

AMERICAN OPINION

“THE CALIFORNIA REPORT”

on

The John Birch Society

REPRINT SERIES

One Dollar

It is our purpose, in issuing these reprints, to recapture for those who care some of the true history of the past twenty years.

Talleyrand said that speech was used by man to conceal his thoughts. Today that wily realist would add that "history" has become the means of falsifying the record of past events.

We hope that the rescue in this series of a few of the honest books of the period, which have been smothered by the Liberal Establishment, will cause some thin rays of truth to pierce through the fog of distortion and falsehood that now envelops America. For when man's past crimes are presented as virtuous accomplishments, he has little chance to avoid the repetition of either the crimes or their cruel results.

REPRINT SERIES

"The California Report"

on

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

July 15, 1963

Dear Reader:

It seems to me that the general public, regardless of its attitude towards The John Birch Society, should find a great deal of encouragement in this Report. For it reveals a controlling tradition of honorableness and responsibility in the legislative framework of our governmental system which has withstood all the pressures and attrition of the dishonorable decades.

For the Burns Committee was composed of Democrats. And while nationally about half of the Birchers are Democrats, in California a preponderant percentage are active in the Republican Party. Also, California's Democratic Governor and Attorney General are both well known to be bitterly hostile to the Society. Yet nowhere in this Report is there the slightest sign of any unfair partisan approach to the task of the Committee.

There are some minor errors and misunderstandings, yes. We think that the Committee's thinking was affected to a small extent consciously, and to a larger extent unconsciously, by the noisy hurricane of "Liberalism" blowing unceasingly around them. Speaking on behalf of the Society and of myself personally, in the letter on Page v, I have asked for the patience of the Committee when my footnotes try to present our side of some of the criticisms. But the important fact is that this Committee of Democratic legislators, in the currently very "Liberal" state of California, was determined to do its investigating job — and did its job — in a completely honorable and objective manner.

Without the slightest apology for being "corny" we say: "Hat's off to the Committee! And hat's off to America!" We are not what we were, but we still have enough strength and honor left to bury Khrushchev and all of his cohorts and successors.

Sincerely,

Robert Welch

AMERICAN OPINION REPRINTS are published by, and may be ordered directly from, Robert Welch, Inc., Belmont, Massachusetts 02178. Price one dollar per copy, or twelve copies for ten dollars. AMERICAN OPINION magazine is published by the same firm. Subscription rates in United States and Canada are ten dollars per year; in all other countries, twelve dollars per year.

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE



TWELFTH REPORT OF THE SENATE FACTFINDING SUBCOMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

1963

MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

SENATOR JOHN F. THOMPSON,
Vice Chairman

SENATOR CHARLES BROWN
(Deceased)

SENATOR J. HOWARD WILLIAMS
(Deceased)

SENATOR AARON QUICK

SENATOR HUGH M. BURNS, *Chairman*
R. E. COMBS, *Counsel*

ELIZABETH NEILSEN, *Executive Secretary*

EVELIN ROGERS, *Secretary*

Published by the
SENATE
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR GLENN M. ANDERSON
President of the Senate

HUGH M. BURNS
President pro Tempore

JOSEPH A. BEEK
Secretary

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

SENATE CHAMBER, STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO, June 12, 1963

HONORABLE GLENN M. ANDERSON
PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, AND
GENTLEMEN OF THE SENATE;

Senate Chamber, Sacramento, California

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN OF THE SENATE: Pursuant to Senate Rules Resolution No. 1, adopted June 13, 1961, under authority of Paragraph 12.5 (13) of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Senate Factfinding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities of the General Research Committee was created and the following Members of the Senate were appointed to said subcommittee by the Senate Committee on Rules: Senators Charles Brown,* Aaron W. Quick, John F. Thompson,† Stephen P. Teale, Hugh M. Burns, Chairman.

The committee herewith submits a report of its investigation and findings.

Respectfully submitted,

HUGH M. BURNS, *Chairman*
AARON W. QUICK
STEPHEN P. TEALE

* Deceased.

† Term expired.



REPORT OF THE SENATE FACTFINDING SUBCOMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

TO THE 1963 REGULAR CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

On March 22, 1961, Robert Welch sent a telegram to Governor Brown and a copy to Senator Hugh Burns, requesting an investigation of the John Birch Society by the California Senate Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, of which Senator Burns is chairman. On the following day this telegram was sent to Mr. Welch:

"Robert Welch, Founder, John Birch Society, Belmont 78, Massachusetts. This will acknowledge your telegram of March 22 in which you express a willingness to appear before our committee. We have been aware of your society's existence and have made some investigation of its activities. In the normal course of events, we would expect to continue this investigation at the conclusion of the current session of the Legislature. At that time you will be beyond the jurisdiction of a California legislative committee. However, if you are still willing to appear before our committee, we will arrange such a hearing. Please bear in mind that our committee policy has been to conduct our inquiries through staff investigation and in executive committee session in order to accomplish the greatest amount of good with the least amount of sensationalism. Our committee would appreciate it if you would keep us posted as to your whereabouts and activities until we have an opportunity to schedule a hearing.¹ Hugh M. Burns, Chairman, Senate Factfinding Committee on Un-American Activities."

Senator Burns then issued the following press release:

"I have sent a wire to Robert Welch, the founder of the John Birch Society, acknowledging his willingness to appear before the committee.

"The committee will be glad to schedule a hearing after the adjournment of the legislative session at which time he will be invited to appear.

"I do not believe it would be in the public interest to embark on an extensive investigation of this organization while the Legislature is in session. It would have a disruptive effect on our legislative duties.

"We have been investigating the society and would continue to do so with or without the current outbreak of controversy. There have been allegations that the society is or could become subversive. Our investigation has not progressed to the stage where a conclusive judgment on this subject could be made.

"Certainly the mere fact that this is a right wing instead of a left wing organization does not clothe it with some sort of holiness which protects it from being dangerous to our country.

"Any movement, from the unbalanced right or the unbalanced left, which tears the country apart by rumor, slander, fear and doubt must necessarily be suspect. We will continue our investigation. It will be thorough. It will be done in a careful, dignified manner, at a time and place where calmness and deliberation can prevail."

Immediately after these telegrams and statements appeared in the press, the committee was deluged with a stream of letters that has continued until the present time. Virtually all of the writers insisted that we hold public hearings. Critics of the society demanded that we expose it as a fascist movement; members of the society were equally insistent that we unmask its critics as Communists or Communist dupes. So vehement and persistent were these demands, so steady was the volume of letters, that the committee was moved to state once again the scope of its authority and the nature of its operation. On April 8, 1961, the Fresno *Bee* carried this statement by Senator Burns:

"... we are not a headline hunting committee. We are not oriented to sensationalism. We are a study and factfinding committee. We get information from documents, personal interviews, closed hearings and other investigative procedures.

"The facts then developed are analyzed and reports submitted to the Legislature. Times, places, dates and names are printed where it is deemed necessary to document conclusions.

"As to the John Birch Society, some thought should be given to the function of our committee in relation to the society. Our committee is a factfinding committee on un-American activities. Our sole interest in the John Birch Society must go to the question of whether the society is un-American.

"We are not interested in investigating the John Birch Society to find out what its views are on Communism. We are only interested in finding out whether the John Birch Society is un-American."

We have pursued our investigation with these limits in mind, having started our file on the society shortly after it commenced to operate in this state. Our study is based on a wide range of newspaper descriptions of the John Birch Society, from the restrained treatment by Gene Blake in the *Los Angeles Times* to the somewhat more critical articles in the *Santa Barbara News-Press*; a variety of booklets and pamphlets ranging from sympathetic analyses from the political right and furious attacks from the Communist Party itself; we have sent investigators out in the field to interview both detractors and supporters of the society; we have secured affidavits and signed statements from 91 people, and we have reports from agents who attended chapter meetings of the society. From official sources we have obtained and studied the literature of the organization, the *Blue Book, American Opinion*, the monthly bulletins and recommended books. We have read the report issued by Attorney General Mosk, and the charges made by Governor Brown.

In April 1961 Welch disclosed that he had requested the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security to conduct an investigation of the society, since it was a nationwide organization and should appropriately be scrutinized by Congress. Our own investigation, while necessarily involving the national origin and development of the movement, will be otherwise limited to its operations in California.

Origin and Growth

While many accounts of the creation of the John Birch Society have appeared in newspapers, magazines and in the personal observations of the state Attorney General, we set it forth briefly here.

Robert H. W. Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, was born in Chowan County, North Carolina, 63 years ago. He received a degree from the University of North Carolina, attended Annapolis Naval Academy for two years and studied law at Harvard. He then became interested in the candy manufacturing business and eventually organized the firm that bore his name and made him financially independent.¹

Welch established residence at Belmont, Massachusetts, served as a vice-chairman of the Republican Party Finance Committee in that state and was a candidate for its lieutenant governor in 1950. Not all of the organizations with which Welch has been affiliated were conservative, as the books and records of the League for Industrial Democracy, founded by Fabian Socialists in England, and in this country by Upton Sinclair, Jack London, Clarence Darrow and other militant liberals, still show that Mr. Robert Welch of Belmont, Massachusetts, is a member in good standing.² The League for Industrial Democracy was aggressively socialist, and for several years was led by the late Robert Morss Lovett.

As a result of his reading and his travels, Welch became convinced that the nation faced imminent peril from Communist subversion at home. Accordingly he asked some of his business acquaintances to come and discuss the problem. They assembled from several states and listened while, on December 8 and 9, 1958, Welch expressed his views. This was the inception of the John Birch Society, and the statements Welch made on that occasion were incorporated into the society's

Blue Book, its basic document. In this 179-page book is set forth the principles, purposes, organizational structure and activities of the society. In addition monthly bulletins are issued from the national headquarters at Belmont 78, Massachusetts, and distributed to members through their individual chapters. *American Opinion* is a magazine also published by Welch as part of the society's literature.

By the end of 1959 there were chapters of the society in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, Virginia, South Carolina, Wisconsin, Florida, Michigan, Tennessee, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Texas, Washington and California. In 1961 the only states remaining unorganized were Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Idaho, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah and Vermont. And as 1961 shortened some of these states were rapidly being organized.

Origin of the Name

The name of the society was taken in honor of the late Captain John Birch of Georgia, who was serving as an American intelligence officer in China and was killed by Chinese Communists 10 days after the end of World War II. Welch researched the case, and wrote about Birch in *American Opinion* magazine. This account depicts Birch as an American martyr, but as the John Birch Society has been beset with controversy every step of its way, so has there been controversy even about the account of the man whose name it bears.

Welch believed the name appropriate because John Birch was undoubtedly the first American to be killed by Communists during the cold war. Having been a Baptist missionary in China, familiar with several Chinese language dialects, Birch later joined the Fourteenth Air Force and at the time of his death on a railroad near Hsueh in 1945 was an agent in the Office of Strategic Services. He aided prisoners of the Chinese Communists to escape from the country, and as he stood for the principles of Christianity, was an implacable enemy of Communism, and was in the uniform of his country's armed forces at the time he was murdered, he epitomized the things for which the John Birch Society also stands.

In 1954 Welch wrote a book, "The Life of John Birch," that has been widely distributed, and which may be found on the shelves of bookstores carrying anti-Communist literature. Of course it is also available at all outlets that supply the various chapters of the society. Birch was only 27¹ when he died. Most of his associates describe him as a highly dedicated, resolute and devout man; courageous and outspoken. Some, however, have asserted that he was brash and outspoken, and that had he not attempted to brazen his way out of the tense situation near the village of Hsueh he might not have lost his life. Some of his party did return to their base.

Joseph S. Sample, Billings, Montana, was a member of the intelligence unit to which Birch was assigned and has stated that:

"Captain Birch chose to bluff his way out of a difficult situation. Harsh words led to insults, and insults to arrogance. Finally, in a fit of rage, the Chinese Communist leader shot Birch. The remainder of the team was released and returned to Kunming."
Sample is president of KOOK Radio and TV at Billings.²

The Politician

In 1954 Welch wrote a 268-page letter for distribution to his intimate friends. The contents were to be kept confidential, and the reason for this restriction on its dissemination became immediately obvious when his views were made generally known. On page 267 of the letter Milton Eisenhower, the former President's brother, is described as a Communist of 30 years' standing. This would have placed Dr. Eisenhower in the Communist Party as far back as 1924—seven years after the Russian Revolution, just after the civil war in that country, and only five years after the formation of the Communist Party of the United States. Those familiar with the history of Communism in this country will know that the first national convention wasn't held until 1922 at Bridgeman, Michigan; that there were actually two Communist Parties operating simultaneously, and there was no effective organization *until* 1924.¹

Government agents raided the Bridgeman convention and secured membership lists despite elaborate party precautions to prevent such a calamity. The Comintern representatives ordered the organization underground, and it has operated with an above-ground and an underground apparatus ever since.

In the light of this perspective, two facts emerge: first, that despite serious reading and analysis of the Communist movement in the United States, Mr. Welch apparently failed to take this historical background into account when he wrote *The Politician*, and, secondly, in view of that background, the possibility of Dr. Eisenhower's having been a member of this ephemeral movement in 1924 is far too remote to warrant serious consideration? One may disagree with Dr. Eisenhower's political, economic and sociological beliefs, and one may even be convinced that his actions have been detrimental to the welfare of this nation and of some aid to the world Communist effort to subvert us—but there has been too much loose accusation that people or organizations with which we disagree are Communist or Communist-dominated. The accusation in the letter becomes even more tenuous when Welch added “. . . this opinion is based largely on an accumulation of detailed evidence³ and so palpable that it seems to put this consideration beyond any reasonable doubt.”

The Politician also contained other charges. Former President Eisenhower was described as “a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.” And amplifying the statement, Welch added, on page 268, “. . . there is only one possible word to describe his purpose and actions. That word is ‘treason.’” He even gave the relative authority of the two brothers, saying: “In my opinion the chances are very strong that Milton Eisenhower is actually Dwight Eisenhower's superior and boss within the Communist Party. For one thing, he is obviously a great deal smarter.”

Others named by Welch in *The Politician* as aiding the Communist conspiracy—consciously or otherwise—were former Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, Chief Justice Earl Warren, John Foster Dulles, and his brother Allen.

As time passed Welch added to this sensational document, and by late 1958, when the John Birch Society was formed, it had grown from 6,000

words to 80,000. It was reproduced by offset and distributed to some of the top members of the John Birch Society, but Welch has been recently quoted as stating that he is trying to withdraw each copy and get it out of circulation as quickly as possible.

It is difficult indeed to reconcile the accusations made in *The Politician* by Mr. Welch with the records of John Foster Dulles and his brother Allan in their fight against the world Communist movement. Bearing in mind that the controversial letter was first circulated by Welch in 1954 and was thereafter expanded and circulated in 1958, one wonders whether he had read the strong anti-Communist public statements by the late Secretary of State, and his brother who recently retired as head of our Central Intelligence Agency! Here are some typical public utterances by both men. John Foster Dulles:

“These challenges of a changing world are the more demanding of us because international communism seeks to dominate the change and thereby ride itself to world rule.

“It professes a creed which, it claims, shows the way to assured peace and great productivity. According to it, human beings are animated particles of matter; order and maximum productivity require that they be directed in accordance with a master plan which will assure conformity of thought and act, and eliminate the discords inherent in a society which gives freedom of thought and choice to the individual human being. The Soviet Communist Party, as the ‘general staff of the world proletariat,’ would devise and administer the worldwide master plan . . . Thus, the challenge of change that confronts us offers, not a choice between freedom and stagnation, or even between freedom and chaos. The choice is between freedom and a world in which great power, strong discipline, and a materialistic creed are combined to end everywhere the exercise of human freedom.” (*State Department Bulletin*, June 23, 1958, p. 1036.)

And speaking of “Progress and Human Dignity” in the same publication for December 1, 1958, our then Secretary of State said of the world Communist movement:

“All of this effort is directed by rulers who seek, through the creation of a vast slave state, to enhance the power of what Mr. Khrushchev calls the international Communist movement. It is hard to believe that this effort will succeed or be enduring. Despotisms have always failed in the past. Any despotism founded upon the denial of human values and upon exaltation of materialism has within it the seeds of its own destruction.” (Page 866)

On April 8, 1959, Allen Dulles, speaking as director of the Central Intelligence Agency, made a speech in New Orleans which was published in the *State Department Bulletin* of April 27, at page 583. He said:

“International communism has not changed its operating procedure since the days of the Comintern and the Cominform. The Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., of which Khrushchev is the leader, is the spearhead of the movement. It has a worldwide mis-

sion, formulated by Lenin and Stalin and now promoted by Khrushchev, but with more subtle techniques than those of Stalin. This mission continues to be the subversion of the entire free world, starting of course with those countries that are most vulnerable.

"Its arsenal of attack is based, first of all, on the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and Communist China. These in turn direct the hard-core Communist organizations which exist in practically every country in the world. Every Communist Party maintains its secret connections with Moscow or, in the case of certain Communist Parties of the Far East, with Peiping.

"In conclusion I wish to emphasize again the pressing need for a clearer understanding of the real purpose behind the Sino-Soviet program. There is no evidence that the present leaders of the Communist world have the slightest idea of abandoning their goal or of changing the general tactics of achieving them.

"Those who feel we can buy peace by compromises with Khrushchev are sadly deluded. Each concession we give him merely strengthens his position and prestige and the ability of the Soviet regime to continue its domination of the Russian people whose friendship we seek.

"Our defense lies not in compromise but in understanding and firmness, in a strong and ready deterrent military power, in the marshaling of our economic assets with those of the other free countries of the world to meet their methods of economic penetration, and finally in the unmasking of their subversive techniques."

We have quoted these public statements to demonstrate that at the very time *The Politician* was being circulated, these men were making the most emphatic and clear attacks against the world Communist movement, and were backing up their public utterances with courageous action.¹ As for former Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower, their records are too well known to require such quotations. During the Roosevelt administration, and to a lesser degree during the administration of Truman, there most assuredly was an infiltration by Communist agents in many strategic government positions. But we are prone to forget that when President Roosevelt criticized the Soviet Union, he was loudly booed by the brash young people of the Youth Congress assembled on the White House lawn; that Truman *did* take positive action to shore up our security program against internal subversion, as did President Eisenhower. They each recognized the patent fact that we did indeed have a problem of domestic subversion, and that we would continue to have it just so long as a Communist organization existed in the United States.

President Truman appointed a commission to study the problem in 1946, and issued Executive Order 9835 in March of the following year which established a loyalty-security program for the entire executive branch of the government. On April 27, 1953, President Eisenhower issued Executive Order 10450, extending the program and considerably widening its scope. These basic orders were implemented from time to time, and while the three Presidents mentioned by Welch in *The Poli-*

tician have been criticized for having been too gentle in their treatment of internal subversion, too tolerant of Communists in this country, we must also recall that the Smith Act prosecutions and a line of Supreme Court cases that were handed down by our highest tribunal until 1956, all combined to harass and smother Communist activities most effectively.

We are dealing at length with the allegations contained in *The Politician* because it set off the criticism of the John Birch Society when its contents became known, because most of the top officials in the John Birch Society attribute the attacks against it to the contents of *The Politician* and because it serves to highlight the character¹ of Robert Welch as the founder and present leader of the movement. Furthermore, it will be necessary to refer to the document hereafter, in distinguishing between the critics of the statements contained in it and efforts to attribute the sentiments of its author to all members of the society.

The Pasternak Plot

Before we leave the writings of Robert Welch as an expert in the anti-Communist field, it is necessary to examine another of his publications. For several years Mr. Welch was the publisher and editor of a magazine called *American Opinion*. It is issued from Belmont, Massachusetts, and widely distributed—not only to members of the John Birch Society and at bookstores, but to the public at large through annual subscription. An issue of this publication in 1959 contained an explanation that the publication and worldwide sale of the novel *Dr. Zhivago*, by the late Russian author Boris Pasternak, was in reality a plot hatched by the Soviet Secret Police.² Despite the fact that the author was roundly berated in official Soviet papers, was forbidden to accept the Nobel Peace Prize, and was hounded until he died,³ Mr. Welch contended that actually the Soviet Union *wanted* the book widely read, and therefore spun this elaborate scheme to only make people *believe* it was opposed to the novel and to only *pretend* it was rebuking Pasternak for having written such an anti-Soviet book.⁴

We are not competent, of course, to make any judgment of the accuracy of this startling contention without at least taking a passing look at what the book contained. Some very brief excerpts will suffice.

On page 223 *Dr. Zhivago* says:

“When the revolution woke him up, he decided that his century-old dream was coming true—his dream of living on his own land by the work of his hands, in complete independence and with no obligations to anyone. Instead, he found he had only exchanged the oppression of the former state for the new, much harsher yoke of the revolutionary superstate.”

On page 259, *Zhivago* says:

“. . . I don't know a movement more self-centered and further removed from the facts than Marxism. Everyone is worried only about proving himself in practical matters, and as for the men in power, they are so anxious to establish the myth of their infallibility that they do their utmost to ignore the truth.”

And on page 507 one soldier says to another :

“I think that collectivization was an erroneous and unsuccessful measure and it was impossible to admit the error. To conceal the failure people had to be cured, by every means of terrorism, of the habit of judging and thinking for themselves, and forced to see what didn't exist, to assert the very opposite of what their eyes told them. This accounts for the unexampled cruelty of the Yezhov head of the secret police period, the promulgation of a constitution that was never meant to be applied, and the introduction of elections that violated every principle of free choice.”

Moreover, the entire tenor of this book, written by a sensitive author whose forte was poetry, contrasted the warm, spiritual attributes of man against the drab materialism of the Soviet regime. We cannot conceive of a plot to promote the circulation of this novel by the Soviet secret police—and besides, there was no vestige of evidence to support Mr. Welch's theory.¹ But there is substantial evidence, aside from the nature of the book itself, in the opposite direction.

We have described in our reports that when Khrushchev delivered his “secret” speech in Moscow in February 1956, his attack on the dead Stalin provoked a deep split in the American Communist Party. The chairman of the southern division of the party in California, together with a large following, was accused of “revisionism.” Many left the party in disgust, others drifted into inactivity and gradually isolated themselves from all party affairs. Howard Fast resigned; so did John Gates. Fast had been the literary leader of American party, while Gates was editor of the *Daily Worker* in New York. Each of them wrote a book. Fast wrote *The Naked God*, and Gates wrote *The Life of an American Communist*. Another Russian novelist, Vladimir Dudintsev, had also written an anti-Soviet book called *Not By Bread Alone*, and so had Milovan Djilas, the Yugoslav, whose book was called *The New Class*. All of these books were highly critical of the Soviet regime and of Marxism in general. All were, for a brief time, sold at the Communist bookstore in Los Angeles. And on the same table with them was *Dr. Zhivago*.

There was no such heretical schism in the Northern California division of the party. There were defections, and there were revisionists, but there was nothing like the defiant upheaval in the Communist ranks of Southern California. Obviously, if there had been a Soviet secret police plot to blanket the capitalist countries with the Pasternak book, it would have appeared on the shelves of the outlet in Northern California where the discipline was sterner, and where such defiant anti-party works as those by Howard Fast and John Gates were not displayed.

The Pasternak novel places man above the state, and praises the value of human dignity and spiritual attributes. Its total effect is at utter variance with the materialist theory of history and the very essence of the Soviet system. And here again it is necessary to consider the matter in proper perspective. When this book was published Khrushchev had made his slashing attack on the dead Stalin, and had promised that the old restrictions would be relaxed. This, of course, was because the masses were restive; the intelligentsia had become more

critical of the rule by terror, and with the change of control after Stalin's long tenure it was practically impossible to continue his repressive policies. In addition there were revolts in the satellites, and after criticism was permitted it was difficult to clamp down the censorship again. It was indeed applied later, but after *Dr. Zhivago* was being sold throughout the world. Pasternak was, however, stopped from accepting the Nobel Prize, and even after his death his secretary was hounded unmercifully by the Soviet authorities.

