

WASHINGTON --Not one of the 51 nations created since World War II has chosen communism as a way of life, the State Department finds.

The Miami Herald, March 11, 1965

Typical of the fare the American government gives its people and the American press its readers, the above story gave neither date nor source. Whether Carl T. Rowan's United States Information Agency had circulated it, as soothing syrup to a nervous public, or some United Nations enthusiast on the paper had inserted it on his own, the reader had no way of knowing. Perhaps other papers across America had received and were reprinting the same lulling poison. Not a voice of protest was heard from a nation crying to be duped.

ONE OF THE NEW NATIONS BELYING THE STATE DEPARTMENT FINDING and the one in which America, more than Russia, is responsible for a communist government today, is North Vietnam, fomenter of the struggle in which Americans are dying. In the six years between 1944 and 1950 America assiduously armed, supported and incited the forces of the communist revolutionary, Ho chi Minh. North Vietnam's existence as a communist nation was made possible by America. Despite the much-publicized air-raids and weighty pronouncements that the tide is turning, everything points to a negotiated American withdrawal from that area at the first favorable opportunity, a withdrawal made palatable to the American public by a false feeling of satisfaction that we will be withdrawing as victors.

SUPPOSE WE DEVOTE THIS REPORT OF APRIL, 1965, TO WHAT IS CALLED INCIDENTAL INTELLIGENCE. In February we covered the subdivisions which regiment Europe economically and politically. In March, for future reference, we traced the development of the anti-Western popular front uniting Asia and Africa, and extension of that front into Europe through the "non-aligned" door in Belgrade. It was heavy reading, but necessary if America is to have an informed public. This month let us turn to the fragments of information, each too small in itself to warrant a special report but which, taken together, are worthy of serious study.

OBVIOUSLY THE FIVE LINES IN THE MIAMI HERALD WERE A BLATANT LIE. To accept them is to proclaim that not only North Vietnam but Mali, Tanzania (formerly Tanganyika and Zanzibar), Sukarno's Indonesia and communist Algeria are allies of the West. All of the 29 labor unions set up in Africa at American expense by American labor "ambassador" Irving Brown, for the purpose, so we are told, of fighting communism, are now obedient to the communist WORLD FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS, the super-union which sits in Prague. And as the labor unions of a country go, so goes the country.

For a time the former French Congo, capital of which is Brazzaville, was anti-communist, pro-Tshombe and adamant in its refusal to permit the Algerians to train communist-backed Angolan rebels on its soil. Eventually, through labor unions, the government headed by the pro-Western Abbé Fulbert Youlou was toppled in 1962 and Brazzaville became the base for a communist revolt in the Congo which cost the life of Dr. Carlson and hundreds of others, necessitated an air rescue mission and plunged Africa into deeper chaos. Here are a few points to bear in mind as the Johnson administration does what Goldwater was pilloried for advising that we do just six months ago.

THE ORGANIZATION WHICH BLEW UP THE AMERICAN EMBASSY IN SAIGON on March 30, killing and maiming Americans and Vietnamese, is known as the FRONT NATIONAL DE LIBERATION, the military force of which is the Viet Cong. To be honest about it, the communist FNL using terrorist methods against Americans in Saigon in a fake war against "neo-colonialism" and the communist FLN in Algeria whose throwing of bombs into French theaters and cafes was condoned by The New York Times, Time Magazine and Marguerite Higgins, are part and parcel of one world-wide movement. The Gbenye "liberation forces" which killed Dr. Carlson were a local

manifestation of the same classic tactics. Such acts are atrocities when practiced against us, but, though today Algeria is Europe's Cuba, our press, radio, TV and Senator Kennedy found Algerian terrorism laudable when practiced against our allies. This brings up a delicate subject.

CONSERVATIVE COLUMNIST HENRY TAYLOR was the first to raise the question of France's outstanding war debt to America, in relation to de Gaulle's attack on the dollar. Others followed. It was suggested that Washington refuse to redeem in gold the banknotes held by de Gaulle until the amount owed America by France is paid. There are several reasons why the liberal economists of the Washington administration will shy away from such action. For one thing, it would only make de Gaulle's offensive against the dollar more popular, since a vast portion of the public in France today feels that they have spent more fighting communists that were financed, armed and agitated as part of America's crusade against colonialism (in Indo-China and Algeria) than the sum involved. Refusal to meet demands, in gold, whatever the reason, would be regarded on the world money market as admission that bankruptcy is just around the corner; a flood of banknotes presented for payment in gold would follow. And last; It is quite possible that Washington's new school of economists, clamoring for an international currency without gold backing, wishes to see America's gold reserves depleted.

Those responsible for halting gold production during World War II and the dissipation of America's gold reserves thereafter are also dedicated to better relations with Russia. In March, 1964, Russia, now No. 1 gold producer of the world, halted her massive dumping on the Zurich, Paris and London markets. Russian reserves have mounted. Washington's difficulties present an opportunity to negotiate Russian gold against the revision of the list of American products barred from exportation to the communist bloc. In sum, those who squandered America's treasure can now use the shortage they created as justification for lowering barriers which they opposed in the first place.

Like the gold shortage, all of the rancors America faces today among her allies, and most of the troubles demanding urgent measures, can be traced back to the senseless crusade to convert stable and prosperous colonies into chaotic, pro-communist nations, which the Miami Herald regards as an experiment 100% successful for the West. (Jean Larteguy, author of The Centurions and one of the most popular writers in France, has just published a new novel called Les Tambours de Bronze. The plot: how Americans forced the French out of Indo-China. More and more European writers are finding exploitation of such rancors profitable.)

ROOSEVELT AND STALIN BLUEPRINTED THE ANTI-COLONIALIST PROGRAM in their secret conference in Teheran on December 1, 1943, as we mentioned in our March report. A race to rake in the rich morsels of the old empires of their allies ensued. Roosevelt, Stalin, and the United Nations organization which they created--all three recognized the importance of politicized labor unions as roadbeds for revolution. So Russia set up a communist WORLD FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS (WFTU) in Prague, with a communist student super-union as a sort of junior order. American labor rigged up its own empire, the INTERNATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF FREE TRADE UNIONS (ICFTU) in Brussels. UN's body for sowing revolution at labor level was the INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION (ILO) in Geneva.

Volumes could be written on the teamwork of these three international labor organizations in the purely negative drive to eject Europeans from their colonies. After that they became rivals in a scramble for the pieces. It was an uneven struggle, for in the end Prague always won and it was the communist student union's orders that the universities of the West obeyed. Cabot Lodge was America's delegate to United Nations, but never did a vote of his oppose the Algerian FLN or any other so-called "Liberation Front" supported by the ILO, on whose governing body his son George was sitting. There was no reciprocal ILO support when America was under fire.

In October, 1962, this newsletter reproduced the order sent out from Prague for students of all nations to demonstrate before American embassies, stage parades, launch protests against American war-mongering and, above all, keep the Prague

office informed of "spontaneous student attacks on America" as new disarmament talks opened in Geneva.

WORD OUT OF EUROPE IN MARCH, 1965, HAS IT THAT PRAGUE IS ABOUT TO REPEAT AN OLD STRATEGY: In 1960 French conscripts were called upon to desert or to resort to insubordination if forced into the army. A petition signed by 125 artists, actors and intellectuals backed the communist order. Signers included Jean Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir and Simone Signoret, the German girl who as Henrietta Kaminker fled Hitler's Germany and took refuge behind the army to which, in 1960, she recommended desertion and insubordination. Reports now indicate that a similar drive is about to be beamed at young Americans being called to fight Vietnam's FNL.

A GIRL NAMED DJAMILA BOUHIRE WAS THE BOMB-MOLL OF ALGERIA'S FLN. The American press extolled her as a new Joan of Arc. When France's communist students staged street demonstrations and set up intelligence networks serving the FLN, one of their leaders was a communist lawyer named Vergès who is now married to Djamila Bouhired and engaged in organizing a Peking-dominated communist party in France. Supplied with ample funds, Vergès mobilizes cells, holds meetings, and regiments new crops of students against the West through two publications--a slick magazine called Revolution and a newspaper called L'Humanité Nouvelle. Two associations, Amitiés Franco-Chinoises and Les Cercles Marxistes-Leninistes, enroll recruits.

PARIS, LYON AND MARSEILLES already have powerful pro-Peking propaganda and recruiting machines; others exist in Belgium, Switzerland and Italy. Particularly militant in Europe's new communism governed from Peking are artists and intellectuals--which reminds us: The Italian composer, Luigi Nono, was denied an American visa as a member of Italy's Communist Party. This did not exclude him from the offer of a \$20,000 plus housing grant by Ford Foundation last summer, for a year's work in West Berlin. (An Italian top-rank communist could accomplish a great deal in West Berlin in a year, with \$20,000 plus housing as an operating fund.) On February 5, 1965, the State Department granted Nono a visa. Whether or not Ford Foundation had a role in the reversal is unknown.

In March of 1960, when a French communist student group known as the Jeanson network was uncovered in Paris, Vergès was the ring's defender. One of the girls accused of sheltering FLN gunmen in her room and carrying money and arms between terrorists in different sections of Paris was a Los Angeles "art student" named Gloria de Herrera. When the group was finally brought to trial in the Cherche Midi Prison, several seats were vacant. Some defendants had been spirited behind the Iron Curtain; Gloria was whisked home by an accommodating embassy and has never been heard of since. She is probably somewhere in America, about to advise GI's to desert or disobey orders.

When Vergès was Ben Bella's advisor, according to French reports, the mistress of one of Ben Bella's associates was a girl named Michelle Duclos. Michelle was arrested with three negroes in New York in February, 1965, for smuggling in dynamite, in a plot to blow up the Statue of Liberty and the Liberty Bell.

A TRUTH EMERGES FROM THE TENUOUS THREADS OF THE WEST'S LIBERAL ORGANIZATIONS: The Left is international. In a criss-crossing web, leftist associations and committees reach back and forth across oceans, smoothing the way for each communist advance. There is no conservative counterbalance on even a national scale, much less a joining of hands of conservatives across the sea. At 55 rue de la Glacière, in Paris' 13th arrondissement, an American liaison representative links the Red-controlled French National Students' Union (UNEF) with American students of the U.S. National Students' Association. An "Experiment in International Living" program will send over 2,000 young Americans abroad to study with host families in the summer of 1965. Many will return indoctrinated.

The one place where Russia would like a subversive movement is Alaska. The Herald Tribune of March 7, 1965, told its readers ecstatically how "friends" had helped an

Eskimo named Igagruk to finish high school in Tennessee, then sent him to George Washington University. And now he is going to Poland to study for two months!

All of these seemingly unrelated events and developments lead back to the war which Americans are fighting in South Vietnam.

ACCUSATIONS THAT AMERICA IS WAGING GAS WARFARE will be a dominant theme in the Red propaganda drive in the next few months, though the gas used is of short effect and more humanitarian than bullets. No word of disapproval was heard from Britons now conducting the "Drive for Peace in South Vietnam" when the London Sunday Observer of August 18, 1963, carried a Dennis Bloodworth report that Ngo dinh Nhu's forces had burned at least 62 Buddhist demonstrators in Hue, some seriously, with a toxic gas similar to the mustard gas used in World War I. The Paris weekly *Candide* carried a similar report on August 14 and Paris Presse on August 17, with no murmur of protest from the international Left. *France-Soir* of August 18, 1963, reported the use of tear gas at Nha-Trang, 250 miles south of Saigon, against demonstrators denouncing the Diem regime, still with no echo in the American or European press. Why does the international Left rise in protest of America's use of non-lethal gas now? The answer is: To place America in the defendant's box at a conference table dominated by UN.

KENNETH YOUNG, FORMER AMBASSADOR TO THAILAND and one of the Americans responsible for America's obstinate backing of the family that drove most of Vietnam into the arms of the Reds, published an article in the Chicago Daily News in mid-March. Excerpts of it were reprinted in Newsweek of March 29, 1965. The 1955 holder of State Department's Vietnam desk, who once offered a Vietnamese the ambassadorship to Washington if he would "go along" with the team, recommended a "Mekong project," beamed at Laos, Thailand, Cambodia and Vietnam. Said he, "The countries of the Mekong basin all want a Mekong project. . . They have been effectively working together in their own 'Mekong Committee', under UN auspices. . . The United Nations General Assembly might later cap it all with enablement for a 'Mekong Valley Authority'." Here is the key to U Thant's appeal for both sides to move to the conference table: a "Mekong project," supported by America but administered by the anti-Western bloc in UN.

STANLEY KARNOW WROTE IN SATURDAY EVENING POST OF MARCH 27, 1965, "One tough ex-officer, who first parachuted into Vietnam during World War II, knew the Vietnamese leaders so intimately that one night last September he personally dissuaded a rebellious Vietnamese general from staging a private revolt. That initiative, along with other unconventional gestures, earned him a quick transfer to Africa. Said one of Taylor's deputies, 'We don't want any Lawrences of Asia.'" Translated into plain English: Washington wants no American in Southeast Asia whose finger is closer to the pulse of events than that of the top. (Africa is the place to which most of the architects of America's disastrous Southeast Asia policies have been transferred.)

HOW PASSING OF THE HOT POTATO TO UN MIGHT BE ACCOMPLISHED: In our March Report we touched on former Communist Intelligence Chief, Colonel Albert Pham ngoc Thao (rhymes with how) and his attempt to seize power in Saigon on February 19. Thao has still not been arrested. This means that someone is hiding him or that the Vietnamese government dares not haul him in. One of three forces must be hiding Thao: Powerful Americans, who undoubtedly slipped him into the country from Washington on December 27, 1964; Ngo dinh Nhu's 70,000-man secret police organization, which Thao commanded until October 31, 1963; or the communists, in whose government Thao's brother Gaston is a high official.

As long as Thao is at liberty anything can happen. One of the premises is that Thao and General Tran thien Khiem, Vietnam ambassador to Washington (Diem's godson who saved the regime at the time of the attempted coup d'etat of November 11, 1960), are in a comeback move, along with Americans responsible for Washington's 1954 to 1963 policy. Thao was the intermediary through whom Nhu had admittedly been negotiating with Hanoi before his death. There is no doubt that if Thao were in power the Viet Cong

offensive would cease, giving the impression that our side was well on top, and America could honorably pull out. Maintenance of the status quo would then be up to UN's "Mekong Valley Authority."

Thao is wily. After all, he has had experience in changing sides. Though he deserted Diem and Nhu on October 31, 1963, and spent the night on the radio, broadcasting for the rebels, he is reported to have persuaded Nhu's widow that he did it to save the "organization"--that he had no idea his chief would be assassinated. The fact remains that the minute Thao and Khiem reached Washington Madame Nhu's debts in America, amounting to between \$11,000 and \$14,000, were paid by the Washington embassy. There is also a possibility that Thao, in his attempted coup d'etat of February 19, had access to other money:

NO. 59 OF "DEMO '60", THE PUBLICATION OF FRENCH SOCIALIST LEADER GUY MOLLET, on December 8, 1960, brought up the possibility of Diem and his family someday losing power. Until the blow-up became imminent Mollet's party was a staunch supporter of Diem. Wrote DEMO's Far East authority, Georges Penchenier, "One must have a springboard for a comeback, and above all a fortune to permit continuation of the fight. Diem's treasure has been put in a safe place abroad. Nhu, no more than Diem, lives in ostentatious luxury. The money slowly amassed by the intelligent Madame Nhu will serve, in case of necessity, to regroup the faithful in exile, to buy arms and to support secret agents."

Yves Gandon wrote in the Paris daily L'Aurore, of March 18, 1958, that the Nhus had purchased the Rex moving picture chain in Paris.

The road to a sell-out at the conference table will be as tortuous as is all oriental politics. Since the end of World War II it has been impossible for a loyal American to write an honest report on America's Far East policies without fear of retaliation. Your correspondent has been writing on Indo-China since 1939, and a book by him, exposing in detail who did what, where, how and when, in America's so-called experiment in South Vietnam will appear in about two months. It will be the public's file on the file-stuffers deciding policies. For it must not be forgotten that in 1959 those responsible for America's Southeast Asia policy tried to muzzle and immobilize your reporter by blocking his passport. Victims of such actions are not permitted to see State Department files against them, or question petty officials using such files to "get" their personal enemies. Such a precaution is understandable when one considers that any absurdity can be filed against a lone citizen with impunity. He has no powerful machine to come to his aid, as do the communists. In 1959 one of the idiotic reports on your correspondent in his State Department file asserted that H. du B. had organized and was directing the opposition in South Vietnam because he hoped to become Minister of Foreign Affairs in the government that would succeed Diem.

THE BOOK "EYEWITNESS STORY", by Madame Suzanne Labin, has caused confusion in America in recent months. In its foreword Mr. Bryton Barron states that "our military ally" (the Diem government) was "demonstrably winning the war against our common enemy" at the time of Diem's assassination. Nothing could be further from the truth, as communist gains since 1960 attest. In Eye-Witness Story, among other inaccuracies showing the author's lack of any profound knowledge of the country or its people, Phan quang Dan, sentenced to ten years in Paulo Condor prison after the attempted coup d'etat of November 11, 1960, is called "Pham Wuang Dan". His ten-year prison sentence is described as "exile". That Dan appeared "vigorous" when he came out and was able to hold a press conference is advanced as proof of the Diem regime's leniency. The truth is, an invisible umbrella protected Dan. He had worked with America's OSS during World War II and organized an American-backed political party after V-J Day. For years Diem and Nhu arrested others, but not Dan, the man rumored to be an agent of CIA. To please the Americans, Diem named Dan his "legal opposition" before he took off for America in May, 1957. Dan was never permitted to campaign, however, and when elected to the National Assembly he was forcibly thrown

out. Until complicity with the rebels in November, 1960, made American protection of him embarrassing, Diem never dared arrest him. Even then Dan's "special treatment" was assured.

Eye-Witness Story is more a book of name-dropping than testimony. Defense of Diem and his brother consists mainly of accounts made by the two men to the author, whose photograph, taken with the Vietnamese president, is in turn her claim to importance. Such statements as "President Diem commented. . ." and "The opening gambit of the grim game. . . was fully disclosed to me by the late Councillor Nhu and President Diem," abound. Far be it from your correspondent to speak a good word for Cabot Lodge or our Saigon embassy, but let us be realistic: If Cyrus Eaton were to whitewash Russia on the basis of conversations and close friendship with Khrushchev, whose apologist he was, and present a picture of himself sitting with Khrushchev to prove that he is an authority, what conservative would take him seriously?

In fact, who but a friend of American labor bosses, the woman whose 1960 lecture tour in France, on returning from America, was sponsored by the French socialist labor union, FORCE OUVRIERE, would have been commissioned by our State Department to write a treatise on Soviet propaganda? The account of that visit to America filled two issues of France-USA, the far from conservative journal jointly supported by labor unions and the American embassy in Paris and published by a man addressed as "the delegate Makinsky". Who else could attack the American government as Suzanne Labin does in her 98-page booklet and still, as an alien, sail in and out of America as easily as a native?

* * * * *

Address all domestic business correspondence to H. du B. Reports, Box 855, Huntington, Indiana. Address all foreign business correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, Hotel Lutetia, 43 Blvd. Raspail, Paris VI, France.

* * * * *

Subscription price: \$10 per year. Extra copies of this newsletter: 20¢ each to regular subscribers; rates on large quantities given on request.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Jennie Edmonds, Managing Editor

MANY THINGS TOOK PLACE IN APRIL OF 1965. Above ground was President Johnson's famous speech of April 7, in which he offered a billion dollars in tribute, which Ho chi Minh would share with the other nations of the "Mekong basin" if Ho would quit fighting. Down in Santo Domingo Castro-inspired rebels touched off a revolution on the assurance that Washington lawyer Abe Fortas, the long-time Johnson friend who succeeded in keeping the Walter Jenkins scandal out of Washington papers until the Republicans heard about it, would block American action while extreme-Left former President Juan Bosch was restored to power. When the plan failed, Bosch's supporters threw off their masks, whereupon Abe Fortas' associate in the venture, a Puerto Rican professor named Jaime Benitez said, "Now, see, the communists are coming into it!" At least, that is the only interpretation one could give to the New York Times' explanation of the affair on May 6.

Underground the pivotal event of international importance was a three-day meeting of Prince Bernhard's Bilderberg group in palatial Villa d'Este in Como, Italy, from April 2 to 4. Hardly anyone heard of this meeting; a brief Reuters' dispatch appeared in the New York Times of April 5, and mention was made of the meeting in the New York Daily News, but America's great press and news agencies in general remained silent.

TO UNDERSTAND THE REAL MEANING OF THIS FOURTEENTH BILDERBERG MEETING, let us go back to the fall of 1964 and study a poll which John J. McCloy, Chairman of the Board of the Council on Foreign Relations, had commissioned the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan to conduct. Such polls have become classic procedure in America: Canvassers ask what purports to be a cross-section of the public a series of often-loaded questions. The answers, accompanied by appropriate publicity, are held up as proof of approval, in other words, a mandate. Implementation of the policy under discussion (already decided upon by the group commanding the survey) follows.

Time Magazine of December 25, 1964, stated that 1,501 people had been questioned in the Council on Foreign Relations Survey. In reply to "What kind of government does most of China have now?" or "Do you happen to know if there is any Communist government in China now?", 28% were reported by the University of Michigan team as saying that they did not know. Next, 39% stated that they did not know of the existence of the Nationalist Chinese government. Of those aware of the two Chinas, 62% opposed U. S. support of the Nationalists if they were to attack the mainland. 75% were in favor of the U. S. remaining in UN when and if Communist China is admitted. Only 5% favored U. S. withdrawal. Concerning the fighting in Vietnam, 25% claimed to have heard nothing about it.

How the 1,501 people questioned in this survey were selected the public has no way of knowing. Suffice to say, the objective of the Council on Foreign Relations is clear: Repudiation of Nationalist China, recognition of Red China and Peking's admission to the UN, and a walk off the field in South Vietnam, since a quarter of America, according to Mr. McCloy's convenient survey, does not know there is a war going on in the first place.

A LAPSE OF THREE MONTHS FOLLOWED ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE SURVEY'S FINDINGS -- three months in which the majority figures and Mr. McCloy's comments were channeled into government offices in Washington, the Royal Institute of Foreign Affairs in London, Holland's Institute of Foreign Affairs in The Hague, Austria's Institute of Foreign Affairs and other foreign affiliates of the Council on Foreign Relations too numerous to mention. Obviously synchronization for some sort of international drive was afoot.

Under other fronts, such as the Common Market, a solidarity campaign was stepped up. In early March thirty-eight Dutch personalities, including former Prime Ministers William Drees and Jan de Quay, addressed an open letter to Foreign Minister (and Bilderberg member) Joseph Luns, criticizing General de Gaulle's attempt to organize Western Europe's defense and foreign policy under himself -- in other words, to contest the right of the supra-national Common Market government in Brussels to handle such matters. Paris' policy, which the thirty-eight letter-writers deplored, was essentially de Gaulle opposition to super-statism as a threat to himself, and a letter to Joseph Luns was not going to change it.

What the prominent Dutchmen charged, on the eve of the Como meeting, was that France was weakening the lines uniting Western Europe with her Anglo-Saxon partners. "Such a policy," they stated, "leads to a rebirth of nationalism (the patriotism decried by Walt Rostow), and seriously undermines the defense of Europe. We have always struggled that the process of integration should not be limited to the Six but should include Great Britain (and U. S., understood) and the other countries of Europe." (Parenthetical observations ours.)

Nothing was said of the area in which French co-operation with Holland was complete. Aux Ecoutés, the Paris diplomatic weekly, reported that France was buying Cuban sugar while extending credits for purchases made by the Cuban economics mission in Paris, and that Castro was depositing his personal fortune in Holland.

A short time after the solidarity letter to Mr. Luns, Bilderberg members on both sides of the Atlantic began packing their bags for the hush-hush meeting in Como.

LITTLE INFORMATION OF WHAT TRANSPIRED WAS PERMITTED TO REACH THE OUTSIDE WORLD. Mr. John J. McCloy, formerly head of Chase Manhattan Bank and currently board chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, is on the steering committee of the Bilderberg group. Among the Americans known to have attended the Como meeting was David Rockefeller, currently president of Chase Manhattan Bank. At the end of the meeting, whose participants were described as "political and economic figures... exploring ways to achieve world peace", a communique was issued stating that they believed that only a united Europe could join the United States in effective direction of the Atlantic alliance.

So let us sum it up: Eighty-some politicians and financiers from America and Western Europe met in secret for three days to discuss "ways to achieve world peace", which is to say, their way of settling America's war in South Vietnam. Another goal of the participants was "a united Europe" for the purpose of being able to "join the United States in effective direction of the NATO alliance". Translated into realistic English, this means, "The Bilderberg members agreed that by uniting they can appropriate unto themselves enough 'effective direction' of NATO to make the Atlantic alliance an instrument for the implementation of their policies instead of someone else's." With the two admitted reasons for the Como gathering in mind, the 1964 survey made for Mr. McCloy by University of Michigan and the use to which the findings of said survey were put at Villa d'Este become clear. As quietly as they came, the internationalists separated.

