison a creature named Mooney, who had murdered nine persons in California to show how much he loved Humanity. Although moved by the plausible and pathetic story told him by the Editor of a “literary” periodical, the gentleman was canny enough to check a few facts and then visit the headquarters of the organization soliciting his support. His unannounced visit gave him a moment of perception. He returned with the conviction that he had seen

specimens of a criminal gang that was burrowing its way beneath the foundations of society, bent on undermining the whole nation. I thought his alarm preposterous, and, I am afraid, smiled at it.

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

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

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

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

A New Yorker says that his moment came early in December when he read a column by Walter Lippmann, whom he had long suspected to be suffering from nothing more serious than a cerebrum bloated with ideals. In the column the punctate pundit, wrapping his feet about his neck in one of his customary verbal twists, claimed that “in a free [*sic*] country” criticism of “Civil Rights and Russia” is “inherently subversive.” Not content with thus having exposed himself, Big-Brained Walt went on tactlessly to yowl that

because Oswald scored a bull's-eye, "the *only* solace for the nation's [*sic*] shame and grief can come from a Purge"—a purge, of course, of the awful Americans who think they still have a country. Thus, said my correspondent, was long covert hatred of Americans and dissembled blood-lust made manifest for all to see. It is possible, to be sure, that the quoted phrase was just lipography, and that Lippmann meant something else, such as forced feeding of castor oil to Americans; but the phrase served to give at least one of his readers an impulse to put together and comprehend many data that his mind was holding in suspension.

Ex uno disce omnes

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

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

You can see fledgling Oswalds in the flesh whenever, as occasionally happens, a loyal American is permitted to speak on or near a college campus. The young "progressives" will be there to jeer and quibble. It will be instructive to observe how many are deformed in body or feature as well as mind, and, if you approach near enough, you can see the hatred glistening in beady eyes. (For a close approach, a handkerchief sprinkled with ammonia will minimize the discomfort.) And you should reflect that you are financing, directly through taxes or contributions or indirectly through the institution's tax-exemption, the hatching and "education" of young murderers.

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

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

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

From direct observation, you, as an American, can now recognize your enemy and know what he is. And if ever you are tempted to doubt the evidence of your own eyes and ears, remember that such monsters are no novelty—that in the brief span of man's sad

and dolorous history one can find almost innumerable instances of recrudescant savagery and of the frenzied and exacerbated rage of anthropoid beasts that cannot bear to be dragged toward civilization and humanity. The best illustration in a book that I have seen is Louis Zoul's *Thugs and Communists* (Public Opinion, Long Island City 4; cf. AMERICAN OPINION, January, 1962, pp. 29–36).

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

The Time Is Now

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

Now that Providence has given us a last chance, we must use it wisely and well. We must act with courage and determination, and, above all, with a rational and realistic understanding of our situation. We are fighting against enormous, though not insuperable odds, and we shall need the utmost effort of every American who will work with us. Our greatest handicap is that we, unlike our enemies, do not have a unified and secret command which plans the total strategy without need to disclose or explain it to anyone, and which carries out that strategy by issuing orders that are obeyed without question. Against a conspiracy that makes its decisions in secret and coordinates with the efficiency of a single organism the movements of its numerous and often hidden tentacles, we can oppose only the voluntary efforts of individuals who are loosely organized into a large number of voluntary organizations, which must, in turn, voluntarily cooperate with one another. In these circumstances a secret strategy is impossible, and we must rely on the rationality and self-control of responsible individuals to supply that minimum of unity without which we could do nothing against a conspiracy that has almost absolute control over its agents through its appeal to their criminal instincts, their complicity in past crimes, and, if need be, fear.

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

That we Americans are so divided is our basic weakness in the present struggle, but it

is not one of which we need be ashamed. It is the weakness of all societies of free men, and hence it is, in large part, precisely what we are trying to preserve. But our conflicts of interest and belief must be candidly admitted and accurately defined, if we are not to succumb to the manipulations of our enemies.

The Unity Of Dissension

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

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

Our task as Americans today is to attain and maintain an effective unity for the specific and strictly limited purpose of (a) preserving our national independence by recovering our federal government from the international vermin who have stealthily captured it, and (b) restoring as rapidly as may be—and that will be over a period of more than a decade—our Constitutional government that those vermin have all but totally subverted. As a *practical* imperative, all other purposes, however passionately important they may be to us personally, must be recognized as secondary and even irrelevant, so far as the cause in which we must unite is concerned.

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

Who Is The Enemy?