Eugene Lyons is one of the most perceptive analysts of the Soviet scene. He was one of the first American newsmen to be stationed in the U.S.S.R., and remained in that country for several years. His books, *Assignment to Utopia*, *Moscow Carousel*, and *The Red Decade*, are still widely read. In an article which appeared in *National Review* on April 11, 1959, he had this to say about the Welch idea of the secret police plot to circulate Pasternak's book:

"Thus the fantasy that the huge success of Doctor Zhivago 'would be utterly impossible if the Kremlin . . . didn't actually want the book to sell' is only the latest in a long array of myths. It reflects the state of mind that attributes to the Communist movement supernatural cunning, unbounded powers of efficient planning, and a diabolism beyond human ability to cope with.

"This is anti-Communism carried to an extreme of sophistication that is self defeating—the kind that sees a 'plant' in every prominent defector from communism, an 'agent' in every escapee from the Communist realm, a crypto-Communist in every opponent of communism who fails to express his opposition in the ritual style of the sect."

And Mr. Lyons concludes his article by saying:

"Only someone bereft of his senses could conceivably be converted to Marxism by *Doctor Zhivago*. Its total effect is a devastating revulsion against communism in practice.

"As a brake on their zeal, the folklorists should understand that the Kremlin's paramount concern is the maintenance of power. In matters affecting its rock-bottom security, its monolithic structure, its defense against actual and potential domestic threats, it never takes undue chances. Clever lying to disorient the enemy stops where the safety of the regime begins. On things like Trotskyism, the Titoist heresy, revisionism, rebellions in its empire, or a book like *Doctor Zhivago*, it cannot risk speculative propaganda tricks.

"The Communist skill in trickery hardly justifies any of us in tricking ourselves. The trouble in such exercises in self-delusion is that, by reducing valid distrust of communist behavior *ad absurdum*, they undermine the effectiveness of exposures of genuine Communist duplicities."

We should also note that Mr. Welch's ideas about the Pasternak book were applied to the work by Djilas, heretofore mentioned, and his conclusions printed in the *Blue Book* of the John Birch Society, eighth printing, pp. 100-101:

"Already, through their stooges like Milovan Djilas, who is supposed to be in disgrace in Yugoslavia, and Boris Pasternak, who is

supposed to be suffering bitter enmity of the dictators in Russia, but whose books have thus been publicized—and, please note, helped by the left wing—to become best sellers in America; already through such books, which gullible Americans are more and more accepting, or finding less unbelievable, the thesis of these books that communism itself is all right—in fact it's a glorious system—and that all that's wrong with it is the character of the people now running the system."

Lyons also mentioned the Djilas book in the article from which we quoted above. He said:

"Milovan Djilas, in *The New Class*, described himself as still a socialist and Marxist. Consequently there were those who raised questions as to the long-run value of the book. To me the doubts seemed unreasonable: Djilas' scathing critique of socialism in practice was so persuasive that it reduced to illogic his restive and nostalgic avowals of faith in theoretical Marxism. But among the questioners were some who saw the book as a hoax, perpetrated by Communists to promote the socialist idea in general even at the price of deadly derogation of the systems actually on display in Russia and the author's own country." (*National Review*, April 11, 1959, p. 645.)

The statements made by Mr. Welch in *The Politician*, his views about the Pasternak and Djilas books, and his expressed ability to detect Communists by "feel," have combined to provide the press with ammunition which has been fired back at Welch and the John Birch Society in salvos and broadsides.¹ In the *Blue Book* of the John Birch Society, for example, he stated:

"Now there are ways of sizing up both individuals and organizations in this battle, which come only with experience, a knowledge of the interlocking pieces and personalities, and a feel for the way the Communists work . . . I have a fairly sensitive and accurate nose in this area." (*Blue Book* of the John Birch Society, eighth printing, 1961, pp. 160-161.)²

He also stated that in checking his feelings about subversive persons and groups with the records of experts, he found that he was frequently right. But, of course, Mr. Welch can make mistakes, too, as he freely admits; and the quickest way to get thoroughly discredited in the anti-subversive field is to sniff too many times in the wrong direction, and to form judgments on anything but the most reliable evidence. Intuition is not only unreliable in this field, but often diverts attention from the real target that has been too-well deodorized to be exposed by a sniff.

Guilt by Association

When the Communist front organizations were especially active during the late thirties and early forties, the party issued some intensive propaganda against the principle of what it termed guilt by association. The purpose of this device was apparent to students of the Communist

movement, but many were convinced that somehow it had become wrong to judge a man by the company he kept and the organizations to which he belonged. Particularly if they were Communist friends and fronts. If he became involved innocently with a front, then became interested in Marxism, then joined another and another such group on a scale of increasing activity and enthusiasm—this was to be ignored as evidence that he was flirting with Communism. This sort of propaganda was accompanied by the planting of an idea that any American citizen was free to join any organization he liked, and to associate with anyone—including Communist fronts and Communist Party members. Anyone who presumed to raise a loyalty question about such matters was frowned upon as interfering with civil rights, and the Communists tried to create an atmosphere wherein no significance was to be attached to these records of subversive affiliation, insisting that the criticism should be directed against those who dared to question these actions.

Guilt by association is as old as civilization itself, in the sense that it is only natural that a man should be judged to some degree by the company he elects to keep and the organizations with which he elects to associate. It may be perfectly lawful for a man to join a Communist front organization—or a dozen or more, for that matter. But it is equally lawful and logical for him to be appraised accordingly.¹

The fact that members of the John Birch Society were associated together in a tightly knit movement led by Welch has prompted many newspapers and magazines to assume that the members held the same views that Welch expressed in *The Politician* and *American Opinion*. Spokesmen for the society, and Welch himself, have repeatedly declared that *The Politician* was written and sent to friends before the society was ever conceived; that it was strictly private correspondence between individuals and marked confidential. It was, however, obtained by the press and given sensational publicity without the consent of the author. Rank and file members of the society point out that Welch's private ideas are his own, and that his views regarding the loyalty of our highest public officials are shared by few of the members. And the same thing goes, they say, for his ideas about smelling out Communists, and the alleged Soviet scheme to disseminate the Pasternak and Djilas books.

Early members of the society never heard of *The Politician*, which was written four years before it was formed. Some of the people to whom copies of this confidential document had been mailed later became members of the society, and a few of them assumed positions of some responsibility, but even some of these have violently disagreed with Welch's accusations in 1954, and members of the John Birch Society were outraged when they read that they were a bunch of crackpots because these views of Welch had been imputed to them.

Since Robert Welch is the founder and acknowledged leader of the society, it is pertinent to know about his personal sentiments, however; and we must then proceed to ascertain to what extent these views are shared by his followers. In an attempt to determine this, we have taken statements from more than a hundred present members of the society, and from our own investigators who have attended meetings. The inescapable conclusion is that few members agree with Welch that the national figures mentioned in *The Politician* were sub-

versive—consciously or otherwise—or that the Kremlin concocted the finely spun plots to circulate the books by Pasternak and Djilas. On the contrary, there is much evidence to the effect that many of the society's national council members have vainly asked Welch to repudiate the views he expressed in this sensational letter of 1954, and that most of the Birchers regard Welch's early accusations as indefensible and ridiculous.

We did not consider it possible to render an accurate report concerning the purposes, organizational structure and activities of a movement such as this without sending representatives to attend meetings in various localities throughout the State; and as the meetings are openly held, this posed no great difficulty. In some places attendance was restricted to known members of the society and persons sponsored by them. In other areas it was quite easy for anyone to attend who manifested an interest and appeared sincere. We shall consider the actual conduct of meetings later. First we shall quote from some of the statements of members concerning the views of Mr. Welch set forth above.

“. . . I must admit Robert Welch in a few of his controversial comments did not use the prudence and judgment a man in his position should have exercised. However, as I understand it, his unfortunate comment about Mr. Eisenhower with which I, and I'm sure 99 percent of our membership disagree, was not a public utterance and represented a violation of confidence that never should have seen the light of day. Unfortunately, it provided a timely weapon for an exploitation, magnified beyond all justification—in view of the actual facts and true philosophy and purpose of the society.” (Statement by Henri de La Chapelle.)

“Several years ago I became a member of the John Birch Society . . . because I saw in it the first opinion group to come to my attention which possessed the potentialities for organizing the scattered voices of conservatism into an effective influence on the political environment of our country. In the ensuing years I have not always agreed with some details of its program; neither Mr. Welch nor the members of the council of the society expect the membership to. But since joining the society I have seen nothing to change my original opinion regarding its potentialities nor to cause me to believe that it stands for anything other than the achievement of constitutional objectives by legal, constitutional means.” (Statement by Robert Blake, Major General, U.S. Marine Corps, retired.)

“If the numerous charges hurled against this fine society by press, radio, television, etc., approached the nearness of truth, I can assure you I would have ceased my membership by now. Without laboring the point, the most glaring example which comes to mind is that the John Birch Society believes that Dwight D. Eisenhower is a conscious agent of the Communist Party. Fine, if Robert Welch wrote this in a private letter or document, but to embrace the entire society by this one phrase—written by Mr. Welch with no anticipation of it being published is, to me, absurd.” (Statement by Thomas F. O'Loughlan.)

“To sum up my reaction to the nationwide smear campaign to discredit the J.B.S., I might touch on the one point that seems to be the greatest stumbling block to most peoples’ acceptance of the society. Robert Welch’s statement that General Eisenhower was a pseudo Communist or a Communist dupe appears to be the heaviest burden the society has had to bear, even though the letter it was quoted from has never been a part of the society.

“Irregardless of the truth of the accusation, the worst that Robert Welch can be accused of is indulging in a little private name calling. Mud slinging, if you prefer. Many of the columnists and politicians who screamed loudest about Mr. Welch’s charges indulge in this old American custom to a degree frightening to any not accustomed to its daily application. ‘Let he who is without guilt cast the first stone.’” (Statement by Charles A. Lovers.)

Coupled with these early views of Welch were the authoritarian character of the society, its employment of front organizations, and allegations of its semi-secret nature—all of which were combined to provoke charges of fascism, irresponsible redbaiting and right-wing lunacy against the membership. We will undertake to examine the accuracy of these charges, together with the replies of the society, and our own estimate of the nature of the movement.

In arriving at our conclusions we have examined the reports of our own representatives, who were instructed to contact members of the society, to attend meetings, to take statements from the most determined critics of the organization, and from officers and representative members of the society. From this mass of material, mostly written, much reduced to affidavit form, we have arrived at what we believe to be the truth. There has been an astounding amount of heat generated over the John Birch Society. And just as Welch, in *The Politician* and in *American Opinion* has made some highly sensational and unsupported charges, so have the critics of the movement been fully as sensational in hurling irresponsible accusations against the society.

Some of the most vocal critics against guilt by association were quick to attribute Welch’s utterances, four years before the organization was formed, to all of the people who have jointed it to date. The evidence before us indicates that this charge is ridiculous. We have found that a few members of the John Birch Society do, indeed, fully agree with Welch’s statements in *The Politician*. They also subscribe to his ideas about the plots behind the Pasternak and Djilas books. It is also true that this minority make a noise out of all proportion to their numerical strength. This type of member is quick to suspect every ex-Communist of being a spy for the party, to sense a complex plot behind every simple Communist maneuver, and to tag as subversive propaganda every picture taken in the USSR.

But we also find this type in the ultra-liberal groups. In organizations of the left we find a minority who would protect the civil liberties of Soviet agents operating in this country to subvert us; who believe we should immediately disarm and scrap our atomic weapons, no matter what the Russians do; that we should liquidate all overseas military bases, bring home all the troops, get out of NATO, recognize Red

China, and trust our destiny to the United Nations. This sort of person regards anyone whose political philosophy is to the right of Norman Thomas as a fascist. They are a tiny minority, but they are most articulate. If two or three such extremists gain control of an organization, whether it is oriented toward right or left, they tend to attract others of similar character.

As we shall point out, this tendency has afflicted the John Birch Society in this state to some degree, as it has also afflicted organizations of the left. Before leaving the attitude of the overwhelming majority of members toward the earlier Welch statements, however, the reaction of W. R. Fawcett pertinently sums up the matter. Fawcett declared:

"I knew . . . that Welch was a crusader and a zealot. But I am not going to damn the John Birch Society because Welch went off the deep end in his pamphlet, which was distributed in strict confidence to a handful of men several years ago." (Los Angeles Times, March 31, 1961.)

Organizational Structure

When Welch called 11 of his friends together at Indianapolis in December 1958, the lectures he delivered to them on that occasion were incorporated into what is now known as *The Blue Book of the John Birch Society*. It contains the reasons for the formation of the organization, its purposes, operational technique, and general structure. It has been referred to by virtually all who have written about the organization, runs to about 178 pages in the eighth edition, and excerpts have often been quoted out of context to suit the purposes of several writers. We consider the following excerpts to be indispensable to our purposes, and trust that we have taken adequate precaution not to quote them out of the general context of the book.

"The John Birch Society is to be a monolithic body. A republican form of government or of organization has many attractions and advantages, under certain favorable conditions. But under less happy circumstances it lends itself readily to infiltration, distortion and disruption. And democracy, of course, in government or organization, as the Greeks and Romans both found out, and as I believe every man in this room clearly recognizes—democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud. ". . . The John Birch Society will operate under completely authoritative control at all levels. The fear of tyrannical oppression of individuals, and other arguments against the authoritative structure in the form of governments, have little bearing on the case of a voluntary association, where the authoritative power can be exercised and enforced only by persuasion. And what little validity they do have is outweighed by the advantages of firm and positive direction of the society's energies. Especially for the near future, and for the fight against communism which is the first great task of the society, it is imperative that all the strength we can muster be subject to smoothly functioning direction from the top. As I have said before, no collection of debating societies is ever going to stop the Communist conspiracy from taking us over,

and I have no intention of adding another frustrated group to their number. We mean business every step of the way." (*Blue Book*, 8th ed., pp. 158-159.)

* * * * *

"Those members who cease to feel the necessary degree of loyalty can either resign or will be put out before they build up any splintering following of their own inside the society . . . We can allow for differences of opinion. We shall need and welcome advice. And we expect to use the normal measure of diplomacy always called for in dealing with human beings. But whenever differences of opinion become translated into a lack of loyal support, we shall have shortcuts for eliminating both without going through any congress of so-called democratic processes. Otherwise, Communist infiltrators could bog us down in interminable disagreements, schisms, and feuds before we ever became seriously effective." (*Ibid.*, pp. 161-162.)

"The John Birch Society will function almost entirely through small, local chapters, usually of from 10 to 20 dedicated patriots, although some chapters may occasionally, and for a while, be larger. Each will have a chapter leader, appointed by headquarters, which is in Belmont, Massachusetts."

"For handling the organizational mechanics of the society, and for helping to form new chapters, we shall have a paid staff man, with the title of co-ordinator, for each area of the proper size. Above these co-ordinators, in time, we shall have supervisors with the rank or title of major co-ordinators; and we shall further build the organizational framework from the bottom up, as made necessary by sufficient membership, in order to keep strict and careful control on what every chapter is doing, and even every member of every chapter so far as the effective work of the John Birch Society is concerned." (*Ibid.*, pp. 163-165.)

At the time the eighth edition of the *Blue Book* (which is the most recent) was published in 1961, there were 28 people on the headquarters staff at Belmont, 30 paid co-ordinators or supervisors, and about 100 section leaders or minor co-ordinators. During the past two years there have been slightly more than 100 resignations. Two members were expelled—one for anti-semitism, and a few all-negro chapters have been formed. There are also several local chapters consisting of both colored and white members.¹

The first chapters were founded in February 1959. Thereafter the movement spread rapidly until now there are members throughout the nation, and many members-at-large whose affiliation is recorded only at the headquarters chapter in Massachusetts.

From the inception of the society, Welch was firmly convinced that tough methods would have to be used to combat the menace of communism. He believed that every means would be taken to discredit the organization and to wreck it from within. The statements set forth in the *Blue Book* drive this conception home again and again. Precautions were taken to guard against infiltration, and against the formation of dissident sects. Anyone familiar with the organization and techniques

of the Communist Party must immediately note the close similarity between these two implacable enemies. Each has a monolithic structure in which the authority gravitates from the top down through the various echelons to the rank and file membership. Each employs front organizations which it controls from behind the scenes and through which it works. Each operates bookstores and reading rooms through which it spreads its ideology. Each has a staff of full-time employees. The Communists call them organizers; the Birchers call them co-ordinators. Each movement operates through small units scattered throughout the country. The Communists call them clubs, and Birchers call them chapters. Each publishes a monthly list of directives that establishes the current line of activity. The communists call theirs *Political Affairs*, and the Birchers call theirs the *John Birch Society Bulletin*. Each is geared to unleash a barrage of invective and attack against the other, and to bring to bear every pressure and device available.

There is, of course, this distinction: the Communist Party is directed from abroad, despite its vehement protests to the contrary. It has always been a part of the world Communist drive to dominate every non-Communist country, and it has pursued this objective consistently. It has never managed to insinuate its regime through the process of the ballot box, but always through stealth, subversion or raw force. When captive peoples seek to cast off the Soviet yoke, they are crushed by armed might. This global operation works through the Communist Parties that exist—legally or illegally—in 81 countries. Their propaganda apparatus is synchronized, and their activities are always co-ordinated.

The John Birch Society, convinced that the threat to the continued existence of our way of life is in mortal danger from the advance of communism, both at home and abroad, is dedicated to prevent it. It has no international ramifications, but it has not overlooked that possibility, as the *Blue Book* declares:

“We have already been under considerable pressure to start chapters of the society in several foreign countries. We have authorized some people in some of those countries to use our material simply as a guide, in setting up some similar but entirely separate local organizations. And we might, at some future date, absorb such organizations, if satisfactory in every way, right into the John Birch Society. But so far the sparing of time, energy, or resources, for international organizing efforts or even for a minimum of supervision of such efforts by others, has been out of the question.”
(*Blue Book*, footnote 18 to 4th printing, February 1961, p. xi.)

The society is completely frank in stating that it has adopted many Communist techniques as its own. It operates to some extent through front organizations, as we have explained, it circulates petitions, it unleashes massive letter writing campaigns, and is currently seeking to bring about the impeachment of the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. It supports conservative legislators and elective officers and it attacks all it believes are furthering the cause of communism—consciously or otherwise.

The society solidly supports such publications as *American Opinion*, *National Review*, *Human Events*, and a select list of anti-Communist

books; it supports such radio commentators as Fulton Lewis, Jr., Dan Smoot, and Clarence Manion. It urges patronage of such anti-Communist literary outlets as *The Bookmailer*, and such publishers of that type of book as Frederick A. Praeger and Henry Regnery.

While the organizational structure is similar to that used by the Communist Party, and some tried techniques of the Communists have been borrowed by the society, there is a vast difference in the matter of disciplinary control. Communists are trained to obey a directive or a party assignment, whether they agree with it or not. Members of the society are constantly told *not* to follow any program or directive unless they agree with it, as may be seen in many of the monthly bulletins sent to the members. When the policies and actions of the society are no longer supported by a member, he may resign and get a proportional rebate of his annual dues.

Robert Welch is the undisputed authority in this movement, and from his decisions there can be no appeal. Operating under him is an executive committee and a national council, but these are purely advisory bodies. If Welch makes a decision and both the executive committee and council unanimously, vehemently and implacably disagree, there is no question about who will prevail: Welch! Indeed, since he appoints the members of these bodies, he can fire them individually or collectively at will.

On the local level, there are major co-ordinators, whose jurisdiction usually encompasses an entire state. The major co-ordinator for California at the present time is Mr. G. Edward Griffin. Operating under him are section leaders, co-ordinators, and chapter leaders. A co-ordinator has jurisdiction over several local chapters of the society, and the section leader supervises an arbitrarily defined area comprising a large number of chapters.²

The major co-ordinator in California has purely administrative duties, his two main objectives being the continued growth of the organization and the supervision of the existing chapters to insure a tightly knit and smoothly running movement at the local level. This, according to Mr. Griffin, "includes the responsibility to prevent both Communists and crackpots from coming into and dominating our local units. In order to adequately discharge these responsibilities, I must largely rely on the co-ordinators who work under me and who are in closer contact with the local situation." (Affidavit of G. Edward Griffin.)

The affidavit submitted by Mr. Harry Browne, co-ordinator for Los Angeles, described his duties and responsibilities with local chapters. He stated:

"In our efforts to recruit new members, we are, of course, selective—just as any reputable organization would be. In our case, we look for men and women of humane conscience, good will, and religious ideals, who also agree with the philosophy embodied in our stated purposes: 'To bring about less government, more responsibility, and a better world.' We also prefer that they be serious students of the Communist conspiracy and have at least begun to pursue such an education on their own prior to joining the society.

"There are no restrictions because of race, religion, political party affiliation or color.

"Because of our policy of not seeking publicity, we do not publicize the introductory meetings that are designed to acquaint prospective members with the background, purposes, and aims of the John Birch Society. Attendance is by invitation only; but no attempt is made to prevent the attendance of anyone who has a sincere desire to learn more about the society.

"The introductory meeting generally runs close to three hours. It consists of a two-hour film, in which Mr. Robert Welch outlines the background of the cold war and the objectives and structure of the John Birch Society; a coffee break in the middle of the film; a few remarks by the co-ordinator in attendance, or someone appointed by him; and a question and answer period.

"The material covered by Mr. Welch in the film is mostly taken from the first and last chapters of the *Blue Book of the John Birch Society*—and a reading of those two chapters will acquaint you with 95 percent of the material covered in the film. However, if you—or any member of your staff—should like to attend one of these introductory meetings, I would be pleased to arrange it for you.

"Those people who desire to join fill out membership applications which are submitted to either the home office or the co-ordinator in the field. Upon acceptance (which is usually always a routine procedure), the member is referred to a neighborhood chapter by the co-ordinator, or someone appointed by him.

"It should be noted that there is an application blank in every copy of the *Blue Book of the John Birch Society* published. Anyone purchasing a copy of the blue book has an opportunity to submit an application for membership." (Affidavit of Harry Browne.)

The subcommittee did not avail itself of the offer of Mr. Browne to attend an introductory meeting, but did have some of its representatives participate without the knowledge of Mr. Browne or any of the others present, and their reports showed that his description of these meetings was substantially correct.

As will be seen, however, all of the efforts to prevent infiltration were not successful, and some of the chapter meetings have been considerably off the prescribed pattern. Ordinarily, a local chapter meeting is opened with a prayer or by giving the salute to the Flag. The chapter leader then opens the meeting for business, and the monthly bulletin is discussed, together with the items of the agenda and plans for the coming month. These may consist of reading and reporting on anti-Communist or patriotic literature on the list recommended to the society's members by the national office at Belmont, on letter-writing campaigns to public officials, on activities through various front organizations and analysis and action on pending local and national legislation. Members receive, each month, an envelope and a printed form on which they report their activities for the past month, enclose their dues and contributions and make such comments or criticisms as they wish. These forms are then sent to the national office at Belmont for study.¹

No one may wander into a meeting of the John Birch Society; no strangers are admitted. But any member may bring friends who manifest an interest in the movement.

Local chapters vary in size from 8 to 20 or 30. When a chapter becomes too populous to be efficiently handled, it is split. Chapters thus vary considerably in size, and there are approximately 300 active chapters of the John Birch Society now operating in California. When new chapters are formed, either from a group of at least eight recruits or by the split of a large chapter into two or more smaller ones, the chapter leaders are selected by the members with the advice of the co-ordinator. Until the leaders are appointed, the chapters are handled by the section leader, who continues to work with the leaders through personal contact.