THREE DAYS ELAPSED, THEN, ON APRIL 7, PRESIDENT JOHNSON WENT ON THE AIR. In substance the President said that, if the North Vietnamese would quit fighting, America would spend a billion dollars on a Marshall Plan for Southeast Asia. Max Frankel explained the proposal in the New York Times of April 8 as emanating from the President's "personal desire to yield to and appeal to opinion abroad, to convey hope for peace in Asia and to erase the impression that the President and his country were heartless, stubborn and unreasonable where peace was at stake." Another wish, according to Mr. Frankel, was "to suggest that Hanoi could profit from a settlement." The opinion abroad to which Johnson wished to appeal and to yield was already being mobilized by Prince Bernhard's Bilderbergers.

There were other interpretations of the President's offer besides Mr. Frankel's. No matter how the American press and the Bilderberg world's "political and economic leaders", apprised of what was coming long in advance, might gild such an offer and whip up expressions of approval and support for it, to the Orient only one interpretation was possible: President Johnson was offering a billion dollars in tribute if Ho chi Minh would quit fighting. The natural reaction of the Oriental when made such a proposition is to spit. And that is what he did in North Korea, Hanoi and Jakarta. To America's enemies the proffering of such a carrot was admission of defeat, evidence that victory was in the bag; consequently, Hanoi would lose, not profit, by being bought off. Psychologically the offer nullified our bombings.

AS OF THAT MOMENT THE SITUATION WAS AS FOLLOWS: American patriots, and realists abroad, had grounds for believing what they hoped was true: namely, that since American planes were bombing communist bases in the North, President Johnson meant

business. Big financiers of the Bilderberg group, American and European, who had made a clean-up through the Marshall Plan in Europe, believed that in return for their support Johnson would permit them to repeat the big boondoggle in Southeast Asia.

TO THE INTERNATIONAL LEFT, encouraging anti-war-in-Vietnam demonstrations in front of the White House, the President's offer to negotiate unconditionally was an invitation to strike while the iron was hot, to obtain American withdrawal and the billion dollars in tribute as well. (American socialist Norman Thomas was a member of Ho Chi Minh's lobby, "American-Vietnam Friendship Association", in 1947; Ngo Dinh Diem's lobby, "American Friends of Vietnam", in 1956; and a backer of students demonstrating for a Vietnam sell-out in April, 1965.

Said Adlai Stevenson, "A search for the consensus and a will to compromise should guide our policies." John J. McCloy, through University of Michigan's polling of 1,501 people, had already sought and found the "consensus". The will to compromise appeared on April 7.

Bilderberg member Senator Fulbright left no doubt where he stood. "The United States should cease the bombing of North Vietnam in order to expedite peace talks," said Senator Fulbright, the exponent of negotiation from weakness, i. e., surrender. Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs Paul-Henri Spaak, the international socialist to whom for a decade the West looked for protection when he was civilian head of NATO, was also in Fulbright's corner. But then, even before he served as middle-man for America's unprofitable nuclear test ban treaty with Russia (H. du B. Reports, Sept., 1963), former NATO-head Spaak had always been an advocate of surrender.

A story common in Europe has it that Spaak not only did not try to extradite Belgian collaborator Leon Degrelle from Spain after World War II but banned his return to Belgium because of the file on Spaak which Degrelle would bring with him: In 1940, so the account goes, when German troops invaded Belgium King Leopold refused to deal with the occupation forces. Messrs. Spaak and Pierlot, both in the government at the time, contacted the Germans for the purpose of discussing a separate peace. When the French lines collapsed, an armistice with Germany was signed by the king, an armistice which Spaak used as a pretext for ousting King Leopold in 1951. Degrelle, sitting in Madrid and watching Spaak pose as the West's warrior at the head of NATO, held up his sleeve the dossier on Spaak's and Pierlot's surrender effort, which the Germans gave Degrelle as blackmail ammunition to protect himself before they pulled out of Belgium. Spaak, like Senator Fulbright, would support President Johnson's offer of tribute in return for "unconditional negotiation".

Such was the climate in which President Johnson delivered his April 7 speech, the terms of which were no doubt known to Prince Bernhard and his closed circle of international political and financial figures long enough in advance to convoke a meeting in which their follow-up could be meticulously prepared.

THREE DAYS LATER, ON APRIL 10, Prince Bernhard appeared in Michigan. Whether the trip was to confer with American labor leaders usually represented at Bilderberg conferences, or solely for the "deeper understanding among human beings" speech he made at Hope College in Holland, Michigan, is still unknown. A desire to be out of the Netherlands while a new government was being formed to replace the cabinet of Prime Minister Victor G. M. Marijnen may have had something to do with it. In this new government Bilderberg member Joseph M. A. H. Luns retained his post as Minister of Foreign Affairs. Mr. Joseph M. L. T. Cals, of the Roman Catholic People's Party, replaced Mr. Marijnen. As finally constituted, five seats in the new government went to the Roman Catholic People's Party, five to the socialists and three to the Calvinists. Such details may seem unimportant to Americans still thinking of Holland as a small country, unimportant and far away. Such thinking fails to consider the power, out of all proportion to Holland's size, exercised through interlocking organizations whose whirring national machines sell policies formulated by an inner circle working behind the snob-appeal facade of Holland's Prince Consort.

NOT UNTIL A NEW YORK TIMES DISPATCH OUT OF TOKYO ON APRIL 16 announced that protesting "student demonstrations" were under way did Americans get an inkling that Walt Whitman Rostow, Chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Council, had been dispatched to address The Japanese Council for International Friendship, which is described as "an organization of political and business leaders interested in world affairs." In other words, the Japanese equivalent of America's Council on Foreign Relations, Britain's Royal Institute of Foreign Affairs, etc.

Only Mr. Rostow's university appearance in Japan was cancelled. The names of the "number of private groups" he "briefed" were not divulged. Since Mr. Rostow, who was appointed by presidents sworn to defend the constitutional integrity of America, proclaims his dedication to the principle that the day of nations and nationality is past, he presumably bore the message promulgated by the super-staters in Villa d'Este on April 2, 3 and 4, and not necessarily a speech in America's interest.

While Mr. Rostow made his sales talk in Tokyo, it was announced on April 13 that Henry Cabot Lodge, former head of The Atlantic Institute, would speak for President Johnson in Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Taiwan, Japan, Korea and India.

Taken all in all, the developments of the first two weeks in April boded ill for America and the world. Announcement on April 17 that garment workers' boss Dave Dubinsky would receive the "Golden Door Award" for 1965 as the "American of foreign birth who had made a significant contribution to the culture of the U. S." was more of the same. What culture?

ABOVE ARE THE BARE DETAILS, THE VISIBLE PART OF THE ICEBERG. But what to do about them? Apprehensive citizens wondered how they could dismantle these international organizations, the self-elected members of which meet in secret. Taken together, with all their minor organizations, they are powerful enough to by-pass Congress and parliaments and turn governments into agencies for the implementation of projects ranging from one-worldism to treasury-looting. To start at this late date and create a machine or press powerful enough to outweigh such a combine is out of the question.

It was the thirteenth gathering of the Bilderbergers, in Williamsburg, Virginia, from March 20 to 22, 1964, that brought Prince Bernhard's group to the attention of enough Europeans to make the question pertinent. Until then only a few initiates were aware that since May, 1954, an invisible super-state government had taken root, grown, and assumed sufficient importance to make the western world a testing ground for the revolutionary ideas of a small but powerful clique. Certain publications in Canada had focused attention on Prince Bernhard's congresses as early as 1957. In Britain only Candour, published in London by the League of Empire Loyalists, showed interest in Bilderberger deliberations. One Dutch editor, Mr. H. A. Lunshof, of Elseviers Weekblad, Amsterdam, had the temerity to bring the Bilderberg group's discussions of Dutch affairs and ours to the attention of Dutchmen.

Even after the Bilderbergers intruded into French politics in March, 1964, in Williamsburg, Virginia, by according world leader status to Gaston Defferre, the socialist mayor of Marseilles, then launching his candidacy for the 1965 presidential campaign in France, the vast majority of politically-conscious Frenchmen knew nothing of the group's existence. The Bilderbergers, on the other hand, saw that their respective countries knew nothing of the conservative candidate whom de Gaulle, Defferre and the internationalists were out to beat, the noted lawyer, Jean-Louis Tixier-Vignancourt.

That America has been kept in the dark could not be because the press is excluded from Bilderberg sessions, since Charles D. Jackson, senior vice president of TIME, Inc., is himself a member and was present at the Williamsburg parley. Others there were David Rockefeller, Senator Fulbright, Max Kohnstamm, Vice President of the Action Committee for the United States of Europe; Shepherd Stone, director of the International Affairs program of Ford Foundation, McGeorge Bundy; John J. McCloy; Joseph E. Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Senator Javits, etc.

LET US TRACE THE GROWTH OF THE BILDERBERGER ORGANIZATION. Over 210 members are regarded as "on the inside". Among them figure men prominent at the Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks Conferences, the men who produced United Nations,

the World Bank, and Bank of International Settlements. Bilderberg interference in the internal affairs of western nations was stepped up through treasonable support of revolts within the colonies of countries of the very men present. Eventually we find in the group such men as Irving Brown, American labor's delegate to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) in Belgium, and Omar Becu, the ICFTU head himself, the two of them engaged in underwriting a terrorist movement all over Africa and particularly one in Algeria which was destined to create Europe's Cuba. (H. du B. Reports, Sept., 1963)

The fourteen Bilderberg meetings to date have been:

1. Oosterbeek, The Netherlands, May 29-31, 1954
2. Barbizon, France, March 18-20, 1955
3. Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany, September 23-25, 1955
4. Fredensborg, Denmark, May 11-13, 1956
5. St. Simon's Island, Georgia, United States, February 15-17, 1957
6. Fiuggi, Italy, October 4-6, 1957
7. Buxton, United Kingdom, September 13-15, 1958
8. Yesilkoy, Turkey, September 18-20, 1959
9. Burgenstock, Switzerland, May 28-29, 1960
10. St. Castin, Canada, April 21-23, 1961
11. Saltsjobaden, Sweden, May 18-20, 1962
12. Cannes, France, March 29-31, 1963
13. Williamsburg, Virginia, United States, March 20-22, 1964
14. Como, Italy, April 2-4, 1965

After meeting No. 12 in Cannes, March 29-31, 1963, the "European Institutes of International Affairs" gathered in Klessheim Castle, near Salzburg, Austria, to discuss "public opinion and diplomacy," i. e., how to impose policies by molding public opinion. Representing Britain was Kenneth Younger, Director of the Royal Institute of Foreign Affairs, Chatham House, 10 St. James Square, London, S. W. 1. Speaking for America was Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. In January, 1964, the European institutes met in The Hague, under Bilderberger Joseph Luns, Holland's Foreign Minister and member of the Common Market triumvirate. This time the authority on America was CBS European chief, David Schoenbrunn, whose efforts to apply the Hitler image to Senator Goldwater were by no stretch of the imagination honest reporting.

In the Royal Institute of Foreign Affairs meeting of October 4, 1960, sponsored by Kenneth Younger, the American invited to tell the combined European institutes about Latin America was none other than Mr. Herbert Matthews, Castro's guarantor from the New York Times.

THE BILDERBERGER PARLEY IN COMO BROUGHT UP AN OLD QUESTION: What can the non-socialist citizen do? Where could successful dismantling of the pyramid of institutes and councils start? It is conceded that no amount of digging would undermine the interlocking institutes and councils advancing internationalist policies by excluding any opposition. Taken individually, such organs as the Council on Foreign Relations, Europe's chain of foreign affairs institutes and western labor syndicates masking political regimentation appear harmless to a public essentially lazy. Any attempt to show them in their ensemble is attacked by our Javits and Kuchels as "fright-peddling". The men fronting for these organizations are too powerful, their names too eminently respectable. Out of long discussions on both sides of the Atlantic came a basic unity of view: The most vulnerable part of the pyramid is its peak: the Bilderbergers.

UN is the world framework within which socialists and communists form a solid front. The Bilderberg "parliament" is western, i. e., socialist alone. And the Achilles heel of the Bilderbergers is the socially impeccable figure at the top.

PRINCE BERNHARD OF LIPPE-BIESTERFELD married Princess Juliana of Holland on January 7, 1937. The Dutch monarchy into which the German princeling married is a contractual one: What the royal family can and cannot do is clearly defined under

its contract with the Dutch people. By the Dutch constitution no member of the royal family, even a member by marriage, is permitted to meddle in politics. It was this clause which created a minor crisis in April of 1964, when Princess Irene of Holland married Prince Hugo of Bourbon-Parma, the Carlist pretender to the Spanish throne. One month later came the Williamsburg meeting where Holland's affairs as well as America's were discussed, and policies formulated, by men who had no approval from anyone but their own committee. The Williamsburg parley, coming as it did a month after Dutch Prime Minister Marijnen's rebuke to Princess Irene, brought a ray of hope to thousands who disapproved of such meetings but did not know what to do about them.

Letters poured into the office of the Dutch Prime Minister in The Hague, begging that the same stern measures applied to the princess and her husband be extended to her father. Not a single American writer received a reply. Instead, a year later, another meeting was convoked to "explore ways to achieve world peace." A more honest way of defining the April 2-4, 1965, meeting's aims would be: To regiment and synchronize international pressure on America for ground yielding in Vietnam, at the behest of self-appointed internationalists headed by a prince consort under contract to stay out of both his country's politics and ours.

WHETHER THE REPLACEMENT OF PREMIER MARIJNEN BY PREMIER CALS would increase the efficacy of a protesting letter campaign is doubtful. Those who have studied Bilderberg machinations, however, agree that if a thousand letters from irate Americans were to pour into the Dutch embassy in Washington, and if carbon copies of such letters were to be sent to Mr. H. A. Lunshof, Editor, ELSEVIERS WEEKBLAD, Spuistraat 110, Amsterdam, Holland, they would not only receive attention but would probably make the April 2, 1965, Bilderberg Conference the last one. And if 500 more letters were to arrive in the offices of Dutch Shell, Limited, Phillips Electric Company (the American firm of which is NORELCO) and KLM Airlines in Amsterdam, saying, "See that your Prince Consort ceases intriguing with our left-wing politicians and economists or we'll boycott," it would speed up the dismantling of the John J. McCloy-David Rockefeller-Prince Bernhard ring.

(Prince Bernhard's address, for those who are interested, is: Soestdijk Palace, Amsterdam. Telephone No.: Baarn 28-41)

For further details on the Bilderbergers, see H. du B. Report, September, 1963.

* * * * *

Address all domestic business correspondence to H. du B. Reports, Box 855, Huntington, Indiana. Address all foreign business correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, Hotel Lutetia, 43 Blvd. Raspail, Paris VI, France.

* * * * *

Subscription price: \$10 per year. Extra copies of this newsletter 20¢ each to regular subscribers; rates on large quantities given on request.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Jennie Edmonds, Managing Editor

OUR REPORT OF MAY, 1965, was devoted to the 14th meeting of the Bilderberg group in Como, Italy, behind the impeccable royal front provided by the Dutch prince-consort. At the time that report was written we did not know that from his appearance in Holland, Michigan, Prince Bernhard was to proceed to Washington, where he would spend three hours in the office of President Johnson. Three hours is a long time for a man as busy as President Johnson, at least for a social visit, which is the only kind Prince Bernhard, by the terms of his country's constitution, is supposed to make. What transpired during this long conversation, as closed to the American public as are Bilderberg meetings themselves, we can only conjecture. President Johnson was giving the appearance of acting resolutely in Vietnam and Santo Domingo, but strange things were going on.

While the Chief Executive was proceeding with all the declarations and surface appearances of determination, popular demonstrations against everything he was doing were not only tolerated but encouraged, as though that seemingly forceful leader himself were searching for an out for which the "consensus" rather than himself would be responsible. In all the power shifts and exilings in South Vietnam since November, 1963, a trend was plainly discernible: A government, acceptable to Ho Chi Minh, capable of bringing a lull which would make American withdrawal, at the request of a neutralist government, more palatable to American patriots.

Given the anti-war-in-Vietnam sentiments of the artists and writers President Johnson and his team were likely to invite to the White House, and given the fact that anything said artists and writers might say on receiving the invitation or after reaching the White House would be front-page news, a suspicion prevails: The administration is providing a forum for opponents of the policy that common sense and patriotism dictate for the nation. So much for the climate that prevailed when Holland's prince-consort, leader of the group whose leanings are closer to Ho Chi Minh than they are to Chiang Kai-shek, was given three hours to expound the views of his self-appointed "world leaders".

WHILE ATTENTION WAS DRAWN TO THE VIETNAM STRUGGLE AND SANTO DOMINGO, strange things were going on in Europe. We have pointed out that Mr. Gaston Defferre, the socialist mayor of Marseilles, first made his appearance on the international scene as a Bilderberg invitee, in Williamsburg, Virginia, on March 20, 1964. Walter Winchell, in his column, stated that CIA was backing Defferre in France. While Defferre fought like a lion to form a union of communists, socialists and even middle of the road Catholics to support his candidacy for the presidency of France this fall, Mr. Jean-Louis Tixier-Vignancourt, the great lawyer who saved General Salan from execution, emerged as the candidate of the French Right. His chances were estimated by many as comparable to Goldwater's in America. Conservative Catholics and those irate over developments in Algeria would support him. Defferre would have all shades of socialists, the labor unions, quite likely the communists, and the support if not actual votes of nearly a million Algerians, three hundred thousand of them thought to be armed, lying dormant as a future fifth column in France. De Gaulle would have his powerful machine, his press, radio, television, and the banking interests sometimes referred to as the Paris Club.

CONJECTURE IS RIFE AS TO WHAT DE GAULLE IS LIKELY TO DO. Few Frenchmen see him descending into the street for a political campaign, his picture on billboards along with the posters of Gaston Defferre and Tixier-Vignancourt. An alternative would be a referendum, a greatly publicized appeal to the nation, such as "Are you in favor of a greater and more prosperous Gaullist France?" Another alternative would be de Gaulle's retirement from the arena and introduction of a new and hitherto unconsidered third man, to all appearances anti-de Gaulle, through whom the present team would continue to rule the country.

The word to our readers is: Watch Monsieur Edgar Pinay. The wheels are already turning to make him the "third man". John J. McCloy, Chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, is one of the directors of the Bilderbergs, as we have pointed out. Both he and David Rockefeller, who succeeded Mr. McCloy as chairman of the board of Chase Manhattan Bank, attended the March 1964 Bilderberg deliberations which turned the spotlight on Gaston Defferre. So did Edgar Pinay. The same four were present at Como in April 1965. The Defferre smokescreen was still maintained, but Edgar Pinay, "the man who saved the franc", the statesman-economist who looks like the common man, is the candidate in the wings

whom the internationalist bankers are about to push onto the stage. Meanwhile, former Prime Minister Edgar Faure, architect of the French accords with Red China, is in America on a lecture tour.

NOW LET US TURN BACK TO AMERICA FOR A LOOK AT A PATTERN OF DEVELOPMENTS THAT HAS BECOME FAMILIAR. For months, and with the knowledge and encouragement of America's Left, agitators all over Europe, particularly among the so-called intellectuals -- writers and painters and students of the same mental age, politically -- have been protesting American policy in Vietnam. Magnified out of all proportion to their importance, such demonstrations are dutifully given newspaper space in America as expressions of foreign opinion. American leftists and the world communist press then take to the streets and meeting halls to call on Washington not to isolate America by ignoring the appeals of the rest of the world.

LONG OVERDUE is a report on the deadly efficiency of Atlantic Community (American and European) teamwork with the communist bloc. Far removed as its motivators seem to be from the world of Prince Bernhard and bankers McCloy and Rockefeller, their aims coincide. Machinery is being set up, not only to give this co-operation of the international Left the appearance of a mighty tide -- the "trend of history" of which we hear so much -- but also to make any opposition to it impossible.

PARIS, BEING THE SOLAR PLEXUS OF WESTERN DEFENSES, IS THE HUB, AS USUAL. Until 1964 the some 35,000 Americans residing in Paris discreetly refrained from airing American differences in the host country. The negro march on the capitol in Washington brought the first indication of change. Headed by the wife of the pastor of the American Church in Paris, a motley crew took to the streets: Blue-jean-clad beatniks, boys with unkempt beards and girls with uncombed hair, joined America's negro colony in Paris, mainly musicians from Montmartre dives whose names make the papers each time French police arrest a dope-pusher with his list of customers. To the American Embassy they marched, to present a petition. That neither the embassy nor the State Department had anything to do with civil rights was immaterial. The dregs of the American colony in Paris, led by the pastor's wife, was determined to air America's dirty linen abroad, and across Place de la Concorde they aired it.

A WORD ON THE NEW BREED OF AMERICAN ABROAD. The period between the two wars saw a crop of young Americans, often hard-drinking but generally likable, on the cafe terraces of Montparnasse. Less conspicuous were the wealthy Americans who maintained the American Cathedral and the American Church and made Paris their home. Tourists were sometimes fatuous, often ostentatious, rarely a disgrace to America.

The post-World War II era brought a new kind of invasion, the American who made bad manners, personal filth and the extolling of policies described by him as "progressive" a national trait. With him came the myth of "America's unofficial ambassadors abroad". Roscoe Drummond, in the New York Herald Tribune of May 12, 1957, carried the absurd theme so far as to suggest that President Eisenhower provide every one of them with an "informal appointment" paper as his "private ambassador".

The American Council for Nationalities Services, of 20 West 40th Street, New York, distributed little booklets by the thousands, telling crusading liberals what to say when, as Americans, they were accused of stirring up native peoples in the colonies of our allies. The claim that Americans never agitated anti-colonialist revolts, only supported them after they started, was ridiculous. However, there was little chance that the coatless and tie-less tourist in blue jeans, using the American Express for a mail address and its wash-room for his morning shave, would meet any Europeans of a class and political hue likely to disapprove of Franklin D. Roosevelt's secret deal with Stalin at Teheran to strip our allies of their possessions and markets.

As ambassadors, our labor union meddlers in foreign affairs and high-riding celebrities were no better. Paris-Presse of July 8, 1962, told its readers that Frankie Sinatra had at last sent a check to pay for the repairing of a Louis XV sofa he had smashed in a hotel in Monte Carlo, in a fit of rage because the concierge had not been sufficiently impressed by his importance. Two years later, on July 10, 1964, the same paper reminded Frankie that Paris is not Chicago. He and his "gorillas" had spent the previous evening throwing firecrackers under ladies' skirts on cafe terraces and telling them to shut up when they

screamed. Photographers attempting to take pictures of the performance had their cameras smashed. On September 19, 1964, Frankie was barring his door to the police, in Spain, after the same "body guards" mauled a Spanish journalist.

Zsa-Zsa Gabor provided the feature story in the Nice-Matin of August 9, 1964. Arriving in Nice from London, on an Air France plane with a tourist class ticket, she insisted that the rest of the passengers be held in their seats while she went out through the first class door to face the photographers. Mrs. Hanna Markow, daughter of Britain's Lord Marks, was not having any of it. In the exchange of insults which followed, Zsa-Zsa ended by calling the English woman a dirty Jew.

The official Paris police bulletin, "Liaisons", reported on September 13, 1964, that 76 of the filthy vagrants living along the quays of the Seine, wearing sandals and hair that hung to their shoulders, sleeping in sacks and existing by begging, were Americans. Imagine one of these tramps holding up to a French gendarme a paper from the President of the United States naming him an unofficial ambassador!

Long before the deliberate mud-slinging of the 1964 election, for which David Schoenbrun apologized to Goldwater after it was over, but never to the Americans and Europeans he lied to, America's image had become a distasteful caricature at the hands of Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles, Christian Herter and Dean Rusk. 1964 was to see its blackening by our "unofficial ambassadors" themselves, and even our official ones, who threw non-partisanship to the winds and entered into the name-calling.

THE FIRST ATTEMPT TO REGIMENT AMERICAN EXPATRIATES, whether business men, students, military personnel, employees of America's countless government agencies or admittedly anti-social tramps, came with the Johnson political campaign, directed in France by Alfred E. Davidson, member of the law firm of George Ball, Fowler Hamilton and three other members of the Kennedy-Johnson government. Social barriers ceased to exist. All that counted was the vote. At the height of the Walter Jenkins scandal, with the Bobby Baker story and Billie Sol Estes splashed over front pages, the Reverend Martin Sargent, pastor of the American Church in Paris, (a graduate of Union Theological Seminary and an adherent of the National Council of Churches) called on his flock to vote for Johnson. It was estimated that between 80 and 95% of the Americans in Paris were fanatically anti-Goldwater, a euphemism for left-wing. This is a point to be borne in mind in any appraisal of Franco-American relations.

Out of the campaign, in which Kirk Douglas stumped Europe as President Johnson's "new volunteer ambassador" (Paris-Presse, Nov. 6, 1964) came the idea of permanent regimentation of Americans abroad. An American liberal "bund", co-operating with European "progressistes", each using the other's pre-arranged clamor as an argument for imposing policies desired by both, emerged overnight. Such activities by internationalist reasoning are non-partisan.