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

Our enemy is the International Communist Conspiracy. Of that, there can be no

possible doubt. Every time the fetid nest of vermin in Washington spends our money and (usually) the lives of American soldiers to enslave and barbarize another country, that country is invariably handed over to Communists—never to Fabian Socialists, Illuminati, or similar groups. East Germany, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, China, Cuba, and the many others are all obviously and notoriously *Communist* provinces. And it is perfectly obvious that what the nest is preparing for the United States, through “civil rights,” disarmament, and the like, is a *Communist* regime.

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

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

Only the most naïve persons today are puzzled by the operations of what is the lowest level in the Conspiracy (although it includes persons of great social or political prominence). The Conspiracy, engaged in total subversion, naturally finds and exploits all the weaknesses that are inherent in our society as in all human societies. It finds, and uses as its unconscious instruments, fat-heads and dunces who can be stirred to glutinous sentimentality or a rancorous resentment of their betters. But it uses above all the criminal tendencies that always have been present in all large populations and always will be present to the utmost verge of the foreseeable future. Every large aggregation of human beings produces, by biological necessity, its sneak-thieves, robbers, shysters, “intellectuals,” perverts, sadists, and other degenerates. As is known to everyone who has thought about it at all, the continued existence of a civilization, like that of a large city, depends on the efficiency of the sewage system that disposes of its organic waste: On this level, all that the Conspiracy has to do is stop up the sewers (which civilized societies seem naturally predisposed to neglect anyway, since no one likes to think about such unpleasant necessities). By this time, we have all learned not to waste time arguing whether a given person, who is knowingly serving the Conspiracy’s ends, is a member, an accomplice, a hireling, or just a petty criminal who has been given opportunity and encouragement.

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

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

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

Now there are very good reasons for believing that the foul brute that is titular Boss in the Kremlin is merely a subordinate, an executive of limited powers. So long as the unspeakable thing called Stalin was alive, most (but not all) observers thought that he was the real head of the Conspiracy. Events subsequent to the death (or, perhaps liquidation) of that monster have made it increasingly apparent to judicious observers that the organization of the Conspiracy is more complex than was once generally supposed—that the bloody beast named Khrushchev is like a “star” in a show on Broadway in that his personal appetites and eccentricities will, within rather narrow limits, be tolerated, since he represents a considerable investment in publicity; but who can always be fired by the producers of the show, and *will be* eliminated the minute the he gets out of hand so far as to endanger the success of production. So, who are the producers?

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

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

The kernel of this long and circumstantial report is that, superior to Khrushchev and similar administrators, and superior even to the Secret Police, is another and more select organization of truly international scope, the Communist Security System (CSS), which has penetrated and controls even the Secret Police. The existence of such an inner organization was first suspected by cautious observers in 1939, when the purulent blob of anti-human protoplasm called Nicolai Yezhov was blotted out and replaced by the equally loathsome thing called Lavrenti Beria. That suspicion, however, remained hypothetical, in the eyes of most observers, until 1953, when the ease with which the

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

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

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

That, of course, must be the darkest and most jealously guarded secret of all. As was to be expected, the report can only state that "the guiding [i.e. controlling] members of the Communist Security System" are "fellow travelers, rich financiers, and secret Communists" whose identity is known only to themselves and the few trusted agents through whom they, as an invisible government, transmit their orders. That description suggests—even implies—that most or all of the real directors of the Conspiracy live outside of Soviet territory. There is nothing implausible in that. Indeed, there never was any real evidence to support the gratuitous assumption that the Conspiracy's headquarters were moved to Russia after the conquest of that country in 1917.

Our Secret Enemy

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

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

No reader of AMERICAN OPINION, I am sure, will be confused, even for an instant, by the semantic quibble made possible by the fact that the Communist Conspiracy is not directed by Communists, if by that term we mean persons who believe in "Marxism." The barbarous jargon and confusing twaddle of "dialectical materialism" has always been what Marx designed it to be, an elaborate deception triply useful for enlisting recruits, stultifying ignorant "intellectuals," and concealing serious purposes. On the lower levels of the Conspiracy, many members of the Community Party believe, or pretend to believe, that drivel as an article of faith; while the more sincere and intelligent rack their brains trying to solve a set of quadratic equations that were designed to be insoluble (and eventually they either defect or get the point and move upward to the next level). We may be quite sure, I think, that anyone who attains the rank of assistant to an immediate subordinate of a branch manager, such as Castro, has left belief in "Marxism" as far behind him as belief in Santa Claus. So, unless we find an adolescent's pleasure in the paradox that Khrushchev and his kind are not Communists, we must understand that by "Communist" we mean a conscious participant in the International Conspiracy, without reference to his real or feigned reasons for participation.