Some members are affiliated directly with the home chapter at Belmont, Massachusetts, on a sort of member-at-large basis. It is thus impossible to arrive at any precise estimate of the number of Birch members in California. Most of the chapters are located in the southern part of the state, the numbers diminishing as one travels northward. There are chapters in virtually all of the southern counties; there are chapters in the San Joaquin, Santa Clara and Sacramento Valleys, in the Bay area, down the Peninsula, and several in the extreme northern portion of the state and throughout the Mother Lode region. We are sure that we are reasonably accurate in putting the number of chapters at 300, and we can only estimate the members at between five and six thousand, but with an influence through front organizations, contacts with other right-wing groups, and through the literature of the society far in excess of that number. If the society exerts an influence outside the formal membership that is comparable to that of the Communist Party, for example, there would be at least 60,000 persons in California oriented toward the Birch program.

There has been some speculation to the effect that the John Birch Society has an organizational relationship with several other movements such as the Coalition of Patriotic Societies, the Cinema Educational Guild, the American Public Relations Forum, Educational News Service, Institute of Special Research, Facts and Education, Americanism Educational League, and the Council for Economic Education. All of these organizations, with the exception of the Coalition of Patriotic Societies, were listed in a publication issued by the California Teachers Association's Research Department. The document purported to present facts about the nature and activities of the John Birch Society, was thereafter found to be inaccurate in several respects, and was withdrawn—but only after it had a wide circulation among California teachers and educational administrators.

This PTA report stated that “. . . it is reasonable to assume” that the society would support various organizations that were listed—including Gerald L. K. Smith's movement and the California Free Enterprise Association. We found no evidence to substantiate these assumptions. In the *Birch Monthly Bulletin* for May 1961, there appeared a list of the organizations supported by the society, pages 23 and 24,

accompanied by the statement that: "None of these groups are affiliated with us in any way. The list follows:

| | |
|---|--|
| American Coalition of Patriotic Societies Rm. 515, 1025 Connecticut Ave., N.W. Washington 6, D.C. | Freedom in Action 2017 Gulf Bldg. Houston 2, Tex. |
| American Council of Christian Laymen Madison 1, Wis. | Intercollegiate Society of Individualists 410 Lafayette Bldg. Philadelphia 6, Pa. |
| Anti-Communist League of America 209 S. LaSalle St. Chicago 4, Ill. | National Laymen's Council Church League of America 1407 Hill Ave. Wheaton, Ill. |
| Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation P.O. Box 321, Clayton Beach St. Louis 5, Mo. | The Network of Patriotic Letter Writers Box 2003 D Pasadena, Calif. |
| Catholic Freedom Foundation 711 Knickerbocker Ave. Brooklyn 21, N.Y. | The Patrick Henry League Box 383, Main Post Office Yonkers, N.Y. |
| Christian Crusade Tulsa 2, Okla. | Public Action, Incorporated 131 E. 69th St. New York 21, N.Y. |
| The Congress of Freedom 1330 Turner Blvd. Omaha 5, Neb. | 20th Century Reformation Hour Haddon and Frazer Aves. Collingwood, N.J. |
| Freedom Club The First Congregational Church of Los Angeles 535 S. Hoover St. Los Angeles 5, Calif. | We, The People! 111 N. Wabash Chicago 2, Ill. |

Robert Welch has insisted in blunt terms that no loosely organized movement that devotes itself to academic studies concerning the origin and advancement of the world Communist movement can accomplish much in the fight against subversion. He has repeatedly declared that any effective organization must have a strong central control; it must function with the precision that only comes from discipline; his society is frankly monolithic and authoritarian.

We have not quoted extensively from the *Blue Book* of the John Birch Society, because it is a lengthy volume, and because those who may be interested in studying this basic ideological and historical work may do so by purchasing a copy at one of the libraries above mentioned, or by sending to the national headquarters of the society at Belmont 78, Massachusetts. It is appropriate, however, to summarize chapters one and two of the *Blue Book*, because this is the material that is first presented to prospective recruits for the society at the introductory meetings.

Chapter one consists of 39 pages and is entitled "Look at the Score." It traces the rise of the communist movement and the development of the cold war. The first three paragraphs dealing with the Communist movement since the death of Lenin sets the pattern for what follows:

"Lenin died in 1924. But before he died he had laid down for his followers the strategy for this conquest. It was, we should readily admit, brilliant, farseeing, realistic, and majestically simple. It has been paraphrased and summarized as follows: 'First, we will take Eastern Europe. Next, the masses of Asia. Then we

shall encircle that last bastion of capitalism, the United States of America. We shall not have to attack; it will fall like an over-ripe fruit into our hands.' To make doubly clear what he meant and how firmly he meant it, with regard to taking Asia ahead of Western Europe, and then using Asia as a stepping stone and base from which to conquer Western Europe and the rest of the world, the strategy was also stated that, for the Communist, the road to Paris led through Peking and Calcutta. Today you can easily see how that road to Paris is leading back from Peking through Calcutta, Cairo, Damascus, Baghdad, and Algiers.

"Now, ladies and gentlemen, there are many remarkable things about that three-step strategy. But the most remarkable is that the Communists have never wavered from it one iota in the 35 years since it was promulgated. Through famines which they deliberately caused in order to collectivize agriculture, through whatever industrialization they have achieved, through wars which they have cleverly and cold-bloodedly brought on and prolonged for the help of such wars in their plans, through periods of peace and prosperity elsewhere in the world, through power struggles within the Kremlin itself, through apparent changes and reversals in the party line that make non-Communist heads swim in confusion, through every upheaval and opportunity, the Communists have always kept their eyes unwaveringly on this strategy and on plans to carry it out.

"They have let nothing stand in their way, and nothing diverts them. They have used the philosophy of socialism as an ideological weapon, in this struggle, whenever they could and for whatever it was worth. But it was only one of their many weapons. They have also used bribery, lies, bluff, brutality, the countless tentacles of treason, murder on a scale never before dreamed of in the world, and every possible means to advance them on the road, without the slightest concern for any moral difference in these various means. And above all, they have used patience. A patient gradualism has been the most important key to the Communists' overwhelming successes." (*Blue Book of the John Birch Society*, 8th printing, pp. 11-12.)

Then comes a description of the processes through which the strategy described by Welch was implemented: recognition of the Soviet Union by this country in 1933; the Communist domination of the satellite nations following World War II; Communist occupation of North Korea, infiltration of Vietnam and Laos, seizure of Tibet and half of Indochina, and Communist penetration in the Latin American countries.

Next Mr. Welch discusses domestic subversion, stressing alleged massive infiltration of sensitive positions in our government by Communist agents and their sympathizers.

"There are three possible ways by which the Communists might take us over," continues the *Blue Book*. "One would be, through a sufficient amount of infiltration and propaganda, to disguise communism as just another political party; and thus to get enough

Communist agents and sympathizers into positions of power in our government to enable them to seize formal power by a peaceful *coup d'état*, as they did in Czechoslovakia in February 1948. We do not anticipate that development.

"The second method would be by fomenting internal civil war in this country, and aiding the Communist side in that war with all necessary military might. This is, of course, the method they used in China. But in the long struggle in China the Kremlin was handicapped by the need for keeping its own intervention from being accurately understood and appraised by other nations. By the time the Soviet rulers ever came to apply this plan to our country, there obviously would be no compelling reason for them to hold back in any way.¹

* * * * *

"But there is a third method which is far more in accordance with Lenin's long-range strategy. It is one which they are clearly relying on most heavily. And this is taking us over by a process so gradual and insidious that Soviet rule is slipped over so far on the American people, before they even realize it is happening, that they can no longer resist the Communist conspiracy as free citizens, but can resist the Communist tyranny only by themselves becoming conspirators against the established government. The process in that direction is going on right now, gradually but surely and with ever-increasing spread and speed. (*Blue Book*, op. cit., pp. 27-29.)

In the concluding chapter of the *Blue Book*, entitled "Through the John Birch Society," Welch proposes formation of the movement, states that it is to be "a monolithic body," that will "operate under completely authoritative control at all levels," and concludes thus:

"We do not have to be too late, and we do not have to lose the fight. Communism has its weaknesses, and the Communist conspiracy has its vulnerable points. We have many layers of strength not yet rotted by all of the infiltration and political sabotage to which we have been subjected. Our danger is both immense and imminent; but it is not beyond the possibility of being overcome by the resistance that is still available. All we must find and build and use, to win, is sufficient understanding. Let's create that understanding and build that resistance, with everything mortal man can put into the effort—while there still is time.

"Then, while we are destroying and after we have destroyed the Communist tyranny, let's drive on towards our higher goals of more permanent accomplishment; towards an era of less government and more responsibility, in which we can create a better world." (*Blue Book*, op. cit., p. 174.)

Infiltration At Santa Barbara

The founder of the society anticipated that there would be efforts to infiltrate it by both Communists and crackpots. Precautions were taken to prevent such occurrences, but the measures were not always successful. By reserving to himself the authority to expel any member at any

time and for any reason, Welch was in a position to take immediate steps to end any internal disruption started by infiltrators. But despite the most elaborate precautions it was inevitable that some of the chapters would nevertheless be infiltrated. At Santa Barbara it was amazingly easy, and the results most damaging to the prestige of the movement.

Soon after several local chapters had been instituted in the Santa Barbara area, it was decided to form a small unit composed of students at the University of California campus near that city. At the same time a front called the Freedom Club was established with a membership of five non-Birch students plus nine student Birchers. These two groups were functioning when David Alan Arnold enrolled as a freshman during the winter-spring semester of 1961. The Santa Barbara *News-Press* had just started a series of highly critical articles about the Birch Society. Young Arnold, an 18-year-old political science major, read these accounts and went to the Birch American Opinion Library to see what the furor was about. There he met Chet Merriam, 26, who had been appointed co-ordinator for the Santa Barbara area. Older Birch officials had been unable to persuade Welch that Merriam was too young, too dramatic and extremist for such a responsibility.

Merriam invited Arnold to attend a co-ordinating meeting at a private residence in Santa Barbara, and in the meantime the latter had joined the Freedom Club. The president of the club told him in strict confidence that it was, in fact, only a front for the Birch Society. At the co-ordinating meeting there were between 90 and 100 persons present, and routine matters were discussed.

Having ingratiated himself into the complete confidence of Chet Merriam, young Arnold was soon appointed chapter leader for the Birch student unit, and vice-president of the Freedom Club. This latter group, it should be made clear, had no connection whatever with the Freedom Club of the Congregational Church in Los Angeles. But Arnold was a triple-threat infiltrator, and launched a front of his own called Publius—and from this vantage he and his cohorts attacked both the Birch Society and the Freedom Club. On the very night of his appointment as chapter leader of the Birch student unit, Arnold called a meeting, tipped off a reporter for the Santa Barbara *News-Press*, and the latter contacted the district attorney and arranged to have the proceedings taped. The recorded remarks by Merriam remove any doubt about the accuracy of those who believed he was too extremist, and the mistake Welch made in overruling them when he persisted in making Merriam Santa Barbara co-ordinator.

He told the assembled students that within one year Mexico would be in Communist hands, and that in two years the United States would be under the domination of the Kremlin. Furthermore, he declared, two of California's highest officials were pro-Communist, and the University of California was heavily infiltrated. In addition Merriam told Arnold that the Birchers had an underground organization, fully equipped, prepared for any emergency, and headed by former intelligence officers.

Our investigation has not disclosed the existence of any underground Birch apparatus operating in this state, nor are the statements made by Merriam characteristic of statements made at any of the meetings of the society our representatives have attended.¹

In the most recent edition of the *Blue Book* there is a statement to the effect that according to estimates of "the best informed authorities" here are at least "30 huge Communist espionage rings operating in this country against the only two or three that have been only partly exposed." (Page 24.) There certainly were Soviet espionage rings functioning in the United States, and it is only reasonable to believe that the Soviet Union has not suddenly abandoned its espionage efforts here. We have just shipped back Colonel Abel, who was convicted of spying against us. Any skeptic who doubts such activities had better read the record, which is readily available and indisputable. And any responsible public official who is rash enough to deny the dangers of domestic subversion has simply not paid sufficient attention to his homework. But a sweeping assertion that there are 30 Soviet espionage rings working here now, and failing to identify the "informed authorities" as proof of the statement, is exceedingly ill-advised! This is the sort of material that inflames the imagination of a young man like Merriam, and spreads rapidly among people of similar temperament. It is almost as dangerous as the dissemination of the idea that the Communist peril in this country is over, and we can all forget about it, and that we can become informed about the front organizations, infiltration techniques, characteristics and objectives of the Communist Party by perusing the Constitution of the United States. It is, of course, essential that we are familiar with the Constitution; but to believe that this is a substitute for learning about the Communist enemy we face is ridiculous.

The effect of such statements on Merriam is immediately evident to anyone who listens to the tape recording of this meeting of students called by David Arnold. There was a stridence and excitement attending the proceedings that was both disturbing and juvenile.

After this meeting had been held and duly recorded, Arnold addressed a letter of resignation to Chet Merriam, Postoffice Box 1083, Santa Barbara, stating that his activities as vice-president of the Freedom Club and as chapter leader of the John Birch Society on the university campus were interfering with his health and his studies. Arnold thereafter was interviewed by several newspapers, including, of course, the *Santa Barbara News-Press*, the *Los Angeles Examiner*, the *Los Angeles Herald-Express*, and the *Los Angeles Times*. To representatives of these papers, and recently to representatives of this subcommittee, David Arnold made it abundantly clear that such irresponsible statements came only from Merriam; that he had heard no such statements from other members of the Birch Society, and said there were many fine, patriotic people in the society. He also was emphatic to state that he did not mean to imply that the danger of domestic Communist subversion should be taken lightly, declaring: "I don't want extremists on the other side to take this as supporting their claims that there is no Communist threat, and that there is no need to fight it. The Communist threat is no ghost."

Grand Right and Left

The attack against the John Birch Society commenced with an article in the *People's World*, California Communist paper, in February 1961, although the *Chicago Daily News* had attacked statements

made in *The Politician* and the *Blue Book* several months previously. This was sensational news, and as the John Birch Society started to grow rapidly in California, several newspapers took up the attack. Naturally, these articles varied with the basic editorial policies of the papers. The Gene Blake series in the Los Angeles *Times* were the most objective and dignified, and gained the respect both of Birch officials and its most critical opponents. The Santa Barbara *News-Press* was much less restrained.

At first the officials of the society believed the furor would diminish slowly and finally end. But they were very wrong. As national magazines took up the subject, and as extreme leftist organizations added their criticisms, the intensity of the articles increased—both in volume and in emotion. Virtually all seized upon the indefensible accusations Welch had made in *The Politician* and attributed them to the membership of the society. Pointing out that only a bunch of crackpots would believe such statements about our national leaders, it was relatively simple to depict the entire organization as a large and dangerous accumulation of emotionally unstable people who were convinced that our entire government was honeycombed with Soviet agents, and that we were about to be taken over by the Soviet Union.

Matters were not eased when Welch launched the campaign to impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren, and such well-known conservatives as George Sokolsky, Fulton Lewis, Jr., and Russell Kirk expressed their views that the venture was foolish. They pointed out that it was one thing to criticize the Supreme Court decisions in the loyalty-security field because they were making it easier for the Communists to subvert us, but it was quite another matter to start impeachment proceedings against the Chief Justice for having lent his weight to those decisions.

Newsweek, (now controlled by the *Washington Post*), carried stories about both the right and left organizations, including the John Birch Society, on April 10, 1961; *Commentary* published 12 pages concerning the society entitled "Fundamentalism on the Right," in its issue for August, 1961; "Revivalism on the Far Right," appeared in *The Reporter* on July 20, 1961; *Time* had an article in its issue for December 8, 1961, entitled "The Ultras," wherein it linked together under this category the John Birch Society, the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, We, the People!, the Conservative Society of America, the National Indignation Convention, and the All-American Society.

These are only a few, selected at random from many; but the theme has been taken up by political figures. Some have openly repudiated support by the Birch Society, while others have welcomed it. Some have bitterly attacked the organization and its members; others have disagreed with the statements of Welch, but declared that the overwhelming majority of the members are solid, average Americans who are tired of what they deem a soft attitude by our government toward communism, and want to do something about it. Most frequently repeated charges against the society were that it was a fascist movement; that it operated in secrecy; that it was composed of thousands of emotionally unstable members who were smearing all who disagreed with their views as either Communists or Communist sympathizers.

Probably the most savage criticism came from the Communist Party. This was, of course, quite natural, as the party is now being harassed through Supreme Court decisions that upheld the finding of the Subversive Activities Control Board that the party was the tool of a foreign government, and requiring the registration of members. The John Birch Society proposed to first study communism and then swing into action against it on all fronts. The first specific Communist criticism of any significance was the attack in the California *People's World* on February 25, 1961. But in June 1961 there appeared a booklet of 47 pages by Mike Newberry, entitled "The Fascist Revival: The Inside Story of the John Birch Society," and published by New Century Publishers, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y. The tone of Mr. Newberry's booklet may be set by quoting from page one:

"In the recreation room in the cellar of a suburban home on Long Island several men are drinking beer.

"Saturday night. High jinks and jokes and 'the boys' feel happy. It seems, at first, like a typical weekend party. Originally the recreation room was built for the children of the host, an advertising man, and there are children's toys in the corner under the color TV. On the bar, beside the beer glasses, is a doll.

"At the feet of the doll is a book, *The John Franklin Letters*, opened to the chapter, 'Thank God (for) the National Rifle Association.'

"'Let's get started,' the host hiccups.

"The bleary guests line up at one end of the recreation room. Rifles are in their fists.

"One by one they begin target practice, rifles wobbly, and the cork ceiling muffles the shots in the night. The revelers of Saturday night are shooting at a photo of Chief Justice Earl Warren of the United States Supreme Court, hung on a target. Cheers ring out when a shot pierces the eye of the photo.

"Fantastic! Insanity! Madness!

"No, these gentlemen of suburbia are merely obeying the latest advice of the John Birch Society."

Newberry, a writer for the communist *Weekly Worker* in New York, then proceeds to equate guerilla bands, anti-Semites, and fascists—lumping them all together as Birchers. He sets forth more angry allegations by calling Welch a fuehrer, qualifying some of his statements by saying that, "If the upper echelons of the big businessmen who run the Birch Society try to keep their hands clean of this filth, in public at least, their errand boys and handymen do the dirty work for them. The secret, authoritarian Birch Society is in the hands of men playing with fascism" (p. 7).

"'The elite' of each community compose these clubs," writes Newberry, "Members are selected from the business, church, police, military, and political officialdom of the town, who could, and often do, control community affairs, and who meet in secret in private homes, with all the conspiratorial trappings of a Grade Z movie" (p. 7).

“Was Eisenhower a ‘communist’? Is Supreme Court Chief Justice a ‘communist’? Of course, replies the Birch Society. They, shrieks the *American Opinion*, are all part of the same plot” (p. 10).

In setting the scene for his description of the members of the Birch National Council, Newberry engages in more dramatics:

“The National Association of Manufacturers was holding its annual conference.

“On the banquet tables of the Waldorf-Astoria’s Grand Ballroom in New York was an epicurean feast of canapes, caviar, and champagne. Flushed of face and with a glint in their eyes, the goodly-sized manufacturers laughed and joked and camaraderie was high. Wine, women and who-knows-what were in the offing.

“However, at the moment, there was serious business at hand.

“Solemnly, the big businessmen became quiet. The highest tribunal of corporate wealth was about to bestow its most honored award on one of its grand old men. A respectful awe silenced the noisy crowd as a benign Chicago banker and manufacturer, Cola G. Parker, rose to the rostrum to accept the plaque that named him the ‘N.A.M. Man of the Year.’

“Cola G. Parker was indeed the Grand Old Man of the N.A.M. He had been the top executive of the big business group for years. He was former chairman, former president, former head of its executive committee, and former head of its powerful finance committee. He was ‘Mr. N.A.M.’

“Yet, he was now ‘retiring.’

“That is, Cola G. Parker, the N.A.M. Man of the Year, was ‘retiring’ to the National Council of the John Birch Society!

“In the inner circle of the John Birch Society Council ‘Mr. N.A.M.’ would soon meet three other past presidents of the N.A.M., two vice presidents, and a dozen N.A.M. directors.

“It would be like old home week. For the N.A.M. is to the John Birch Society as father is to son” (pp. 12-13).

Having then described how the National Association of Manufacturers masterminded the establishment of the society, inaugurated its first chapters, lent it their prestige and financial support, the author asserts that serving on the National Birch Council with these former members of the N.A.M. are many retired officers of the United States Armed Forces.

“There is no question,” he writes, “about the flamboyant role that open, bombastic and powerful ‘retired’ generals, admirals, and lesser officers of intelligence and CIA, who strut about like cocks of the walk, have assumed in the Birch Society and its ‘fronts.’ There are enough military men in the leadership of ‘the fascist revival’ to form their own general staff.”

The list, according to Newberry, is comprised of the following retired officers: General W. Payton Campbell; Major General Charles A. Willoughby; Colonel Lawrence E. Bunker; Lieutenant General Charles B. Stone; Lieutenant General William Lee; General Alfred Wedemeyer; Lieutenant General John O’Daniel; Lieutenant General P. A. del Valle;

Vice Admiral A. E. Jarrell; Rear Admiral Harley Cope; Colonel John Beatty; Colonel Victor J. Fox (whose true name, asserts Newberry, is Robert Winson) (pp. 18-19).

For the rest of his booklet, Newberry asserts that the Birch Society is connected with racists in the deep south; with the white citizens councils of New Orleans and its anti-Negro policies; with the Ku Klux Klan, and with anti-labor organizations.

The reason for what he terms the fascist revival is the decline of capitalism in this country, Newberry concludes. It is a basic theory of Marxism that the capitalist form of government contains the seeds of its own destruction, and that during its death throes it will resist desperately. Now that our way of life faces a crisis, contends the author, it desperately erects such organizations as the Birch Society in an effort to protect itself.

In previous reports we have frequently stated that the American Communist Party was patterned after the Soviet model; that the peculiar Aesopian language, the propaganda, the activities all follow the Soviet prototype. At the conclusion of Soviet propaganda publications there is usually an exhortation urging firmer devotion to the class struggle, more international solidarity, more determined warfare against the class enemy. The exhortations are liberally sprinkled with exclamation marks. Mr. Newberry, writing Communist propaganda, employs the customary slap-bang, insulting, irresponsible style throughout. And he ends it as follows:

“Let our answer to the fascist attack on democracy be to increase democracy, equality and freedom!

“Let our answer to the fascist onslaught on civil liberties be to defend the democratic traditions of America!

“Let our answer to the fascist cry of ‘war now!’ be ‘peace now!’ ”

It is interesting to contrast this foaming assault with the dignified approach of the Los Angeles *Times* articles by Gene Blake, heretofore mentioned, and with the scholarly and objective treatment in *Commentary*.¹

Mr. Edward Hunter, an expert on psychological warfare, recently testified before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate concerning the new drive to discredit all anticommunist operations in this country, and in passing had this to say about Mr. Newberry's booklet:

“Never, since the most virulent days of Goebbel's ‘hate’ propaganda, has anything appeared in the United States comparable to a 47-page booklet, dated June 1961, put out by the Communist Party of the United States in connection with its drive to smother the expanding anti-Communist movement in this country.

“The 35-cent booklet is entitled *The Fascist Revival*, and purports to tell ‘the inside story of the John Birch Society.’ The author is Mike Newberry, another *Worker* specialist in unbridled smear.

"The booklet is evidence of the degree to which the Communist Party considers itself immune from libel, through a complex legal barrier it has built around itself, and by the exploitation of the double standard. Communists have created an atmosphere in which those victimized by its lies feel it is futile to seek recompense.