LARA -- "LEAGUE OF AMERICANS RESIDING ABROAD" -- is the name given the new foundation. A few details: Among the advisors are Cabot Lodge, George V. Allen, Robert D. Murphy and our former minister to UN, Henry S. Villard. The objectives of LARA may seem innocuous on the surface. Under scrutiny the pitfalls become apparent. "To speak for all members with one voice in Washington. To exchange information and arrange for discussion of common problems. To promote educational programs of international benefit. To provide members with legal, tax, group insurance, absentee ballot and other needed services" are the aims listed. Americans abroad, however, are divided into two categories, and the aggressive ones, those who would take over any organization pieced together, are at the far left and of the political spectrum, with Cabot Lodge, of Atlantic Institute, the new organization's advisor.

"The most effective goodwill ambassador for the United States is the well-informed citizen living abroad", states the LARA prospectus. A well-indoctrinated citizen, adding his voice to the support of measures which American liberals say will make us loved by the type of foreign citizen who writes "Americans go home" on the walls, would be closer to the truth. The men who set up "Americans Abroad for Johnson" and SNCC (Students' Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee), in co-operation with the American Church in Paris, the Artists' and Students' Center, the U. S. Information Service and its director with his films and his scholarships to like-minded foreign students and paid visits to America for

liberal writers and professors -- all of these must be taken into consideration. Carl T. Rowan's use of USIA to send James Baldwin and the Los Angeles sex criminal, Bayard Rustin, to lecture abroad in U. S. Information Agency centers only exported American-type anti-white racism to Europe.

LARA proposes to work on the international, regional, national and local level. It appeals to "aware Americans". Aware of what? -- of what is really going on, or what they are told that the so-called "extremists" who oppose it are doing? "Action groups", co-operating "with other American associations and clubs", are to carry on local activity. The spectre raises its head of powerful interlocking organizations, pumping directives and funds into Cabot Lodge's Atlantic Institute, Irving Brown's international labor union centers (such as FRANCE-USA, in Paris), extending America's internal civil rights squabble, and alternately regimenting and reporting on Americans abroad.

LARA Headquarters are at 910 Seventeenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. Though the European office is at 348 Rue St. Honore, Paris, the vast flood of mailing matter posted to American residents abroad, their addressograph plates presumably furnished by USIS, is mailed in Zurich. Aside from American nationals, "non-Americans interested in the objectives of the organization" are eligible as associate members. "Local bi-national meetings, with appropriate lectures, films and discussions" (emphasis ours) will be offered as part of the educational aspect of the foundation. It is not difficult to imagine the type of non-American who will be attracted to Cabot Lodge-advised LARA.

SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH THE SETTING UP OF "LARA" CAME THE SURFACING OF "SNCC" in Paris, accompanied by the organization for "Paris American Racial Integration Support". Except as a provider of propaganda ammunition for the international Left, neither serves a useful purpose. The adopted slogan is "Civil Rights is your fight, too". Out of the U. S. Artists' and Students' Center at 261 Blvd. Raspail poured appeals for volunteers willing to do "secretarial work, publicity, fund-raising or other". Pictures of negroes living in squalor, accompanied by assurances that donations are tax-exempt, flowed to those on LARA's magically-acquired addressograph plates. USIA's Kennedy film was extolled by the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune of June 11 as "all the more admirable for showing scenes that frankly depict the poverty of the American negro and the need to redress his wrongs".

All this crying of American culpability abroad will only substantiate everything European communist parties have told their members. It leaves those who would defend us without a leg to stand on. They will be out-shouted by the union of America's LARA with their own liberal organizations of "non-Americans interested in the (same) objectives". Any improvement of Franco-American understanding that will result will take the form of an international alliance against national conservatives.

USING SNCC AND LITERATURE ON PARIS-AMERICAN SUPPORT FOR INTEGRATION as unsolicited admissions of American guilt, the letter-writing section of the "Union of Communist Students in France" (3 Place Paul-Painlevé, Paris 5) swung into action, fronting for the Viet Cong center at 2 Rue Monge. "Today the Yankee assassins, those who are shooting down the blacks in the United States, are launching a war in Vietnam as they did in Korea", proclaimed the "U. S. ASSASSINS!" handbills. "In attacking the socialist Democratic Republic of North Vietnam it is the entire socialist camp that they (the Americans) are attacking!" Reports of the Washington "teach-in", Professor Hans Morgenthau's latest pronouncements, and American student demonstrations against the war in Vietnam were eagerly seized as proof of hands-across-the-Atlantic solidarity. There was no organization to raise its voice and tell the world that the anti-American storm, within America and without, was Communist tele-commanded.

H. DU B. REPORTS OF OCTOBER, 1962, reproduced in its entirety the directive sent out by the International Students' Union, in Prague, on the occasion of the meeting of the 18-nation disarmament conference in Geneva, on March 14, 1962. The sabotaging of all American initiative was in that case also "everyone's fight", in the cause of world peace. Students were ordered to publish declarations, organize meetings, demonstrate outside U. S. embassies abroad, write letters to the disarmament committee in Geneva and to the UN Secretary-General, send representatives of national and local students' unions to the embassies of all countries on the committee. Above all, those participating in the mass

pressure against America were reminded of the importance of keeping the Prague bureau informed "as soon as such activity is organized". Said the Prague secretariat, "We need this information in order to give adequate publicity to our common campaign in the publications of the Union of International Students."

This time America's "Intellectual Left", by the thousands, from Hans Morgenthau at the professorial peak to Bettina Aptheker on the student level, is more open than ever before in its obedience to Prague. That Mr. Morgenthau will remain American and a professor, while our boys die in Vietnam, is an indication to foreign patriots of our unreliability as a bulwark.

THE UNORGANIZED EUROPEAN, who has no press or international organization to pose his questions for him and track down the answers, is worried. Before World War II, when the groundwork was being laid for the fifth columns and dormant agents that sprang to life at the time of the Hitler-Stalin Pact and the German break-through, a great deal was heard about "second-hand citizens" -- naturalized nationals using money, votes and powerful organizations in support of men and policies undermining the nation. Now experience-educated Europeans read of new laws removing immigration barriers in America, permitting immigrants to acquire a new umbrella of nationality and then, as bona fide Americans, with all the currency and other privileges American nationality entails, go forth and live and agitate where they will.

While Russian propaganda warns Europeans not to think that American protection can save them and boasts of sleeping cells in every major American plant, American papers gushed over a new law that will prohibit an American employer, be he a manufacturer of guided missiles or nuclear submarines, from asking a job applicant where he was born. And on June 8, when papers reported the jeering telephone calls received by Mrs. Eleanor O'Sullivan in New York after she had been notified that her husband had been shot down in Vietnam, the first thought of the European reading the report was "Second-hand citizens".

THE REMOVAL OF DISCIPLINE is the first step toward making America's "university Left" the force for mischief that communist-agitated students have become in Latin America and elsewhere. "Freedom of expression" is the line under which the breakdown is carried out. Americans read of the student campaign by obscenities, in California. Conservative Europeans were aghast when they heard that one of the numbers at a "Freedom of Expression" show in the American-Church-sponsored U. S. Artists' and Students' Center in Paris had a boy and girl on the stage, in a sack, going through what the French delicately describe as "the love act", while a student at the side provided rhythm by repeating over and over a four-letter obscenity.

PUT ALL THESE SEEMINGLY UNRELATED EVENTS TOGETHER. What they add up to is a complete collapse of America's basic moral foothold abroad and insidious blows against traditional liberty at home since last November. For two decades the erosion went unchecked. Then came the 1964 orgy of debasement. Now we have LARA, to synchronize the pressure choir by which Americans and non-Americans together force their respective non-approver into line. Colored racist organizations have sprung up to link American (and foreign) liberals with the Black (and Algerian, in France) undergrounds at work in countries where Americans reside.

UNNOTICED BY AMERICANS but closely watched by analysts in the foreign ministries whose fates and decisions are linked with our own is a move in Washington to pass a measure known as the Hayes Bill -- HR 6277. What this bill actually means is that a project is being pushed whereby our Civil Service, along with all our other government agencies and bodies, will be drawn under the control of the Department of State, with its own personnel department, headed by a man and his team, capable of eliminating completely from any branch of government service all those in disagreement with themselves. Tagged for the job, according to confidential foreign reports, is William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State. Put it this way: Under such a set-up the Civil Service will lose its last vestige of protection and Americans the last barrier between them and a police state. One man in a Washington office will control the hiring, firing, security clearances, promotions, transfers, investigations and retirement of every American in government employ, with his own special "investigative corps". Senatorial investigations

or inquiries will no longer be permitted. Demands to look at the files of any individual will be a thing of the past. All this will be handled by one super-chief of personnel. Every indication of the direction in which America is sliding with such rapidity gives reason to believe that man will be of the ilk that thought no word was strong enough and no fate too vile for American constitutionalists when the anti-Goldwater head-hunters were on the rampage in 1964. Presumably, here also it will be unlawful to ask applicants for the most sensitive jobs in government where they were born.

Europe's tragic experiences with "second-hand citizens", men who worked at menial tasks for years, awaiting one crucial half-hour in time of war or an agitation mission in time of crisis, often with the approval and co-operation of native traitors, make our allies shudder.

* * * * *

Dear Reader: Our June Report is late. Forgive us. There was an ocean trip, important meetings, Paris press conferences and radio interviews, details accompanying French and American publication of a painstakingly-compiled book on America's senseless four policies in South Vietnam. (The years, study and expense that went into that book could have made me a surgeon.) The French edition was badly translated and not corrected at all, the American was conscientiously proof-read and is a damning indictment of the State Department which a critic has accused the author of defending. A loyal American writing honest reports on our policies in Asia had a thankless job. He is attacked from every angle. If he told America what Ho chi Minh really was, in the years when Washington openly or covertly backed him, he was in trouble. If he predicted what was certain to happen, when the same crowd backed Ngo dinh Diem and crammed him down the throats of his countrymen, he did so at the risk of his livelihood.

It would have been so much easier to sell the popular line. Free rides to Saigon (at the American taxpayer's expense), trips from town to town, passed on from one Diem official to another, then well-oiled publicity machinery building the government guest up as an "authority", wealthy and disinterested -- just "wandering around" to see the scenery -- were there for the asking. The alternative was to tell the truth and receive brick-bats and subscription cancellations. When what we predicted happened, those in State Department, USIS, CIA and our foreign aid agency who made disaster inevitable simply tip-toed off the stage and misinformed patriots moved in to prove that the wreckers had been right all the time. Said one of the Washington "elite" insulating the very men who ought to know the truth, "H. du B. tried to reach Senator Thurman, but I couldn't let Thurman see a man like that. He (H. du B.) has been taken in by the Reds."

In "BACKGROUND TO BETRAYAL - The Tragedy of Vietnam" the whole shocking story is spread out on the table, step by step, just as it unfolded. Read it and then decide who was taken in. All the ammunition sound-thinking senators should have is there. Whether it will get past the visitor-and-information-sifters at the door is another matter. BACKGROUND TO BETRAYAL - The Tragedy of Vietnam, may be ordered through H. du B. Reports or direct from WESTERN ISLANDS, 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont 78, Massachusetts; \$1.00 for the paperback edition and \$4.00 for the hard cover. (Enclose 10 cents for postage).

* * * * *

Address all domestic business correspondence to H. du B. Reports, Box 855, Huntington, Indiana; address all foreign business correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, Hotel Lutetia, 43 Blvd. Raspail, Paris VI, France.

* * * * *

Subscription price: \$10 per year. Extra copies of this newsletter 20¢ each to regular subscribers; rates on large quantities given on request.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent
Jennie Edmonds, Managing Editor

SOS FROM EUROPE'S ORIENTAL FRONT! Since Greece's admission to NATO in 1952 America has taken Greek adherence to the Western camp for granted. There was no justification for such complacency. What we have witnessed in the past month is the eruption of a well-planned coup d'etat plot. At stake are Greece, Turkey, Italy, next in line for conquest, and NATO itself. All that America spent after World War II to block the communist advance in Southeast Europe was on the verge of being wiped out on the weekend of July 18. Given the explosive nature of Greek temperament and the thoroughness of the ground-paving during the years when America and Western Europe took Greek stability for granted, anything may happen between the date of the writing of these lines and the publication of this report.

While the riots agitated by the deposed Prime Minister, Papandreou, shake his country and civil war is spoken of as a possibility, here is the background of the storm into which America's new ambassador, Phillips Talbot, is stepping on Europe's southeastern flank.

FIRST, A GLOSSARY OF THE ORGANIZATIONS you may be reading of in the weeks ahead is in order:

ASPIDA (Shield): Communist organization set up by pro-Papandreou Leftists in the Greek Army to prepare a purge of anti-communist officers. ASPIDA is the Greek version of the Soviets, set up by Russian soldiers to judge their officers in 1917. It also resembles the "Anti-Fascist Committees" formed by French Reds in 1960 to compile files on loyal officers.

E. D. A.: Greek Communist Party

A. K. E. L.: Cyprus Communist Party. Since ENOSIS (Cyprus independence) and the constitution based on the 1960 Zurich Agreement, A. K. E. L. has been adroitly worked by Moscow as an advance post in the West, and its strength constantly increased.

CENTER UNION: Greek majority party which obtained 171 seats in parliament and carried Papandreou into power 17 months ago. Center Union is a misnomer. Liberals, politicians of indefinable political shades and Marxist fellow-travelers make up the rank and file. About 100 deputies are not satisfied with Papandreou. Communists gave him his majority.

LAMBRAKIDES and DAN: Crypto-communist organizations, organized for street action.

THE PRINCIPAL ACTORS OF THE DRAMA ARE: Greece's 25-year-old monarch, King Constantine, and his loyal Defense Minister, Petros Garoufalias, on one hand. Opposing them: 77-year-old George Papandreou, the ousted Prime Minister, his 47-year-old son, Andrew (Andreas in Greek), a product of Harvard and the era that produced the political and economic whiz boys of our own New Frontier. Villain of the piece and Greece's shadow communist dictator is Andrew Papandreou.

FOR HIS BACKGROUND LET US GO BACK TO THE MID-40'S. Young Papandreou was arrested for communist activity after World War II, when Greek Reds, supported by armed bands from Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, ravaged the country. On the plea of his mother, the Greek police chief agreed to release him, on condition that his family would send him out of the country. Accordingly the young revolutionary was sent to what was already becoming the breeding ground of extreme Left liberalism in the West: Harvard.

The philosophy of action which the young Greek assimilated there, in the company of men who have since risen to inner councils in America and elsewhere, may be summed up as follows: The military are bad. By nature they are fascist, unless sprung from a people's army. Since their thoughts are against the people, they are insurgents. The most effective counter-insurgency is for the people to eliminate bad military before insurgent thoughts can be interpreted into action.

The younger Papandreou took American citizenship, moved on to the University of California as a teacher of economics. In 1963 his father induced him to come home and enter

politics. Andrew became Joint Minister of Economic Co-ordination, under his father's wing introduced the liberal give-away measures which Greece's economy could not support but which won him a following. As Andrew's demagogic "planning" gained headway the father became the prisoner of his son and the E. D. A.

From 1955 to '63 Greece was governed by the conservative National Radical Union of Mr. Caramanlis. But Caramanlis resigned in protest against the visit of King Paul and Queen Frederika to London in 1963, on grounds that the Cyprus question made it untimely. Elections followed in December, and under the barrage of vicious attacks launched against Caramanlis by the Greek Left, which had been quietly grouping its forces for a comeback, his party received only 40% of the votes and communist support carried the elder Papandreou into power.

CYPRUS HAD BECOME A LAND OF ENDLESS CONFLICT. Greeks faced Turks with enmity, and Moscow saw the island as an ideal base for the ultimate assault on Europe. Blowing first hot and then cold, alternately encouraging Cypriot Greek demands for independence and encouraging Turkish cries for firmness, Russia eroded the Turco-Greek Alliance which was the keystone of western defenses in the Balkans.

It was in Moscow's interest to prolong the Cyprus quarrel, to oppose attachment of Cyprus to Greece for the moment because an independent Cyprus better serves Russia's interests. Once Greece is communized, Moscow's attitude will change: The powerful Cyprus Communist Party, A. K. E. L., would merge with E. D. A., the Communist Party on the mainland.

Equipped with 32 T-34 tanks supplied by Moscow, and the ground-air missiles, Comar torpedo boats and DC2's already given to Archbishop Makarios, the Cyprus President, Greek Cypriots cut off the 6000 Turks in Lefka from their compatriots in Ambelikou. Washington ignored Ankara's appeals for support, whereupon, early this spring, Moscow dispatched Russia's ace trouble-maker, Podgorny, on a sympathy mission to Ankara. Podgorny was followed on May 17 by Gromyko. Mr. Ichik, Turkey's Minister of Foreign Affairs, declared that Turkey, deceived by her British and American allies, might break her ties with NATO and accept Moscow's support, since Russia was prepared to recognize the validity of the Treaties of Zurich and London regarding the two communities on Cyprus, which both Athens and Makarios considered null and void.

On October 4, 1964, the Greek Prime Minister's son announced, "Greece has for a long time been a NATO satellite. She will no longer be anything less than an equal ally, subject to orders from no one." The following month he resigned from the government, giving the impression that the Center Union, as his father's group is officially called, was becoming moderate. Actually it was a maneuver to permit the younger Papandreou to take over the Left-wing of the Center Union and strengthen it by fusion with E. D. A., the Greek Communist Party.

On the heels of Andrew's resignation from the government came a speech from the Secretary-General of E. D. A., praising his judgment. Then the younger Papandreou made an unreported trip to Cyprus to outline a plan of action for A. K. E. L. It was on this trip that he elaborated plans for the communist delegation to Moscow which contacted Brejnev and Kosygin.

Since the approaching showdown's first test of strength would be with the army, Andrew prepared his counter-force. A law was pushed through by his father which turned control of Greece's labor movement, the Confederation of General Workers (CGT) over to a communist minority. By another measure most of the 9,000 communist prisoners remaining in prison for atrocities committed between 1945 and 1949 were liberated. Some 70,000 communist terrorists who had murdered thousands of Greeks in the post-war communist struggle, and had been receiving "higher education" in Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria ever since, returned home to form the action spearhead of the Andrew Papandreou revolt.

On the intellectual front an ambitious project, also sponsored by the Papandreou father and son team, took shape, to create a "truly international university" in the western coastal city of Patras. In late 1964 a conference attended by thirty leading scientists from all over the world met to draw up plans for Greece's new tri-lingual (Greek, English and French) center of learning, which Greek Leftists planned to make the intellectual Mecca of the under-developed countries.

The Minister of the Interior, while all this was going on, was a distinguished World War II officer and patriot named Admiral John Toumbas. Already Toumbas' desk was littered with alarming reports on the formation of two Marxist action organizations, the "Lambrakides", named after a Left-wing deputy who died in an "accident" after a clash with the police in Salonika, and "Dan", officered by former terrorists and loyal to the Papandreous. The politician setting up Lambrakides units was a deputy with known communist leanings named Theodorakis (known abroad as a song-writer and composer of the music for the film "Zorba the Greek").

When the Admiral moved to suppress the two organizations, Papandreou dismissed him, and put in his place the former treasurer of the communist movement, Tsirimokos. With the Ministry of the Interior, which is to say the police, under Andrew Papandreou's control, the movement to remove loyal officers and officials from key positions got under way. Ambassadors to London, Paris and Washington were relieved of their posts. But care was taken not to precipitate a nationalist move to save the nation and the throne. Caution was the watchword: A slow slide to the Left through gradual elimination of loyal nationalists and repeal of measures taken against the communists in 1949 was the plan, not violent revolution. With Admiral Toumbas out of the Ministry of the Interior, only the War Ministry remained in the plotters' way.

On April 29, 1965, with his hands strengthened by communist participation in his popular front, Andrew Papandreou came back into the government. By this time he was a communist dictator, governing the country through his father in all but name, and holding at his disposal a national fifth column.

It was Balkan intrigue at its most sensitive sore-spot: The fertile field of Greece's hereditary hatred of the Turk. If the climate was ideal for Moscow's game, it was no less so for the 47-year-old "economic co-ordinator" from Harvard. Quietly a Red organization called ASPIDA (Shield) was set up in the army to report on "fascist" officers and to prepare for the drive to take Greece out of NATO.

THE FIRST BREAKDOWN IN THE PLOT CAME IN SALONIKA, Greece's second largest city, in early June, when a soldier was caught pouring sugar into the gas tank of an army truck. Security officers of the War Ministry launched a wide-scale investigation and learned to their dismay that the same sort of sabotage had been discovered in an artillery unit posted on the Turkish border. The deeper army officials dug, the more obvious it became that the two acts were not unrelated, that a widespread plot was afoot to cause incidents which, exposed at the right moment by the Greek Left, would undermine confidence in the army and justify Papandreou's call for a purge.

As the investigation progressed, word leaked out to the Papandreous through intelligence officers on their team that a War Ministry crackdown was imminent. On Friday night, June 11, Papandreou called members of the government for a meeting in his home, while Athens police by the hundreds, under orders from the Defense Ministry, began rounding up suspects who had come to light during the investigation of ASPIDA's role as a Communist front in the army. Exposure of ASPIDA had resulted in four arrests and the resignation of three high-ranking intelligence officers. Among those taken in on the night of June 11 were eleven Lambrakides members.

The Defense Ministry announced that it had broken up a communist plot. Papandreou and the Left came back with the cry that "fascist" officers were cooking up a plot in the army, and, fitting his actions to his words, Papandreou père summarily dismissed the Defense Minister. Garoufalias refused to step down and called on the king to back him up. While the storm mounted, General Grivas, hero of the Cyprus fight for independence, came onto the scene and announced in the leading paper of Athens (the KATHIMEERINI) that Andrew Papandreou was the leader of ASPIDA, that ASPIDA had been infiltrated by his own men (Grivas) in Cyprus, on his orders, and that they would testify that ASPIDA was a clandestine communist organization preparing to eliminate loyal officers from the army and seize power. Already, Grivas stated, communists had sabotaged a unit of Greek artillery.

This brings us up to the clash.

TO PAPANDREOU'S SURPRISE THE BOY KING REACTED LIKE A MAN. Constantine refused to dismiss his Minister of Defense, on grounds that the army must be kept out of

politics. Papandreou, pushed by his son, decided to stir up the people. A violent press campaign was launched, demanding the departure of the War Minister and General Yenimatas. The young king temporized. He would ask Mr. Garoufalias to resign, on condition that the Prime Minister would not take over the Defense Ministry: Such a step would have been shocking, since Papandreou's own son had been named as head of the subversive movement in the army which was under investigation.

Papandreou screamed to heaven that the king was overstepping his role as sovereign and attempting to rule instead of reign, trying to tell the Prime Minister whom he could appoint to the government. If Constantine would sacrifice Garoufalias, Papandreou promised to take measures to stop the violent press campaign which he himself had set in motion. If he would not, the old Liberal threatened to cause a constitutional crisis. As it became evident that the Papandreou clan intended to go over the head of the young king and appeal directly to the mob, Constantine called in 48-year-old Constantine Hoidas, a member of the Council of State and professor of constitutional law, for advice. On the professor's assurance that he was within his rights, in a lightning move he accepted his defiant Prime Minister's threat to resign and appointed Athanasiades-Novas, a man from the Center-Right of Papandreou's own party, to succeed him. Back with Novas came Admiral Toumbas to the Interior Ministry.

THEN THE CALL FOR DEMONSTRATIONS STARTED. "The situation is grave. The palace is fostering a plot", Papandreou telephoned a henchman in Paris. And on that note the escalation toward civil war started in principal cities across the country. The first force called into the streets was Greece's left-wing labor union, the Confederation of General Workers (CGT).

On Saturday morning, July 17, events were following the conventional communist coup d'etat pattern. The government fought to defend itself. The arrest of Colonel Anagostopoulos, the assistant director of intelligence, for tapping the telephone lines of ministers marked by Papandreou for destruction, was answered by cries of "Down with the fascists!" Instead of a stabilizing force, attempting to restore order, the armed forces were pictured as murderous supporters of the fascist traitors. In a monster meeting at Panathinaikos Stadium the army of the revolutionists, Greece's labor unions acting as storm troopers for fascism-of-the-Left, swung into action. Riots, blood and hate-spewing calls for more violence ensued. When Sotirios Petroulas, a 25-year-old student, on file in the Athens Security Office as an active communist, was asphyxiated by tear gas, the mob had a "victim" and funeral to provide a polarization point for a bigger mob and more violence.

Such are the salient points of "Who? How? Where? When? and Why?" against which the reader can measure all news out of Greece in the days ahead. What is afoot is a well-planned communist revolution, brought into the open by government realization of what was happening. If it is successful, a contraction of the free world will have taken place while America (described by Dean Acheson as "the engine of mankind, and the rest of the world is the train") was hanging on Averell Harriman's trip to Moscow. Mastermind of the plot, for such pride as it may afford, is, as we have pointed out, a Harvard-educated Greek Communist who, for as long as it suited his purpose, was an American citizen. Under his economic planning and political action Greek Reds have turned the clock back to December 1944, when the civil war they lost was started.