Some Theories

It has long been apparent that the Communist Conspiracy was something quite different from the picture that its members tried to hold before the general public. It was clear to judicious observers a century ago that the degenerates who publicly headed or secretly financed the International were not in the least interested in the "workers" or the "proletariat" about whose "oppression" they pretended to snivel. When the Conspiracy effected its first territorial conquest in 1917, only the simple-minded could describe as "Russian" a revolution whose leaders and executives had, almost without exception, swarmed into Russia a few months before the take-over, and have been financed from both Germany and the United States, although those two nations were technically at war with one another. And after the conquest of Russia, it was clear that the total resources of that hapless and more than decimated land were utterly inadequate to finance an international conspiracy. And although Trotsky, Lenin, Stalin, and the rest were, without doubt, viciously cunning monsters, it was extremely improbable that they had either the brains or the time to direct such a conspiracy while discharging their duties as executives in Russia and, incidentally, clawing at one another's throats.

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

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

to boobs they considered so stupid as to believe in Allah or any god.

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

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

Mr. de Courcy has *not* said that “Force X” was the inner core of that Communist Conspiracy, but many of his readers have drawn that inference from the indications that he has provided. Mr. de Courcy has described “Force X” as “basically a criminal group,” which directs the entire drug traffic of the world,” high-class prostitution and homosexual rings, and many other forms of profitable crime. But he says that it “has made use of Communism,” that “in Russia, Trotsky, Zhdanov, Beria, and Litvinov” were its agents (as were, in Germany, “both Ludendorff and Himmler”) , and that its executive head, a homosexual and necrophiliac degenerate, gave advice to Stalin and now advises both Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung. Mr. de Courcy concludes that “The alliance between this person and Communism is very close, although there are fundamental clashes of aim. Neither seems to mind that at present.”

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

Less Blood-Pressure, Please

If not two, then not three or five or ten. What we have said about “Force X” will *apply, mutatis mutandis*, to any other conspiratorial group that we may consider in connection

with the Communists. Let us, therefore, draw some conclusions.

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

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

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

- (4) That our inferences about the Conspiracy are incorrect, and that "Force X" and the Communists really are independent in the sense that neither controls the other.
- (5) That the data supplied by Mr. de Courcy are wrong, in part or in their entirety, either because his informants were mistaken or because they were supplied with false information (a common trick in all intelligence work) or because they or Mr. de Courcy have some interest in deceiving us. Thus "Force X," as described to us, may not exist at all.

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

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

a trail that could be followed back to the lair of some criminal syndicate or subsidiary thereof.

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

Horrid Hypotheses

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

I confess that I cannot understand the extraordinary amount of passion that can be generated by violent asseverations and hysterical denunciations of theses that can be established or refuted only by ascertaining facts. Quarrels on this subject remind me of two men whom I once saw engage in a violent brawl to determine which of two teams would win a ball game on the following day. I could not but wonder whether they imagined that their exertions would, through some sympathetic or methectic magic, affect the result.

Less Heat, More Light

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

Few Americans realize that all of our uncertainties and the futile quarrels that they occasion are directly caused by the International Communist Conspiracy’s success in stifling, frustrating, or preventing official investigation. A raid, carried out jointly by the State of Michigan and Federal officers in 1922 on the headquarters of a nest of homicidal vermin disclosed evidence that should have scared every sober American as much as though a bullet had whizzed past his ear. But the net result was that a gang of

subversives, headed by the malodorous Felix Frankfurter, stopped in 1925 all Federal investigation of the enemies in our midst. Nothing more was done by our Federal government, despite its obligation under the Constitution to protect us from foreign enemies, until a great American, Martin Dies of Texas, established what became the House Committee on Un-American Activities (see his new book, *MARTIN DIES' STORY*; The Bookmailer, New York; \$5.00). Mr. Dies' committee accomplished a great deal, despite open opposition and clandestine harassment from the great War Criminal in the White House and the scabrous louts with which that being surrounded himself.

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

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

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

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

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

Armageddon

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

I do not see how there can be a reasonable objection to that policy, with which even the most incensed should concur. We are prudent men and we therefore know that every prudent man knows that—if it happens that he is unjustly accused of a crime of which he

is innocent—he cannot destroy public documents and sandbag witnesses on their way to the Grand Jury without arousing some grave suspicions that he may be less innocent than a new-born lamb on the hills of Arcadia.

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

In the meantime, we certainly know enough about our enemies to attack effectively the Conspiracy on fronts that can absorb all our energies. Enough of our enemies have exposed themselves in acts of open treason to make inquiry into their motives or antecedents a waste of time. And time is what we cannot afford to waste: We have so little of it left.

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

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

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