"The virulent tone of the booklet, with all stops out in vituperative propaganda, indicates that the Communist Party would like to create a new, Pavlovian trigger word for this period in its psychological warfare, and believes 'Birchite' might be put into the language this way, replacing McCarthyite. The impact of the latter fabricated word apparently no longer is strong enough to meet red needs. Communist deeds have deprived it of its effectiveness in Red 'spywar.'

"The Communists now seek to create a new scare word. This would evoke a conditioned response in a background of fear, founded on the specter of a fascist plot inside the United States, which would attack all minorities, and spread terror to everyone. This Red propaganda objective is a terror maneuver. It would be what they call the 'correct' line for this time, to make the American public jittery through pressure from abroad, by manufactured crimes in places such as Berlin and Laos, and by pressure at home through visions of a 'fascist revival.' A jittery United States would be off balance and vulnerable." ("The New Drive Against the Anti-Communist Program," hearing before the Sub-committee on Internal Security, July 11, 1961. United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., p. 75.)

It would be a mistake to attribute all criticism of the John Birch Society to the Communists, or to credit the Communists with actually planning the propaganda crusade against the society without proof. Certainly there is ample evidence to the effect that a recent Moscow directive called attention to the rising tide of anti-communism and stressed the imperative task of squelching it; there is also ample evidence that the American Communist Party undertook to do precisely that, and launched a campaign to label all members of the society as very close to insane, fascist, sadistic, and irresponsible. Furthermore, there is evidence that many people tend to so label all anti-Communist movements—official and unofficial alike. But there is also much proof available to show that there is a growing number of critics who are neither extremists of the right or the left, and who violently dislike any organization headed by one man, when that man persists in making alarmist statements to his followers to the effect that our national leaders cannot be trusted, that our government is teeming with spies, and that the Russians spun the complicated plot to foist Pasternak's book on a naive world.

As the criticisms mounted, officials began to react. Governor Brown was moved to ask the state Attorney General to make an investigation and report. This was done through his assistant, Howard H. Jewel, who prepared a report for Attorney General Mosk's signature and submitted it to the Governor on July 7, 1961. This document, consisting of 14½ typewritten pages, does not purport to be an exhaustive report;

indeed, it frankly states that the entire paper is intended to be no more than the personal opinions of the state Attorney General. In that regard Mr. Mosk declared:

“Having thus divested myself of some personal observations on the John Birch Society, I must hasten to add that they are just that—personal observations.” (Attorney General’s Report, p. 13.)

And on the following page he adds:

“As Attorney General, I have no greater right, but no less a right, to an expression of my opinion than any other Californian. This is the right of which I avail myself here. Accordingly, we have not conducted an investigation of the John Birch Society, nor do we intend to—we are not ‘Birch Watchers.’”

It should be observed that the document opens as follows, being addressed to Governor Brown:

“Pursuant to your request of recent date, I am reporting herewith on the John Birch Society.”

The second paragraph of the report, on page one, sets the pattern for what ensues:

“The cadre of the John Birch Society seems to be formed primarily of wealthy businessmen, retired military officers and little old ladies in tennis shoes. They are bound together by an obsessive fear of ‘communism,’ a word they define to include any ideas differing from their own, even though these ideas may differ even more markedly with the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Khrushchev. In response to this fear they are willing to give up a large measure of the freedoms guaranteed them by the United States Constitution in favor of accepting the dictates of their ‘founder.’ They seek, by fair means or foul, to force the rest of us to follow their example. They are pathetic.”

As will be seen hereafter, our own investigations cause us to disagree with the conclusion that the members are primarily formed of the three classes specified above. Neither have we found that any members of the society have relinquished any constitutional freedoms. On the contrary, they are determined that they shall not be whittled away by Welch or anyone else.

On page 4, Robert Welch is referred to as “an embittered candy maker” of Belmont, Massachusetts. We have studied Welch’s life, his business career, educational background, and have read almost everything he ever wrote—all of his writings in connection with the society. We do not agree with much of what he wrote or what he has said, but we did not find him embittered, either through reading his writings or through personally interrogating him.

The report closes by pointing out that:

“Understandably, neither Welch nor the Communists brook dissension [sic] or the discussion which is its progenitor” (p. 15).

Our own study of the society brings us to almost the same conclusion, but not quite. Dissension assuredly exists in many of the local chapters,

but it cannot exist very long, as the members causing the protracted dissent will be asked to resign. And each person, upon being admitted to membership, must execute this agreement:

“ . . . I agree that my membership may be revoked at any time, by a duly appointed officer of the society, without the reason being stated, on refund of the pro-rata part of my dues paid in advance.”

We have mentioned Albert J. Lima as chairman of the Northern Division of the Communist Party of California. His present views concerning the John Birch Society are therefore worth quoting. Referring to the State Attorney General's Report on the Society, Lima declared in April, 1963, that “. . . one spokesman for the liberals described the John Birch Society as consisting of little old ladies in tennis shoes. The reality is far different. They are a serious political movement with long-range objectives. Therefore, one skirmish leads to another. The ultra-Right will be removed from political life when the sections of big business which spawn this movement are stripped of their political and economic position.” (California Rejects Anti-Communism,” by Albert J. Lima. *Political Affairs*, April, 1963, p. 18 at p. 21)

And there is often long and vehement discussion at meetings of the national executive committee and the national council of the society. But, as will be seen later, these bodies act in advisory capacities only, and even on these high levels the final authority is Robert Welch. We will also discuss the situation that exists at the present time between Welch and his national council, which has provoked more controversy than any other matter that has ever come before that body, and no little dissension, as well.

As the critical statements about the society and its leadership persisted month after month, the members determined to counteract it. A study of the monthly bulletins discloses this step-by-step process, but without access to the mass media of communication there was little the Birch Society could accomplish.

As the outright Communist press onslaught abated somewhat, and the propaganda type of publication from the extreme left began to wane, there was a brief period of respite. Then came criticism from the right. The late syndicated newspaper columnist, George Sokolsky, well known as a determined conservative, termed the move to impeach Chief Justice Warren ill advised; so did other conservative figures, as we have already indicated. At the beginning of the widespread publicity, many conservatives declared that in this sort of an *ad hoc* organization, there was no reason to call it a secret society merely because it did not wish to open its meetings to the general public. They disagreed violently with the statements in *The Politician*, but did not believe guilt by association should be applied to impute Welch's statements—made before the society was formed—to the members who joined several years thereafter. They saw no reason to criticize the movement because the founder saw fit to run it himself, as he told the members not to do anything he advocated unless they fully agreed.

Statements from the critics on the right and left present striking contrasts. As we have seen, the most pointed criticisms charged that

the Birch Society was fascist, secret and conspiratorial, crackpot, anti-Semitic—composed of members who were suffering from schizophrenic delusions. The conservative press and leading figures on the right contended that while they didn't go along with the statements in *The Politician*, that anyone could buy the *Blue Book*, anyone could buy *American Opinion*, any member of the society could bring his friends to meetings, and in some localities meetings were open to the public and advertised in the newspapers; that it was not unreasonable for the founder of a movement to prescribe the conditions under which it should operate, and that many of the extreme charges against the society by its angriest critics were fully as irresponsible and unfounded as the Welch charges in *The Politician*.

As the publicity continued Welch wrote in the monthly bulletins that are issued from Belmont, Massachusetts, that such attacks were to be expected as the society grew and spread its influence across the country. It was also natural, he said, that weak members should be shaken out of the organization by the criticism, and that recruiting should be slowed. But the society nevertheless has been doubling in size every four months from February 1960, to December of that year, and since that time gaining approximately 1,500 new members each month. According to the *Bulletin*, resignations diminished as the intensity of the criticism of the society increased; members were angered and determined not to be alienated through what they deemed were utterly false charges.

The *Bulletin* for February 1962 is in some respects the most important issue of that publication to date. On page 2, Welch announced that an attack from the right was developing and running parallel to the attack from the left—although completely different in character.

“ . . . there has gradually been getting underway an attack on us from the forces of the right, which is just now growing so extensive an affair that we simply cannot afford to ignore it any longer.”

The *Bulletin* then describes how, in Welch's opinion, Robert Taft and Senator Joseph McCarthy were shorn of their influence as anti-Communists through Communist attacks. The slogan used against Taft was “I like Taft, but he can't win.” The slogan against McCarthy was “I like what McCarthy is trying to do, but I can't stand his methods.” And the slogan that has developed against Welch is “The John Birch Society is a wonderful group of people and a wonderful organization, if they would only get rid of Bob Welch and his dictatorial control.”

But, Welch continued, the Communist Party was deeply bothered about the Birch Society's growth and the persistence of its activities against the entire party line in this country and abroad.

On page 5 of the February *Bulletin* Welch said:

“ . . . the thing that really frightens the Communists about the John Birch Society is our monolithic structure. Their greatest weakness and danger, in facing the society, is from the effectiveness of our concerted action, the permanence and unwavering direction of our purpose, the unshakable solidarity of our organiza-

tion, and its potential for the future—all of which derive to a considerable extent from this monolithic structure. So the Communists are attempting, exactly as they did with regard to McCarthy's methods and Taft's vote-getting magic and many smaller problems, to convert this greatest danger into their most potent weapon of attack in the particular situation at hand."

These remarks naturally lead one to inquire how Welch knows that the idea Taft couldn't have been elected President even if he did win the nomination actually originated with the Communists; or how he knows the communists also started the anti-McCarthy slogan. He may be perfectly correct, of course. But what he implies is that everyone who thought Taft couldn't get enough votes to be elected President, and all who disliked McCarthy's technique were Communists! There are, of course, many staunch anti-Communists who hold either or both of these views. There is a very serious danger in falling into the false belief that because the Communists held and circulated these views, then all who also held these opinions were Communist dupes who were unwittingly aiding the conspiracy to subvert the nation, and should therefore be undermined along with the Communists. In this regard, Welch stated:

"... Of course it is not the Communists themselves who have been giving it (the attack against Welch) widespread circulation. Probably 95 percent of those who made such devastating use of the slogan 'I like Taft but he can't win' were conservative anti-Communists who had no idea that they were mouthing a phrase, and promoting a scheme, which had been designed by the Communists. The same is true with regard to other examples. It is only because the Communists are able to devise such 'reasonable' sounding slogans, and then to get good anti-Communists to spread these slogans for them, that they make the slogans so effective. And of course the same thing is true with regard to the present example." (*Bulletin, op. cit., pp. 6-7.*)

The *Bulletin* then stated that it was impossible to ascertain in how many places this anti-Welch slogan had been planted, "or how many times it has been replanted by the Communists themselves." But from those sources, Welch declared, "it spread to some of our most prominent members and friends, to a few strongly anti-Communist members of both the House and the Senate, and even to a few members of our council. We believe now that the Communists who designed the whole drive expected the movement they had thus set in motion to be early, palpably, and completely successful." (*Bulletin, op. cit., p. 7.*)

The membership at large was unaware that some council members were advising Welch to relinquish at least a part of his authority. In June 1961 it was being suggested at executive committee meetings that someone replace Welch, so his earlier statements could no longer provide a basis for charges against the society as a whole, and the subject was scheduled to be discussed further at the council meeting in September of that year.

By December the matter had apparently been shelved, but was unexpectedly fanned into flame

"By a right wing group with tenuous but very widespread and influential connections. And the slogan, which most of our members had never even heard of during the past many months, when it had been something of a headache and a time-consuming topic for ourselves, is now being tossed around, amid both whispered slurs and outspoken disparagements of all kinds, in such ways that the whole argument is reaching and disturbing our membership at large. Which is why we have felt constrained to bring the matter at least out into the open in this bulletin." (*Bulletin, op. cit.*, p. 8.)

Welch then frankly described his relationship to the council, and his attitude toward the relinquishment of authority.

". . . I am glad to listen, and frequently to be overruled in my views or proposals. With regard to the one, by far, most important single matter which has recurrently been before the council for months, I personally have been in firm disagreement with the wishes of the majority. But I respect their judgment so much that I have abided by those wishes. We have an executive committee with which I meet regularly every month. One of its duties is to review these *Bulletins* with me in advance of publication. If they object to any or all of these paragraphs you will never see what I have written here. Their advice has caused me to discard some proposed projects, modify others, and add still others which I had not planned.

"But the ultimate responsibility in all of these matters is one I neither can, nor wish to, escape." (*Bulletin, op. cit.*, p. 9.)

It is too early to predict the outcome of the growing pressures against the continuance of one-man rule by Mr. Welch. As this report is being completed, the matter has been before the national council and openly discussed. Welch has indicated that the authoritarian, monolithic nature of the Birch Society is its greatest asset, and that if the authority is divided much of the anti-Communist drive will be dissipated. As the matter now stands, it appears that Welch has no intention of either resigning or turning control of the movement over to anyone else. As we have already stated, his control is absolute. He listens to the executive committee and the national council, but he makes all the appointments to each body, and technically has the authority to remove any or all of them at any time. He listens to their advice, but is not obliged to follow it—although it may be unanimous. In the event of his illness, or his incapacity to efficiently direct the society for any other reason, there is no provision that the council has any authority to determine that matter or act to remove him from control. The council's status and jurisdiction is defined as follows:

"The *Council* of the John Birch Society was set up during December, and will hold its first meeting in January. Although we carefully waited one year to establish the *Council*, its purposes and functions will be exactly as planned when the society was founded a year ago. It will consist of a small group of outstanding American conservative leaders, most of whose names are well known to most

of our members. And we'll tell you more about the membership and the responsibilities of the *Council* in our bulletin for February." (*Bulletin*, December 31, 1959, p. 22.)

"The basic function of the *Council* is threefold: (1) To show the stature and leadership of the society; (2) to give your founder the benefit of the *Council's* advice and guidance, both in procedural or organizational matters, and in substantive matters of policy; and (3) to select, with absolute and final authority, a successor to myself as head of the John Birch Society, if and when an accident, 'suicide,' or anything sufficiently fatal is arranged for me by the communists—or I simply die in bed of old age and a cantankerous disposition." (*Bulletin*, February 1960, p. 6)

National Review for February 13, 1962, a conservative magazine of general circulation, faced the issue squarely. In previous issues this publication had commented on the matter of guilt by association (June 3, 1961, p. 342); on Welch's contention that *Dr. Zhivago* was a Soviet plot (April 11, 1959, p. 645); the Birch move to impeach Chief Justice Warren, (December 30, 1961, p. 442); and on the basic structure of the society (April 22, 1961, p. 241).

This article undertook to explore the problem of whether the John Birch Society could function as an effective anti-Communist organization notwithstanding the fact that its leader continues to make statements through which he expresses "... views on current affairs . . . so critically different from those of the members, and so rash and indefensible." And, says *National Review*, when such conservatives as Senator Barry Goldwater, Congressman Walter Judd, Russell Kirk, Fulton Lewis, Jr., and George Sokolsky, agree that Mr. Welch's statements are often rash and indefensible, such criticisms cannot be ascribed to a plot hatched by the Communists. The Communist Party will, of course, gladly capitalize on the situation, as it always does in all such cases. But the best way to prevent this is to carefully refrain from providing it with propaganda material.

One must not confuse active pro-Communists with liberals who proclaim their anti-Communist position while being utterly ineffective in opposition to communism. Unless this distinction is made, says the article, "the mind freezes, and we become consumed in empty rages."

According to this issue of *National Review*, Welch has continued to advance the basic concepts expressed in *The Politician*, but instead of accusing Roosevelt, Truman, Dwight and Milton Eisenhower and John and Allen Dulles of favoring the Communist cause, he has reiterated the thesis in general terms. He has continued to contend that the government is rife with Communist agents; that Castro planned the unsuccessful attempt by this country to foster a counter-revolution so that our prestige would be undermined; that the disagreements between Tito and the U.S.S.R. were planned and phoney; that Nasser of Egypt and Nehru of India were as dedicated to communism as Mao Tse-tung; and that even the 1956 revolts in Poland and Hungary were not genuine efforts to cast off the Soviet grip on those countries, but were also planned by the Kremlin.¹

“There are members of the John Birch Society,” concludes this article, “and they include, in our judgment, some of the most morally energetic, self-sacrificing, and dedicated anti-Communists in America, who ask: But what does it matter, if we and Mr. Welch disagree on a number of things? The answer—Senator Goldwater, Mr. Judd, Russell Kirk, and other critics of Mr. Welch would agree—is in two parts. The first is political: are these disagreements on trivial or substantive matters? It is essential, if one would endorse Mr. Welch’s analysis, to believe that the Government of the United States is under the operational control of men who desire to betray this nation and cause us to become a satellite of the Soviet Union. That is a substantive premise from which all political analysis, strategy, and tactics are derivative. Should one, disagreeing with Mr. Welch on so central a matter, nevertheless support him because he is also against federal aid to education and flouridated water? Gerald L.K. Smith will not disagree with Goldwater on most domestic proposals. Should Goldwater then be pro-Gerald Smith? Nikita Khrushchev favors medical aid to the aged. Should the liberals be pro-Khrushchev? Robert Welch cannot be compared to these men, but the point is valid, that there are bounds (often unrecognized by the liberals) to the complimentary dictum, anyone on my left is my ally.

“And, secondly, there is the moral consideration: Can one endorse the efforts of a man who, in one’s judgment, goes about bearing false witness?” (*National Review*, February 13, 1962, pp. 83-88.)¹

This outright repudiation of Welch’s leadership by a leading conservative journal, coupled with the rising insistence by the Birch national council and executive committee that he at least delegate some of his responsibilities to others, is now in full swing. It is bound to permeate the entire movement, and it is too early to predict the result. As matters now stand, it appears that Welch will refuse to step down from his position of absolute authority in the society he founded, and for which he established the rules of operation. But the pressures are constantly growing, and with every rash utterance he makes, they will continue to grow. There is no question, as *National Review* points out, that he has stirred the slumbering spirit of patriotism in thousands of Americans, roused them from lethargy, and changed their apathy into a deep desire to first learn the facts about communism and then implement that knowledge with effective and responsible action. The central question, of course, lies in the nature of the training, the accuracy of the information being disseminated through the society, and the responsibility of the action which Mr. Welch prescribes.

Thus the John Birch Society has been caught between the grand right and left—in a surge of criticism ranging from Mike Newberry’s venomous booklet, through other extreme left organizations and publications, through the middle-of-the-road media, to the conservatism of *National Review*. And, as we have seen, while most of the critics have leveled their guns at Robert Welch, many have ascribed his beliefs to the entire membership of the society.

Anti-Semitism

Among other unjustified criticisms against the society is the charge that it is anti-Semitic. Our investigation leads us to the opposite conclusion. The organization is open to people of all religions, all races, all political persuasions except those deemed subversive. A member of the society in Southern California stated:

“As a member of the John Birch Society and also a member of the American Jewish League Against Communism, I vehemently deny the allegations of persons or groups claiming that the John Birch Society is a fascist, or any other un-American, collectivist organization. It has been my experience, as a member of a so-called ‘minority group,’ that I have felt in the society a very great sense of mutual co-operation and respect—a conviction of ‘belonging’ *far above* the actual circumstance to be found in daily life outside the society.” (Statement from Jerome E. Linz, January 13, 1962.)

Several publications on the extreme right have accused Mr. Welch of welcoming Jews into the society, and Lyrl Clark Van Hyning and Elizabeth Dilling have attacked the movement on the ground that Welch’s committees and followers are nothing but “A bunch of Jews and Jew-kissers.” (*Bulletin*, April 1961, p. 16.)

There are many Jews on the Birch committees, many in the society; some members have been asked to resign because they were found to be disruptive with their anti-Semitic attitude; the Jewish B’nai B’rith has found no evidence of anti-Semitism, and Welch has explained that in some localities his co-ordinators are working with representatives of the B’nai B’rith to squelch anti-Semitism.

Commentary, published by the American Jewish Committee, dealt with this anti-Semitic charge in its issue for August 1961.

“All the evidence available at the moment suggests the presence of a certain ambivalence in the Birch Society on the matter of anti-Semitism. Welch himself seems to be personally without bias toward Jews, and he wants the society to reflect this position. Yet there is no doubt that some local leaders and members are well-known anti-Semites. With one after another of the rabbinical associations and major Jewish civic groups speaking out in complete condemnation of Welch and his movement, there will be rising pressures to respond to the ‘Jewish attacks.’ Probably Welch will allow some light flirtation with the more sophisticated anti-Semite spokesmen. But it is a testimony to American maturity and the activities of Jewish defense agencies that open anti-Semitism is seen as a dead end today for any ‘middle-of-the-road right-wing organization.’ ” (*Commentary*, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-103.)

It should also be pointed out here, as it is in a footnote to the article above cited, that Mr. Welch has been consistently opposed to the political activities of Nasser, it being his belief that the Arab nationalists have been abetting the Communists in striving to dominate the entire Middle East. This being in conformity with the predominant Jewish position, tends to further negative charges of anti-Semitism. Indeed, it

may also be pointed out that since Welch is unquestionably not anti-Semitic, and wishes his organization to be open to people of all faiths; and since he is the sole source of authority in the society and has already acted to oust anti-Semites from the movement, there would appear to be little more than empty assumption to the belief that ". . . he will allow some light flirtation with the more sophisticated anti-Semitic spokesmen." At any rate, our investigations have disclosed no evidence of anti-Semitism on the part of anyone connected with the John Birch Society in California, and much evidence to the effect that it opposes racism in all forms.

Secrecy

The alleged secrecy and conspiratorial atmosphere in which the society is said to operate, coupled with the authoritarian control, have provoked allegations that it is a fascist organization. We found little evidence of secrecy, so far as the conduct of meetings was concerned. David Arnold had no difficulty in penetrating the Birch Society, and, as we have seen, became leader of its secret chapter on the campus of the state university at Santa Barbara, and vice-chairman of its front organization there. The literature of the society may be procured either through one of its bookstores or by writing to the headquarters at Belmont, Massachusetts. Any member may bring his friends to meetings, and anyone may patronize the reading rooms and book outlets.