NOW BACK TO VIETNAM: On July 16 Albert Pham ngoc Thao, on whose head the Saigon government had placed a three million piastre reward, was captured in the heavily communist-infiltrated Bien Hoa area, seven miles from Saigon. For Thao's communist background, atrocities, duplicities, intentions, fawning praise by the American press and an idea of who was backing him in his plot to seize power and turn South Vietnam into a Marxist state, see H. du B. Reports of Sept. and Oct., 1964, Jan., March and April, 1965.

A laconic AP report out of Saigon on July 18 announced that Thao had died of wounds while being transported to Saigon aboard a helicopter. (American?) The principal detail emphasized in American papers was, as usual, that Thao was a Catholic, a form of spotless bill of health which, if pursued no further, exonerates anyone connected with his December, 1964 disappearance from Washington, and concealment between two coup d'etat attempts since then, from charges of being involved in some very embarrassing business.

With Thao dead in transit, chances of court disclosures as a source of public information are out. TIME Magazine, one of Thao's greatest ballyhooers during the honeymoon period with Diem, did not mention Thao the following week at all. NEWSWEEK, having the inside track on a good story, published such excerpts as somebody saw fit from a letter which Thao had written to NEWSWEEK'S Pentagon correspondent. Lloyd H. Norman, whose friendship to a man of Thao's particular talents and leanings was understandably important.

A "passionately patriotic Catholic" is the way NEWSWEEK described Ho chi Minh's persuasive former Intelligence Chief. "The Americans originally fought me tooth and nail, but afterwards realized that I was right", wrote Thao (which is what we have always thought!). A socialist South Vietnam, Thao explained, was his aim. "One ought not fear the socialistic or leftist tendency of these new men", Thao told his sympathetic contact in Washington, through whom he figured his letter would reach policy-deciding eyes.

"If the U. S. supports them (Thao's 'new men') sincerely, they will reject the communist camp... It is essential that the Americans support a socialist or almost socialist program." (Where have we heard this line before? --Aside from Joseph Buttinger's use of the same argument in support of Ho chi Minh (THE NEW LEADER, June 27, 1955).)

Thao further does his best for Ho chi Minh by putting up an argument for halting bombings in North Vietnam, then he substantiates another of our convictions, long pooh-poohed by "all knowledgeable people in Washington". "Do not believe that I work alone in Vietnam. Our group is very strong. If it does not triumph now it will triumph later... We are not communists. We are nationalists, but also socialists... I am confident that in the end we will triumph and with the aid of the Americans, including CIA." (It would be interesting to know if Pham ngoc Thao and Bobby Kennedy ever met during Thao's stay in Washington, since their arguments against bombing North Vietnam are identical.)

ONE OF THE MOST TRULY ILLUMINATING PAGES ON PHAM NGOC THAO and one which it is doubtful that any American with NEWSWEEK-type feelings on our South Vietnam errors will bother to read may be found in a book written by Southeast Asia authority Jean Lacoutre, "Le Vietnam Entre Deux Guerres" (Editions du Seuil, Paris. 267 pages, \$3.25), published in May, 1965.

On P. 175, Lecoutre tells how in September of 1946 he spent some time with the Vietminh underground. "Received by the Central Committee," he wrote, "I was able to see for myself how diversified the directing team was, made up of Communists of Catholic origin such as Pham ngoc Thuan (Thao's father), the nationalist Nguyen Binh, who was principal military chief of the organization, and Huynh phu So, the famous "mad monk", leader of the Hoa Hao (who was assassinated, probably on order of the Vietminh, a month later) and a priest communist named Ung van Khiem, who later became North Vietnam's Minister of Foreign Affairs."

From the above it should be obvious that a wide gap exists between the Catholicism of the Pham ngoc family and, say, America's Dean Manion. The white-washing line that the late colonel was a Catholic, repeated in the American press like a litany, is therefore meaningless if not an intended deception. But let us continue.

"Eighteen years later, in Pnom Penh," writes Lacoutre, "I ran onto the same Pham ngoc Thuan who had welcomed me in the Plain of Junks. He had become ambassador to East Germany, then President of the Committee of Cultural Relations Abroad. It was in the latter capacity that he took a group of folk lore dancers to Cambodia.

"As we talked he outlined before me the interesting parallel between the methods of the Vietminh in 1948 and the Vietcong in 1964. 'We were awkward primitives. We tried to oppose the colonialists and their Vietnamese allies by setting up a counter-state with its own administration, its money and its system of education. Wherever they have been able to, our successors, who have made great progress and profited by our experiences and setbacks, have taken another course. They have insinuated themselves as far as possible into the existing state, to utilize it. Instead of systematically defying legality, they prefer to make use of it as a means of eventually substituting another. To put it more simply, we used to cut a road in order to wreck a bus; they prefer to board the bus.' "

What more realistic description of Pham ngoc Thao's activity over the past eleven years can one ask than this frank speech from his own father? An associate of Pham ngoc Thuan (the following page of the same book) went on to tell Lacoutre how the Vietcong is now working through co-operative organizations in the South, since these are not too committed politically. They are open and very educational, and they will assure the communists of the fidelity of the base of the country "when neutralization gives us a double foreign aid: American aid which will not corrupt us as it has in Laos, and aid derived from control of commercial channels and the disposal of funds provided for economic assistance, even though at the top we have a government that is partially bourgeois."

* * * * *

BACKGROUND TO BETRAYAL - The Tragedy of Vietnam, by Hilaire du Berrier, may be ordered through H. du B. Reports (paperback edition) or direct from WESTERN ISLANDS, 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont 78, Massachusetts; \$1.00 for the paperback edition and \$4.00 for the hard cover. (Enclose 10 cents for postage).

* * * * *

Address all domestic business correspondence to H. du B. Reports, Box 855, Huntington, Indiana; address all foreign business correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, Hotel Lutetia, 43 Blvd. Raspail, Paris VI, France.

* * * * *

Subscription price: \$10 per year. Extra copies of this newsletter 20¢ each to regular subscribers; rates on large quantities given on request.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Jennie Edmonds, Managing Editor

THE SCENE IS VIETNAM, where Roosevelt made "liberation" from colonialism his goal. Twenty years of misery and prospects of indefinite slavery were the results for Asiatics, war and the prospect of moral bankruptcy for America. America is now bogged down in a morass created by Roosevelt, Truman and the team that under them entrenched itself in power. The parents of today were apathetic while this was happening. Now for America there is no choice but to win. Against the dictates of MacArthur's "There is no substitute for victory", all talk is of negotiation.

Max Frankel (New York Times, March 14, 1965) informed the world, "Johnson's foreign policy (is) negotiations, new style. . . . The principals have actually begun to negotiate, intensely and even publicly." In the magazine section of the same paper seven history, international affairs and law professors at Columbia University opposed military measures in Vietnam. Roger Hillsman, formerly Assistant Secretary of State, now a Columbia professor, supported them, saying America could not bluff and should not bomb the North.

On April 7 LBJ dangled before the Vietcong his offer of a billion dollar Marshall Plan for the Mekong Delta, in which Hanoi would have a share, if her leaders would negotiate. Up came Frankel again with praise for the President's "personal desire to yield to and appeal to world opinion". Mike Mansfield, who with his favorite, Frank Valio, helped to get us into this mess, came out for neutralism, i. e., surrender. On June 28 Adlai Stevenson comforted the Vietcong by stating that the UN is against our bombings. London's SUNDAY TIMES, on July 18, told Europe (and Ho chi Minh) that Averell Harriman had gone to Moscow "to try to enlist Soviet support for some kind of negotiations over Vietnam".



"The U. S. must play for a draw and not to win", pontificated the London FINANCIAL TIMES. On August 1 the SUNDAY TIMES announced that "the President is ready to discuss even the Hanoi terms", while its sister paper, THE OBSERVER, called for "American withdrawal and genuine neutralization of a unified Vietnam". Ghana, India and Yugoslavia had teams in Peking, offering American concessions, while Martin Luther King (whose sex orgy in Stockholm on the eve of the Nobel Peace Prize award made him no emissary for polite society) prepared to open his own negotiations with Ho chi Minh.

Long overdue is an honest report to the American public on what negotiation means in North Vietnam, since Patrick Donovan, the London OBSERVER's man in Washington (and Goldwater assassin of 1964) proclaimed on August 1 that "LBJ's aim is (the) green baize table -- not victory".

ON NOVEMBER 20, 1953, GENERAL HENRI NAVARRE, French commander in Indo-China, learned that his government was about to participate in a Berlin conference for the setting up of Geneva talks on Indo-China. "Do not mention negotiations", begged Navarre. "To make a premature announcement of willingness to negotiate will only spur the enemy on and compromise the chances of any plan you may have."

Against his advice Paris announced that the conference in Berlin would open on January 25, 1954. Overnight the war in Indo-China changed. French troops had been installed at Dien Bien Phu to block an anticipated Communist drive against Laos. Red General Giap dropped his Laos plans and, with Chinese support, threw everything he had against the Europeans in Dien Bien Phu, so that he might appear as a victor in Geneva.

Navarre said later, of his government, "Had they possessed any understanding of revolutionary war, had they not failed to foresee the adroit propaganda that would be made of the least sign of diplomatic weakness, they would have taken the precaution of sending all possible reinforcements to Indo-China before accepting the invitation to negotiate, to show that unless the enemy made adequate concessions also we would continue to fight." Instead, Paris was over-anxious to talk.

On February 18, 1954, it was announced that a conference would open in Geneva on April 26 to settle the war in Indo-China. The Vietminh moved immediately. On February 20 Ho chi Minh's Central Committee gave General Giap the green light: At any cost, Dien Bien Phu must be taken. The shock of its fall would shake the West and permit the Vietminh to dominate the conference table. The overrunning of Dien Bien Phu at a psychological moment -- the day before Indo-China was to be taken up at the conference table -- became a necessity for the Reds, the moment it became known that a conference was in the works. It was estimated that the West's admission of weakness cost the French Army 100,936 men -- killed, wounded and missing -- between January 1, 1954, and May 11, 1954. Giap sacrificed the bulk of his army and all of his elite for a victory to exploit at Geneva. He could not have continued the war if he had wanted to -- but he won his gamble.

Eleven years later America repeated the French mistake. But in 1965 Ho chi Minh's Central Committee's theoreticians, always searching for "the correct solution", reason that America is over-anxious. There must be a weakness somewhere. The teach-ins, the demonstrations, the letters to the press and harassment of widows of men killed in Vietnam: What can these be but proof that a revolution is rumbling beneath Johnson's feet? If America wants the green baize table -- then it must be in Ho chi Minh's best interests to fight. How many thousands of boys were killed in the past four months of negotiations chatter we may never know. Suffice to say, all experienced Indo-China analysts consider it a blunder, only explainable by the necessity of Johnson's placating his defeatist and communist-appeasing electors while trying to give no ammunition to those who never wanted him. The explanation does not inspire confidence in America.

WHAT OF THE MEN WITH WHOM AMERICA WOULD NEGOTIATE? An illuminating picture of the leaders who would sit across from us at the green baize table which is our proclaimed goal is to be found in Lucien Bodard's authoritative book, "La Guerre D'Indo-Chine--L'Enlissement". *

Here the guile with which Ho chi Minh signed a treaty with Monsieur Jean Sainteny in the spring of 1946 is spread before our eyes. Sainteny was a liberal of the Fulbright school, a champion of the under-dog and a worshipper of de Gaulle. He it was who was sent to Indo-China as High Commissioner, to treat with Ho chi Minh, whom America's General Philip Gallagher had bolstered against the French just as Mao Tse-tung is backing him against us today.

"Ho chi Minh assumed the face of a benevolent wise man", wrote Bodard. He caressed little children, spent hour after hour with Sainteny. And Sainteny was taken in. All the previous emissaries whom Ho had tracked down and massacred were forgotten. In a burst of good will Ho invited French troops to move north, to Haiphong and Hanoi. It was Sainteny's first experience with "the correct solution", the acceptance of an evil to destroy a greater one. Not until it was too late did Sainteny perceive that Ho had only used the French to run the Chinese troops out of Indo-China.

"Sainteny had no conception of hatred as preached by Mao Tse-tung and adopted as a doctrine by Ho chi Minh", Bodard continued. "Evil, according to the Mao-Ho cult, is a metaphysical abomination of which the supreme form is imperialism. Anything pertaining to the Whites can never be despised, punished, driven out sufficiently.

Yellow Communism is the implacable revenge of egotism. It necessitated the invention of a new form of xenophobia. Spontaneous hatred was not enough; one had to learn to hate, educate oneself to hate, educate the masses, day after day, hour after hour, with an infinite meticulousness of hatred. The people as a whole must live in a collective tension of vengeance, with no other sentiment."

These were the people with whom Sainteny, the man who thought like Mike Mansfield, was sure he could reason.

"With infinite art Ho chi Minh succeeded in selling the picture of 'Uncle Ho', the kindly old gentleman with the traditional appearance of a sage but with a soul of fire", wrote Bodard. (In sum, the picture Harold R. Isaacs gave to America in 1946, writing in Newsweek and Harper's Magazine.)

"Inveterate Asiatic Communists succeeded in making most of the world think they were not Communists and that therefore they should be given anything they wished. Unfortunately, around the green-topped tables of Dalat and Fontainebleau, French negotiators quickly perceived that the words they used -- liberty, democracy, association -- had exactly opposite meanings. The French saw in them the formation of a humanist, socialist Vietnamese state, tied to a France that would no longer dominate: Not yet independence but union.

"The Vietminh wanted a Red Vietnam based on what they called 'the democratic dictatorship of the people'." Again a fatuous West had grasped at the myth of a non-Communist Left in what was really only a fight for power between Fulbrightism and Maoism, but which against traditional society formed a solid front. "United Vietnam" was on everybody's lips. Bodard's description of Ho's patient efforts to lull his enemies through personal charm while his lieutenants attacked should be translated into simple English for LBJ.

"Ho chi Minh never gave up trying to move French public opinion against its government; on the contrary, he took up his staff and became a pilgrim... He crossed the ocean to proclaim his love for the French people. It was a monster campaign of hoax and persuasion. The former cabin boy of the D'Artagnan appealed to French women and children. With touching words he talked of his love of peace. He repeated over and over to French mothers that their sons must not die needlessly in rice paddies.

"During his crusade Ho chi Minh was received by the government, almost with honors due a sovereign. In a car escorted by motorcycle policemen he rode up Champs Elysees to place a wreath on the tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Still the nation refused to yield. Then it was that Ho chi Minh suddenly signed a compromise one night -- a 'gentleman's agreement' -- which settled nothing but appeared to avert open war."

The agreement lulled his enemies while he prepared their massacre. Sainteny, Ho chi Minh's dupe, became his defender. "Ho chi Minh is staking his prestige on an audacious initiative to avert loss of lives", cried Sainteny. "His own Vietminh, the extremists, are against him; therefore, he must be trusted, supported and strengthened."

Change the names in Bodard's book from French to American and we have a picture of what is happening today. "A hecatomb for Europeans, a general massacre, everywhere, starting in Hanoi and Haiphong, was what Ho had in mind. Through the fall of 1946 his preparations continued while Sainteny fought for 'peace' by preventing military commanders from taking security measures. Never for a minute did Sainteny see Ho chi Minh as the implacable enemy he was. Ho was his ally in keeping the peace, a reasonable man trying to restrain 'fanatics', the war-mongers who were partisans of his generals. Sainteny and Ho were friends. Every day they saw each other. They acted as though they were fighters in the same cause. Neither pretended to desert his camp; they were loyal opponents, 'explaining' their views in order to avoid a catastrophe." Sainteny preened himself on the service he was rendering humanity by becoming the friend and intimate of Ho.

"December came, and Sainteny still believed in Ho, though it was no longer possible to ignore the preparations that were taking place. Still the military were prevented from striking the evil at its source. They were ordered to accept insults, menaces, any sort of provocation, even the wounding and kidnapping of their men, lest they hurt Sainteny's talks and bring about the irreparable."

On December 17, 1946, Sainteny received another warm letter from his friend. They were going to renew negotiations; everything was going to be all right. "In reality, the most frightful trap of our times was being set with a meticulous eye to detail." Only vague accounts of what happened ever reached the electors of FDR, who had set Ho chi Minh up in business.

Two days after Sainteny received his soothing letter, on the night of December 19, Vietminh terrorists by the tens of thousands erupted out of the night. "Soldiers, red political commissars, guerillas, militia; men, women and children formed into shock troops,

launched a wave of mass assassination. An assault that was hysterical in its savagery, but also systematic murder, carried out in conformity with battle orders prepared weeks in advance and covering hundreds of pages of finely written script. Street by street, house by house, every step was foreseen for the extermination of the white population of Indo-China in a wave of horror."

Sainteny himself, Ho chi Minh's "friend", was wounded. "All Ho's initiatives", Bodard points out, "had only one end in view: the enlarging of his monstrous trap. How could Sainteny or anyone forget that for an Asiatic Communist such as Ho, such as Mao Tse-tung, human lives are of no importance, nor the methods employed, nor anything else. The triumph of the cause demands any action, permits anything."

So much for the people with whom Martin Luther King and Arthur Goldberg would negotiate.

THE ROAD TO HANOI AND PEKING was taken in July by Mr. Harold Davies, an emissary of the British Prime Minister whose rise to power was so assiduously desired by the American Left. Harold Wilson, the Prime Minister, for all that Britain is supposed to be committed to support of American policy in Vietnam, had tried to sponsor a "Commonwealth Peace Mission to Vietnam". Neither Peking nor Hanoi would have any of it. So out of obscurity came chubby Welshman Harold Davies, the long-time Communist sympathizer in the government our press and leaders wanted for Britain. Ho chi Minh could hardly refuse to see him, for it must be remembered that Davies is no backbencher but a member of the Wilson government. Back in the thirties we find him a propagandist in Britain's extreme Left, running adult education courses in Staffordshire, assisted by a man named George Wigg. Wigg led Davies into politics and got him a Labor seat in the House of Commons, representing Leek. They went to London together, and in 1945 they were sharing a flat with another member of the Staffordshire adult education team, Stephen Swingler. Labor put Swingler in Parliament also. Thereafter he and Davies headed the original "Keep Left" group so important in Britain's "Victory for Socialism" movement. In 1954 he trekked to Indo-China to help Ho chi Minh. British opposition to any American air action to save the French at Dien Bien Phu was kept at fever pitch by Davies.

In 1957 British Labor gave ground and accepted America's hydrogen bomb as the keystone of British defense, but not Davies. He remained adamantly hostile. That same year he returned to Hanoi as Ho chi Minh's guest where he prepared an article on "Twelve Years of Vietnam History" (Vietminh version) for the December issue of a French Communist monthly called HORIZON, edited by the former Communist Air Minister, Pierre Cot, and translated into thirteen languages. (HORIZON had an American correspondent named Thomas Buchanan who later wrote a book exonerating the American Left of guilt in the Kennedy assassination.)

In 1961 Davies wrote a pamphlet denouncing "the ruthless intervention of the U. S. in Laos" in which he stated, "The progress of Asian man has been warped to serve the Cold War and arid capitalistic foreign policies."

Today George Wigg, Davies' old fellow-indoctrinator of adults and political mentor, is one of the closest friends and advisors of the Prime Minister. Buddy-buddy with both Wigg and Davies, and hence enjoying a pipeline straight to 10 Downing Street, are two North Vietnamese "journalists" working on a London weekly. Another collaborator of Davies and Wigg is Lord Bertrand Russell, whose "Peace Foundation" has invited Nguyen van Hieu, the foreign affairs spokesman of the Red-dominated National Liberation Front (FNL) currently killing Americans, to come to Britain and "explain the Vietcong case".

What sending a man with Davies' known sentiments and record to Hanoi means is: This is the Labor Government's first giant step in the break with what, since the war, has been a pro-American policy.

IN MID-JULY DE GAULLE SENT HIS MAN ON THE DAVIES CIRCUIT. On July 3 de Gaulle had told Sukarno, according to the latter, that North Vietnam would win the war against America. Eight days later a diplomatic courier brought de Gaulle a secret report from France's ambassador to the Vatican. It covered in detail all the attempts at

mediating the American-North Vietnam dispute to date. To spare the French President's eyes this detailed report was reduced to what his assistants regarded as essential, and the contents read to him. Tito's advances, backed by Shastri, Nasser's feelers, N'Krumah's fishing in troubled waters, Harriman's snub by Kosygin, Algeria's efforts to acquire importance, and U Thant's -- they were all there. The only serious rival for France was Davies, Britain's Red. De Gaulle's card in the game for top place as "friend of the power of tomorrow and rejector of the ally of yesterday" was André Malraux. Some Frenchmen saw the choice as a build-up of Malraux as de Gaulle's heir.

ANDRÉ MALRAUX, DE GAULLE'S MINISTER OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS, is 65. There is no record of his having studied at any institute of higher learning, nor even in the course offered by the Louvre. In 1923, accompanied by his Polish wife, daughter of an antique dealer, and a friend named Chevasson, Malraux, then 22, went to Indo-China. On the night of December 24, 1923, the two young men were arrested with seven bas reliefs, hacked from a Khmer temple by a pick and a metal saw, concealed in their luggage. While the two awaited trial, Malraux's wife returned to Paris to hide anything likely to be seized by the police, according to a 430-page book by Professor André Vandegans of Belgium. (La Jeunesse Litteraire d'André Malraux). On July 21, 1924, Malraux was sentenced to three years in prison. The case was appealed and another sentence, never formally sustained, gave him a year and a half suspended sentence on October 28. Actually, the original three-year sentence for archeological burglary and vandalism still stands unserved.

At 6 A. M. on November 1, 1924, Malraux quit Indo-China for Canton, where he became propaganda commissar for the Russian-directed Kuomintang. TIME Magazine of August 13, 1965, credits him with being "too individualistic ever to join the party" and having become "disillusioned with Communism at the time of the Nazi-Soviet Pact". The Paris diplomatic weekly, AUX ECOUTES (August 5, 1965), better informed, states that Malraux was never a member of either the French or Spanish Communist Party but that he was a member of the Chinese and as such participated in street fighting in Canton and Shanghai in his early days with the Kuomintang. It was as a former party member and fighter in the insurrection, according to AUX ECOUTES, that Malraux was assigned to bear de Gaulle's letter to his old comrade in revolution, Mao Tse-tung.

In 1925 Malraux returned briefly to Indo-China as a Kuomintang agent and set up a Communist daily called L'INDOCHINE, which folded two months later. Malraux then organized a Communist movement called "Jeune Annam", openly treasonable. He stated in a letter of October 2, 1933, to Edmund Wilson (author of "The Shores of Light") that he was made Kuomintang commissar for Indo-China. Then back to Canton and eventually to Europe via the Middle East. In 1936 Malraux was in Britain with Ilya Ehrenburg to attend a meeting of the Red "International Association of Writers".

In late 1936 he was leading a bomber squadron for the Spanish Reds. Then came World War II and his period as "Colonel Berger" in the Communist underground. Friends suggested that he and de Gaulle get together. "Malraux?" de Gaulle exclaimed. "He's a Communist!" (Stalin was snubbing de Gaulle at the time.) "De Gaulle?" Malraux retorted. "He's a fascist!" Today Malraux sits at de Gaulle's right in daily Council meetings, often carrying on a low conversation with "the leader" while Foreign Minister Couve de Murville reads a report.

April, 1961, brought the revolt of the generals in Algiers. The population of Paris was called upon by Malraux and Prime Minister Debré to rise, to flock to points where parachutists might land and with their bodies bar the way. The Communist machine sprang into action. Cars with loud speakers criss-crossed the Red belt around Paris, mobilizing shock troops. Malraux harangued the "volunteers" at the Ministry of the Interior, told them where to go to get arms. Manifestoes appeared calling "Workers, democrats, arise en masse; stay mobilized. Insist that the government give you arms."

Two months later, according to Arthur Schlesinger, on the eve of her departure for Paris, Jackie Kennedy confided to Madame Alphand, wife of the French ambassador, that her sole desire was to meet André Malraux. Thus, "fresh from a fascinating day with Malraux... (Jackie) glittered in a Givenchy gown at the state dinner in the Hall of Mirrors in Versailles." On May 11, 1962, Malraux was given his state dinner at the White House,

"filled with writers, dancers, musicians, actors and actresses" for the occasion.

"HOW DO YOU SUM UP THE MALRAUX TRIP TO PEKING?" A prominent Frenchman, asked this question, answered, "He was the logical liaison man between his two heroes, Mao and de Gaulle. It was de Gaulle's idea. An invitation to visit Peking will help in the December election. Refusing planes to America and selling them to Cambodia was first 'payment' on the invitation. De Gaulle knows that nothing he can do will change events in Vietnam, and that American withdrawal would only extend the war, but he wishes to appear as a man of peace. If the Peking invitation doesn't come through, the Malraux trip will still have served a purpose. It will have irritated America and the new team in the Kremlin, who annoyed de Gaulle by withdrawing his old 'friend' Vinogradov and sending the German Affairs Staff of the Soviet Foreign Ministry to Paris. It will also put pressure on the Russians not to go along with the Americans on any nuclear disarmament scheme without de Gaulle.

"Of course, the greatest gift for de Gaulle", the French analyst continued, "was George Ball's announcement, before leaving for Paris, that America would welcome his efforts toward peace in Vietnam. It assured the anxious French electorate that everything is fine between de Gaulle and America -- in fact, that America is looking for peace to come through Paris."

So much for "negotiations" as an acknowledged end in itself, the men with whom we would negotiate, and the mediators in whose hands Britain, France, and no doubt no few of our senators and intellectuals, would place America's future.

* * * * *

BACKGROUND TO BETRAYAL - The Tragedy of Vietnam, by Hilaire du Berrier, may be ordered through H. du B. Reports (paperback edition) or direct from WESTERN ISLANDS, 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont 78, Massachusetts; \$1.00 for the paperback edition and \$4.00 for the hard cover. (Enclose 10 cents for postage).

* * * * *

* LA GUERRE D'INDO-CHINE, L'Enlissement, by Lucien Bodard, 457 pages (in French), published by Gallimard. \$4.00, postpaid.

LA GUERRE D'INDO-CHINE, L'Humiliation, by Lucien Bodard, 603 pages (in French), published by Gallimard. \$6.00, postpaid.

As a courtesy service, H. du B. Reports will accept orders for these books from subscribers.

* * * * *

Address all domestic business correspondence to H. du B. Reports, Box 855, Huntington, Indiana; address all foreign business correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, Hotel Lutetia, 43 Blvd. Raspail, Paris VI, France.

Subscription price: \$10 per year. Extra copies of this newsletter 20¢ each to regular subscribers; rates on large quantities given on request.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Jennie Edmonds, Managing Editor

INDONESIA: Torn with revolt and plagued with misery. Singapore, under Prime Minister Lee Kuan-yew, the one-time communist law student of Cambridge, is moving into the enemy camp. A stock-taking is in order. There is no indication that Indonesia, Singapore, Kashmir or any of the other powder-kegs of decolonization have taught America's pressure groups and policy-forming foundations a thing. They are still working for more of the same: a decolonized world -- FDR's Great Society.

IN KASHMIR THE OPEN FIGHTING HAS STOPPED. The cease-fire is hailed as a triumph for Arthur Goldberg, the former labor lawyer, ex-Supreme Court Justice representing America in the UN. But the causes of the conflict remain. When Britain was rushed into granting independence in 1947 there were 562 states in India, comprising over 500 million polyglot people. Over 150 million were Moslem. More than half a million Indians were killed in the rioting that accompanied premature independence. This was to have been expected. Roosevelt said at Teheran that "he would like to talk with Marshal Stalin on the question of India; that he felt that the best solution would be reform from the bottom, somewhat along the Soviet line". Stalin replied that "reform from the bottom would mean revolution". (The Bohlen minutes, Cairo-Teheran Papers)

In the revolution which was Roosevelt's war aim, each Indian state was to choose between India and Pakistan. "A man who had never been to India before, who has never been there since, decided how India should be divided during seven weeks in July and August, 1947", stated the SUNDAY TIMES (London) of September 12, 1965. This man was Lord Radcliffe (remembered as chairman of the tribunal that tried Vassal, the homosexual who spied for Russia).

When the Moslem Nawab of Junagadh acceded to Pakistan on August 20, 1947, Nehru sent an army to run him out and seize his country on grounds that the majority of the subjects were Hindu. Hyderabad, a Hindu country under a Moslem Nizam, Nehru took by force in the same manner in November, 1948, under the same pretext. (LIFE Magazine hailed it, "Democracy Comes to Hyderabad").

No one doubted that Kashmir would join Pakistan. British authorities estimate that Moslems outnumbered Hindus 96 to 4. On the throne was a Hindu playboy Maharajah, Sir Hari Singh; Britain had sold Kashmir to his Hindu ancestor for 500,000 pounds sterling in the game of divide and rule, a hundred years before.

Nehru, blown into heroic stature by the liberal press, wanted it both ways. On the demand of Hari Singh, Nehru grabbed Moslem Kashmir also. On November 2, 1947, he broadcast the promise he was to make over and over again, that once order was established a referendum would be held in Kashmir. The promise was never kept. Nehru had no intention of keeping it. Pakistan waited almost 18 years, then forced the issue. To give Kashmir to India was too blatant an injustice even for LBJ. Accordingly, since Russia and America were in accord, a cease-fire was successfully imposed and the Pakistan-India dispute was turned over to UN.

What are the chances of a just settlement? Almost nil. The head of UN is a Burmese whose own country is holding at least eight subject peoples against their will. Other Afro-Asiatic nations have captive minorities waiting only for a precedent. Roosevelt visualized no escape hatch for "colonialism of the decolonized". India says she will never give up Kashmir. Look for a LIFE Magazine headline, "Democracy Comes to Kashmir". Military aggression, if the strident elements in UN are for it, is "democracy". This takes the aggressor out of the defendant's box and makes him a plaintiff against society.

Now bitterness has increased. While Goldberg fiddles the fuse burns. What sort of consensus can we expect from the grab-bag that sent Indians and Swedes into Katanga? Fifty-nine voracious new nations created since 1945 assure a majority for the worst possible solution. Maneuvered by Moscow or Peking, or both, and with a Burmese "colonialist" for a spokesman, the vote is expected to be for partition. The solution will satisfy neither side. Agitation for reunification will keep the feud alive.

MAO TSE-TUNG'S STRATEGY, as European specialists see it, is to keep trouble spots in Asia as uncertain and explosive as possible. To bring America in deeper and deeper, preventing America the while from taking truly effective action. To keep America sending more and more men into more operation theaters, as widely dispersed as possible. Augmentation of American forces will in turn be used to inflame native populations using UN as an amplifier. Mao is betting that America will eventually give up, no matter how spectacular her military victories. In that event, the specialists see Mao's triumphant sword-rattlers automatically taking over native communist parties around the world. Communist world unity will be re-established under Peking, and Asia's hordes will dictate to the West, beginning with America.

AMERICA'S INTENTIONS APPEAR UNCERTAIN. The Johnson-Goldberg team can make America leader of a united West and face Russia as such; or, go in business with Moscow, form a partnership in which the two super-powers will exchange presents, flatter each other, and agree between themselves on the conduct of the world.

Many fear that America will choose the latter course.

REPEAL OF 14 (B), THE LAW PERMITTING STATES TO OUTLAW COMPULSORY UNIONIZATION, is one of the disturbing straws in the wind. When labor seized power in Britain at the end of World War II a drive for compulsory unionization followed, to make labor's victory permanent. British sense of justice refused to accept labor's "pay tribute or no work" ukase. THE ECONOMIST expressed it, "To farm out to private organizations the right to impose compulsion, to do so with open eyes and in the full light of day, would be the beginning of the end of free society. This is why the community ought to look with a very jaundiced eye on any of the manifestations of the 'closed shop' principle. For an employer to say, when a substantial majority of his employees have joined one union, that he will not conduct collective bargaining with any other body is perhaps legitimate. For an employer to insist that his employees must be members of a union, while leaving them free to choose which one, is already verging on an infringement of liberty. . . . But. . . . to make every worker choose between unemployment and membership of a union he may detest, and which may refuse to have him -- is to go altogether too far. The union is perpetrating a tyranny and the (Labor) Board is condoning it."

A promise to institute such a tyranny in America was part of LBJ's deal with labor in 1964. How hard the administration is working to ensure perpetuation in office by turning America over to the giant that delivered the vote may be gathered from a U. S. Court of Appeals judgment in the case of Allis-Chalmers versus the unions. (U. S. News & World Report, Oct. 4, 1965) "A union is a form of industrial government and the rights and duties of a member are similar to those of a citizen in a democratic society. . . . A union member may express agreement or disagreement with union rules or policies. . . . but he cannot simultaneously be a member. . . (and) be immunized against discipline."

Another way of saying it would be, "Within the nation is another government, more brutal, whose edicts every worker will obey or lose his right to employment." The policies of this "industrial government", which American workers are ordered to approve and finance or lose their livelihood, are hardly likely to be less disastrous than those "dungaree diplomacy" produced in the past. A few examples:

WHEN THE KING OF MOROCCO VISITED WASHINGTON in the winter of 1957 his first request was to see George Meany, to express thanks for American labor's role in restoring him to his throne by what Lester Velie (in his book "Labor-USA") described as dungaree diplomacy. The king was over-hasty. No sooner was he restored, in labor's war against colonialism, then the crusade against "feudalism" started and a labor-mobster named Mehdi ben Barka was backed to replace the king. What right American labor has to make and un-make kings was never asked.

On March 9, 1960, Walter Reuther, out to destroy the Union of South Africa through "dungaree diplomacy", wrote Christian Herter, demanding that America break relations

with South Africa, cease purchasing gold from there and "suspend purchase of strategic materials from the Union of South Africa now being stockpiled by the United States government for defense". Reuther then reproduced his letter by the thousands and distributed it through the Trade Union Congress of Accra, begging African labor leaders to add their voices. Thus a "consensus" is created. Reuther would sabotage America's defense program to extend his political power abroad.

On December 1, 1960, AFL-CIO representative to UN, Jay Lovestone (former Secretary-General of the American Communist Party) wrote the delegate of pro-communist Mali, requesting African support of UN's resolution against France in Algeria... to "hasten Algerian independence and serve the cause of world peace".

On February 1, 1961, AFL-CIO announced in Miami, "Unions Plan Own Foreign Policy". What it would be was expressed by G. Mennen Williams when labor held its national congress in Forest Park, Pennsylvania, on May 29, 1961. Said "Soapy" Williams, addressing the volatile firebrands of Africa as U. S. Under Secretary of State for African Affairs, "You have asked whether we are going to follow our revolutionary traditions or be guided by our alliances with the colonialist powers. The speeches of our President and our UN representative, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, bear witness to our attachment to liberty, and our votes in UN have backed our words... Our labor unions have brought you both moral and material support in the past, directly or indirectly through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and they will continue to do so."

In plain English, Mr. Williams was saying: When you African labor bosses clash with our allies, you can count on us to knife the allies. U. S. Information Service translated this speech and distributed it through Africa. Americans were indignant when the USIS center in Algiers was mobbed.

By January 22, 1963, the N. Y. Journal American was reporting, approvingly, "Reuther maps Global Union". Two weeks later the Wall Street Journal (Feb. 4, 1963) announced that U. S. labor was financing strikes in other countries, that interest and dividends from Reuther's great strike reserve would go into "a broad overseas program", but to avoid charges of political meddling it would be handled through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) in Brussels. \$3,250,000 was to be spent in such activity in the next three years. A glance through ICFTU reports discloses that backing of the Aden Trade Union Congress for an Algeria-type revolt against Britain, with outside-supported unionized labor providing the political force, was an ICFTU, and beyond it an AFL-CIO, project. Bear this in mind in the weeks to come.

Through the waves of atrocities that shook the Belgian Congo after independence the former French Congo (capital, Brazzaville), under the Abbe Fulbert Youlou, remained relatively stable. The Abbe opposed Lumumba, sided with Tshombe, permitted no communist diplomatic missions in his country and barred training camps for terrorism in Angola.

Sekou Touré, of Guinea, contacted subversive elements in Brazzaville in June, 1963. Mennen Williams visited Brazzaville a short time later. Then the three labor unions--the new emerging political force for communist coups d'etat--struck. Two were Brussels-controlled, one was out and out communist. Fulbert Youlou's government fell. The victory for civilization was tremendous. Simba terrorists got Brazzaville for a base, a new civil war ignited the Congo, foreign missionaries were killed like animals (Dr. Carlson among them), decomposing Africans polluted the air, Angolan killers got their training camp, and UN had a new case against Tshombe for bringing "mercenaries" in to spoil the fun.

Back in New York Mr. Jay Lovestone was promoted from his UN post to head AFL-CIO's department of Foreign Affairs. The Algerian FLN he backed "to ensure world peace" were massacring Europeans and Algerians indiscriminately, offering 200,000 volunteers if Nasser would invade Israel, and preparing to plunge Africa into civil war.

If 14 (B) is repealed, any American workman who opposes this sort of thing cannot, as a citizen of the "industrial government" against which his national government offers no protection, expect to "be immunized against discipline".

THE NEW SOLAR SYSTEM OF ORGANIZATIONS by which the directives of the labor empire within the nation are implemented is worth constant study. The 1953 FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION directory lists 787 "private" American organizations and foundations, many of them with State Department and Foreign Service ties and most, if not all, tax-exempt, working as overlapping propaganda and pressure groups. A smaller 1963 directory issued by the FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION (345 E. 46th St., New York) states that AFL-CIO's Foreign Affairs Section "issues policy and educational material on international questions, promotes legislation; (is) member of International Confederation of Free Trade Unions".

Affiliated with the AFL-CIO is the "COMMITTEE FOR UN, INC.", also at 345 E. 46th St., New York, "to provide opportunities for UN delegates to meet American trade unionists; sponsor meetings and conferences". A "consensus" is thus established for Arthur Goldberg.

Then there is the CONFERENCE GROUP OF U. S. NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE U. N. (170 E. 64th St., New York 21), composed of 81 national organizations "cooperating to increase public understanding of the United Nations; serves as clearing house for the exchange of information and opinion among participating groups; conducts forums, programs and briefings; provides information and material". This coalition of 81 national organizations orchestrates clamor which, for want of an opposing claue, establishes consensus by default.

THE U. S. PRINTING OFFICE IN WASHINGTON provides a directory of tax-exempt organizations in the United States, of which the above are a part. The price is \$2. In 1961 the solar system of tax-free organizations and foundations, urging the throwing away of more tax money in foreign aid, and relinquishment of sovereignty to the UN, covered 363 pages.

Under attack is patriotism. W. W. Rostow says there is no place for nation and nationality in the modern state. (He remained as advisor to a President sworn to defend America). Adlai Stevenson, in an article entitled "The Hard Kind of Patriotism" denounced narrow love of country, which is easy, and recommended the hard kind of patriotism by which men of strength betray their country for the good of the world. (81 tax-free national organizations were ready to take up this theme.)

WEST POINT MILITARY ACADEMY, its cadets erect behind solid granite walls, stands in the minds of Americans as the breeding ground of the antidote for Rostow-Stevenson poison. Moscow, Peking and Hanoi were elated when West Pointer Richard B. Steinke, educated at the taxpayer's expense, refused to fight in Vietnam. Then another West Pointer, Major Sarkisian, sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, drew up invasion plans for a proposed UN military offensive against the Union of South Africa. (See Chicago Tribune, July 24, 1965.) How did we sink to this?

President Kennedy's May 25, 1961 speech before a joint session of Congress may have had something to do with it. Extolling the "lands of the rising peoples", the President exclaimed, "Their revolution is the greatest in human history." Another development is also significant:

On December 4, 1964, according to the West Point ASSEMBLY, "222 student delegates from 91 colleges and universities, led by 34 adult specialists from the fields of government and education, (emphasis ours) gathered at West Point", for the 15th annual Student Conference on U. S. Affairs (SCUSA). Prince Bernhard of Holland, head of the Bilderberg group through which the internationalists impose policies, crossed the ocean to address the impressionable students brought to West Point's hallowed halls by "specialists from government and education". His subject: the developing nations.

BRUSSELS IS THE CAPITAL OF SOCIALISM, as we have pointed out. (H. du B. REPORTS, Sept., 1963) And Prince Bernhard, on whom such meetings as the West Point conference and the Bilderbergs depend for dignity, is the Brussels socialist world's front. The international clearing house for socialist, one-world propaganda is the UNION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS. It is in Brussels. The 1962-63 yearbook listing the UIA's interlocking fronts covers 1500 pages and costs \$16 (obtainable by sending a check, made out to the UIA, to the First National City Bank, 55 Wall Street, New York). The monthly report of the UIA is \$18 per year.

Spread out and pieced together, the above items provide a picture of the heyday Reuther's lieutenants, Irving Brown (who is AFL-CIO delegate to the ICFTU and ICFTU delegate to UN) and Jay Lovestone will have, toppling kings and igniting revolutions, when repeal of right-to-work laws legalizes labor's taxation of American manpower for labor's ends.

Almost unnoticed in the greater picture has been the relationship between labor unions and student unions. As this is written, one of the most sordid sheets ever produced in the name of students is circulating through the FRENCH NATIONAL STUDENTS UNION (UNEF). The UNEF is closely associated with France's Red labor unions and maintains ties with the U. S. National Student Association through the latter's Vice President for International Affairs and his Paris office. The sheet in question is issue No. 4 of FREE STUDENT, published by the May 2nd Movement, 640 Broadway, New York. European editions of the N. Y. Times and the Herald Tribune, preoccupied with a hate campaign against the John Birch Society, have not mentioned FREE STUDENT's appearance on the continent. It can be obtained for 10¢ at the address listed.

TO BRING THE AMERICAN SCENE INTO PROPER PERSPECTIVE: Medicare, Rent-care, Job Corps, Peace Corps, welfare giveaways, sprawling agencies that would be closed if men dedicated to the country were elected to office--what are these, actually, but legalized fronts for purchasing votes? Citizens electing Great Society candidates for the above reasons become professional voters, those disapproving of purchase by hand-out are compulsory members of another union. The cynicism of the claim that the party in power is motivated by anything but a desire to create a class of government-subsidized voters is obvious. Let us take a look at liberal compassion when Truman was on top and the liberals were secure.

THE AMERICAN CIVILIANS turned out of Japanese prison and internment camps in China were one of the most pitiful sights of the war. Ex-service men caught in China when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor had been charged with espionage and consequently tortured. Most of them were there because they had Chinese or part-Chinese wives whom the Exclusion Act would not let them bring home. Other Americans were there because everything they had was in China and they were too old to start over again elsewhere. All had lost everything, including health. But this group, compared with the army of GI's being turned loose, was too small to bother with, for a politician. Few of them had vote-bearing, letter-writing parents alive.

A number of important doctors, in a report headed "WAR'S DAMAGED GOODS" (News-week, June 19, 1950), stated that, "speaking for Jap POW's... their duration of life will probably average ten to fifteen years less than that of the general population. No one who suffered the prolonged starvation, degradation and physical suffering experienced by this group has been able to make a complete recovery, either physical or emotional."

Military prisoners were cared for, since veterans' organizations and articulate mothers swung into action if one were slighted. Tortured American civilians were turned loose from Jap prison camps without a medical examination, without clothes, shoes or money. Britons and Australians were provided with food, clothing, help by their national Red Cross. Americans were given nothing by anyone. UNRRA and its equally corrupt subsidiary, CNRRA, helped Chinese, German refugees -- everyone but Americans. American Red Cross food parcels stockpiled in Vladivostok were sold outright to the British. If liberated Americans got any of it, it was through the black market, which few could afford.

Through the war years the Japanese had refused to provide prisoners with enough food to keep them alive. Accordingly, money was advanced by Swiss consulates for prison camp heads to purchase food. Civilian prisoners were forced to sign loan notes for their share. If a prisoner, apprehensive of a big bill (at an exchange rate yet to be stated) after the war, refused to sign his loan note, he was placed "in Coventry", prohibited from eating with fellow prisoners and charged with endangering the health of the camp by reducing its purchasing power. Eventually all were forced to accept and sign. But they were assured it was only a formality; the Japanese would be made to pay. Of the seven nationalities involved, only Americans were forced to pay for the food they ate while prisoners.

In the case of ex-service men, their bills were held out of their pensions. Civilians had no pensions; accordingly a State Department Finance Division chief named Louis F. Thompson blocked their passports until they could pay. Sleuths in Thompson's office hunted sources from which American victims of the Japs, already broke, sick and unemployed, might be expecting money, with the idea of attaching it.

Any aging American, fresh from a Jap prison camp was a candidate for the bone heap. Many stayed in California because they could not get any farther. The negroes in Watts were better off. In reply to queries about a passport, without which no American too old for the job market at home could get a new start, the reply of the passport office was, "Fill out this application, buy a money order made payable to the Secretary of State, and we'll see what we can do."

Dean Acheson, he of the "Christian compassion" for Alger Hiss, was Secretary of State. When emaciated Americans spent their last dollars for a money order, Mr. Acheson, literally, used the mails to defraud. Money orders tendered in good faith, at a sacrifice, for a passport were simply kept. The money was never refunded when the passport was refused, pending payment of the forcibly signed loan notes.

Congressmen were not too busy to pass a bill awarding nationality to Olivia de Haviland, the actress, thus freeing her from returning to her country of origin (Japan) to await a place on the quota, but they couldn't be bothered over a few hundred ruined Americans. Letters written to them were turned over to Louis F. Thompson and his assistant, Mr. R. C. Reeley, which only strengthened Thompson's and Reeley's determination to get the writer. Civilian war victims caught on the Chinese mainland were explicitly barred from war reparations or any payment for imprisonment or loss of health. On the other hand, Associated Press reported on April 1, 1949, that every man, woman and child in Western Europe would receive \$18 in the first eleven months of the Marshall Plan. Americans couldn't get medical expenses out of the frozen assets of the enemy nation that stripped them.

Ten years after V-J Day Harry Truman's old State Department Finance Division chief was still hounding Americans for what should have been paid by the Japs. Those who thwarted him by not returning home were eventually pushed into his clutches when the Reds took over China. There was no statute of limitations. LIFE Magazine, when asked to do something on destitute Americans from Mr. Luce's favorite country, was hypocritically philosophical. "This is just one of life's inequalities", opined the publication's letter-writer. "The individual surrounded by glamor receives the benefits, while the other, who may be doing quite as worthy work, is neglected."

Foreign aid enthusiasts threw America's gold reserves to the four winds around the world, in the race to see if they could drain the country of dollars faster than Washington could raise them in taxes. Mr. Louis F. Thompson said of the men in his geographical debtors' prison, when they protested that the Japs were supposed to pay those bills, "Why, it's un-American! These fellows are trying to get something for nothing!"

* * *

Business Office: H. du B. Reports, Box 855, Huntington, Indiana.

Foreign Business Office: Hilaire du Berrier, Hotel Lutetia, 43 Blvd. Raspail, Paris VI.

Subscription price: \$10 per year. Extra copies 20¢ each to regular subscribers.

Jennie Edmonds, Managing Editor

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Dear Reader: Another year of compiling your reports is drawing to a close. Across the ocean your personal fact-gatherer is watching a humming, communist-directed machine mobilize and synchronize students around the world, in demonstrations against America and for an unprincipled rabble of murderers in Vietnam. The same machine, working a previous generation of students, mobilized support for other assassins in the same country in 1945.

Through your correspondent's hands pours a stream of tracts which the French Communist Students' Union mimeographs in France, wherever there is a university. The same tracts, dictated at the same central source, calling for solidarity with American students when they march to the door of the White House on November 27, in protest against the war in Vietnam, appear simultaneously in Italian, German or French at other universities across Europe.

How does one explain what is called the "tele-commanded" communist student demonstration? Obviously the objective of the men directing this international uprising of students is creation of a world opinion (consensus in Washington-jargon) which will do what Vietcong terrorism has failed to do: force America to surrender.

To create pro-Vietcong, draftcard-burning students, one must first have pro-Vietcong professors. To have pro-Vietcong professors one must first have universities that will permit a mature professor to tell young students that he hopes for a Vietcong victory, while other young Americans are dying in a war with that same Vietcong. To have such universities one must have governors, senators, university presidents and parents who will tolerate treason and call it freedom of expression.

FOR AN IDEA HOW SUCH A NATIONAL CLIMATE CAME TO BE INCULCATED IN AMERICA, there is no better example than the article by Adlai Stevenson in the July, 1963 issue of HARPER'S Magazine, called "The Hard Kind of Patriotism". It is a diatribe against "super-patriots", which is to say, those who love their country but not in "the right way". The man who was almost foisted on us as president argues that we have no "manipulated news, no dictatorial government imposes on us its version of the truth, we are at liberty to speak up against our shortcomings". Therefore, there is no reason why we should give the instinct to protect what we have (towit: our country) "a colored wrapping of patriotism".

"Patriotism", says Mr. Stevenson, quoting Dr. Johnson, "is the last refuge of a scoundrel". The kind of patriots he would have are those "who love America enough to wish to see her as a model to mankind... Our separate sovereignties and nationalisms must be transcended in a common, overwhelming union of deterrent strength." A common, overwhelming union of deterrent strength--detering patriotism to one's country--is what the united unions of communist-manuevered students are trying to erect before us today. Americans who think we should pay no attention to their artificially-created world opinion are, according to Mr. Stevenson, "misguided patriots".

"My friend, Jean Monnet, has outlined the essential list", said Adlai Stevenson, bringing France's devotee of one-worldism into his plea for "hard patriotism". Stripped of the colored wrapping of UN jingo, the objective of the two friends mentioned is: obedience, first to a regional, European super-state, headed momentarily by such impersonal socialists as Paul-Henri Spaak, Walter Hallstein and Holland's Joseph Luns, and beyond them (or the worse commission that will follow them) a UN headed for the moment by a Burmese socialist named U Thant, and certainly no one better when he goes.