We experienced no difficulty in sending representatives to meetings of local chapters, nor in obtaining the names of the members. The number of local chapters actively operating in California at the time this report was written was obtained without much trouble, and if there is a secret underground organization connected with the society, its security structure is excellent, as we have endeavored to discover it without success for several years. Aside from the statement made by Chet Merriam to a group of students, we have found no indication whatever of the existence of such an underground.¹

During the several months of preparation of this report, we interviewed and took statements from many members and officers of the society. In each instance we requested permission to disclose the name of the person from whom a statement or affidavit was received. It would have been possible to secure many times the number of statements we actually took, but it was felt that these were sufficient for our purposes, and there was no point in obtaining more. Statements were received from the following members and officers of the organization:

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Mrs. Alma Hagen | E. L. Haynes |
| James M. Lea | Helen D. Philips |
| Thomas S. Morehart | Adolph Neumann |
| Mr. and Mrs. M. J. Masteller | Darleen Meechan |
| Paul H. Talbert | Alfred L. Maguire |
| Herb Rocklitz | Valerie Hanrahan |
| Kenneth Pagar | Robert P. Hollis |
| Sylvia and Ben Bone | Alta G. Weiss |
| D. C. and M. V. Ericson | Julie Boyes |
| Beverly A. Burton | Bernice Harvey |
| Mr. M. Louis | D. E. Baker |
| Alvah S. Pendell, Jr. | Kenneth L. Maddux |
| Lowell and Tressa Cates | Frances Taber |
| Mrs. Roger W. Craddock | Mr. and Mrs. M. J. French |
| Keith D. White | Robert L. Leebody |

G. W. Johnson
 Ernest D. Phillips
 Mr. and Mrs. Doyle C. Carson
 Astrid Johnson
 Carolee Nance
 Mrs. Mary Alice Albaugh
 Adeline Dickinson
 Marilyn Pierose
 Mrs. Nondas Youngblood
 Georgette McCarthy
 Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence D. Machado
 Muriel H. Kirk
 George A. Ferrier
 Mildred Marshall
 Gerald Mouser
 Robert J. Boyd
 Murray and Marion Beebe
 Rosemary Dawson
 Mr. and Mrs. H. R. Goodell
 Mrs. H. Johnson
 Jerome E. Luiz
 Martha Mullin
 James J. Hanrahan
 Henry C. Stephens
 Gail Reneau
 Jay Kaufman, Ph.D.
 Arthur W. Bromfield
 Max A. Koffman
 Frank M. Exum
 Oscar T. Gillan
 Betty McLaughlin, Jr.
 William H. Thomas
 Mrs. Randolph Pirie
 Georgia B. Maxey
 Helen C. Hansen
 Mrs. Leonard W. Clark, Jr.
 Ivan W. Moore
 John D. Fobes
 Mrs. Elizabeth Welch
 Mr. and Mrs. Seward K. Richardson
 Jack Reneau
 G. R. Wynne
 Mr. and Mrs. William A. Holt
 Nancy W. Crippen
 Mrs. E. Hall Wilt
 C. A. Savant
 Ronald P. Schmidt
 Romeita S. Lloyd
 J. Hickman
 Mrs. H. D. Nunnally
 Leila K. Saunders
 Harry Browne
 H. T. Graham
 C. J. Shroeder
 Mrs. E. Nance
 Mrs. Vera M. Ballif
 Royle N. Strom
 B. G. Chynoweth
 Mrs. Bruce A. Bevan
 Richard N. Howe
 Thomas F. O'Loughlan
 David R. Beckley
 Mrs. Dorothy Reneau
 Nona Ritter
 Mrs. Bruce L. Odon
 Mrs. Dorothy Leavey
 Mrs. Frederick B. Richards
 Mrs. Dorothy Morris
 Mrs. R. M. Bohanan
 Raymond and Esther Reeser
 Marie V. Hackett
 William W. Eaton
 Ann Doty
 Ursula C. French
 Mary Gibboe
 Josephine Bunbury
 Joseph A. Coffman
 Arnold W. Clark
 Helen Reddell
 Edith E. Breyfogle
 Chas. A. Levers
 C. J. Hawblitzel
 Ralph E. Davis
 Mrs. Patrick H. Cox
 Mrs. R. E. Schenke
 Matilda Brooks
 Mrs. Carol M. Dey
 Mrs. Don Howell
 Harry S. Heck
 Mr. and Mrs. R. J. Innes
 Jacqueline Knight
 Steve H. Pubiak
 Helen Fitzpatrick
 Hubbard S. Russell
 Charles M. Crawford
 R. E. MacLean
 Kenneth I. Weld, Jr.
 Mr. and Mrs. Joseph L. Warner
 Dan R. Branch, Jr.
 C. H. Hussey
 Helen Oshier
 Carol Ransford
 Mrs. R. T. Schmitt
 Mrs. Paul R. Johnson
 Sam B. Pearce
 Norine Cone
 Louis S. Reed
 Thesta Pegg Etheridge
 Judith B. Stephens
 C. L. DeVries
 Viola H. Chambers
 Mrs. Don L. Williams
 E. Chase Burns
 J. V. Carson
 Mrs. Walter H. Tenniga
 Harrison Lobdell
 Chas. Huedepohl
 Lenora Cox
 Maj. Gen. Robert Blake (Ret.)
 W. E. Kane
 Darleen Wynne
 Dorothy M. Stevens
 Virginia Meyer Carson
 Calvin G. Zeboray
 Henri de La Chapelle
 Helen K. Luer
 Beatrice M. Duncan
 Inez M. Elliott
 John C. Pearce
 Mrs. Robert F. Sullivan
 Viola Hughes
 Mrs. Joyce M. Kimball
 Doris C. Irvin
 G. Edward Griffin
 Jane Crosby
 Granville F. Knight, M.D.

In addition, statements were received from people who were not members of the Birch Society, but who had useful information concerning its membership and operation. From all sources, we found that there was little more secrecy about the society than any other private organization; indeed, that since there had been so much publicity about this movement, in papers and magazines of general circulation, that it is now probably less secret than the Elks Club, Moose Club, or other private group that accepts members by vote or invitation and does not open its meetings to the general public.

National Council

The Communist publications and some of the national magazines have listed only a few members of the National Council of the John Birch Society. As the essential character of any organization must be gauged by the character of its members, and since we have a recent list of the council members, it is given herewith:

Dr. N. E. Adamson, Jr., Boston, Massachusetts, assistant medical director of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Co.
 Thomas J. Anderson, Editor and Publisher, *Farm and Ranch*.
 T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, United States Government.
 Spruille Braden, former Assistant Secretary of State, United States Government.
 Col. Lawrence E. Bunker, former personal aide to General Douglas MacArthur.
 F. Gano Chance, former president Missouri State Chamber of Commerce.
 S. J. Conner, president of the Conroth Company, Chicago.
 Ralph E. Davis, president, General Plant Protection Corp., Los Angeles.
 Dr. S. M. Draskovich, author and editor.
 Rev. Richard Ginder, editor of *The Priest*; Catholic writer.
 William J. Grede, president of Grede Foundries, Inc., Milwaukee; former president National Association of Manufacturers; former head of the International YMCA.
 A. G. Heinsohn, Jr., president of Cherokee Mills, Secierville, Tennessee.
 Fred C. Koch, president, Rock Island Oil & Refining Co., Wichita, Kansas.
 Clarence Manion, former Dean of Notre Dame Law School.
 Frank E. Masland, Jr., president of C. H. Masland & Son, Carlisle, Pennsylvania.
 N. Floyd McGowin, president, W. T. Smith Lumber Co., Chapman, Alabama.
 W. B. McMillan, president Hussman Refrigerator Co., St. Louis, Missouri.
 Dr. Revilo P. Oliver, professor Classical Languages and Literatures, University of Illinois.
 Cola G. Parker, former president of Kimberly-Clark Co., and National Association of Manufacturers; former delegate to International Labor Organization.
 M. T. Phelps, former Justice of the Supreme Court of Arizona.
 Louis Ruthenburg, former president and chairman of the board, Servel, Inc., Evansville, Indiana.
 J. Nelson Shepard, president Midwest-Beach Co., Sioux Falls, South Dakota.
 Robert W. Stoddard, president of Wyman-Gordon Co., Worcester, Massachusetts.
 Lt. Gen. Charles B. Stone, III, U.S.A.F. (Ret.) who succeeded Gen. Claire Chennault as commander of the 14th Air Force in China.
 Paul H. Talbert, president of Paul H. Talbert Co., Beverly Hills, California.
 Frank Cullen Brophy, industrialist, Phoenix, Arizona.
 Robert D. Love, leader in National Right to Work Committee, Chairman of the Board of YMCA, Wichita, Kansas.¹

California members of the National Committee of Endorsers are:

Frank P. Adams
 Mrs. Gertrude Derby Bale
 Andrew Brown
 William B. Coberly, Jr.
 C. M. Crawford
 Matt Cvetic
 Mrs. Helen H. Garretson

D. Hanson Grubb
 Hon. Edgar W. Hiestand
 Max A. Koffman
 Doane M. Lowery
 Mrs. Doris A. Parks
 Ray M. Spalding
 L. A. Alesen, M.D.

Major Gen. Robert Blake
 Hon. Kit Clardy
 William W. Cone
 Richard H. Creel, M.D.
 W. R. Fawcett
 Francis P. Graves

J. H. Harris
 Rev. Francis Keane
 D. B. Lewis
 Sister M. Margaret Patricia, Ph.D.
 Hon. Thomas H. Werdel
 Col. A. Vincent Wilson

There are 173 national endorsers, from the following states: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and from the District of Columbia.

Retired officers from the armed forces occupy positions of leadership in the society, and, as could be anticipated, are treated with ridicule in the Communist propaganda attacks. So emphatic has been the effort to belittle these men, in fact, that one is moved to observe that if they are all as irrational and unstable as their critics alleged, then our military leadership is in a sad state. Here is a list of the more prominent leaders of the society who also held prominent positions in the armed forces:

Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond
 Maj. Gen. Robert Blake
 Col. A. Vincent Wilson
 Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers
 Rear Admiral Paulus P. Powell
 Vice Admiral T.G.W. Settle
 Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby
 Col. W. Bruce Pirnie
 Lt. Gen. James P. Riseley
 Vice Admiral C. S. Freeman

Commodore Frederick G. Reinicke
 Brig. Gen. W. L. Lee
 Col. L. E. Limpert
 Maj. Gen. W. G. Weaver
 Brig. Gen. T. F. Wessels
 Capt. Stephen Abbott
 Capt. R. W. Orell
 Col. Tom R. Hutton
 Col. Lawrence E. Bunker
 Lt. Gen. Charles B. Stone

Caliber of Members

Some of the more irate and immoderate reports on the Birch Society have described its members as schizophrenic, pitiful, irresponsible and crackpot. Others have stated that they were for the most part comprised of retired army officers, old women and wealthy businessmen. Mindful of these allegations, we have tried to ascertain the truth about the sort of person who is attracted to the society. We have done this, not by relying on the declarations of members, but through attending meetings without the knowledge of the society, and by running the background facts concerning those we believe to be average members of the society throughout the state.

We have found the average member to have been concerned about the advances of the world Communist movement and the advances of Communist subversion in this country. The John Birch Society has provided the only organization with a militant program of study and action through which the frustrations of these people can be released. Very few of the members agree with the rash statements of Mr. Welch, but their position is that despite this disagreement, he did conceive the movement, organize it, instill it with life, provide a national me-

dium through which people can actually do something about the menace of communism. The average member is firmly convinced that the real threat is not essentially from abroad, but that since our foreign policies are evolved here, and as they are influenced here, and since our retreat from one European crisis after another has been engineered in Washington, then the problem must be faced in this country.

A situation exists throughout Latin America that becomes more critical each day, the Birchers declare. From a solid base in Cuba Communist agents are being scattered among all the Latin American countries—spreading propaganda against us, softening up the opposition, inciting riots against the United States and its representatives. Jet planes, expert advisers, munitions, arms of all descriptions, and even rocket bases are being rushed to Cuba, the Birchers insist—and all of this desperate situation resulted from bad advice and disastrous decisions made in Washington.

The average member of the society avidly reads reports of all governmental agencies dealing with subversion, studies the books on the approved list on the same subject, reads the literature issued through the society, and is utterly opposed to the United Nations and its subsidiary units such as UNICEF, and UNESCO. These organizations are regarded as no more than convenient centers for the espionage and propaganda actions of the Soviet Union.

As stated earlier, we have found some highly emotional and unstable members—especially in Santa Barbara in the person of Chet Merriam and some of his student following—and to a limited extent in Riverside County. These situations were speedily rectified through the elimination of the members whose actions were incompatible with those of the majority. The meetings attended by our representatives were conducted with restraint and dignity, and the discussions were moderate and objective. We do not agree that massive letter-writing campaigns accomplish much, but everyone has a right to write letters to elected officials, and the Birchers have certainly availed themselves of the privilege by unleashing at least 50 such undertakings that deposit thousands of letters on the target almost overnight.

From some of the letters and affidavits we have received from members of the society, we have selected the following as representative of answers to the charges that have been made against the Birch membership.

(1) "In the past 12 years that I have been able to vote I've felt a definite need to do something more for my country than just going to the polls and casting my vote. We hear the cry from every section of our land 'Write your Congressman,' but, express your views and what happens? Immediately you are labeled a crackpot or a fascist. In my way of thinking the John Birch Society has filled the gap of political indifference. It has made us conscious of our duties as Americans and informs us of what we can do to safeguard our precious heritage.

"Too often the public is quick to condemn an organization that has its best interests at heart, because they are not informed as to its goals and how it plans to accomplish this within the bound-

ary of law and constitutional authority. I can assure you, the John Birch Society is within the law and the Constitution when it requests the members to act on a given subject with protests and demonstrations. The John Birch Society is trying to awaken the American people to the fact that we can't talk peace with the Russians, or trade with the Yugoslavs, or give foreign aid to those who would murder us if given the chance. They are trying to get the people to realize there are hosts of treasonous acts committed against our country every day by those in our most trusted positions in government." (James M. Lea, 23424 Mobile Street, Canoga Park.)

(2) ". . . we meet once monthly to discuss books, lectures, and so on. We review the monthly bulletin and its 10 suggestions. (Anyone is perfectly free to decline to follow any of the suggestions in it.) We often invite friends and show films such as 'Communism on the Map' or the Pepperdine College film. And we write letters and postcards praising such people as the sponsors of the televised anticommunist schools. And of course we try to keep up with current legislation and often write to encourage our legislators. Anything that we do is only what every good citizen should do, but often does not, through either ignorance or apathy." (Mrs. E. Nance, 16820 Sunset Boulevard, Pacific Palisades.)

(3) "As a member of the society of two years' standing, I wish to emphatically state that I am *not* a fascist; I am *not* a subversive character; my membership is a secret from no one—nor is anyone else's that I know of. Also I am *not* one of Mr. Mosk's 'little old ladies in tennis shoes.'

"I am an American citizen who is extremely worried over the encroachment of a tyrannical centralized federal bureaucracy, creeping socialism and ever-increasing communism throughout the world. The John Birch Society is a group dedicated to study of the problems and the *constitutional* methods by which they may be solved. Its main function is educational; to make more and more people aware of the existing situation and thus to make more citizens effective in combating the dangers which threaten our freedom." (Mrs. Vera M. Ballif, 3869 Deervale Drive, Sherman Oaks.)

(4) "About a year ago my wife and I awakened to the fact that we have a responsibility to our children and to our country to become better informed American citizens.

"I was given the opportunity to join the John Birch Society which presented a means of becoming better informed about ways of combating the current threat to our freedom—communism. It was as simple as that—a desire to become better informed and take an active interest in the affairs of my community and my country.

"Then, two months later, after joining, came the blast. All of a sudden my desire to become a good citizen was labeled 'subversive,' 'fascism,' and now 'extremism' and 'super-patriotism,' etc., etc.

"The downright lies and distortions about the society and its members have been vicious, to say the least. Of course, my knowledge of the society is primarily concerned with my own chapter's activities. Without exception, the members of my chapter are people of high moral character. We have a great desire to preserve our constitutional government for ourselves and especially for our children. We have a meeting once or twice a month for educational discussion. Our actions have been letter writing and passing information on to neighbors and friends. We are not regimented or coerced into any action and each individual does what he thinks is best. None of us enter into any activity which will conflict with our moral principles. We invite any person of good will to our meetings. We do not operate in 'secret' nor do we 'spy' on our neighbors." (Mr. and Mrs. Doyle C. Carlson, 10122 Groveside Avenue, Whittier.)

(5) "The John Birch Society is not a political organization. Its members are drawn from the two major parties and independents, and it welcomes all of those, regardless of religion or race, who want to ally themselves with other aroused citizens, to stem further damaging concessions to the Communist world conspiracy on the part of our elected and appointed public officials. The society members are willing to give of their time to fight determinedly against the further spread of the Communist ideology in our schools, churches, social and fraternal organizations. I doubt if you will find a member who will hide behind the Fifth Amendment when the chips are down." (Hubbard S. Russell, Maricopa.)

(6) "Both Mrs. MacLean and myself have been members of the society for approximately two years. Knowing first hand its aims which simply consist of preserving our constitutional form of government and exposing the Communist conspiracy, it has been heart-breaking to see the smear campaign against these fine people which has been done with no basis of fact.

"As a third-generation Californian, my devotion to my country has never changed from my days in school, when I learned to cherish our traditions and our way of life. It is indeed a sad period in our history when people such as ourselves are termed fascist and accused of turning neighbor against neighbors by radical and misinformed elements in the news media." (R. E. MacLean, Los Angeles.)

(7) "We have been members of the John Birch Society since the beginning of last summer and we have never once been asked to do anything that would in any way jeopardize [sic] our country.

"We are the parents of six small children. My husband is employed as an engineer with the Los Angeles City Fire Department. For some time, we have been growing more and more concerned with the way in which our nation seemed to be heading and as to what kind of a future our children might expect.

"When the John Birch Society was presented to us, we knew at once that this was what we had been looking for. The people we have met through John Birch are the finest one could hope to

meet. As to the charges that they are of the lunatic fringe, then I believe our country could use more lunatics." (Mr. and Mrs. Joseph L. Warner, San Gabriel.)

(8) "I am not a 'joiner' but I have never for one moment regretted being associated with this fine group of dedicated patriots who understand and respect our great American traditions and principles. I have not found one bully, coward, rabble-rouser, hate monger, dictator or mentally ill among them. But if there is such a membership as these, I believe they should be exposed. If not, the name should be cleared." (Thesta Etheridge, Los Angeles.)

(9) "Several years ago I became a member of the John Birch Society . . . because I saw in it the first opinion group to come to my attention which possessed potentialities for organizing the scattered voices of conservatism into an effective influence on the political environment of our country. In the ensuing years I have not always agreed with some details of its program; neither Mr. Welch nor the members of the council expect the membership to. But since joining the society I have seen nothing to change my original opinion regarding its potentialities nor to cause me to believe that it stands for anything other than the achievement of constitutional objectives by legal, constitutional means.

"The fringes of Asia were still salvageable until Panmunjom. Now their loss to the Reds seems only a matter of time. Is it any wonder, then, that a deeply sincere gentleman like Mr. Welch, imbued with a great spirit of dedicated patriotism, viewing the relentless forward movement of the Iron Curtain as it pushes back our marshmallow drapery to a point where we are becoming enmeshed in the tumbling folds of its bland, bipartisan, sticky sweetness-and-light, is moved to an occasional extravagance?

"In closing it is only appropriate to state that I have found the members of the John Birch Society with whom I have been associated to be a splendid body of representative Americans, deeply interested in the maintenance of our free institutions, the modern American concept of the capitalist system and in the concomitant solvency of the nation's economic system. It is about as subversive as the National Geographic Society or as 'a group of little old women in tennis shoes,' as our distinguished State Attorney General is reputed to have described the society's membership." (Major General Robert Blake, U.S. Marine Corps, Retired; San Francisco.)

(10) "First of all, I must admit Robert Welch in a few of his controversial comments did not use the prudence and judgment a man in his position should have exercised. However, as I understand it, his unfortunate comment about Mr. Eisenhower with which I, and I am sure 99 percent of our membership disagree, was not a public utterance and represented a violation of confidence that never should have seen the light of day. Unfortunately, it provided a timely weapon for an exploitation, magnified beyond all justification—in view of the actual facts and true philosophy and purposes of the society.

"In all my experience at the monthly meetings and in my association with its members, I have never seen or heard anything that would remotely justify the accusations of our critics. At no time . . . have I noted the slightest suggestion of pressure or coercion on the part of those charged with the handling of our activities. We have all worked under conditions of greatest latitude and complete freedom to accept or reject any suggestion offered. And toward this end—the full and free exercise of conscience—we have many times been so admonished.

"All this talk about fascists, extremists, superpatriots, haters, etc., is utterly ridiculous. The lengths to which some members of the press have gone to discredit the society is best illustrated in referring to John Birch Chapters as 'cells.' One need not search very far, however, to understand the purpose, the self-interest, of such a smear campaign that has all the earmarks of the anti-anti-communist line—unfortunately all made possible thanks to Robert Welch's mistake." (Henri de La Chapelle, Los Angeles.)

(11) "Contrary to popular belief, this is not an organization of 'rich old women in tennis shoes,' nor are our members a part of the 'lunatic fringe' of society.

"The John Birch Society is made up of conscientious, patriotic Americans who recognize and accept their responsibilities as citizens. Many of us are in the process of raising families and we are doing what we can, as responsible citizens, to save for our children the liberties that we were fortunate enough to have inherited." (Mrs. Fred Cox, Jr., Whittier.)

(12) "I joined the John Birch Society just 10 months ago and my respect for it and its members has steadily grown.

"I shall be forever grateful to it for awakening me from my apathy, my bridge games, and my TV set. It has stimulated in me a thirst for more knowledge of my God and my country. But above all, it has awakened me, through education and much reading, to the clear and present danger which communism presents to my country and my children's future." (Mrs. Don L. Williams, San Gabriel.)

We have included these statements because they reflect the attitude of the average member of the society toward the allegations that have been widely circulated in the press and by other media of mass communications. As of the date this report is being submitted to the Senate, we have received many statements that we took from sources outside the John Birch Society, and 191 unsolicited letters and formal statements from both members and nonmembers. Naturally, these unsolicited communications are much like those presented above, and we hardly would expect present members to make derogatory statements about the society. Our own conclusions, drawn from a consideration of all sources of information, will be presented later.

The Birch actions to throttle Communist activities provoked immediate reaction, and on December 5, 1960, through the Manifesto of 81 Communist Parties, and again through the Communist Party of the

Soviet Union, the anti-Communist movement in the United States was specifically and unmistakably pointed out as the most important target against which to concentrate communist strength. On July 29, 1960, Moscow declared:

“The chief ideological and political weapon of imperialism is anti-Communism. Rallied to this black banner today are all the enemies of social progress. Anti-Communism is a reflection of the extreme decadence of bourgeois ideology.” (“The New Drive Against the Anti-Communist Program,” Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Internal Security, Washington, D.C., July 11, 1961, p. 33.)

The December 1960 manifesto stated:

“To effectively defend the interests of the working people, maintain peace and realize the socialist ideals of the working class, it is indispensable to wage a resolute struggle against anti-Communism—that poisoned weapon which the *bourgeoisie* uses to fence off the masses from socialism.” (*Ibid.*, p. 32.)

In January 1961 the *Manifesto* of the 81 Communist Parties was printed in the official publication of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States. So far as the American communists were concerned, this was an order—plain and incontrovertible. It was not lightly printed. It was an implementation of orders from the highest source of the world Communist movement, and it was therefore imperative that the party here do everything in its power to render the Birch Society, the anti-Communist schools, and all of the other rising anti-Communist organizations ineffective. It is, as we have stated, also true that some of Mr. Welch’s utterances have provided welcome ammunition not only for the Communists, but also for left groups and prominent spokesmen for the conservative right.

Position of the Communist Party

On July 16, 1961, Gus Hall, head of the American Communist Party, issued a directive for an attack on the anti-Communist forces throughout the country. Published in the *Weekly Worker*, and repeated in all the Communist-controlled propaganda sources, this move has never diminished. As we emphasized before, there are assuredly many other critics who are bitterly anti-Communist, but we are here only concerned with the strictly party attitude toward the Birch Society and all other anti-Communist groups. Hall wrote: “In the opinion of the Communist Party, there can be no question but that the threat from the extreme right is serious.” He ascribed the upsurge of activity against the party to the classic Marxist-Leninist dogma that holds it inevitable for a capitalist regime to become desperate when it becomes weak. Desperation and confusion ensue; its people become divided and there will be divisive groups set against each other as the government frantically strives to preserve itself from collapse. This, according to the Communist theoreticians, gives rise to a “revolutionary situation,” which they must be ready to use to their advantage.

There is, however, a much simpler and more common-sense explanation for this tortured and complex Marxian analysis. Capable observers of the obvious rise of conservative and anti-Communist feeling in the nation have attributed it to the fact that people have become angry and impatient because of the tensions at home and Communist advances abroad. Accustomed to regard the United States as a proud, powerful and respected nation, people have seen our officials humiliated before jeering crowds in foreign countries, and have seen the Communist advances throughout the world and the arrogance of the Communists among us. Frustrated and eager to act, many of these people have joined a number of so-called rightwing organizations.