Opposing this, according to Mr. Stevenson, "voices are raised in the name of some super-patriotism, to still all criticism and denounce honest divergences as the next thing to treason". Outreaching any "lunatic fringe", he added, "we have risen from the pit of McCarthy's time, when honest men could lose their jobs for questioning whether there were 381 known communists in the State Department."

Not only did no furor of indignation arise over such drivel, but when this article was delivered as a speech, the senior class of Notre Dame University awarded Adlai its "Patriotism Award".

"True patriotism", said Adlai, "demands that in some essential categories purely national solutions be left behind. . . It is this effort to transcend narrow nationalism that marked the supremely successful Marshall Plan. . . It marks the great enterprise of European unification - after so many tribal wars (emphasis ours). It could mark the building of an Atlantic partnership as a secure nucleus of world order." (Reminiscent of "There will be no wars when all the world is communist!")

"The open society fulfilling itself in an open world. This we can love", Adlai told HARPER'S readers and the "Patriotic-Award-bestowing senior class of Notre Dame. "This is patriotism which sets no limits to the capacity of our country to act as the organizing principal of wider and wider associations, until in some way not yet foreseen we can embrace the family of men." (Emphasis ours.) What Adlai is saying in all this fatuous verbiage is that if we will cease being petty, a European super-state, followed by a wider and wider world super-state, will come into being. Then all men will be embraced--a euphemism for tightly encircled--in one big "family of men" which, try as they may, they will never break out of. And America, if her obstructionists can be hammered into line, has the capacity to make this monster, to which we should give our patriotism, a reality.

The exponent of national betrayal continues, "Our prayer is that men everywhere will learn, finally, to live as brothers. . . 'Victory' in war has become a mockery. What victory--victory for what or for whom."

AMERICANS SHOULD READ THIS STEVENSON ARTICLE AND SPEECH. They should study it. For here in essence is the doctrine expounded by the Union of Communist Students, at 3 Place Paul Painleve, in Paris, the Association of Franco-Chinese Friendship, at 136 Quai du Port, Marseilles, and the whole network of European student organizations setting up mutual support meetings and information exchanges with the May 2 Movement, of 640 Broadway, New York. It also is the reasoning by which scientists are persuaded that national betrayal is a must on the thorny road of "learning how to love mankind".

Another advocate of this common doctrine is Jules Roy, the French Red recently returned from Peking, whose long-discredited book on Dien Bien Phu has been resurrected and is being pushed by Harper and Row in America. It is also the line of Henri Salem, the French communist whom The New Yorker, the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune praised to the skies when, under the name of Henri Alleg, he wrote his propaganda book, "The Question", in the cause of the Algerian F. L. N.

In 1960, '61 and '62 French students provided demonstrations, couriers, espionage cells and gun smugglers for Algerian assassins in France, encouraged by the American Left and the usual international solidarity agitators. It will be recalled that Gloria de Herrera, the so-called art student from Los Angeles, was arrested in the rounding up of one such ring. Today it is America's turn. The same international group of actors, actresses and writers who urged French draftees to insubordination and desertion in 1960 is now encouraging draft-card burning in America.

On January 26, 1962, CBS offered American viewers a documentary called "France's Threat from the Right" -- actually France's threat from "the easy kind of patriots" who had no patience with the sort of thing we are experiencing today. Blinking his eyes behind thick glasses the head of the National Union of French Students stood before the CBS camera and affirmed that he and his student groups were "joining other groups" to make a stand. With what groups were they making alliances? CBS prudently did not ask.

The American public was not told that the French student leader they were watching was a communist named Dominique Vallon. American students of the U. S. National Students Association knew him, however. When they gathered in New York on February 10, 1962, under UN auspices, to hear Sargent Shriver and Roger Tubby, U. S. ambassador to UN organizations in Geneva, tell them to go back to their respective communities and support the plan to loan UN a hundred million dollars to destroy Tshombe, they were full of the same spirit of solidarity which handbills in the Sorbonne courtyard are regimenting today. The same master authors were composing the slogans.

Ben Bella, the Algerian Red, was then the darling of the international Left and those dedicated to Adlai Stevenson's brand of difficult patriotism. No responsible official or popular American columnist suggested for a minute that our helping communists lead a government to betray its army would have anything but the most salutary effect on NATO. So Ben Bella was handed the sort of victory we are now being urged, by student demonstrations, to give Ho Chi Minh.

Ben Bella turned Algeria into a European Cuba and last June one of his henchmen named Boumedienne toppled Ben Bella. (Henri Alleg took refuge in the Soviet embassy, but other student heroes whom our budding traitors used to laud were summarily arrested.)

Today Peking is concentrating its propaganda fire on the Middle East. Syria and Lebanon -- key spots in Peking's drug empire with its lines spreading throughout the world -- are seething. One of Peking's master agents, and a man whom Americans are going to hear of during the months ahead, is a French communist named Jacques Vergès. Our great dailies and busy liberals waxed eloquent over him when he was defending Algerian terrorists and their student accomplices in French courts.

Under the name of Mahmoud Younés and on an Algerian passport, Vergès worked in Algeria until his friend, Algerian Foreign Minister Khamisti, was assassinated; then he returned to Paris and opened an office on rue Francois I for a new publication called REVOLUTION. Vergès was the only European on the staff, the others were Chinese. Last year Khamisti's widow went to America on a propaganda tour and she in turn became the darling of the New York Times.

After de Gaulle established diplomatic relations with Peking, Vergès returned to Algiers on a mission and lived with Djamila Bouhired, the Algerian gun-moll whom our press pictured as a North African Joan of Arc six years ago. Then came the coup d'etat of June 19, 1965. Vergès married Djamila and the two took off for Paris. In late September the Chinese decided to step up terrorism in Syria and Vergès was dispatched there. At date of this writing he is in Israel. He entered Israel under his French name, on a French passport, ostensibly to defend (under his Algerian name) a Syrian terrorist named Mahmoud Bakar Khidjazi, who is now being tried. In early October the Israeli government had a flurry with the native communist party and it was discovered that Vergès was intermediary between Israeli Reds and the pro-Peking group in Beirut.

From the Middle East to the courtyard of the Sorbonne, in Paris, as October drew to a close, pictures were circulated of American professors, indistinguishable from their students, as they paraded behind death's-head masks in demonstrations against the war America is fighting in Vietnam. That an indignant nation did not rise up in wrath was taken as a tacit admission of its guilt. This is how a mood is created in which West Pointers refuse to fight and students burn their draft cards. The same Red fronts distributing pictures of American professors and students marching in death's-head masks today were, a few years ago, showing pictures of Walter Reuther's hoodlums wearing gas masks at the Kohler plant in Wisconsin. A pattern is discernible.

PUBLISHERS AND BOOK REVIEWERS HAVE THEIR ROLE. Together with the universities they make up the "intellectual Left", which is also international. On October 17, 1965, Cyril Connolly extolled Theodore C. Sorenson's book on Kennedy, in London's SUNDAY TIMES: "He (Kennedy) wanted a ministry of talent and got it", wrote Connolly, of the crew whom Sorenson described as "men who thought his (Kennedy's) thoughts, spoke his language and put their country and Kennedy ahead of any other concern".

Perhaps the draft-card burner and the West Pointer who refused to fight can reconcile this claim of dedication to national interests with the credo of the man whom Kennedy appointed to defend America in UN and the declaration of Walt Rostow, the President's personal advisor, that the age of nation and nationality is dead.

How deep such poison has seeped into the bloodstream of America's body politic is evident from the fact that Professor Genovese, the teacher who hopes the Vietcong will win, is still at Rutgers, and the treason marchers still in the streets.

There is no such frenzy to tear them limb from limb, such as Chris Chapman (then in the U.S. Embassy in Laos) and his ilk launched in 1959 against men who only warned that the hated man in Saigon whom they were foisting on the Vietnamese people and on America was a liability. (When the tocsin-sounders were proven right, Chris Chapman was not fired; he was promoted to the National War College.)

Such are the thoughts of men who weigh incoming reports on the synchronized demonstrations in Paris, Washington, Prague and Rome, against a background that the readers of newspapers have forgotten, if they ever knew. It is not easy to compress into six pages each month the facts subscribers deserve to have.

WHILE THE UNKEMPT YOUTH IN DIRTY LEVIS OPT FOR NATIONAL SUICIDE RATHER THAN PERSONAL DANGER in America, elsewhere other Walt Rostows and Adlai Stevensons move on apace. At 208 rue Pessac, in Bordeaux, a Franciscan priest named Father Hervé Chaigne publishes a magazine called FRERES DU MONDE (Brothers of the World), in which the final embrace in the "family of men", desired for us by the late American delegate to UN, is under the aegis of brothers in Peking.

FRANCE IS PREPARING FOR A NATIONAL ELECTION AS THIS IS WRITTEN.

Strangely enough, though subway stations and streets are littered with mimeographed papers calling for demonstrations, parades, deputations to American embassies and centers and automobile processions in support "of the New American Left", there has been no organized clamor against the government ruling that ballot boxes throughout France will not be counted at the polling centers but sealed and sent to Paris for an official count.

Communists, socialists, members of the Unified Socialist Party, Officers and Reserve Officers Associations (purged of anti-communists during the last days of the Algerian war and now slated to command forces that might be mobilized in the event of disturbances) and the national Teachers' Union are joined in a solid front to oppose Lawyer Jean-Louis Tixier-Vignancour. T-V, as he is called, alone among the presidential candidates, supports American action in Vietnam; even so, the American press is against him.

A French editor addressed himself to his public, bewailing the paralyzing blanket of apathy spreading over the nation as election day approaches. A few days later he received a letter from an old acquaintance which is worth translating for its diagnosis of France's ills, and the world's.

"Dear Friend: Though I have not the privilege of being a provincial, I am writing to you anyway. I have followed your editorials with interest for a long time. One thing surprises me in your analysis of the conduct of Frenchmen toward the General (de Gaulle): your surprise that they disinterest themselves completely with public affairs and lie down with so little protest at the feet of their master. The two go together and are the logical consequence of what is called democratic evolution. It has been recognized since de Tocqueville (1835).

"What is there at the base of this sort of democracy? Two essential factors: a passion for prosperity and for equality. The passion for prosperity, which means not only conserving what one has but making more, necessitates keeping the public unperturbed. The daily life of the modern man, during his money-making span, is so busy, so hurried, so full of work and preoccupations that he has neither the energy nor the time to bother with any affairs but his own. The only political passion he has left is the yearning for tranquillity. As this grows, other political aims disappear. The main preoccupation then is to get out from under the bother of public affairs and turn them over to some visible, permanent representative of the state -- to some central power which alone seems to have the interest and the means of defending the public against anarchy, and which it is hoped will do so because that is its only way of defending itself.

"All those who withdraw into this frame of mind become foreigners to the destiny of all the others. To each, his children, his friends, his particular family become the only

group that counts. As for his fellow citizens, the other groups, the other clans, he doesn't even see them. If he crosses their paths at times he does not feel them. Hence the abandonment, so easily approved, of the Algerian departments of France. Hence certain projects which under the label of international cooperation and regional one-worldism propose attaching Brittany to England and France's northern departments to Belgium, because that, some believe, will lead to prosperity, and only prosperity counts.

"Besides this passion for prosperity there is the one for equality. It is the only remaining part of the republican slogan. Fraternity, the sense of being shoulder to shoulder in the same community, the country, has vanished. Liberty, as long as the right to make money remains, interests no one, except in its exterior appearance. But a ferocious determination remains not to see a neighboring group enjoy any powers one's own group does not have, not to permit any man to distinguish himself and rise above the common level to pretend to tell others what they ought to do. At the same time, the public recognizes and even clamors for a strong central government, but will accept it only if it comes from outside the country, if it is above everyone else and everyone else is equal before it. (An international super-body).

"Consequently all the intermediary bodies between the public and the central government have become discredited and have disappeared, whether they were constitutional assemblies or notables. Thus we have proportional representation which, putting all men on a common level within their parties, realizes equality between the mediocre and the exceptional, and produces a merciless struggle between parties, more with the idea of keeping another from assuming power than to accede to it oneself.

"In this way our democracy evolves naturally toward an authoritarian system, a sort of new absolutism -- such as we know in France today -- to which the old words of despotism and tyranny are not applicable. 'I foresee', wrote de Tocqueville of Democracy in America (1835) 'an innumerable multitude of men, all looking alike and equal, turning without repose on themselves to secure small and vulgar pleasures with which to cram their souls. Over them rises an immense, guardian power which alone decides their joys and watches over their fates. It is absolute, detailed, regular, far-seeing -- everything.

"It would resemble paternal power if, like it, its object were to prepare man for manhood. But it does not try, on the contrary, to do other than fix them irrevocably in a state of childhood. It looks after their security, foresees and assures their needs, facilitates their pleasures, conducts their principal affairs, directs their industries, regulates their succession, divides their inheritances. What does it not do to remove entirely the trouble of thinking and the bother of living? It does not break men's wills; it softens them, bends them, directs them. It rarely forces men to do anything, but it applies constant pressure to keep them from acting otherwise. It never destroys; it simply prevents anything it does not like from being born. It does not tyrannize; it hinders, it compresses, it exasperates, it stamps out, it stupefies and in the end it reduces each nation to nothing more than a troop of timid, industrious animals over which the government is shepherd.' "

"Good luck to you", the disillusioned Parisian ended his pre-election letter to his editor friend. He signed it A. A. The recipient, an intelligent man, published A. A.'s letter and agreed with him completely. But twelve months earlier this same editor was telling his readers what a tragedy it would be for the world if America elected Goldwater. And American correspondents in Paris seized his quotes to raise the specter of a hostile Europe if Johnson, the embodiment of everything A. A. and his friend deplore, were not re-elected. This is our divided world.

It is with the thought that A. A. has a message for our readers also that we translate him for our November-December Report, and wish our readers a respite of merriment on Christmas eve and strength in the year ahead.

FOR CHRISTMAS: BACKGROUND TO BETRAYAL - The Tragedy of Vietnam, by Hilaire du Berrier. Order this book (paperback edition) through H. du B. Reports or direct from WESTERN ISLANDS, 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont 78, Massachusetts; \$1.00 for paperback edition and \$4.00 for hard cover edition. (Enclose 10 cents for postage).

* * * * *

Gift subscriptions to H. du B. Reports will carry a Christmas greeting card bearing the name of the donor.

* * * * *

Address all domestic business correspondence to H. du B. Reports, Box 855, Huntington, Indiana; address all foreign business correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, Hotel Lutetia, 43 Blvd. Raspail, Paris VI, France.

Subscription price: \$10 per year. Extra copies of this newsletter 20¢ each to regular subscribers; rates on large quantities given on request.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Jennie Edmonds, Managing Editor

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE 1966

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM -- Marxism is a more appropriate word -- made giant strides in 1965, the "year of co-operation". H. du B. Reports of September, 1963 dealt with the importance of Brussels as the geographical capital of international socialism. This report deals with the international groups and clubs which, through control of money, are advancing the world body on New York's East River and, more specifically, its "colonization" of western Europe.

INTERDEPENDENCE is the new jingo. It implies an obligation on the part of industrious nations to subsidize shiftless ones. America, by the end of 1965, had been bled white by twenty years of foreign aid, annually prolonged on the argument that to halt it would hurt America's foreign policy. What foreign policy? -- the ruining of the dollar?

New rumors of impending dollar devaluation are sweeping Europe, some based on political Coue-ism, an assumption that if repeated long enough it will eventually come to pass, like Washington's 1954 to 1963 statements that everything was going swimmingly in Vietnam. One school plunks for classical devaluation which is to say the raising of the price of gold. The school of Robert M. Roosa, former Under-Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, is for tying the dollar to a "Fund Unit Account" controlled by UN. A world currency, managed by an international financial club which will throw gold out altogether and, by accepting its own notes, automatically make them good, is another scheme for replacing the deliberately discredited dollar as a medium of international payments.

The alternative is to restore confidence in the dollar by halting the mass give-away hemorrhage. Instead the hemorrhage is being stepped up, while tourists and productive industrialists are told to keep their money at home.

THE INTERNATIONAL CLUBS, GROUPS AND COMBINES, acting as financial "fronts", paralleling the political ones, are endless. We will touch on the leading ones. They are too big, too far away from the people whose futures they hold in their hands, to be subject to any control. Consequently, few individual citizens see any point in thinking about them.

THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (IMF) IS AT THE TOP. It is UN's supra-national bank, controlling the financial affairs of 102 member captive nations. Among other things, it is the transfusion room where capable nations are bled to maintain the incapable.

THE BIG TEN, SOMETIMES REFERRED TO AS THE PARIS CLUB, was set up in 1961 as a financial "ministry" through which Belgium, Britain, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden and the U. S., with Switzerland sitting in as an observer, can approve policies already decided upon by the IMF. Within the Big Ten, France's Finance Minister, Giscard d'Estaing, works to restore the gold standard. Until now world transactions have been conducted on the assumption that the dollar is as good as gold. D'Estaing holds that this is no longer so. Most foreign countries agree with him, think wistfully of the old gold standard days but reflect that Monsieur d'Estaing's prime minister is the Rothschilds' business manager (on loan to the de Gaulle government) and that the Rothschilds control the open market for gold, of which more later.

THE 21-NATION "ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT" (OECD) has its own powerful "Working Party Group" which tells the money-lending nations (they meet in Paris every six weeks) who is deserving of credit and who is not.

THE CLUB OF SIX is one to watch. These are the central banks of the six Common Market countries: Belgium, France, West Germany, Holland, Italy and Luxembourg -- meshing gears with other groups which in turn spread over the world. The Common Market's banking group extends political power by offering nations money (profits) in return for sacrificing national sovereignty. A growing number of Americans would opt

for such an exchange, attractively presented as interdependence today. The Atlantic Institute, Paris headquarters of which was headed by Cabot Lodge until mid-1963, prepares America's eventual entry into the expanding supra-national, socialist state for which the Common Market Six is a catalyst. Predictions are that Signor Guido Carli, director of the Bank of Italy, who is a member of Prince Bernhard's Bilderberg group, will replace Walter Hallstein on the Common Market Commission. Hallstein and Sicco L. Mansholt (another Bilderberger) will then be named Ministers of Foreign Affairs in the Common Market government, marked to become supra-national.

THE BASEL CLUB, which meets monthly in Basel, Switzerland, is a grouping of the big Paris Ten, plus Austria and Switzerland. It decides the common attitude to be taken by the twelve central banks concerned in the meetings of the IMF and Bank for International Settlements (BIS, Swiss) which follow. Its 12-member consensus is strong enough to impose the club's will on the rest of the world.

Berne, Switzerland, is Peking's banking center in Europe, though operations are gradually being transferred to Paris. Berne was also the home of what was called the "Berne Agreement", by which the leading bankers agreed not to extend credit to Russia for longer than five years. Britain broke the agreement in June, 1964, and others have followed mainly for petroleum, petro-chemical and fertilizer plants.

THE CLUB OF PARIS BANKS, sometimes referred to as the local Paris Ten, together make up a formidable force, capable of applying terrific pressure, or suction, anywhere on the international scene. Luxembourg is the seat of discreet transactions with and between Holland, West Germany, Switzerland and France, but Paris and Brussels remain the capitals to be reckoned with. Leading banks in the Paris banking family are Rothschild Frères, Worms Banque, Lambert et Cie., Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, Lazard Frères, Banque de l'Indo-Chine, Société Générale and Crédit Lyonnais (the latter two owned by the French government).

Crédit Lyonnais is the largest bank in Europe. Lazard Frères is the most open operator in America, with Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas (Bank of Paris and the Netherlands, referred to simply as Banque de Paris) more discreetly in the background. Kuhn-Loeb, the American house charged with helping finance the Russian revolution out of hatred of the czars, is a close collaborator of the Paris group. Roger Mennevé's report on Paris banking (16 Blvd. de Montmartre, Paris IX) states that six members of the de Gaulle cabinet, starting with Prime Minister Pompidou himself, are directly or by family relations connected with leading banks of the Paris local club.

Each of the member banks has a clearly defined role, often apparently opposed but permitting the group to have a finger in every pie. Worms Banque is the anti-communist bank. It has its own political office with its own anti-communist journal (Est-Quest). When Senator Dodd delivers a fact-crammed speech on communism his information is accurate because, more than likely, it comes from a Frenchwoman (regarded in her own country as an aggressive socialist) using Worms' political office findings to establish a reputation in America as "the French expert" on communism. By the same token, Worms has a pipeline to Senator Dodd and, insofar as Dodd has the President's ear, to the White House.

BANQUE DE PARIS ET DES PAYS BAS handles most above-ground transactions with Moscow, such as Russian gold dumping on the Paris market. (Paris, London and Zurich are used for this operation.) Transfers to the French Communist Party, which is not self-supporting (the Italian is the only one in Europe that is) go through Banque de Paris. There are other operations also. In mid-September, 1964, Banque de Paris' weekly statement announced that the bank had "come to the aid of the dollar" by buying up \$70 million on the open market and not presenting the same for collection. This was so that Johnson would not be embarrassed by a gold crisis on the eve of the election. Financial observers regarded it as a Russian loan to Johnson, in the fight to beat Goldwater.

Banque de Paris is now going into tourism, a provider of foreign currency and offices abroad with preferential treatment from governments concerned. The oil pipeline

empire is another field of Banque de Paris penetration. Through Société Latium it is helping finance the pipeline between Rome and Civita Vecchia. More on pipelines later.

FORTUNE Magazine of November 1965 reported on Banque de Paris' American branch, Parisbas Corporation, and noted the extreme discretion of the parent house's operations -- without, however, mentioning the role as Russia's agent abroad, or that the wife of pro-Moscow Jean Reyre, a Parisbas director and formerly head of Banque de Paris, was long an editor of the extreme Left, pro-Castro weekly, L'EXPRESS.

PARISBAS CORPORATION was launched in 1960 by Lehman Brothers in New York. Head of Paris Banque's American branch is Mr. Otto Marx. Other branches span the globe, with principal offices in London, Luxembourg, Brussels, Liege, Ghent, Madrid and Milan.

LA BANQUE DE L'EUROPE DU NORD is not listed as a member of the Paris group as it is Soviet-owned. However, it meshes gears with Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, mainly in Europe. Heading it is 47-year-old French communist, Guy de Boysson, the direction of whose loyalties is hardly open to conjecture since he is the only non-Russian to head a Russian bank. Outside of this Report you may never hear of the Bank of Northern Europe. Briefly, two White Russians, a man named Wissotsky and a czarist banker named Grouber founded it as the "Comtoir des Banques de Change", in Paris, in January, 1921. Seven months later they put in more capital and named it "La Banque Commerciale Pour L'Europe du Nord". Then, in 1924, France recognized Soviet Russia. Moscow wanted a Paris bank. French financiers had had their fingers burned on czarist bonds and shied off. Thereupon the French government forced Wissotsky and Grouber to sell out and their anti-Lenin institution became communist Russia's second bank in Europe, a first having been established in London in 1919. Under Roosevelt AMTORG became Russia's financial agent in America.

Guy de Boysson, inspired by patriotism, fell into a 90% communist network in the French Resistance when he was twenty. The result was inevitable: he became a communist, and a few months later was head of his unit. The Reds sent him to the French Assembly in 1945. Soon he was president of the largest communist youth organization in the world, the "World Federation of Democratic Youth". In eighteen years he rose from simple employee to boss in the bank which comes immediately after Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas in importance in France. French Communist Party funds are deposited in the Banque de l'Europe du Nord.

THE HOUSE OF ROTHSCHILD. Intertwined with Banque de Paris operations run the threads of the Rothschilds, from tourist clubs such as Club Européen du Tourisme (CET) to oil pipelines for the transfer of modern nations' liquid gold. PIPELINE FINANCE, based in Luxembourg, is owned by the French Rothschilds, Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, Dresdner Bank, White Weld of Zurich, and the firms of N. M. Rothschild and S. G. Warburg of London.

The day the late Edouard Rothschild died, Banque de Paris stock, for no accountable reason, dropped 120 points on the Paris bourse, which has led to charges that the family was deeply enough involved to hammer the stock down, to save several hundred million francs in death duties. Base of the Rothschild fortune, it will be remembered, was international transfers, conducted on paper but entailing huge profits. Britain's subsidies to the ruler of Hesse, for action against Napoleon, were entrusted to the Rothschilds, who in turn sold their prince on the idea of depositing his money in England for safe-keeping. Thus the actual gold was skimmed off of a commission at each end without ever moving. It was axiomatic that who controlled gold controlled nations. The international gold standard as we knew it was launched by the Rothschilds and, according to banking historians, sold to a Democrat administration in America by a Rothschild agent named Belmont. From gold, Rothschild interests were extended to coinage in general: nickel, copper, lead and zinc.

Rothschild mines in New Caledonia and their Penarroja holdings in Spain continued to supply Krupp through World War I, though the barons themselves acquired favorable

publicity for returning their patents of nobility to the Emperor of Austria. A French senator charged on January 25, 1917 that Germany would never have risked a war had she not been assured in advance of a steady supply of Rothschild nickel.

When Morgan Bank requested a guarantee before granting France a World War I loan of \$100 million, the Rothschilds exacted a commission of 0.75% before affixing their signature. A short time later Clemenceau came into power and heard of it. Calling Barons Eduoard and Edmund before him, he gave them twenty-four hours to waive their commission or face arrest and, with the documents in his possession, probably a firing squad. The commission was dropped, and since there was no other reason for a guarantee Morgan Bank never again brought up the matter.

On September 1, 1965, the Banque Européenne d'Investissements announced the floating of a \$20 million loan in America through Lazard Freres, Kuhn Loeb and First Boston Corporation. This was another climate-conditioning issue, the second since 1958, to draw American private investors into Common Market thinking. Behind it were the inevitable key houses: Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas and Societé Générale de Belgique, with the Luxembourg State Caisse d'Epargne (savings bank), the Banca Commerciale Italiana and the Amsterdam-Rotterdam Bank there for "interdependence".

Two months later came an exchange of feints in the international sparring. America barred importation of French metals likely to contain Rothschild's Cuban nickel. SOCIETE FRANCAISE DE NICKEL, the Rothschild firm, had been shipping its New Caledonia nickel to Red China and using its Cuban nickel in France. The matter was settled behind closed doors, on the word of the French Government (Prime Minister of which is the Rothschild business manager, on loan to de Gaulle) that no Castro nickel would reach America's shores via France. (Castro's personal fortune from nickel and sugar is being deposited in Holland through the banks of the remitting firms.)

IN AMERICA THE THEME THAT GOLD IS WORTHLESS is diffused through countless gratis newsletters issued by investment houses and foundations. The theme is always that an international currency backed by a group of leading nations will automatically become good, with no gold reserve necessary, if the world's Big Ten accept it. One of the aims of those hawking this new money in which our dollar would be submerged is said to be socialist political advancement through inflation.

While the theme that gold is worthless is diffused through America and Western Europe by gratis newsletters and economic reports rolling from the presses of investment houses, foundations and research institutes, the basic problem is international liquidity: How to settle debts between nations -- return to the gold standard or creation of the international currency which will replace the dollar. As the public is being prepared for a voyage in uncharted economic waters, shanghaied aboard the ship if necessary, interdependence moves ahead. Meanwhile, at 10:30 in the morning on each banking day five men meet in the offices of the Rothschild firm in England to set the day's price of gold. They represent the firms of N. M. Rothschild & Sons, Samuel Montagu, Mocatta & Goldsmid, Johnson-Matthey and Sharps-Pixley. International transfers proceed as they did in 1814 between London and the court of the Landgrave of Hesse, which is to say, on paper. When American dollars are allocated for relief work or re-lending by foreign central banks, dollars are accredited in the countries concerned, with commission deducted. In international trade, 0.50% is skimmed off on imports and another 0.50% on exports. The Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, at the time of the \$70 million purchase of our money on the Paris market, to prevent a raid on the dollar during Johnson's 1964 re-election, held some seven billion gold florin in foreign currency, enough of which was in dollars to create a great inrush of air into Fort Knox if presented with a demand for gold. But Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas (among whose directors is a man from the board of Lazard Freres) is also subject to centralized "information", just as the investor receiving his newsletter that has come down from the top through his brokerage firm and its "researchers". The organism through which the interlocking clubs diffuse their truths is called "EUROFINANCE".

EUROFINANCE WAS SET UP IN PARIS IN 1961 under a French, Harvard-educated Lazard Freres man named Marc Alexandre. It is the central clearing house for pro-

nouncements of the financial giants. Here some hundred operators classify and file incoming reports in 20,000 bulging dossiers fed into the Eurofinance mill through its thirteen members. These include Banca Commerciale Italiana (which played such a great role in financing Mussolini), Germany's Dresdner Bank (which did the same for Hitler, along with, so we are told, the Warburgs), Credit Suisse of Zurich; Paris' Société Générale, Holland's Algemene Bank; Baring Bros. & Co., Ltd., of London; banks in Spain, Portugal, Switzerland and Sweden. Most important member of all, perhaps, was Belgium's Societe Belge de Banque, since it has been swallowed by international socialism's own central bank.

AT THE CENTER OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST VORTEX sat the Société Générale de Belgique, in Brussels. We will recall that Brussels is the capital of Belgium, of which socialist Paul-Henri Spaak is Minister of Foreign Affairs. It is also capital of the one-world seed group, the Common Market. It is international labor's capital, home of the 107-nation labor empire, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. It is also the seat of Spain's communist "Republican Government in Exile" (H. du B. Reports, September, 1963). In sum: Brussels is international socialism's geographical base, and the Société Générale de Belgique became the financial barque of those who, like de Gaulle, opted to ride the leftward-roaring current rather than buck it.

In January, 1965, S. G. B., as we shall call it, ranked 57th among world banks. By January 1966 it had absorbed the private Bank of Antwerp and Société Belge de Banque to become the dominant factor in Belgian finance and the second bank in Europe (following Crédit Lyonnais). Its new name is Société Générale de Banque. SOFINA, the international group dominating nuclear energy in Europe, is among its holdings. Negotiations are under way to add a Dutch bank and a West German one to the S. G. B. empire.

AMERICAN BANKS ALREADY INSTALLED IN THE FICTIONAL, SUPRA-NATIONAL NATION, alternately spoken of as "Europa" and "Atlanticus", include Morgan Guaranty Trust, of New York; Bank of America, of San Francisco; First National City Bank, of New York; and Chase Manhattan. The latter, headed by Bilderberg member, David Rockefeller, and advanced politically by its former chairman, John J. McCloy, currently head of America's Council on Foreign Relations and a member of the Bilderberg group's steering committee, has branches in London, Paris and Frankfurt. It has representatives in Geneva, Madrid and Rome, and at year's end was negotiating to take over the Antwerp Bank of Commerce, a subsidiary of the Bank of Brussels. Chase Manhattan has decided advantages for obtaining advance information and influencing national political policies along desired lines, through the subsidiaries and affiliates of Britain's Royal Institute of International Affairs, which has branches in other nations throughout the world and of which Mr. McCloy's Council on Foreign Relations is a part. This American tie-up with the Bilderberg group of internationalists, headed by Prince Bernhard, is considered partially responsible for the fact that tiny Holland holds the heaviest continental investments in America, \$1.1 billion.

INTRA-BANK, THE SOCIETE GENERALE OF THE ARAB WORLD, with headquarters in Beirut, hovers in the wings, as it were. On the margin of the field being worked by the big clubs. The importance of oil will eventually bring Intra-Bank into the main current. At present its lines enter the Paris Club through the banque du Nord and other banks in Paris and Switzerland. It is the financial arm of the Arabs, extending from the Near East into Africa. La Banque des Pays Arabes, Banque du Nord, Banque Commerciale de Liberia, Banque Unie d'Irak, the Arab Real Estate Bank and others running all the way to Brazil form a financial and political arm the West will eventually have to reckon with. The head of this Arab financial empire is an extremely sharp Lebanese financier named Beda. Oil is not its only asset. Sami Kouri, Lebanese king of the international dope ring of which the AIR FRANCE hostess, Simone Christman, now languishing in a New York prison, was a hapless victim, is reported to be a heavy holder.

Within Intra-Bank a gentleman's agreement between Petrofina, the socialist world's bidder for world distribution markets, and the established oil giants -- Dutch Shell, British Petroleum, the Rockefellers and the Italians -- will come down through the usual intermediary clubs and closed meetings. Former labor bums, radio newscasters, socialist

politicians and bankers, dubbed members of the elite by Holland's Prince Consort and elected by no one, make up Europe's new socialist legislative assembly, meddling in our internal affairs, and Holland's.

ON NOVEMBER 22, 1965, THE EUROPEAN EDITION OF THE NEW YORK TIMES carried a report out of Brussels headed "U. S. URGED TO ACT". Who wrote it? Who was urging us? No one knows. The nameless authority stated, "There is a feeling among foreign diplomats that it is time for the United States to re-invigorate the idea of an Atlantic Partnership." What diplomats? Maybe the New York Times.

* * * * *

For Americans who read French we heartily recommend Jean Larteguy's latest book, UN MILLION DE DOLLARS LE VIET, published by Raoul Solar, Paris, 318 pages, \$3.50, plus 50¢ for postage from France. Larteguy's acquaintance with Southeast Asia and its principal actors is uncontested and in this book he answers many of the questions that have bothered Americans. Here for the first time he tells who executed Diem and Nhu, who ordered it and why, and where it was carried out. His explanation of de Gaulle's recognition of Red China through what Larteguy calls a Machiavellian plot involving "Cabot Lodge in his embassy in Saigon, Nhu in his office in Gia Long Palace and in Paris, Charles de Gaulle" merits study. Larteguy's lack of acquaintance with Cabot Lodge is adequately compensated by his deep knowledge of the other two.

* * * * *

Order your copy of BACKGROUND TO BETRAYAL, by Hilaire du Berrier either through H. du B. REPORTS (paperback edition) or direct from WESTERN ISLANDS, 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont 78, Massachusetts. \$1 for paperback edition. \$4 for hard cover. Please enclose 10¢ for postage.

Subscription price: \$10 per year. Extra copies of this newsletter 20¢ each to regular subscribers. Rates on large quantities given on request.

Address all domestic business correspondence to H. du B. Reports, Box 855, Huntington, Indiana. Address all foreign business correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, Hotel Lutetia, 43 Blvd. Raspail, Paris VI, France.

CONFLICTING VIEWPOINTS WERE BEAMED AT THE AMERICAN PUBLIC as those of Fulbright-Mansfield persuasion scurried to make the temporary bombing lull permanent. One, based on no substantiating facts, had it that traffic down the Ho Chi Minh Trail had stopped. Hence, it was argued, if bombing were to cease completely, the Vietcong build-up would halt and eventually the war would end. Other reports had it that from 120 to 150 men were taking the southward trail daily.

INTO PARIS COME PRECISE DETAILS OF VIETCONG TROOP MOVEMENTS TOWARD THE SOUTH. The funnel of the Ho Chi Minh Trail is Vinh. (See our map.) Below Vinh is the staging area, a triangle formed by Kamkeut and Kanmon, in Laos, and Nape, in North Vietnam. At the bottom of a humid, jungle-concealed ravine in the Kamkeut-Kanmon-Nape triangle is the take-off point. Through the ravine runs a small river, the Nam-Pao. A mile and a half from the Nam-Pao, at the foot of a waterfall, its opening protected by camouflage nets and branches, is a cavern fitted with office tables and illuminated with acetylene lamps. This is the briefing center of Colonel Chung, Chief of Staff of the Support Division of the National Liberation Front in the South.



COLONEL CHUNG IS BOSS OF THE HO CHI MINH TRAIL. His personal field extends to the Cambodian border. Along the trail Chung maintains a relay system of 24 stations, some 30 miles apart. Thousands of bearers drawn from the "Dang Cong", a corps of volunteer workers engaged for four months at a time, go up and down the trail. Two men transport up to 165 pounds, suspended from a bamboo pole on their shoulders. The "Dang Cong" also repair roads, rebuild bridges and carry off the dead and wounded.

Chung is a veteran of the pre-independence war with France. He was Ho Chi Minh's man in the montagnard area. Consequently, like Le van Vien, the anti-communist former pirate whose services we are still refusing in the south, Chung knows every secret passage along the spine of the mountain range forming the watershed of the Mekong River.

A TYPICAL WORKING DAY IN CHUNG'S CAVERN NEAR THE NAM-PAO goes as follows: 12,000 Dang Cong workmen are assembled in the jungle triangle. With them are 3,000 soldiers. The Dang Cong are from the area, the soldiers from the training camp of the elite 145th regiment in the north. While the 15,000 men rest, poised for the take-off, some thirty officers and four political commissars face

Colonel Chung for a briefing around a long table in the cavern. Suspended on the wall is a 1/100,000 map.

"Comrades," says Chung, "you are about to start on a 57-day march. Trucks are too easily spotted by the aviation, therefore you will go by foot. Equipment will be reduced to a minimum: one nylon cover, one bag containing six pounds of concentrated food, of sugar and soja base; one rifle, two grenades and forty cartridges, or an automatic rifle and three chargers. The Division Staff has seen that you will have no logistics problems. Everywhere along the road you will find small depots where you will be fed. Dang Cong columns will supply you with heavy arms and munitions in relays right up to the combat

zone. Your itinerary will cover over 750 miles and will be divided into three sections.

"The first, from Nape to the Nakai plateau, presents no difficulties. Giant trees, and mountain cliffs into which we have cut protected passages and grottos, will provide protection from air attack. At Nakai you will check up on your effectives and divide the regiment into companies.

"From Nakai your trail will run along the Nam-Ca-Dinh valley and join a canal called the Se-Ban-Fay. In the valley you will follow the river bed. Part of the way will be underground, 'til you reach the Cliff of the Bats. Facing you, across the river bed, will be the beginning of the Tiger-Tooth mountain chain. Here there are two obstacles: Bloodsucker Pass and Ai-Lao Pass. From there you will descend a narrow passage from Tschepone to where the road branches off to Saravane (in Laos). From Saravane to Attopeu you will stick to the bed of the Sekhong River. Ten miles east of Attopeu you will start the third and most dangerous part of your trip. There the regiment will break up into groups of ten men. You will be in the territory of the Stieng tribes.

"Remember that the Stiengs are our allies. Respect their customs and be careful how you speak. They are extremely sensitive. They will guide you past the Cinnamon Mountains and Kontoum plateau. Throughout this region watch for crosses formed by branches, along the path. They mark the deadly traps placed by the montagnards.

"The last part of the march will be hard. Helicopters and enemy reconnaissance will be everywhere. Follow security regulations. No fires. Avoid all contact with the airborne division of the "interventionists" based at An Khe. Until you reach the Cambodian border observe absolute radio silence. Good luck. I now turn you over to your technician comrade."

A SMALL, THIN MAN, HIS FACE DISFIGURED BY A LONG SCAR (result of an artillery fragment), steps up to the map. This is the famous Nguyen Phuoc, doctor in science, commissar of anti-aircraft equipment and formerly fire commander of the 351st Division, which fought at Dien Bien Phu.

Speaking slowly, in a voice unusually harsh for a Vietnamese, Nguyen Phuoc gets down to business. "Some of you who are veterans have noticed that we have changed our route of march. We no longer follow the mountain ridges. Our path is now in the valleys and along the rivers. This is because the American interventionists have perfected a new radar detection system. Their reconnaissance planes are equipped with infra-red "eyes". Each time a warm object, such as a man or animal emitting infra-red, crosses the field of that "eye", it is registered on a television screen. Though metal is a neutral object, it reflects infra-red and is also immediately detected. This permits the enemy to pinpoint your arms.

"The minute a warm spot is picked up on the indicator of the sighting screen, an electronic calculating machine instantaneously registers its position on the ground and transmits a co-ordinating signal to the artillery or to fighter-bombers in the vicinity. With such a precise system any source of heat on the ground becomes a target.

"Now we know that water presents an obscure body for the infra-red. It absorbs warmth but does not reflect it. When a photo-fighter makes a night reconnaissance, it flies slowly. You can hear the motors from a distance. To escape his radars and his infra-red cameras, you will get in the water. This is why your route now follows the bottom of the valleys where there are always streams.

"Be careful of tunnels and subterranean passages, because the warm air at the entrance and exit will show up as a clear spot on the infra-red screen. To avoid being spotted, dig extra tunnels, but instead of soldiers put buffaloes in them. Five buffaloes will produce the body heat of fifty men. A troop of buffaloes and ten camp fires may save a regiment.

"Let me add that the American imperialists have extra-sensitive films, capable of differentiating between dead foliage and live, therefore you will have to change your camouflaging branches frequently. That is all."

THUS STARTS THE 57-DAY MARCH. Before we halted bombings, progress of the column was slow and hazardous. Even broken up into small groups, 52 effectives of the column described were lost along the way; 11 killed by bombing, 28 wounded, 18 incapacitated by dysentery. Each extra day on the trail increased the percentage of casualties by both bombing and disease. Whether the technical efficiency of our infra-red target detectors is as great as Commissar Nguyen Phuoc says can best be judged by the airforce. Suffice to say, it is feared by the enemy.

Final destination of the unit mentioned was an area northwest of Saigon called Ho Bo forest, which extends into the dreaded Zone D, only 30 miles from Saigon. Here first the Vietminh and then the Vietcong enjoyed undisputed control for over twenty years, free to honeycomb the zone with tunnels and underground galleries at will. While they were tunneling, an air of false tranquillity, plus rigid censorship in Saigon, lulled America. In the fall of 1963 the lid was blown sky-high. When the surface calm was shattered, many Americans again misjudged cause and effect and assumed that until the false picture collapsed we were winning. Then the bombings which drove the Ho Chi Minh Trail from the ridges to the valleys, for shelter, started. The same source which furnished the above account of the briefing given officers and commissars at the start of the trail reports that until the recent truce the immobilization of North Vietnam was widening daily.

On January 18 your correspondent discussed reports out of Vietnam with the former Emperor Bao Dai and his cousin, Prince Buu Loc (who preceded Diem as Prime Minister) until 2 A.M. Word was that bombings were hurting. Ho Chi Minh had advised Pnom Penh "We are looking for the correct solution." Then came the voluntary lull which Senator Fulbright would like to make permanent.

WORD FROM THE NORTH IS: During the five-week lull new anti-aircraft missile bases were constructed. When the pause ended there were over sixty. Intensive, uninterrupted training of North Vietnamese in Russian-supplied MIGS was pushed. Between 20,000 and 40,000 Chinese coolies worked unhindered to repair railway supply lines north of Hanoi. North Vietnamese by the thousands swarmed over roads and bridges on the key supply routes. A grid of alternative, interconnecting roads was constructed. 200 railway carriages moved southward daily, bearing supplies for the frenzied build-up, where before the bombing pause the daily average was 18. North-south roads were packed with traffic. Some 6,000 men totalling between 9 and 12 regiments reached the south. Anti-aircraft guns, both 20 mm and 37 mm, were transported to South Vietnam with impunity. Military stocks were brought up to a new all-time high in the feverish activity precipitated by our one-sided "pause". There is no IBM or other machine capable of translating this activity and our inactivity into actual numbers of G.I.'s who will die because of the latter.

NO-WINISM IN ACTION. While this was going on, back in America senators, professors, doctors and students pressed a knife between the shoulder-blades of our boys at the front. Fulbright and Mansfield (the latter more responsible than any other senator for the mess we are in in Vietnam) called to make all North Vietnam a sanctuary. In Rutgers University a professor (Genovese), able to flunk any student who disagrees with him, expressed hope that the Vietcong would win. Professor Staughton Lynd, of Yale, not yet advocating the shooting of American patriots but implying approval of those who do, took off for a visit with Ho Chi Minh. President Johnson, whose dedication to freedom does not extend to according Americans the right to work without paying protection money (in the form of dues) to Walter Reuther, called it a "healthy example of freedom of expression" when traitors brazenly carried Vietcong flags to the door of the White House. The government made no attempt to protect the wives and families of boys at the front from menaces and foul telephone calls at home.

While Senator Fulbright claimed that bombings did not accomplish anything anyway, Ho Chi Minh demonstrated how badly he wanted them stopped by stating that he would never negotiate with the Americans as long as bombings continue. Read: He will never negotiate as long as America can negotiate from a position of strength -- if then.

IN EARLY FEBRUARY intelligence reports stated that a Vietcong noose, strengthened with reinforcements from the North, was closing around Saigon. One battalion was estimated to have infiltrated the city. Two rings formed by separate regimental commands

surround the capital, along with its twin city, Cholon. Ring No. 1, formed by the "Capital Regiment", is made up of three regular battalions, with a fourth being trained. Four other battalions form Ring No. 2.

The area threatened is the one which the French entrusted to General Le van Vien, the ex-pirate, and his private army, the Binh Xuyen, when Saigon was threatened by the Vietminh fourteen years ago. Raymond Cartier, the French political authority, wrote of that period, "In the labyrinth of Saigon's putrid quarters, the Binh Xuyen waged a ceaseless, bloody, ferocious war, killing the Vietminh like a terrier exterminating rats. There is no doubt that Le van Vien desired to rise above his past and acquire respectability. Had he and his Binh Xuyen not turned against the Vietminh, no one dares think of what we would have done to maintain order in Saigon."

On January 19, in an interview conducted by Mr. Robert C. Cody, of U. S. TV NEWS-FILMS, (15 Avenue Messine, Paris) Le van Vien said, "If the Americans will let me return to Saigon and give me the force I had when Colonel Lansdale bought out the allies defending my flanks, I will guarantee the security of Saigon, Cholon and Cape St. Jacques, which will include the Bien Hoa airbase, the protection of which no one else is now able to assure." He added, "And I can rescue 90% of all American prisoners held below the 17th parallel", which is probably true. There is no passage or hiding place in his old fief which Le van Vien and his followers, so devoted that three thousand died on one occasion to cover his escape from a communist trap, do not know.

It is doubtful whether America will let the man whom one of the greatest hate mongering campaigns of the American press tore to shreds in 1955 save the lives of our boys. To do so would be to admit that we made a terrible blunder, and that, instead of having his picture taken with Allen Dulles, Colonel Lansdale (now general) should have been court-martialed.

THE HATE BANK LANSDALE BUILT UP WITH THE FRENCH IN 1955, not de Gaulle's policy of rapprochement with Ho Chi Minh, is responsible for the French public's indifference as to what happens to us now in Vietnam. The only anti-communist forces which possessed a morale and devotion to their leader equal to that of the Vietcong were the ones Lansdale helped destroy: the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao sects and the Le van Vien's army, the Binh Xuyen.

On June 9, 1960, General Le van Vien wrote a letter warning President Eisenhower of the trend developments were taking. There was no reply. On April 23, 1965, he wrote a letter begging President Johnson to permit him to return to his country and regroup his followers for a campaign against Vietcong terrorists. Johnson did not reply either, but in answer to the copy of the letter which the general sent to the American Embassy in Paris came a brush-off letter dated May 4, 1965, signed by John A. Bovey, Jr. There the matter rests as of February, 1966. General Lansdale is back in Saigon, General Le van Vien, whose country is at stake, is prevented from returning, and in Saigon terrorism is rampant.

Hanoi is attacking the morale of our troops with anti-American tapes, shipped to North Vietnam by a 27-year-old Californian named Ronald B. Ramsey, while the first great military build-up in history aimed at surrender via a conference table, instead of victory, continues to grow. From government-encouraged campaign against patriotism to professors like Rutgers' Genovese to men like Ronald B. Ramsey was the logical sequence of American liberal planning since the founding of UN.

THE FOREIGN COMMUNITY OF HANOI. A "Maison de France" was left behind as a cultural center when, on October 8, 1954, the tricolor was hauled down from the citadel and given to Colonel Argance, for his heroic defense against the Japanese in March, 1945. A school, the "Lycee Albert-Sarraut", staffed with ten French professors, continued to hold classes. Some ten functionaries passed the black decade in boredom, in quarters housing the "Delegation Generale de France". Five or six old gentlemen, in their eighties, are still there, preferring to die where they had spent their lives, rather than return to a France they had forgotten -- if they ever knew it.

AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE maintained a correspondent there. Britain sent a vice-consul. The Australian communist, Wilfred Burchett, enjoys privileged status. Then there are

the Canadian diplomats, and the Indians and Poles of the International Control Commission. These are the social elite. After them come a small group of French turncoats, some brainwashed after capture, who call themselves ideological deserters. Two work on Radio Hanoi, playing the tapes furnished by Ronald Ramsey, of Los Angeles. Scattered about the country are a few Frenchwomen who married Vietnamese students and followed them home.

Vietcong sympathizers in Europe openly predict that Cuba is passe', as a Mecca for American revolutionaries, that a stream of unkempt students, left-wing professors and fellow-travellers in general will soon join the small French group of a previous decade in Hanoi, now that the trail has been blazed by Thomas Hayden (founder of "Students for a Democratic Society"), Professor Lynd of Yale, and Communist Herbert Aptheker.

* * * * *

BACKGROUND TO BETRAYAL - The Tragedy of Vietnam, by Hilaire du Berrier. Order the paperback edition through H du B Reports for \$1.00 per copy. Hard cover edition may be ordered direct from WESTERN ISLANDS, 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont 78, Massachusetts for \$5.00 per copy. (Enclose 10 cents for postage.)

Address all domestic business correspondence to H. du B. Reports, Box 855, Huntington, Indiana; address all foreign business correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, Hotel Lutetia, 43 Blvd. Raspail, Paris VI, France.

Subscription price: \$10 per year. Extra copies of this newsletter 20¢ each to regular subscribers; rates on large quantities given on request.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Jennie Edmonds, Managing Editor

* * * * *

THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS, Box 4068, Santa Barbara, California, has published an 80-page booklet, called "How the United States Got Involved in South Vietnam", by Robert Scheer. The project was financed by Fund for the Republic, and sample copies of the booklet are available on request. Two to twenty-four copies cost 75¢ each. How this report happened to be written, and why the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions published it, is a great question.