Whatever the reason for this anti-Communist revival, it was natural for Hall to be concerned. For the facts about the Communist Party were being explained to huge masses of people as never before, and the party—harried by governmental agencies and legislative committees; having lost its battle to prevent the Supreme Court from deciding that the party should register its members, and torn by divisive elements within its own ranks, had to react against this new mass threat. Courses about communism were being instituted in schools and colleges across the country. At U.C.L.A. some of the most distinguished and scholarly experts on the subject were assembled to deliver a series of six lectures. This was inaugurated by the university's new chancellor, Dr. Franklin Murphy, formerly a member of the Commission on Government Security in Washington. He also closed the academic portals to Dorothy Healey, who had been scheduled to deliver an address at the university just before the two Supreme Court decisions were announced. As the movement gained impetus, it became increasingly difficult to operate through the same array of party-controlled front organizations, because people were now familiar with this device.

Thus the Marxist-Leninist dogma that proclaims capitalism to be weakening and becoming desperate, perhaps might be applied more aptly to the American Communist Party itself; it may well be the party that is becoming desperate and confused, while the American people are becoming strong in their patriotism, more aware of the subversive activities in the nation, and more determined to thwart them.

Hall was very explicit about what the party must do. He wrote:

“. . . it requires a common outlook and united front activity in all fields by the left and progressive forces, Communist and non-Communist. Without the unity of such forces in the ranks of labor, among the Negro people, in the youth movement, and among the fighters for peace and democracy, the promising popular movements now arising will remain disjointed and apart, prey to the mounting attacks of reaction.

“How is such unity to be attained? First, of course, it is necessary to reach a mutually agreed-upon outlook for the immediate period ahead, agreement on tactics and on programs. This requires discussion among all forces of the left, in which past differences are subordinated to the need to find common ground to meet the onslaught of reaction. Still better, common action should develop around such issues and positions that can immediately be agreed upon, even while broader and long-range discussions proceed.

“One of the obstacles in some parts of the left is a sharply critical or negative attitude to the Communist Party. Some of it is of older social-democratic or Trotskyite origin, but another current is of more recent vintage. This is the product in one way or another of the intensified campaign by big business against communism, of renewed reactionary attacks, and of the recent crisis in the Communist Party.

“Undoubtedly, the party crisis contributed to a certain disorientation in the left. While I realize this cannot be dismissed with a sweep of the hand, the fact remains that the new reactionary attack opened by the Supreme Court decisions has created a new situation both for the party and for the entire left.¹

“For example, how can the position now be defended that the Communist Party is no longer needed in the United States? Those on the left who claimed this should think over how it is that the reactionary majority of the Supreme Court, for its own motives and reasons, came to a similar conclusion?

“It seems to me imperative that left and progressive forces should not lose a moment in beginning now to find the common meeting ground, in fraternal discussions, for the united front approach and programs leading to common action for common objectives.

“There should be a coming together of such forces in the ranks of labor, in the Negro rights movement, in the youth movement, among the advocates of peace. The effort should be made wherever possible, in the localities and cities and communities, not waiting for a nationwide development, but contributing to it, building up the movement, giving it a living base on which it can flourish.

“It is my hope that all elements and currents of the left will set such a movement into motion, that in their publications and organizations discussions of this kind should proceed. I am convinced that once this is set in motion, it will grow and spread with a speed and depth that will surprise all of us.”² (Gus Hall, General Secretary, Communist Party of the United States, *Weekly Worker*, July 16, 1961.)

Now, obviously, one must not fall into the error of lumping all critics of the John Birch Society with this Communist-motivated drive by the old united front techniques which we have often described in previous reports. But neither should we be blind to the unified and massive nature of the movement. The Communists have long employed this highly effective technique, most dramatically during the last war, and on numerous occasions with incredible skill and success. They are adept at selecting a particularly offensive phrase, or a susceptible organization and using it indiscriminately against all anti-Communists.

Gus Hall, one of the most defiant and outspoken leaders the party ever had, also expressed himself on the matter of civil liberties. At a press conference shortly following the announcement of the two Supreme Court decisions requiring Communists to register, the following exchange occurred:

“Q. (By a reporter): Do you believe the Bill of Rights should cover the John Birch Society?”

“A. (By Hall): No, the John Birch Society is out to destroy the Bill of Rights.” (Press conference transcript, *Natl. Rev. Bulletin*, July 8, 1961.)

The feature that distinguishes the Birch Society from other anti-Communist groups is its combination of study and direct action. This provides an outlet for the members, who thus can feel that they are participating in a co-ordinated campaign. As Professor Alan F. Westin put it:

“Unlike those right-fundamentalist groups which have energetic leaders but passive memberships, the Birchers are decidedly activist. ‘Get to work or learn to talk Russian,’ is a slogan Welch recommends to his followers, and they are certainly hard at work.” (“Fundamentalism on the Right,” *Commentary*, August 1961, pp. 98-99.)

This sort of implementing of study by direct action is what disturbs Gus Hall and his followers. And if they are reading the monthly Birch bulletins they would see the action develop. In March 1960, 96 additional books were added to the list of 97 that had already been recommended to members of the society, and the great majority of them dealt with various aspects of communism. The April *Bulletin* presented a sample letter for members to follow in drafting their messages to Washington opposing the proposed summit meeting between President Eisenhower and Khrushchev; in May members were urged to check books in public libraries, and request anti-Communist items. Some members protested against the savagery of the anti-summit message to the President that Welch proposed: “Dear President Eisenhower—If you go, don’t come back!” But Welch responded that critical situations called for drastic measures. In June, 600,000 anti-summit cards were mailed by members of the society. The July *Bulletin* cautioned local chapters not to embark on their own projects as members of the society, without first obtaining the sanction of the national headquarters or of their co-ordinator. During the summer of 1960 and until the end of that year, the *Bulletins* described the attack against the society, stated that the movement was growing at the rate of approximately 2,000 new members per month, asked that letters be sent to Secretary of State Christian Herter protesting against the weak resistance to communism, instructing that the letters be written on stiff paper, and closing the year with a statement in the *Bulletin* for December 1960, that the society was doubling its membership once every four months, and thenceforth could be expected to double once during every six-month period.

During 1961, despite harassment from its critics, and despite the fact that there were some resignations in the face of the mounting press attacks, the society launched its campaign for the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren; analyzed the current Communist Party line; urged members to support the motion picture “The Alamo,” because its star, John Wayne, had demonstrated his staunch anti-Communist stand, and because it was financed by another anti-Communist, Clinton Murchison; asked that letters of praise be sent to persons and organi-

zations engaged in fighting the spread of communism, and making it clear that the letters should be short and say that no replies were expected; cautioning members that "... if we cannot impeach Earl Warren, I doubt if we can save America." And in the *Bulletin* for June 1961 Welch declared: "This is not because his impeachment is intrinsically quite that vital, although it has immensely significant ramifications. It is because there is no better battleground on which to meet the whole motley crew of misguided idealists, dupes, do-gooders, troublemakers, 'civil rights' phonies, fellow travelers, 'liberal' intellectuals, comsymps, and the actual Communists pulling the strings on which their puppet soldiers dance. If we cannot stop being eternally on the defensive, go on the offensive, and win *on this battleground*, I see little chance of our doing so on any other part of the whole cold war front."

The campaign to impeach Warren continues unabated, through circulation of petitions, repeated instructions in the *Bulletins* and discussions in the local chapters. As the third year of the society's existence drew to a conclusion, there were 35 co-ordinators drawing a total salary of \$8,000 per week, 41 home office employees drawing salaries amounting to another \$3,000 per week, and growth was still doubling about once every five to six months.¹

The *Bulletin* for January 1961 opposed the creation of a United Nations Peace Force, as suggested by the United States representatives at the UN Sixteenth General Assembly; termed the UN a "Fifth Communist Internationale," and excoriated those who brought about the death of Povl Bang-Jensen, who was forced out of the UN because of his refusal to surrender the names of persons who disclosed facts about Soviet espionage agents in the organization.

Development Since 1962

This report on the John Birch Society was to have been submitted when the Legislature met a year ago, but was postponed because of the illness of Senator John F. Thompson and the death of Senator J. Howard Williams, both valued and experienced members of this subcommittee. It was then decided to bring the investigation up to date and publish it as a section of our regular 1963 report.

Since March 15, 1962, the society has instituted chapters in all states except Alaska and Hawaii. The six western states, California, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, Nevada, and Idaho, have recently been combined to form a district under the supervision of former Congressman John Rousselot, who commenced his new duties on January 1, 1963.

During the last week of February, 1963, H. L. Richardson replaced G. Edward Griffin as California Co-ordinator, the latter assuming charge of the audio-visual department of the society in this State. There are still approximately three hundred chapters in California, although total membership has been increased. Small chapters are frequently combined, large ones split, and new districts are constantly being created.

Nationally the membership has been variously estimated to be from 50 to 60 thousand members. In our opinion the membership will amount to at least 60,000—which includes the so-called "members-at-

large" or "home office members," whose affiliation is strictly confidential. To that extent the membership of this class is, indeed, secret. Based on a trend we have been observing since January, 1961, we may confidently assume that there has been a proportional increase of these "home office members."

As this movement steadily becomes larger it finds itself facing the problems that inevitably beset any organization of national proportions that is sustained on a high degree of emotionalism. As efforts are made to recruit more members, and as more subordinate officers are sent out into the field, there is an increasing probability that among the new members will be a fringe of unstable, chauvinist people who are prone to accept as accurate the most irresponsible charges of Communist activity. This is the sort of person who is quick to accuse an innocent liberal of being a Communist, and of forever damning anyone who was trapped into joining a Communist front group. Some of these members have been making accusations that are impossible to sustain, and as a result have found themselves facing legal actions for libel or slander.

This type of member is, of course, not peculiar to the John Birch Society, and as Birch activities have increased in California so have these irresponsible charges increased—both from Right and Left. The suits against Birchers provoked this response in the Society's Bulletin for September, 1962:

"In the open letter to George Romney, enclosed with this bulletin, we have discussed at some length the theme of the renewed attack on us which was set off nation-wide some three or four months ago. This smear consists of the audacious, foul and typically Communist trick of calling *us* Communists; and of beguiling their Liberal dupes and allies into doing so for them. Since we have discussed this theme and its variations at some length in that letter, we'll not repeat ourselves here. But the point we do need to make here is that obviously our members do not intend to stand still for this kind of treatment any longer. Right while this part of this bulletin was being written, we received a telephone call informing us that four of our members in the Oyster Bay section of Long Island had brought suits, each for \$100,000 damages, against a Republican town leader, C. Bruce Pearsall, in that area. Their complaint is that Mr. Pearsall had said 'Birch members are just like Communists and subversives'; and that 'said words were known to the defendant to be false and untrue.' The complaint further charges that 'said words were spoken by the defendant, C. Bruce Pearsall, with actual malice toward the plaintiff and members of the John Birch Society.'

At the same time we have learned that some of our members in Connecticut—although we do not yet know who—are planning to bring similar suits against Dr. Albert Burke for some of his statements, in an interview he gave to UPI. Among other things, according to UPI, 'he said the Birchers "think and act like Communists"' and we have rumblings of other suits being considered for the same kind of libelous statements in other parts of the country. Up until now, anyway, we have always discouraged our

members from bringing libel suits. We still and most assuredly do not encourage them, for we feel that *as a general rule* the same energy and time can be put more effectively into our constructive education program. We agree, however, that this present campaign of falsehoods against us is not only unusually vicious, but that such statements as those quoted above can do immense harm, business-wise and in other ways, to thousands of our members. The recovery of compensation for such damages would certainly seem to be justified and in order. We shall no longer spend our time arguing against the bringing of libel suits, therefore, as we have done so often in the past.

In the meantime this headquarters, or the society as a whole, is proceeding to meet these particular attacks along our usual lines, but more aggressively because of their nature and our own increased strength." (*John Birch Society Bulletin*, Sept., 1962, pp. 25-26)

By September, 1961, it was painfully evident to the officers of the society that widespread attacks against it in the press had caused considerable damage. Recruiting dropped off and the overhead increased, because the staff had been enlarged to handle a quickly growing membership that was confidently expected to continue. By March, 1962, expansion began to pick up again, and Welch wrote:

"... we do not want *anybody* to get hurt who is really 'on our side,' as most of our prominent present critics certainly are."

This bulletin also devotes considerable attention to a new organization known as the Committee to Warn of the Arrival of Communist Merchandise on the Local Business Scene, 8124 N.E. Second Avenue, Miami 38, Florida.

"These people have done a tremendous job in ridding their own state of Florida of such merchandise; and an even more important job of preparing and making available a comprehensive manual which will help other patriots throughout the country to accomplish the same results in their respective areas. On studying this manual you will find many aspects of the problem, and of its solution, which you may not have thought of before." (p.8)

In recent months several large downtown stores in Los Angeles discovered that some of their merchandise manufactured in Iron Curtain countries carried cards stating in effect that the merchandise had originated in Communist-controlled areas, and asking patrons not to buy it. In one instance the store instituted a lawsuit which was settled out of court when it was agreed that the employees responsible for surreptitiously placing these printed notices on the merchandise promised to discontinue their efforts. Whether or not this sort of activity was influenced in any way by the September 1962 issue of the *John Birch Society Bulletin*, we are unable to say; it is quite obvious, however, that such action was strictly in accord with the general line of the society in stirring up resistance against the sale of Iron Curtain Merchandise in this country.

Commenting on the slow-down in recruiting new members to the society, Mr. Welch had this to say in the May 1962 issue of the Bulletin on page 19:

“There is a ‘delayed reaction’ effect to these attacks on us, and hence also to our recovery from them. The all-out attack from ‘our confused friends of the Right’ reached its crescendo in February. February, as we have already reported to you, was our largest month in new chapters and new members since the Society was founded. The attack did have its effect, however. For during March and well into April our rate of growth declined. And we even had an appreciable number of resignations, although percentage-wise our resignations always make the estimates of our enemies look absurd. Now there are strong indications that May will be an excellent month, and perhaps again our best on record. Also, please note and remember that we kept right on growing, in both strength and numbers, through both March and April. What we are reporting was merely a slowdown in our *rate* of growth. Please note, too, that more and more, as time goes by and the battering waves get worse, all we shall have to do is to stand firm, with sufficient patience, dedication, and courage, for others of like mind and determination to start rallying around us. Already the woods are full of fragmented ‘freedom groups’ which did not have the organizational structure and strength, nor the clear sense of direction, or the foundation in morality and long-range purpose, to enable them to stand the buffeting of the rising storms. We *have*—as unfortunately our enemies recognize far better than do our friendly critics—because we have built so much more solidly from the very beginning. And because we do not trim our sails for the sake of creating a better ‘public image,’ nor dilute our purpose for the sake of organizational comfort and prosperity. The key to our small success so far, and our great potential for the future, is that we know where we are going, fully realize how hard is the road, will not swerve from that course, and mean business every step of the way. More and more our recruiting job will be simply to help others to find out the truth about us, through all the smog of falsehood and smears blown over that truth by the Communists¹ whom the Comsymps can beguile, through clever ruses of every variety, to do their dirty work for them.”

Mr. Welch then goes on to explain some of the techniques by which new members are attracted to the Society, and in that regard we believe we can best explain the program and operation of the organization by again directly quoting from its official publication:

“As a means to that end we believe that our short new film, a brief introduction to the *John Birch Society*, will be very effective. Our Co-ordinators will make as full use of it as they can—with your help in setting up meetings. Wherever chapters or groups may wish to obtain a print for their own use, such prints are available from the home office at seventy-five dollars each. Our much thinner *Introductory Packets*, which do not contain the Blue Book, are

one dollar each. Our *Introductory Brochures* (with the Draskovich article and *Why Join the John Birch Society?* inserted) are five for one dollar—which is just about exactly the printing cost of this combination.

Our 'Question Cards' and 'Question Sheets' come fifty of each for one dollar (or we'll send them free to any member who can't afford them and simply asks us for a supply). Whether you can afford to distribute any of this material or not, the work which you do in personally telling others the truth about the Society, and thus the contribution of your time and energy for that purpose, is by far the most important and necessary ingredient for our growth."

Since March, 1962, there have been several statements in the monthly bulletins of the society to the effect that the American Communist Party is composed of a relatively insignificant number of confused members, but that the unknown Communists and Communist sympathizers who occupy strategic places in our government far exceed the strength of the Communist party itself, and constitute the real serious danger to our way of life through internal subversion and the handling of our foreign policy.

Thus in the June 1962 issue of the Bulletin Mr. Welch says:

"... The total numerical strength of the poor misguided bums who constitute the CPUSA is not, in our opinion, equal to even the number of strategically placed crypto-Communists in our government alone." (p. 14)

On page eighteen of this issue members of the society are urged to keep up their opposition against the sale of goods manufactured in Communist-dominated countries. The entire section, which starts on page sixteen under the title "Slave Labor Goods," states that the materials are still being imported despite the efforts of Birch Society members and other patriotic groups to stop them, but, the article continues, without these protests the influx would be far greater.

"... every item of such merchandise sold in our country helps to strengthen tyranny of Communist bosses over the suffering workers who made it. Each sale also puts dollars into the hands of Communist dictators who, through the central banks of Europe, can convert these dollars into gold from our dwindling supply, in preparation for whatever trouble in that area the Kremlin may be preparing for the future; and each such sale, by utterly unfair competition, takes jobs away from American labor and needed business from American manufacturers.

Everywhere you come across such merchandise, please continue your patient and friendly but emphatic protests—in person, by telephone, by letter, by petitions—to clerks, store managers, purchasing agents, and presidents of the stores and chains involved. We discovered early that most of these goods are being imported as a result of pressure on these distributors by our state department. And 'state' probably discovered long since that most of the

effective opposition to such imports is being inspired by the John Birch Society. This develops a contest worthy of our mettle, but which we should win decisively because of having the American people overwhelmingly on our side to whatever extent we can get them to realize the truth."

The July bulletin attacks the Supreme Court's decision banning compulsory prayer by students in the New York City schools, opposes sale of "slave labor goods," advocates the resignation of this government from membership to the United Nations, and advocates a continuation of the number one item on the society's national program: the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren of the United States Supreme Court.

Political Action

Harry Keaton, former president of the California Young Republicans, predicted in mid-January, 1963, that the John Birch Society would endeavor to assume control of his organization. Characterizing the effort as a "power grab," by means of infiltration and the use of paid staff workers and organizers, Keaton asserted that the John Birch Society had been endeavoring to insinuate itself into the affairs of the Young Republican organization for more than a year but he felt constrained to keep the information to himself until after the general election on November 6 and the special election in the first Congressional District in California, and then decided to make his information public. In a Los Angeles newspaper on January 25, 1963, Keaton claimed that Birch co-ordinators enticed Society members to join Young Republican clubs and county organizations immediately prior to the elections and to pack election meetings and gain control of those groups.

At the Young Republican Convention which was held in Fresno on February 15-17, 1963, the predictions of Mr. Keaton were amply corroborated when Robert Gaston, with the support of the conservative element among the Young Republicans, won election as head of that group with a personal endorsement of the new Birch co-ordinator for the western states, former Congressman Rousselot.

Immediately the displaced officers asserted that this was a move entirely engineered by the John Birch Society, which provoked an immediate denial from Mr. Rousselot who stated that it should be quite obvious that members of the John Birch Society who belonged to either major party had the right to support the candidates of their choice. He denied accusations made by Fred Hall, California Republican Assembly President, to the effect that the society was a fascist-type organization in America, secret in character, and with strong anti-Semitic tendencies. Commenting on Hall's charges, Rousselot responded that:

"We've asked only one-half of one percent of our entire membership to leave who were anti-Semitic or anti-Negro. I know of at least three chapters that were disbanded and reorganized because there had been tendencies toward anti-Semitic discussions. Hall tends to see two Birchers under every bed, and unfortunately wants to blame all the problems of the Republican Party on the Birch Society." (*Los Angeles Times* February 21, 1963)

These angry charges, denials and counter-charges are typical of the type of publicity that has recently attended every major activity of the John Birch Society in California. It seems manifest that as the society continues to grow and become more active this type of publicity concerning it will continue to increase. Considerable space in the monthly bulletins has been recently devoted to emphatic denials that any members of the society are permitted to engage in anonymous telephone call campaigns, and stating that any member who associates himself in any way with the activities of John Rockwell's American Nazi Party will be immediately expelled from the Society.

List of Birch Chapters in Greater Los Angeles Area

When it became known that the House Committee on Un-American Activities intended to come to Los Angeles for the purpose of holding hearings in the spring of 1962, a full-page advertisement was published in the *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner* on Monday, April 23, 1962, over the names of the chapters of the John Birch Society in Greater Los Angeles. Since these chapters differ somewhat from those that were operating at the time the first portion of this report was compiled, the Committee deems it of interest to publish the names of each of these chapters for the purpose of showing the geographical locations of the John Birch Society units designated by the organization as comprising "Greater Los Angeles."