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, in the European edition of the New York Herald Tribune of February 9, 1966, describe Scheer as "a bearded editor of the leftist RAMPARTS Magazine and an articulate apologist for the Communist Viet Cong".

Now if Evans and Novak, who are certainly not conservatives, consider Mr. Scheer an unprepossessing Vietcong apologist, Mr. Scheer must be very far to the left indeed. Or else Evans and Novak are pals of Wesley Fishel, the Austrian socialist Joseph Buttinger, General Lansdale, Leo Cherne and the public relations huckster whom Scheer tears to shreds. There is also the possibility that both hypotheses are right and that the American extreme left has outpaced the boys it supported whole-heartedly while the harm was being done.

If the Evans-Novak description is correct, it is understandable how the Center for the Studies of Democratic Institutions happened to give Scheer a grant. Robert A. Popa, of the Detroit News, wrote on November 28, 1965, that "Not all officials at the center, which paid for the study, agree with Scheer's presentation, but they felt that this viewpoint should be published." Such tolerance would have been unthinkable had the same report come from a clean-shaven conservative, for the men and institutions Scheer exposes are themselves indigenous to the climate which Fund for the Republic has worked unceasingly to promote.

Popa adds that Professor Wesley Fishel, of Michigan State University, thought of suing Mr. Scheer for libel, but dropped the idea as being a "poor and costly remedy". It was only elementary prudence. The boys on the left never sue each other. And the chances are extremely remote that Wesley Fishel, Michigan State, or any of the characters Scheer holds naked before the public would bring suit against the author of a booklet paid for by Fund for the Republic. What a cesspool would be pumped into that courtroom if they did!

TIME, of February 11, 1966, quotes Michigan State President John Hannah (who sits on 7 policy-making committees in Washington) as saying that he can tap his campus specialists and get an answer to almost any question for government or research groups "within thirty minutes". The years of "tripe" on Vietnam which Michigan State's "campus specialists" fed students, professors, government research groups and the public, provide an example. These are the specialists who brought us where we are.

Scheer may be a rampant Red. Knowing nothing personally of him or his motives, I am not going to hazard a statement on anything as flimsy as the word of Evans and Novak. All I will say is that "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam" is the best report on the shocking meddling of Michigan State, American Friends of Vietnam, International Rescue Committee and a whole pack of earnest, single-purposed rascals that the public has been given to date.

No newspaper would have provided a grant for such research. No conservative organization could have afforded it. The above-mentioned center would never have accorded it to a man likely to come up with a report like Scheer's. And the tragedy is, no objective American would have been able to get such a report in print in 1956, when it might have done some good. Fund for the Republic would never have printed such a report then, had it been dumped in its lap.

Certainly there are errors. The role of AFL-CIO'S NEW LEADER is never sufficiently gone into. In areas outside his ken, Scheer accepts the liberal jingos as dogma. That the Vietminh only duped Major Patty and the OSS into thinking they were fighting the Japs, Scheer had no way of knowing, nor the real extent to which America helped Ho chi Minh. Scheer writes off the Vietminh massacres of women and children in 1945, on the word of a pro-Vietminh French professor named Paul Mus who was on the committee of Pierre Mendes-France's extreme-left "Centre d'Action Democratique". The first thing Mus' leader -- Pierre Mendes-France -- did when he became premier in 1954 was squelch the cases pending against two extreme-left French papers for passing military intelligence to the Vietminh while French soldiers were dying. But then, Mendes-France is one of the lions of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Scheer calls the American Friends of Vietnam, the lobby through which Fishel and his ilk worked, "primarily an organization of the liberal center". That J. Bracken Lee, totally inactive in the whole shoddy program and sitting out in Salt Lake City, was on A. F. of Vietnam letterheads is considered sufficient to counterbalance the presence of Senators Kennedy and Neuberger, Max Lerner, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (now one of Ho chi Minh's greatest sources of aid and comfort), Representatives Edna Kelley and Emanuel Celler, and pro-Ho chi Minh socialist Norman Thomas. And Scheer does not add that this propaganda lobby was tax-exempt. But this is par for the course.

Do not reject Scheer's findings on grounds that if Fund for the Republic and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions underwrote him he must be wrong. Rather, take the exposure of Michigan State, Wesley Fishel, Colonel Lansdale and the rest of the clique involved for what it is worth, and remember that while the harm was being done, neither you nor I could have gotten a foot inside the door of the fat institutions that provided Scheer with money.

BOBBY, CHINA AND GHANA

Through February the Fulbright-Morse fight to rule out "Winism" as a policy in Vietnam mounted. At its height Bobby Kennedy jumped to put his political surfboard in the pre-crest path of the wave. What Bobby wanted: Repetition of the policy that broke the back of Nationalist China nineteen years ago--inclusion of communists in the government we are supposed to be defending.

It is unlikely that the example of China had taught Bobby nothing. Rather, Raymond Cartier's explanation in Paris-Match of March 12, 1966, is no doubt the correct one: "Robert Kennedy is seizing leadership of the Left-wing of the Democratic Party from Hubert Humphrey." In sum, Bobby (experience with Asiatics nil) was ready to put the fox in the chicken coop, as Humphrey phrased it, to court our irresponsible Left. Humphrey, faced with responsibility, had no choice but to turn his back on everything that the Humphrey of AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION stood for.

France's pro-Castro weekly, L'EXPRESS, carried Bobby on its cover of February 28th and gave him four pages. The tenor: "The French are, on the whole, for Kennedy against Johnson." Likewise Bobby made the cover of the far-Left NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR on March 2. "The knowing ruses of Bob Kennedy --With diabolical avoidance of haste Robert Kennedy faces President Johnson. At stake: the White House"; thus opened the story signed by Oliver Todd.

FULBRIGHT RAISES THE SPECTRE OF RED CHINA. With tenacious arrogance, Fulbright and Morse continued to fight for "quitting" in South Vietnam. Britain's pre-war Cliveden set never pleaded with more short-sighted righteousness for perpetual concessions to Hitler, on grounds that it would (for the moment) save lives, than Fulbright did for yielding to Ho Chi Minh.

TIME Magazine (February 18, 1966) forgot its contempt for American conservatives and came to Johnson's aid with a statement that might have been filched from Robert Welch or General Walker. "The trait that has made Rhodes scholar Fulbright a Senate storm center for two decades, put simply," said TIME, "is an emotional and intellectual reluctance to believe that Communism is a monolithic doctrine of belligerence based on a fanatical dream of world domination."

TIME's essay on August 6, 1965, told Luce readers that "it would be foolish for the West to pretend that Communism in 1965 is the same monolithic menace it once was."

Sensing that the game was up, that the field could not be won by preaching that the war in Vietnam is un-winnable, that therefore bombings and resistance are futile, Fulbright changed tack. The spectre of war with China was held up. Calling on the so-called "Intellectual Left", a Left where inflationary degrees lend weight to the pronouncements of politically committed professors, Fulbright pushed his play. Mr. A. Doak Barnett, acting director of the East Asian Institute of Columbia University, testified for him that America should throw open the door to Red China, accord Red China a tribune, admit her to UN, encouraging in every way possible "non-official contacts" with Red China.

To make it sound good, Barnett added that the new aim of "maximum involvement of the Chinese Communists in the international community" would also "involve continued commitments to help non-Communist regimes combat Communist subversion and insurrection as in Vietnam and pledges to defend areas on China's periphery". The pattern was familiar.

When "maximum involvement of the Chinese Communists in the international community" is put over, "commitments to help non-communist regimes combat communist subversion and insurrection" will become waste of American lives, in struggles "which cannot be won, anyway."

WHILE FULBRIGHT DANGLING THE SPECTRE OF WAR WITH CHINA before American mothers and vietniks, China herself was faring badly. In May, 1965, Chou En-lai proclaimed, "Africa is ripe for revolution. On February 24, 1966, military officers in Ghana took advantage of the presence of their "Osagyefo" (redeemer) in Peking to unload him--the eleventh "infallible, pro-Peking liberator" to be ousted by unhappy Africans since June, 1960. This does not count the pro-Western Abbe Fulbert Youlou, deposed on August 13, 1963, by a labor union "revolution" in the former French Congo, for refusing to help destroy Tshombe, Portuguese Angola and the Union of

South Africa. We will return to China's setbacks in Africa later, for the upheavals in Africa are inextricably linked with Peking's value to Fulbright as a bogey with which to frighten America. Fulbright's drive to encourage "maximum involvement of the Chinese Communists in the international community" is also a race to outbid de Gaulle for the purchase of a political Trojan Horse. The nation whose doors Fulbright would open to Red China is ours.

How frightening is this China, in whose prisons innocent Americans are rotting, but to which Senator Fulbright, who knows nothing of the Orient, would like to see more Americans travelling?

CHINA'S STRENGTH. Article 42 of the Chinese constitution, voted in September, 1943, made the President of the Chinese Republic commander-in-chief of China's armed forces, in his capacity as president of the Council of National Defense. This was reaffirmed in September, 1949, in a conference of the consultative assembly in Peking. In reality, military decisions are in the hands of the military council of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. The Ministry of National Defense has replaced the old general staff of China's army of liberation, and now exercises complete command through three departments which it controls: The Department of the Commander-in-Chief of the General Staff, the Department of Political Affairs, and the Department of Logistics.

What are the aims of this all-powerful ministry watching over ten military regions under the eyes of Defense Minister Marshal Lin Pao and his nine assistants from China's various services? The answer is: eventually, war with the West. But until the West is deemed beatable or too decadent to fight, nothing that America might do will bring about the confrontation which Walter Lippmann, Senator Fulbright and our Leftist professors predict. A miscalculation on the part of Peking might save America. Failing that, it is evident that when the showdown comes it will be at a time and place of Peking's choosing. An administration interested in winning elections, not in protecting America, would, understandably, delay confrontation with China until China forces confrontation on us.

ACCORDING TO LATEST ESTIMATES, China has 115 divisions on war footing, totalling 2,540,000 men, plus her ponderous militia. The trend is towards reduction of forces, increase in fire power. The native heavy armament industry is far from satisfactory, but each year will see it and China's nuclear capacity increase. The light armament with which China's 36 armies of infantry are equipped is made in China and of good quality.

Placement of these troops provides an idea of China's order of battle. Some 480,600 men are in Manchuria, facing Eastern Siberia and the sea. Reports of incidents between Chinese forces and Russian have been greatly exaggerated. Only 9,900 Chinese soldiers are in Inner Mongolia, 64,100 in the military region of Lanchow; 21,400 in Sinkiang Province, and 71,800 in Tibet. Obviously China does not fear an attack from Russia nor plan one against Russia.

It is the provinces facing Formosa that are heavily defended. Here we find 1,123,000 men, almost half of the Red Chinese Army. There is no doubt about it, Chiang Kai-shek's promises that someday he will return are taken seriously. And whatever reasons Mao may give his people for not attacking Formosa, the most important is fear of America. Peking knows that Washington has given Chiang no support in his guerilla operations on the mainland. But that situation could change overnight if China were to make her interference in Vietnam too flagrant.

Granted, there is discontent in the army, and perhaps discontent in the popular militia which exists as a vast reserve. A police "empire" existing side by side with the military hierarchy rules out any possibility of a spontaneous army revolt unless some drastic event such as an invasion from Formosa provides a favorable occasion.

PEKING'S NAVAL FORCES are divided into three fleets, the northern one in Tsingtao, the eastern one based in Shanghai and the southern fleet in Canton. In all: some 1,200 ships of various types totalling around 285,000

tons. Thirty-two submarines, built in China with Russian assistance, are in operation, but no aircraft carriers.

Duration of service in the navy is six years, five in the airforce. Latest reports fix the naval airforce at around 3,000 planes. One division of infantry, plus an autonomous regiment, are airborne. The regular air force, under General Liu Ya-lu, has about 316,000 men, badly equipped and mostly geared to defense. They have 1,650 obsolete pursuit planes and around 350 bombers.

FACING THIS HUGE BUT MEDIOCRE FORCE is an excellent army of some 440,000 men on the Island of Formosa. For the moment Formosa is restricted to sabotage raids on the mainland and the protection of Quemoy and Matsu. America is holding Formosa back. Despite the numerical difference, reliable military observers estimate that Formosa with her modern American equipment could deal Red China a staggering initial blow, perhaps bring about the collapse of the regime. Red China's nuclear capacity could be destroyed in one raid.

Peking is stalling for time. On the world political theater of operations, Red China's policy as outlined by Marshal Lin Pao in September 1965 is: The strengthening of China's positions in Asia, Africa, South America and in Europe. Creation of a new world bloc--opting for violence--under Peking leadership. Division of the world into two regions, one "urban"--the world of cities of which America is the leader; the other "rural"--a grouping of the voracious have-nots. Slowly, under the direction of Peking, the rural would strangle, infiltrate and devour the urban. It is precisely this last which the Fulbright policy would favor.

Red China's inroads in Asia, Africa, South America and among the leftist parties of Europe have already created potential diversionary theaters capable of immobilizing America. Meanwhile, under Dr. Chien Hsueh-shen, head of Peking's missile program, the drive for surface-to-surface missiles, to reach American targets in the Western Pacific and ultimately North America and Europe, is being pushed. A new Chinese-made heavy bomber will replace the cumbersome Russian TU-4s, while Peking's first two G-class submarines (constructed in Dairen in 1964), capable of firing three 400-mile range ballistic missiles from upright tubes, are going through training for operations farther afield than Formosa.

In the political field China is weak. Mao Tse-tung is sick, about to retire. Political setbacks are shaking Red China's prestige everywhere but in France.

Add all the factors. The result is a mathematical certainty that Red China fears Formosa, will do nothing to touch off a war within the next three years. By that time the war in Vietnam can be won if America's civilian leaders want to win it.

Mr. Huynh sanh Thong, who served as chief press officer in the Nguyen Khanh government in 1964, has charged in the Yale News, of February 7, 1966, that General Edward Lansdale, Deputy Ambassador William J. Porter and CIA are working feverishly "to bring about a quick political 'settlement' of the war with the Communists before the next American elections".

As an example of errors that are inexcusable because an office boy could have foreseen them, and the fallacy of the myth that Red China is likely to make war in the foreseeable future, let us turn to Ghana, the scene of Peking's latest setback.

GHANA--FROM PROSPERITY TO MISERY. No American paper tells us what organization wafted Kwame Nkrumah, the son of a poor African workman, to a university in Lincoln, Pennsylvania. In November, 1947, after fifteen years in America and Britain, he returned home, filled with marxist ideas gleaned on campuses and in workmen's meetings. It was the era of America's great crusade against colonialism. Why America, per se, wanted to break up the world pattern, immediately and by bloody revolution if necessary, is inexplicable on any basis of common sense.

Russian Reds, Chinese Reds, UN, international socialists and American labor bosses wanted decolonization, but they had reasons. Each group counted on installing its own man over the colonies of America's allies and through him ruling the nations newly put up for grabs. America had nothing to gain by being the wrecker in this operation. It was obvious that the allies we were knifing would in the end be delighted to see us knifed. And the "countries" we were creating would be attracted to those who were out to bury us. (H. du B. Reports, "Africa the Turbulent", March, 1960) The end could only be disastrous for both Africa and the West. Nevertheless, as the bulldozer to level civilization, America went full speed ahead.

EXPORTATION OF ANARCHY. In 1956 Assistant Secretary of State George Allen went to Africa to "sound the will to independence of the native population; a strong, free and friendly Africa being important to the United States". Read: George Allen went to Africa to stir up a cry for independence NOW. In early '57 George Meany went to Ghana. Speaking for America's 15 million "free" workers (and presumably you and me), he exported immediate trouble and future grievances against America.

He compared France's territories to Hungary, goaded African mobs with such words as, "I speak with equal consternation of Algeria, where patriots deprived of liberty are now locked in final, and I am sure victorious, struggle for independence from French colonialism, the most degrading expression of an outworn and declining imperialism." Mao Tse-tung might have written it. The atrocities Algerians have committed since independence are unprintable.

A few months after Meany's visit Ghana got her independence. Nkrumah took over. A New York lawyer named Lawrence C. McQuade flew to the big 1958 conference in Accra, Ghana's capital, accompanied by Mr. Irving Brown, American labor's revolution-sower around the world. There the two professed to speak for America, came away ardent propagandists for Nkrumah, the Redeemer.

The European edition of the New York Herald Tribune carried McQuade's article, "Ghana's Bid for Leadership", on January 13, 1959. It was a plug for Nkrumah dictatorship over all Africa. McQuade provided the terrorism-inciting slogans, "Africans, you have a continent to regain! Unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains!" The truth: Africans found themselves in chains, and hundreds of thousands lost their lives under atrocious conditions. The following winter McQuade lauded Nkrumah's Ghana in the Yale Review as "The Showplace of Black Africa".

A CONFIDENTIAL INTELLIGENCE REPORT TO THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT detailed the situation of each country in Africa in September 1959. Since this writer obtained a copy, it must have been available to our government and Messrs. Irving Brown and McQuade.

Let us take Ghana. According to this report, the Red offensive in Africa ("last bastion of imperialism and colonialism") had four objectives: Arab Africa in the North, destination, Gibraltar. Black Africa, in a sweep through to Dakar. A drive southward from Egypt, toward Madagascar. And a drive to the South and the West, against the Belgian Congo, Rhodesia, Portugal's colonies and the Union of South Africa.

METHODS USED IN THE COMMUNIST DRIVE: Two. First, the "classic"--diplomatic action, military aid, delivery of arms, military advisors. Second, "the methods of mass"--organization of communist parties, infiltration of parties and labor unions set up by others (Irving Brown.) Diffusion of propaganda by the entire communist apparatus, Russian and Chinese. Youth organizations, students' clubs, cultural activity, Russian scholarships, "Peace" movements, friendship associations, solidarity meetings, and women's organizations.

GHANA AT THE TIME LAWRENCE McQUADE AND IRVING BROWN WERE BOOSTING IT FOR ALL-AFRICAN LEADERSHIP was already in the Russian camp. A Soviet ethnological mission, a delegation to "study West Africa", and a Soviet embassy were all set up and working. Czechoslovakian arms and military advisors were being poured into both Guinea and Ghana. Ghanaian commercial accords

with Czechoslovakia, Russia and Yugoslavia served as subversion fronts. East Germany, China, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Russia had started "student exchanges". East German, Polish and Yugoslav "technicians" were setting up a conquest-of-Africa machine. Aid was arriving, though America and Britain were providing most of Ghana's actual cash. (Nkrumah had been left 300 million pounds sterling by the British. The country was 400 million in debt when he fell.)

Marxist students controlled Ghana's labor unions, and the World Federation of Labor, in Prague, was furnishing the directives. Two propaganda themes--Russian friendship and western enmity--were used. The "colonialist" bogey used by Russia and China is still worked for all it is worth by America and UN. Four Ghana delegates were sent to a big Afro-Asian briefing session in Tashkent in 1958. The International Democratic Federation of Women and the Women's Peace Committee had already set up women's "fronts". Red China was using Ghana as a base for operations against the Ivory Coast and had flown contingents of students to Peking for training. "The New China News Agency" was pouring out propaganda and Chinese cultural missions were everywhere. With all this before our eyes, American newspapers, labor unions, Bilderberg members, congressmen and great foundations worked for more of the same.

IN BRITAIN a Leftist writer named Russell Howe turned out propaganda for the new African despots, while Labor parliamentarian Fenner Brockway advanced their interests in the House of Commons. Articles by Howe appeared in the Washington Post of January 1 and 2, 1959. A Queen's Councillor and former Labor M.P. named Geoffrey Bing handled Nkrumah's travesties on justice within the country, and put over the legislation making Ghana a one-party state. It was Bing who wrote Nkrumah's speeches and devised the law which deprived Nkrumah's opposition of Ghanaian nationality. Now back to America.

JAY LOVESTONE, FORMER SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST PARTY, as AFL-CIO's delegate to UN, wrote to the delegate of pro-Communist Mali, "1960 will go down in history as the year of Africa." Lovestone was regimenting African Reds behind the terrorists in Algeria because, he said, it would "serve the cause of world peace". Let us turn back to 1960, the "African year", and see what it did for peace.

FEBRUARY 5, 1960: Frank Montero and William X. Scheinman (Scheinman carrying an extra passport in the name of John Ball) drove from Leopoldville to Angola, posing as tourists. According to Portuguese authorities, they contacted subversive elements and planned the bloody uprising that occurred a year later. Montero was not arrested for inciting a massacre; instead Kennedy appointed him to UN as Adlai Stevenson's aide for African affairs.

MARCH 9, 1960: Walter Reuther wrote a letter to Secretary of State Herter, but it was meant for Africa. Distributed by the thousands through Nkrumah's "Trade Union Congress" (P.O. Box 701, Accra), it called on African labor unions to insist that Washington withdraw her ambassador from the Union of South Africa, suspend the purchase of South African gold, "suspend the purchase of strategic materials from the Union of South Africa now being stockpiled by the U. S Government for defense". (Read: sabotage America's defense program to hurt South Africa.) This in the name of "the world-wide struggle for freedom".

JUNE 30, 1960. Robert Murphy represented America at Congo independence ceremonies. While Congolese were drawing lots for white men's homes and wives, Murphy praised them for their "maturity and wisdom". Utter savagery has been the Congo's way of life ever since.

NOVEMBER 22, 1960: Congolese Lieutenant Ikuku shouted to departing Ghanaian diplomat, Mr. Welbeck, "You have eaten our colonel."

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS AND THE NATO ALLIANCE. On May 29, 1961, "Soapy" Williams, Kennedy's Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, addressed the Fourth National Labor Conference on the Rights of Man at Forest Park,

Pennsylvania. Said "Soapy": You Africans have asked if we (Americans) are going to follow our revolutionary traditions or if we are going to let ourselves be guided by our alliances with the colonialist countries. The speeches of our President and our representative at UN, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, bear witness to our attachment to liberty. Our votes in UN reinforce our words...Our own labor unions have brought both moral and material support to the struggle of the young African unions, either directly or through their intermediary, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (in Brussels)."

NATO was served notice. Should our alliances with NATO conflict with the interests of African mobs incited by Reuther and Lovestone, our loyalty would be to the latter. Permitting an assistant Secretary of State to make such a speech was bad; translating it into French and distributing it through USIS all over North Africa, at the height of the Algerian war, was suicidal. We are paying for it today.

OCTOBER 8, 1961: Tom Stacey wrote in the London Sunday Times, "Hatred grows in Ghana--'His High Dedication' turns the screw." Those informing America said nothing. Nkrumah of Ghana and Sekou Toure, Guinea's "past master in the art of mobilizing the masses along the Marxist technique" (Paris-Presse, Dec. 12, 1959), continued to turn their countries into Red outposts. America was their ally in Algeria, Mozambique, Angola, Katanga and the Union of South Africa. "Guinea Gives Reds Deserved Comeuppance" screamed an encouraging headline in Washington's conservative HUMAN EVENTS of Nov. 10, 1962. Nothing could have been further from the truth. Sekou Toure never deviated from the communist line. He was doing some horse-trading with Reuther at the moment, that was all.

NKRUMAH FALLS. On February 24, 1966, the "Redeemer" was toppled. Over 2,000 Red agents, advisors and instructors were in Ghana by that time, streamlining the Ghana end of the Nkrumah-Sekou Toure plan to make Africa Red. A mysterious town was discovered north of Accra, in which a monster espionage and sabotage school was turning out agents for all Africa. Jet aircraft bases and a Soviet nuclear reactor were brought to light. Nkrumah's Russian-trained palace guard alone tried to prevent his fall. The scenes in the over-crowded prisons were ghastly, as Nkrumah's opposition and the West's friends staggered out.

Helping Nkrumah run this country, the political cancer of Africa, were Allen Nunn May, the British traitor, and Conor Cruise O'Brien, who as a UN official helped destroy Tshombe (with the aid of one Carl T. Rowan). Bing, the British Red, we have already mentioned. Another member of the Nkrumah clique was Hannah Reitsch, Hitler's woman pilot.

On March 2, Sekou Toure, with the stroke of a pen, made his deposed friend Assistant President of Guinea. Side by side with America and Britain, Nkrumah and Sekou Toure will continue the war against Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique and the Union of South Africa. Call it "Guinea's bid for leadership", Mr. McQuade.

* * * * *

BACKGROUND TO BETRAYAL - The Tragedy of Vietnam, by Hilaire du Berrier, is available in paperback edition through H. du B. Reports for \$1.00 per copy. Hard cover edition may be ordered direct from WESTERN ISLANDS, 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont 78, Mass., for \$5.00 per copy. (Enclose 10¢ for postage.)

Address domestic business correspondence to H. du B. Reports, Box 855, Huntington, Indiana; address foreign business correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, Hotel Lutetia, 43 Blvd. Raspail, Paris VI, France.

Subscription price: \$10 per year. Extra copies of this newsletter 20¢ each to regular subscribers; rates on large quantities given on request.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent
Jennie Edmonds, Managing Editor