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Westwood Chapter #795 | Whittier Chapter 664 |
| Brentwood Chapter 217 | Pico-Rivera Chapter 939 |
| Palos Verdes Chapter 846 | Whittier Chapter QISP |
| Santa Monica Chapter 654 | Huntington Park Chapter 294 |
| Mar Vista Chapter 927 | Norwalk Chapter QABZ |
| San Pedro Chapter QOTO | Whittier Chapter 490 |
| Long Beach Chapter 121 | Monrovia Chapter QCGX |
| Westwood Chapter QINN | Woodland Hills Chapter 158 |
| Pacific Palisades Chapter 112 | Van Nuys Chapter 344 |
| Redondo Beach Chapter 557 | Saugus Chapter QCOZ |
| Brentwood Chapter 671 | Sherman Oaks Chapter QNQH |
| West Covina Chapter QOQD | Burbank Chapter 847 |
| Covina Chapter QHKM | Sherman Oaks Chapter QNZF |
| Hacienda Heights Chapter QUIZ | Reseda Chapter QNOX |
| Santa Monica Chapter QLXO | Reseda Chapter 507 |
| Redondo Beach Chapter 591 | Capistrano Beach Chapter 804 |
| Santa Monica Chapter 416 | Anaheim Chapter 766 |
| Brentwood Chapter QOBZ | Anaheim Chapter 21 |
| Rolling Hills Chapter 148 | Garden Grove Chapter QJYA |
| Long Beach Chapter 479 | Costa Mesa Chapter 597 |
| Pacific Palisades Chapter 160 | Inglewood Chapter 459 |
| Long Beach Chapter 239 | Torrance Chapter 88 |
| Pacific Palisades Chapter 928 | Manhattan Beach Chapter QHOG |
| Brentwood Chapter 328 | Lawndale Chapter 717 |
| Covina Chapter QEVZ | Manhattan Beach Chapter 491 |
| Glendora Chapter 538 | Compton Chapter 543 |
| Covina Chapter 821 | Whittier Chapter 195 |
| Lawndale Chapter 889 | Long Beach Chapter 624 |
| Covina Chapter 838 | Downey Chapter QLPN |
| Hawthorne Chapter 264 | Whittier Chapter 739 |
| Azusa Chapter QLKO | Whittier Chapter 116 |
| Covina Chapter QGLR | El Monte Chapter QFOD |
| Gardena Chapter 917 | Temple City Chapter 556 |
| Downey Chapter 86 | Northridge Chapter 943 |

Burbank Chapter QNZO
 Sherman Oaks Chapter QOWL
 Encino Chapter 767
 Van Nuys Chapter 443
 Encino Chapter 525
 Chatsworth Chapter 210
 Anaheim Chapter QJRG
 Capistrano Beach Chapter QLOB
 Anaheim Chapter 725
 South Laguna Chapter 721
 Costa Mesa Chapter 471
 Newport Chapter 773
 Garden Grove Chapter 450
 Anaheim Chapter 601
 Costa Mesa Chapter 733
 Santa Ana Chapter 777
 Newport Beach Chapter 442
 Santa Ana Chapter QOKA
 Newport Beach Chapter QFOO
 Newport Beach Chapter QFCN
 Santa Ana Chapter QOLZ
 Santa Ana Chapter 191
 Newport Beach Chapter 480
 Santa Ana Chapter 845
 Costa Mesa Chapter 414
 Fullerton Chapter 555
 Altadena Chapter 495
 Altadena Chapter QFRG
 South Pasadena Chapter 132
 Arcadia Chapter 782
 Monterey Park Chapter 871
 South Pasadena Chapter 362
 San Marino Chapter 131
 San Marino Chapter 221
 Arcadia Chapter QOU
 San Marino Chapter 381
 Arcadia Chapter 791
 Eagle Rock Chapter QDRJ
 Glendale Chapter 345
 Garden Grove Chapter 826
 Costa Mesa Chapter 839
 Santa Ana Chapter 377
 Santa Ana Chapter 747
 Los Alamitos Chapter QIWZ
 Santa Ana Chapter QFUN
 Balboa Chapter QBNG
 Corona Del Mar Chapter 900
 Santa Ana Chapter 584
 Orange Chapter 738
 Santa Ana Chapter 235
 Buena Park Chapter QHDR
 Altadena Chapter 207
 South Pasadena Chapter 544
 Monterey Park Chapter 475
 South Pasadena Chapter 735
 San Marino Chapter QATV
 South Pasadena Chapter 632
 Arcadia Chapter 567
 San Marino Chapter 113
 South Pasadena Chapter 307
 Arcadia Chapter 784
 South Pasadena Chapter 436
 Arcadia Chapter 964
 Glendale Chapter QOWP
 Pasadena Chapter 66
 Pasadena Chapter 48
 La Canada Chapter 133
 Glendale Chapter 755
 Pasadena Chapter QDMB
 San Gabriel Chapter QITY
 La Canada Chapter 521
 La Canada Chapter 677
 Sun Valley Chapter QGRJ
 North Hollywood Chapter 503
 Woodland Hills Chapter 701
 Northridge Chapter 744
 San Jacinto Chapter QATO
 San Bernardino Chapter QJKV
 Riverside Chapter 929
 Fullerton Chapter 435
 San Bernardino Chapter 679
 Los Angeles Chapter 214
 Playa Del Rey Chapter 240
 Los Angeles Chapter 908
 Los Angeles Chapter 938
 Malibu Chapter QACS
 Los Angeles Chapter 740
 Los Angeles Chapter QNIB
 Palmdale Chapter 930
 Los Angeles Chapter 493
 Los Angeles Chapter QHJT
 Los Angeles Chapter QIDE
 La Crescenta Chapter QELK
 La Canada Chapter 273
 Alhambra Chapter QNOM
 Sunland Chapter 748
 San Gabriel Chapter 6
 La Crescenta Chapter 581
 San Gabriel Chapter 706
 North Hollywood Chapter QKTW
 Northridge Chapter QORM
 Studio City Chapter 731
 North Hollywood Chapter 150
 Ontario Chapter 95
 San Bernardino Chapter QFMI
 Fullerton Chapter 472
 Riverside Chapter 995
 Los Angeles Chapter 135
 Los Angeles Chapter 157
 Los Angeles Chapter 309
 Los Angeles Chapter 149
 Lancaster Chapter 168
 Los Angeles Chapter 898
 Los Angeles Chapter 690
 Los Angeles Chapter 332
 Los Angeles Chapter 946
 Los Angeles Chapter 172
 Los Angeles Chapter 163
 Los Angeles Chapter 89
 Los Angeles Chapter 346
 Los Angeles Chapter 986
 Los Angeles Chapter 174
 Los Angeles Chapter QCGS¹

This advertisement was headed "Welcome H. C. U. A., (House Committee on Un-American Activities), and stated:

"This duly authorized Committee of the Congress of the United States is charged with the grave responsibility of investigating subversion and un-American elements operating within our borders.

The Communist apparatus in the United States, acting on direct orders from Moscow, has officially proclaimed its intent to discredit and destroy by any means available the H.C.U.A. The Committee has always been a thorn in the sides of the 'Consymp's' for obvious reasons, and their opposition to any inquiry into their conspiratorial activities is quite understandable. The objective of the secret Communists, however, is to beguile innocent and idealistic non-Communists into doing the 'dirty work' for them. They are masters of this sort of thing and have developed the technique to the point of perfection. Using sugar-coated phrases such as 'civil liberties' and 'freedom of association' (and twisting the definitions of these phrases to suit their own purposes), the Comsymps are sometimes able to manipulate the uninformed into mob action against, not only the H.C.U.A., but against local law-enforcement agencies. The Red-induced riot against the H.C.U.A. in San Francisco is ample evidence of what a few well-trained, dedicated Communist agents can do.

Knowing that Marxist-oriented groups here in Los Angeles have been feverishly planning massive and supposedly 'spontaneous' public demonstrations against the H.C.U.A., we are resolved not to stand idly by in the face of such gigantic deception. It is our firm belief that the only way to prevent the Communists from repeating their San Francisco triumph here at our city of Los Angeles is to expose their modus operandi. Exposure, of course, is one thing they cannot stand, and is the very reason why they fanatically are determined to abolish the H.C.U.A.

In the hope, therefore, that the citizens of Los Angeles may become sufficiently aware of the true issues at stake and consequently be able to avoid the carefully-laid traps being set for them by the Communists and their friends, we are pleased to be able to reprint here the major part of 'Communist Target—Youth,' a report by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F.B.I., illustrating Communist strategy and tactics in the rioting which occurred during the H.C.U.A. hearings in San Francisco, May 12-14, 1960."

There then follows a complete reproduction of the article by Mr. Hoover, and at the bottom of the advertisement, which comprised a full page, is the sentence: "The John Birch Society, Belmont 78, Massachusetts."

A few days before the first portion of this section was completed in 1962, an affidavit was submitted by the attorney for the John Birch Society, Mr. Thomas H. Werdel, former member of Congress and a former California Assemblyman. The affidavit is too lengthy and detailed to print, but we have received it as an official exhibit and made it a permanent part of our record.¹

Conclusions

We find the John Birch Society to be a Right, anti-Communist, fundamentalist organization. It was conceived, organized, and is dominated by Mr. Robert Welch, who runs the society with the aid of a National Council and Advisory Committee, whose advice he is not, however, bound to follow. The accusations he made in *The Politician* in 1954 are shared by few of his followers, but he has since made other declarations that are as irresponsible and insusceptible of proof.

We have not found the society to be either a secret or a fascist organization, nor have we found the great majority of its members in California to be mentally unstable, crackpots, or hysterical about the threat of Communist subversion. As we have stated, there have been instances of imprudent activity and indefensible statements, but such isolated occurrences are not typical of the organization as a whole.

It is evident to us that since few members agree with Mr. Welch on a variety of matters, if he continues to make sensational and insupportable charges he will alienate rank and file loyalty. There is no doubt that such statements have rendered the society vulnerable to much legitimate criticism.

We agree with Prof. Alan Westin, who studied the Birch membership and wrote:

“. . . the Birch Society has been successful in attracting to it some highly substantial figures in local communities—physicians, stockbrokers, retired military officers, lawyers, business men (particularly small and middle-sized manufacturers in the Midwest and South), and professionals, many of whom have become local chapter leaders and state co-ordinators.” (*Commentary*, op. cit., p. 99)

We found no evidence of anti-Semitism by the society, and again can appropriately quote Prof. Westin, whose opinion is especially significant since he expressed it at a plenary session of the national Community Relations Advisory Council at Washington, D.C. on June 22, 1961:

“Until information is available to indicate differently . . . Birch Society is not overtly or silently anti-Semitic in its policies and analysis.”

After publishing the Blake series on the Society, the *Los Angeles Times* was deluged with pro- and anti-Birch letters. These moved the editor to consider a question which had bothered him and which has bothered others:

“What really bothers us is the probably justifiable criticism that exists in the minds of many but is manifested by the very few who contact us directly, that concerns the imponderable ‘so you don’t like Birchers’ method, but what better alternative do you offer?’ ”

We believe that the reason the John Birch Society has attracted so many members is that it simply appeared to them to be the most effective, indeed the only, organization through which they could join

in a national movement to learn the truth about the Communist menace and then take some positive concerted action to prevent its spread.

Our investigation and study was requested by the society, which had been publicly charged with being a secret, fascist, subversive, un-American, anti-Semitic organization. We have not found any of these accusations to be supported by the evidence.

ABOUT THIS REPORT

The following few pages of footnotes are not added in any spirit of quarreling with the Committee or of complaining about its Report. We think that Senator Hugh Burns, his fellow Committee members, and their staff all did a very praiseworthy job of objective investigation. And we think that they arrived at general conclusions about the Society which were basically sound and entirely fair.

But some segments of the American press and other news media have spread very widely a great many misunderstandings, misrepresentations, clever innuendoes, and even deliberate falsehoods about both the Society and its Founder. It is almost inevitable that results or traces of this vilification and distortion would creep into any report. These notes are added, therefore, at some places where we believe the falsely painted smears in the background -- against which the Committee itself had to work -- are clearly visible, through the carefully painted strokes of the Committee's own honest investigation.

Also, especially with regard to the opening pages of the Report, I should like to rise to a few points of personal privilege. I hope the Committee will not mind. For I am not attacking anybody, but simply defending myself. And it is doubtful if there have been many men within our times who have been so extensively and so viciously smeared, simply for telling the truth as they saw it.

Robert Welch

Belmont, Massachusetts
July 15, 1963

FOOTNOTES

(Consisting of comments by Robert Welch)

Page: Note

1:1 My telegram in reply stated that with as much as a month's advance notice I could and would be in Sacramento to appear before the Committee. I was never invited to do so. In fairness to the Committee, however, it must be stated that this was undoubtedly due in part to the fact that we had been insisting on "open hearings." The Committee, certainly with considerable justification from their point of view, preferred a combination of closed hearings and staff investigation. And I did meet once informally with one member of the staff.

3:1 This is an error of fact for which the Committee can hardly be blamed, because it has been so widely published and repeated despite all I could do to correct it. The business in which I spent most of my adult life, as sales-manager, and then as Vice-President in charge of Sales and Advertising, was founded by my brother and bears his name. This has always been made clear at all suitable places in all publications of the Society, from the very beginning. The rumor to the contrary has apparently been spread by the Comsymps, also from the beginning of the Society, as just one part of their diligent campaign to discourage financial contributions by picturing me as a multimillionaire. Actually I have had no connection whatsoever with the company in question for several years.

3:2 This interpretation of the facts is so funny that even the painfully solemn *New York Times* appeared to get a laugh out of it two or three years ago. For a decade I have subscribed to all publications of any importance that were relevant to my work, from the *Communist Worker* and *Political Affairs* at one end

Page: Note

of the ideological spectrum to *The Freeman* and *The Dan Smoot Report* at the other. But the only way you can get the publications of the League For Industrial Democracy, easily and regularly, is by being a member. This costs, as I recall, five dollars per year, and exactly the same amount of formality and effort as putting your name on a subscription blank to any magazine. While I would now have to check with our Research Department, I strongly suspect that I am still a "member" of not only the L.I.D., but of a number of other organizations which put out published material that interests us. And we would be naive not to think that there are some members of The John Birch Society who joined for the same purpose.

4:1 John Birch was 26 when he was killed.

4:2 This is the only unforgivable entry in the whole Report. The statements of Sample, like those of a columnist named S. L. A. Marshall which appeared later, deserve absolutely no credence by anybody, and much less by an official investigating Committee. The facts about the character, career, and death of John Birch, as set forth in my small book, are so well established, carefully documented, and confirmed by so many men of all ranks who knew him well and worked with him closely, that the only reaction prompted among them by Sample's attempted smear has been disgust.

5:1 Correction, please. In fact, several corrections to the whole paragraph. The letter I wrote in 1954 consisted of nine thousand words, which would have been about thirty printed pages. By 1958,

through constant additions every time it was retyped, it had grown to 287 pages (not 268) in the form finally reproduced by offset. The statement about Milton Eisenhower, to which reference is made, appeared *for the first time* in the 1957 version. And thirty years from 1957 goes back to 1927, not 1924. By 1927 Milton Eisenhower had already been for one year an assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture; and was already establishing that reputation in government circles for both brilliance and leftward leanings which, in a few more years and in the words of Franklin Roosevelt, was to cause the New Deal agencies to be fighting for his services.

The matter would not be important except that, as shown in the next two paragraphs of the Report, it is typical of such incredibly extensive efforts — frequently by people who are unaware that they have been beguiled into their attitude by a whole propaganda campaign for that purpose—to distort something I have said just enough to make it look ridiculous. You do not have to agree with this opinion which I expressed in 1957 and repeated in 1958, but — the Burns Committee to the contrary notwithstanding — it was a carefully considered opinion, even as to its wording, and does “warrant serious consideration.”

5:2 The idea that there was anything ephemeral about the Communist Conspiracy in America, even in 1924, has certainly been disproved by history. The importance of this paragraph, however, lies in another direction. For it shows how little Americans still understand today—even such well informed and patriotic Americans as the members and staff of the Burns Committee — the length of time that the Communists have been at work in our country; or the influence that they exerted, with few members but great brilliance, during the Wilson Administration, several years before Lenin and Trotsky had even established a physical base for the Conspiracy in Russia. That subject deserves a huge and well documented book — which nobody has

yet written. And of course these highly placed and secret Communists were not the kind that got mixed up in any such tawdry affair as the Bridgeman convention.

5:3 Obviously through typographical error the two words “so extensive” somehow were omitted at this point.

6:1 Basing this criticism of my opinion of John Foster Dulles on what Dulles said seems to me a little out of order in view of the essence of my whole contention—which was that the clearly established role of John Foster Dulles on behalf of the Communist Conspiracy, during the years that he was Secretary of State, was always to say the right things and always to do the wrong ones. In fact, since the Report quotes often from *The Politician*, perhaps I can be forgiven for myself quoting a part of the very paragraph which is involved here. “In speeches and public statements Dulles is always the proponent of the real American position, the man who announces the policies and intentions which the American people want to hear, and which they recognize as right. He thus serves to convince the American Congress and people that the Administration is *trying* to do the right thing. Then Dulles backs down, or is overruled, or appears to be forced by circumstances and pressures he can’t control to reverse himself; the government does exactly the opposite of what he has said it would do; and the defeat of our side is worse than if he had never spoken at all. But the American people simply do not grasp that it was all planned that way in the first place.”

The fact is that nobody should pay any attention to these criticisms of what I said in *The Politician* without reading the book and judging it for himself. Despite the “conspiracy of silence” which has been imposed against it since publication, it can be purchased through any bookstore if you are simply insistent enough. And the 468 pages of facts and documentation may show you how different is the truth about it from what

you have been told.

Also, since the Committee “wonders” about my reading and knowledge with regard to John Foster Dulles, I can’t help wondering myself whether the Committee knew several bits of history—such as the following. It was Edward Mandell House, working largely through the instrumentality of Woodrow Wilson, who did so much to advance huge parts of the Marxian program, in the United States and in other countries, during the years 1912 to 1919. By the time Col. House came to that first great strategic step in the direction of a Communist *one-world* government, which was then known as the League of Nations and was later to be reborn as the United Nations, he had a “brain trust” of five diligent young men to help him. And three of those five were John Foster Dulles, Allen Dulles, and Christian Herter.

Or, further. That the one part of the Versailles Treaty which did the most damage to Europe after World War I, and which caused so much economic chaos and suffering and bitterness in Germany, when fully exploited by the Communists, as to make possible the rise of Hitler, was the establishment of reparations claims against Germany with no limit and an indefinite total. And that the man who actually suggested this monstrous plan, to create exactly the kind of turmoil and hopeless frustration which the Communists love and in which they make great headway, was Edward Mandell House’s brilliant young satellite, John Foster Dulles. To answer the “one wonders” of the Committee, I do not claim to have learned everything John Foster Dulles ever *said* to criticize the Communists, or everything John Foster Dulles *did* to help them, in a long life devoted to both activities. But my statement about him was the result of a very considerable study of his career, and not any casual offhand accusation as the Committee appeared to assume. None of my statements ever are, if the reader can forgive me for being brutally frank about the matter in this seemingly appropriate place.

7:1 Let’s hope that the two paragraphs beginning with this sentence were put into the Report as a way of trimming its sails before the strong winds of uninformed public opinion. For as a defense of the three men named, against the complete record of what actually happened under their respective administrations, it is too visibly inadequate even to be taken seriously.

8:1 I am entirely willing to let the judgment of my character — including the accuracy, honesty, depth, and purpose of what I write — be formed on the contents of *The Politician*, by anybody who has read carefully the whole book. But of course I am not willing to have my character judged on the basis of what I said in *The Politician* by those who have never read *The Politician*. My only answer to such *ex cathedra* statements as the one covered by this footnote is: Read it—and judge for yourself!

8:2 The article in question, which appeared in the February, 1959 issue of *American Opinion*, contained about five thousand words. Nowhere in the whole fourteen pages was there one word about the Soviet Secret Police. And the whole substance of the article makes clear that having let the Soviet Secret Police have anything whatever to do with this massive public enterprise would have defeated its very purpose.

The Communists had in mind sweeping in the desired direction before this huge propaganda net a tremendously larger number of fish than could be handled by the hook-and-line methods of the Soviet Secret Police.

8:3 According to at least one American writer who actually visited Pasternak in Russia in 1960 — and who sent this information in a personal letter directly to myself—the author of *Dr. Zhivago* was then living in comparative luxury on an estate with several servants. There are around two hundred million Soviet subjects of the Kremlin who would love to be so “hounded.”

8:4 I most assuredly did contend so, and still do. But since it would take at least the equivalent of the original article of five thousand words to discuss and refute the arguments, from the intrinsic evidence of the book itself and from other related items, which the Report sets forth in its next several pages, that course is denied me here by practical considerations of space and relative importance. So let's follow the lead of the Committee itself, in its very next line, and address ourselves frankly to the question of competence on the part of myself, my supporters, my critics, and the Committee, with regard to the Pasternak-and-Djilas affair.

And if you never knew, and the Committee never knew—as apparently they did not—that I had any authoritative supporters on my side of this argument, that is quite understandable too. For my critics “planned it that way”; and I kept silent and allowed them to get away with it, rather than stir up any additional discord among the anti-Communist forces in this country. This is the first time I have ever taken the trouble to defend myself from any of the ridiculous ridicule which was heaped on me in the article by Eugene Lyons, called *Folklore Of The Right*, which appeared in the April 11, 1959 issue of *National Review*—and to which such extensive attention was given in this Report.

Even now I want to stir up just as little rumpus as possible. But, as I said in the *Prologue to The Politician*, and indicated again in the letter preceding these footnotes, when a man is hounded long enough and mercilessly enough for simply telling the truth as he sees it—and especially when that truth can stand up against all arguments to the contrary—there comes a time when he simply must be allowed the privilege of self-defense. And when the supercilious and condescending criticisms in *Folklore Of The Right*, which we had simply ignored, get themselves revived and glorified years later in the official Report of a governmental investigating committee, it seems worth the cost to do what little the cir-

cumstances will permit to set the record straight.

* * *

For the truth is that, shortly after this article appeared, three of the finest scholars and most penetrating students of the Communist conspiracy in America all came to my vigorous defense—specifically and emphatically with regard to the Pasternak book. They were Dr. S. M. Draskovich, Dr. Revilo P. Oliver, and Dr. Medford Evans. All of these men had contributed extensively to *National Review* in the past, with their names appearing on its masthead. Each of them, entirely independently of the others, and without knowing that the others were doing so, wrote—not just letters, but—whole scholarly articles emphatically confirming my analysis and conclusions as correct. (Each of them sent me copies.) *National Review* not only never published even one of these articles by three of its own most highly regarded contributors; it never made the slightest reference in print to having received any of them, or to indicate that there even was any “other side” to the argument.

Now of course the Burns Committee could not have known this. But it could at least have read with some care my own exposition of my point of view in my original article, which seems extremely doubtful. If it had examined conscientiously that February, 1959 issue of *American Opinion*, which actually went into the mails the middle of January, then a serious question would arise as to its objectivity and purposes. For in that very same issue appeared another article, emphasizing and confirming another position of mine for which I was smeared and ridiculed and vilified far more extensively than for anything I had said about Boris Pasternak and Milovan Djilas. This was my contention that Fidel Castro was a Communist. Why did the Committee devote all of this space in its Report to the Pasternak argument, and none at all to a simultaneously “startling” assertion of mine for which I was far more viciously and extensively ridiculed? Is it simply because history has already

proved that I was right, and my critics completely wrong, in the Castro case? And all that the Committee really wanted was to try to highlight my supposed errors?

I doubt it. Or at least I doubt that there was any such conscious intention on the part of the Committee. But again I believe that, being aware of the fire they would be under from the Liberals, for being obliged to make so unpopular a finding and report—namely, that The John Birch Society was all right—they felt that they had better make as much of a compensatory and conciliating gesture to the Leftists as they could, by discrediting me wherever they might find what seemed to be a good opportunity.

But the Castro affair may throw some light from two different angles, on my being so pilloried for putting Pasternak in his proper place. For while the particular article about Castro, in the February, 1959 number of *American Opinion*, had been written at my request by Dr. J. B. Matthews (when Castro actually took over Cuba on January 1, 1959), I had personally written many pages as early as August, 1958, which appeared in the September *American Opinion*, making it clear that Fidel Castro was simply another murderous Communist agent of the Kremlin. Then in March, 1959, in the issue dated April, I presented a fifteen-thousand-word article of my own, far more definitively and conclusively giving the whole truth about Castro for those who had not been made too willfully blind by propaganda even to want to see the truth. All of this time the *Reader's Digest*, of which Eugene Lyons was not only Senior Editor but *the* authority on Communism, was still supporting Castro. And it so happened that the April, 1959 issue of *Reader's Digest*, which also appeared in March, carried a long article by Dickey Chappelle, glorifying Castro to the skies as a "revolutionary idealist," and insisting that it was a criminal absurdity even to think of him as a Communist.

Although in 1959 the April *American Opinion* reached a few thousand people,

and the April *Reader's Digest* reached millions, these two articles clashed head on when they both appeared in March. Here was the unknown Robert Welch, despite all of the smearing he had already sustained over his views about Castro, daring to disagree with the pontifical authority of that great expert on Communism, Eugene Lyons. And so in April there appeared, in *National Review*, the article by Eugene Lyons which made me out a simpleton, dealing in childish fantasies and old wives tales, completely beneath the notice of any serious student of Communism. And four years later a governmental agency trots out this satirical diatribe as supposedly solid criticism with which to discredit me.

* * *

The other point of view from which to look at this episode brings us back to the question of comparative competence. The Burns Committee's report simply took for granted the exalted competence of Eugene Lyons, compared to my own or that of my friends and advisors. But I raise the question, purely in self-defense, as to how justified is this appraisal. For not only did I have on my side the three superb scholars mentioned above, Drs. Draskovich, Evans, and Oliver — none of whom were ever fooled by the pro-Castro propaganda as Lyons evidently was — but many others. Among them was certainly one of the ablest and most knowledgeable scholars about the Communist Conspiracy in the whole world, Dr. J. B. Matthews. Dr. Matthews not only agreed with me—one hundred percent, to the best of my knowledge, in the whole controversy—but with regard to the Milovan Djilas part of it he had already written an article entitled *A Dissenting Review*, which we had published, setting forth the facts and arguments to show that, as a supposedly anti-Communist book, Djilas' *The New Class* was as phony as the "neutralism" of Nehru. But the Burns Committee, while quoting Eugene Lyons at great length, completely ignored so superior an authority as J. B. Matthews who was on my side.

Also on my side in this dispute (if I

had raised any dispute) would have been another scholar with penetrating insight into the workings of the Communist Conspiracy, which he has acquired through a whole lifetime of study. This is Dr. Francis X. Gannon, who is today head of our Research Department. And that raises another point well worth noting. For not only had Dr. Gannon, like Drs. Draskovich, Evans, and Oliver, never been fooled by Castro; they had never been fooled by Communism itself, as Eugene Lyons had. It's amazing how these people who were gullible enough to fall for the Communist line at some point in their lives, and to become either Party members or at least ardent fellow travelers, now feel that they are so superior to and so much wiser than those of us who never were deceived by it at all. And that assumption, which simply does not stand up against either analysis or observation, has always caused a tremendous amount of trouble, misunderstanding, and futility among the anti-Communist forces of every country.

For most of these men, having gone into the Communist movement because of being idealists, and having then left it because the supposed idealism of the system was not working out in practice, never have fully grasped either the fallacy of Communist theory or the professionalism of Communist deception. No man achieves high power in the Communist hierarchy who does not first realize that the romantic appeal of a socialist system is simply a bait, and a weapon in Communist strategy to achieve and maintain power. But the idealist never realizes this. With rare exceptions—Elizabeth Bentley, Manning Johnson, J. B. Matthews—the returned traveler from dreamland never does come all of the way to seeing and exposing the fraud in the very "idealism" which tempted him to enter the Communist world in the first place.

Even less does the idealist realize why the Communists sustain a socialist system in a country after they have taken it over, and when they are well aware of how much more efficient and productive

a free-enterprise system would be. It is basically because they cannot maintain the tyranny of three percent of a population over the other ninety-seven percent without exercising almost infinite police-state controls. And a socialist economic system supplies the *framework* as well as the excuse for watchful controls by police-state bureaucrats over all of the activities of the citizens at every level. Without socialism the amount and pettiness of the supervision imposed by the regime for its own safety would appear too blatantly arbitrary and tyrannical.

Further, the idealist never grasps all that is fully covered by the brilliant phrase "masters of deceit." Or that the Communist is willing actually to hurt his own cause in every speech, every book, and every action, provided he also gains something for the cause at the same time, and the gain is greater than the loss. A Communist professor will deliver fifty-seven minutes of an hour lecture to a still non-indoctrinated college class, in which he completely gains their confidence through expounding sound principles logically and well, in order, during the last three minutes, to make most of that class accept, store in their minds, and follow unswervingly as truth, some Communist falsehood which is extremely important to Communist strategy for the years immediately ahead. I have heard them do it. A Comsymp author will write a two-hundred page book, in the whole first 195 pages of which he gains the enthusiastic confidence of his anti-Communist readers by a brilliant and logical exposure of the Conspiracy, in order to drive home in the last five pages, with lasting conviction, his own suggestions for opposing this menace by exercises in utter futility and defeatism — thereby completely neutralizing the efforts and the resources of many who would otherwise be powerful and determined leaders in real anti-Communist action. There are several such books on the market today, and I have read some of them.

There is no doubt that Lyons is an earnest idealist, as I described him in

May God Forgive Us way back in 1952. Also there is no doubt that he has never fully lost that contempt for the American businessman and dislike for the competitive free-enterprise system which, as a part of that misguided idealism, first led him as a young man into the Communist camp. He made that clear even in his otherwise excellent books on Communism. It is obvious from his proclivity for at least spiritual association with extreme leftwing anti-Communists today. All of which is a matter of honest opinion, and I have no wish to quarrel with him about it. I am sorry that this whole *Folklore Of The Right* business ever came up again. I ignored it at the time, and went right on praising and recommending the magazine in which it appeared, as I have done ever since and still do despite the other attacks on me that have appeared in its pages in the meantime. I think that Mr. Lyons did a tremendously useful job with his first two or three books in waking people up to the Communist menace by recounting his own observations and experiences. And I hope that I can have only complimentary things to say about him in the future. But I cannot let the shallowness of his perception of Communist methods, which grows out of his own idealism, be used to discredit me at this time and in this manner without both a protest and a refutation.

* * *

For the truth is that, in his super-sarcastic diatribe against me known as *Folklore Of The Right*, Mr. Lyons failed to understand what was going on right before his eyes — as he obviously did simultaneously with regard to Cuba. This was because he was still looking through the veil of communist “idealism.” In fact, Mr. Lyons already had in his own mind the attitude and outlook which the Communists were trying to inculcate through the works of Pasternak and Djilas. So naturally he was quite convinced by those books. And the fact that both authors said so many bad things about the Soviet regime (and obviously

true things), in order to win the confidence of the reader and be convincing as to the points they wanted to “put over”—this constantly used technique of the Communist propaganda machine is something that the idealistic Mr. Lyons failed completely to recognize.

Actually, the socialist system as bait had grown very stale and unappetizing during the long Stalin regime, even to such of those newly awakening “colonial peoples” who could read and write. The socialist appeal as a weapon had been badly blunted and tarnished, even for the use of those thousands of “intellectuals” in America who wield that weapon so industriously on behalf of the power-seeking purposes of the Conspiracy. All of this had to be blamed, like so many other things, on the Stalin regime, and on the criminal character of those who had been running the system. The bait had to be freshened up, some of the too visibly rotten ingredients had to be confessed to be rotten and thrown out, and the whole thing had to be made to look more appetizing with the dressing of idealism. Or, to use the parallel figure of speech — and they both apply — the weapon had to be refurbished and re-sharpened, so that those who wielded it could speak with more authority once again on any ideological battleground. Above all the idea had to be planted that the deep thinkers in the Communist world and the deep thinkers in the remaining non-Communist world were, basically, all idealists together, and really thinking fundamentally alike and towards the same goals. And all of this had to be done somehow, and in such a manner, as to reach huge audiences all over the world — and reach them convincingly — instead of the few thousands that might have been reached and half convinced by some academic essays on the same subject, undramatically presented. The Communists simply used, with their usual painstaking brilliance as to details, a couple of long tried and tested formulas of deception. With striking success—including the deception of Eugene Lyons.

9:1 It is hard to see why the Committee would make so pontifical a statement as this, obviously with "no vestige of evidence to support it," and without any investigation. Actually it was the external evidence of a Soviet propaganda operation which first caused me to look into the contents and purposes of the two books. There were reports we were receiving, or reading, of the helpful impact of the Djilas book to *socialist* propaganda in several Asiatic countries. There was the background and character of the non-Communist publishing and distribution channels being used for the Pasternak book in the United States, and the nature and extent of the exploitation which was giving the book its huge immediate sale. There was the fact that the Nobel Prize Committee had offered Pasternak its award in the first place. As I have pointed out elsewhere, since at least as early as 1950 the various Nobel Prize Committees have been, for all practical purposes, simply propaganda agencies of the Kremlin. They sometimes give prizes to non-Communists, of course, but only when the award serves some Communist purpose. The Communist propaganda machine—and as a result even the Burns Committee—made much of the fact that the Soviets would not allow Pasternak to receive the Nobel Prize. But the Committee did not stop to ask why it had ever been offered to him in the first place (by the Swedish Academy, of which Dag Hammarskjöld—who was consulted—was a member, serving as the Nobel Prize Committee for literature), when this would have been impossible without Soviet approval.

It was these "external" circumstances, and many others, which caused me—and obviously caused many far abler students of the Conspiracy than either Mr. Lyons or myself—to start asking ourselves: "Just what goes on here, anyway?" The answer is that the Communists were then already pushing very hard and very cleverly, in these books, the exact line which means so much to them today, as the pressures increase to "merge" us into a Communist *one-world*;

namely that, for all the faults and crimes of the Communist world and of our world, we idealists in both are still just brothers under the skin. So why not *merge*, and let the sensitive idealists out of both worlds—like Pasternak and Eugene Lyons—run everything?

11:1 This is at least a gross exaggeration. The "salvos and broadsides" fired at the Society and myself by the press have been almost entirely over what I had said or was supposed to have said, about the Eisenhower brothers, the Dulles brothers, Earl Warren, Fidel Castro, Charles de Gaulle, and a few other famous characters on the world stage; and to a lesser extent over such topics as our efforts to wake people up to the differences between a republic and a democracy, or to the Communist drive behind the "civil rights" agitation. Not one percent, I am sure, of the thousands of newspaper and television attacks on us have ever even mentioned the Pasternak matter, because the whole argument would have been too uninteresting and too unconvincing to the general public when presented in the space and manner to which the newspapers are limited. It was because the Pasternak-Lyons affair was dragged in here so surprisingly, and blown up so out of proportion to its importance, that I decided perhaps I too had better take the time and space to put it in a proper light.

11:2 This paragraph would have sounded far less devoid of humility on my part if it could have been quoted in full, and in the context of the other paragraphs around it. But although—as the Committee was kind enough to admit I had admitted—I can certainly make mistakes, I am entirely willing to stand on the record. And it is a long one, from which I shall extract only a few samples here.

As far back as 1952, in a book which had a wide sale, I insisted—and gave many facts and arguments to support what seemed to me obvious—that Tito always had been, still was, and always

would be simply a murderous Communist agent of the Kremlin. And that all the pretenses and artful management otherwise were carried out as an excuse for our Government to give him billions of dollars and for other Communist purposes.

Years ago, when our press and governmental agencies were spouting all kinds of arguments as to how to woo the "neutralist" Nasser over as "a friend of the West," we were emphatically pointing out that Mr. Nasser was and for years had been a Communist agent of the Kremlin. And that our proceeding on any other assumption was stupidity—at best. (One of the many reasons we advanced for our assurance that Nasser was a Communist was something well-known to the chancelleries of Europe — or at least taken for granted by them on the basis of what they did know—but completely unknown to the American people; namely, that Nasser had been a protégé of our CIA, and subsidized during his rise to power by our CIA under Allen Dulles.)

In 1956, when Achmed Sukarno of Indonesia was being fêted so by our Government as an honored guest, and being introduced by Richard Nixon to a joint session of our Congress as "the George Washington of Indonesia," we were already gathering and publishing what seemed to us conclusive evidence to support our statement that Sukarno was and for years had been a Communist agent of the Kremlin.

The Castro story I'll not repeat here. Except to point out that I was later lambasted and ridiculed by one Conservative publication for having said, in the summer of 1958, that Castro was a Communist; instead of having said, as they did then, that Castro *might* be a Communist. But the factual record was absolutely clear in 1958 that Castro was and always had been a Communist—and all you had to do was to go dig it out.

In all of the above cases, and a dozen more, history has already proved conclusively that I was right. With regard to Charles de Gaulle, Romulo Betancourt,

José Figuéres, Giovanni Gronchi, Willi Brandt, J. Nehru, and U Thant, history will certainly complete the conviction in due course. Nor does this record of accurate appraisal derive from any tendency on my part simply to designate important international figures indiscriminately as Communists because the woods are so full of them at this stage of the Communist advance. For right when we began pointing out, practically one year ahead of any other publication in America, that Charles de Gaulle was still a Communist, exactly as he had been when he imposed the reign of terror on France in 1945, we were equally emphatic that his longtime associate—and originally extremely leftist associate—Jacques Soustelle, had completely turned against Communism, and would prove to be one of the strongest and most hated enemies of the Communists. Nor was any of this guessing, or "feel," except as "feel" is simply a putting together, into their meaningful pattern, of a large number of items of incontrovertible facts and dependable information.

When it comes to the home front it would surprise most people to know how very few individuals there are about whom I have ever expressed the opinion that they were Communists or even Comsymps; and, exactly to the contrary of the impression that has been carefully created—and is perpetuated to some extent by this Report—how restrained I have been in applying any such labels. In fact, Mr. Robert Kennedy and his cohorts have been jumping all over me off and on for years because I would not "name names." But the press and my critics have simply made the extreme most of those very few cases where, in order to be realistic in this battle, I have spoken out.

12:1 The Committee deserves, in my opinion, tremendous applause for this very sound exposition of a much misunderstood Communist propaganda device.

16:1 There have been three printings

of the *Blue Book* since this paragraph was written, or was applicable. And of course the size of our staff, both in the offices and in the field, has greatly increased since then. But we find almost all statements of the Report, with regard to the Society itself, and even as to its size and specific operations at the time this Report was actually prepared, to be decidedly accurate and entirely fair.

18:1 This simply is not true, as the Committee would have discovered on checking with any other member of our COUNCIL except the one who was most responsible for, and most helpful about, getting out this Report. This very good friend of mine, and very valuable member of our COUNCIL, still happens to have disagreed with me more about more things than all the rest of the COUNCIL put together. So I am afraid his attitude is apparently reflected here; and while quite understandable, it is still grossly exaggerated and incorrect.

Here, for instance, is an extract from a letter recently written by one of the nationally best known and most highly respected members of our COUNCIL, to somebody who had made inquiry on this very subject:

"Mr. Welch does not try to run The John Birch Society single-handed. At considerable sacrifice I and other members of his Executive Committee meet with him once each month to go over the material proposed for the Bulletin and in no instance has Mr. Welch failed to eliminate anything that any member of the committee thought objectionable or unwise."

The obvious truth is that you simply do not have an advisory COUNCIL—or at least you do not keep one very long, of men of the stature of those who comprise our COUNCIL—unless you welcome, heed, and are benefitted by their advice. And this Report itself quotes evidence further along which shows how much attention I pay to the views of our COUNCIL, and how continuously I defer to those views even when I disagree. The sweeping statement under dis-

cussion, while remotely possible in extreme theory, simply has no basis in fact. But we are so appreciative to the COUNCIL member in question, for all of his help in connection with this Report, that we are going to surprise him. The next time he has any advice to offer I'll take it—even if he and I have to fight the whole COUNCIL in opposition.

18:2 The words "coordinator" and "section leader" seem to have become reversed in this sentence, as the function of each is given for that of the other. It is worth noting, too, that all Society literature capitalizes such titles as Coordinator, Section Leader, and Chapter Leader, while the Committee's Report does not. We regard these names as designating specific rank and functions within the Society, rather than as merely job descriptions.

19:1 Two different things are confused here. One is the Chapter Report made by the Chapter Leader, covering the activities of the members for the preceding month, which is forwarded to Belmont along with the dues collected. The other consists of the Members Monthly Message forms, on which each individual member makes any comments, criticisms, or suggestions he may wish. The member then encloses this form in a sealed envelope—with or without a contribution, entirely as he may wish—which envelopes are also collected by the Chapter Leader and forwarded to Belmont.

23:1 It seems unfortunate that the Committee did not feel it had room, or did not choose, to quote the second paragraph in the *Blue Book* following this one, and making its meaning clearer. Because of the current timeliness of that paragraph written years ago, and the now visible accuracy of its analysis and predictions, we submit it herewith.

"In fact, it is clear that the Communists long ago made plans to have this method available, in whole or in part, to whatever extent it might be useful. The trouble in our south-

ern states has been fomented almost entirely by the Communists for this purpose. It has been their plan, gradually carried out over a long period with meticulous cunning, to stir up such bitterness between whites and blacks in the South that small flames of civil disorder would inevitably result. They could then fan and coalesce these little flames into one great conflagration of civil war, in time, if the need arose. The whole slogan of 'civil rights,' as used to make trouble in the South today, is an exact parallel to the slogan of 'agrarian reform' which they used in China. And the Communists, who are pulling innocent and idealistic Americans into promoting this agitation for them, have no more real interest in the welfare of the Negroes and no more concern about the damage they actually do to our colored population, than the Chinese Communists had with regard to the welfare of the Chinese peasants."

(*Blue Book*, pages 28-29.)

24:1 I wish both to compliment and to thank the Committee for reporting on this whole episode with complete fairness and a very high degree of accuracy.

25:1 The only changes in the *Blue Book* from one edition to another, except for a minor omission on the recommendation of our COUNCIL at the time of the fifth printing, have consisted of footnotes added at the end of some chapters mainly to bring certain items up to date. There have been no additions to the text itself.

The statement in question, therefore, was made in the presentation at Indianapolis almost five years ago. In that presentation, which became the exact text of the *Blue Book*, there simply was not time to go into all the sources and documentation of the hundreds of statements similar to this one. And I was addressing men of great character who, giving me credit for equal integrity—as most of our members have long since learned to

do—knew that I would not be making any such statement unless it was based on information which I considered dependable. These men, however, had known me for years. The Burns Committee not at all. So the Committee was entirely justified in expressing skepticism.

In making this statement, however, as I well remember even now, I was leaning over backwards to be conservative. For the information, which had been fairly widely published, was to the effect that there were thirty-eight Soviet espionage rings operating in the United States — with only two that had been exposed. I gave the figure as "at least thirty." And the original source of the statement was the Hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee for February 14 and 15, 1957.

29:1 We agree with the Committee. I personally thought that the article in *Commentary*, although bitterly hostile to the Society, was such a carefully done and scholarly presentation, that I ordered enough extra copies and sent one to every member of our COUNCIL.

34:1 Of course I have not implied any such thing. As the Committee itself makes plain in the quotation that follows. Just why this contradiction, I don't know. As to the evidence and arguments that both the slogan used against Taft and the one against McCarthy were deliberately manufactured by the Communists according to a time tested formula, they are set forth in my speech, *Through All The Days To Be*, of which several printings have been sold and which is still available.

36:1 With certain corrections as to wording, I have indeed contended, and do contend, all those things. And history has already borne me out, or is rapidly bearing me out, in every case.

As to the Bay of Pigs horror, I pointed out at the time our "invasion" was getting under way that there would be three results: a great loss of prestige and moral leadership by the United States;

a great gain in prestige by Castro; and the destruction by Castro of much of his potentially dangerous resistance through luring it out into the open this way in a revolt which had been intended to fail. And I also said that, in my opinion, the whole thing had been "planned that way" by Castro and his Communist friends within our Government. And if you think that collaboration between Castro and our Government is anything new or hard to believe, may we remind you that in 1958 Dr. Milton Eisenhower spent several days with Castro at his headquarters in the Oriente hills, just a few weeks before Castro took over Cuba. You don't suppose he was there as a tourist on a vacation, do you?

As to the revolts in Poland and Hungary, they were genuine enough all right, on the part of the patriots who participated and lost their lives—and I have never implied anything to the contrary. But they were both planned and deliberately precipitated by the Communists. In the case of Hungary the Communists had the help of our Radio Free Europe in precipitating the revolt by promising assistance; exactly as they had had the help of London Radio in 1944 in precipitating the Polish revolt against the Germans in Warsaw, which brought about the destruction — so desired by Stalin — of Bor-Komorowski's army. Now that Stalin no longer feared the Germans he wanted those "allies," consisting of an underground army of 250,000 Polish patriots, lured prematurely into open revolt against the Germans and completely wiped out of existence, as he was sure they would be. Otherwise these veteran fighters would soon be opposing his own take-over of Poland which was about to start through the Lublin gang.

Every student of the Conspiracy knows well the extent to which the Communists use the principle of *divide and conquer*. Why should it be so hard to get the same students to realize that, as the Communists take over more and more of the world, their task and their worry consists more and more of maintaining

their rule against insurrection in already conquered territory; and that consequently these "masters of deceit" make equal use of the principle of *divide and keep conquered*. They precipitate revolts in order to kill off the latent nationalist oppositions piecemeal, when it is safest for themselves; and thus to avoid all possibility of *simultaneous* revolt among the enslaved peoples of several different nations—which has for many years been the greatest nightmare of the Kremlin.

As to the Polish and Hungarian revolts, the circumstantial evidence that they were both planned by the Kremlin, at least as far back as the 20th Communist Congress, in Moscow in February, 1956, is overwhelming, and there is considerable direct evidence besides. I have presented it many times in seminars, but it would take entirely too much time and space to develop here. I'll stop for only one point, to illustrate the additional purposes which the Communists carefully planned for the Hungarian revolt to serve—besides luring the potential resistance in Hungary out into the open and destroying it at their convenience. Congressman Francis Walter himself, Chairman of the HCUA, was authority for the statement that of the first 6200 Hungarian "refugees" brought over here so hurriedly and with such fanfare by our Government, every one of them was a Communist agent!

37:1 I have no wish to quarrel with *National Review*. It is in many ways an excellent magazine, especially for the collegiate world, with a strong appeal to literate readers everywhere. And lately it seems to me to have been getting even better. We have always recommended it, and still do. But in connection with the final paragraph quoted here, we shall leave it to history and our members to decide who has been bearing false witness, and against whom.

39:1 Let me put the Committee at ease on this point, so far as I can. Our argument from the very beginning has been that if we cannot stop the Communists

by activities entirely aboveboard, then we have no chance of stopping them at all. For trying to match them underground would be like a human being trying to teach a rattlesnake how to rattle. It is for this very reason that we bring the matter of Communist infiltration into our Government so emphatically out into the open—and naturally get viciously criticized for doing so despite all of the evidence to support us.

And just to keep the record clear, we do intend to stop the Communists.

41:1 There have been two or three changes in the COUNCIL since the Committee finished its work. But this list was correct as of the end of 1961. The same thing is true of the two lists submitted in the next paragraphs.

50:1 This buildup by the Communists themselves of the "importance" of the Supreme Court decision that Communists must register—and their complaint about the Supreme Court's "reactionary" majority—would be the best joke of the decade if the Communist danger did not make us all necessarily so serious. As it is, we are not amused. We simply point out that, to the best of our knowledge, no Communist has ever yet registered anywhere, or even been asked to register by anybody, since the Supreme Court decision required them to do so. And we are positive that the "reactionary majority" of the Court never had the slightest expectation that they would. But for protective odor against all of the *pro-communist decisions* of the Supreme Court—which are being enforced, some of them at bayonet point—this anti-red herring served a very useful purpose.

50:2 The Committee does not make clear the extent to which this whole attack was directed by Hall primarily at The John Birch Society, specifically and by name. But to learn this all you have to do is to refer to the Communist publications indicated.

We do not know about the "surprise," but we certainly do know from bitter

experience how Mr. Hall's movement grew and spread as he planned, pulling into its school of eels and snakes a few very big fish indeed even from Conservative waters. And these, strange to say, not the eels and the snakes, were the only attackers whose bites really hurt us.

But if the Communists could not stir up that kind of divisiveness in the Conservative streams, and beguile that kind of help into following the Communist decoys, there would not even be any problem about destroying their whole conspiracy. So we have simply taken all of the sniping from the Right in stride as well as we could—and gone on growing in both strength and influence, as well as determination.

52:1 If by "the third year" the Committee means the calendar year of 1962, the last line of this paragraph was too optimistic. The attacks *from the Right* had hurt us enough, with a delayed but continued reaction, so that it was by then taking about twelve months to double our membership—as we believe our later bulletins made clear.

55:1 Obviously through typographical error, a whole clause was left out here. The original sentence in the bulletin read: "More and more our recruiting job will be simply to help others to find out the truth about us, through all the smog of falsehood and smears blown over that truth by the Communists and their dupes and sympathizers—and by all of the good anti-Communists whom the Comsymps can beguile, through clever ruses of every variety, to do their dirty work for them."

59:1 Perhaps it should be mentioned that there were approximately forty chapters in Greater Los Angeles which did not participate in this advertisement; and which, therefore, are not listed here. This was either by preference on the part of a chapter, or because there had not been sufficient time, after the advertisement was planned, to get in touch with a Chapter Leader and have him in turn get the approval of his members.

60:1 The only important item overlooked by the Committee, it seems to us, in this brief bringing of their Report up to date, was the development in the Moscow press. There is where the line is laid down for the local Communist press in the United States and elsewhere in the world; and thus through that American Communist press to the Comsymps in every area of our national life—including those planted in our general press and mass media of communication.

It is quite significant, therefore, that for the past two years *Pravda*, *Izvestia*, *Nedelya*, *Krokodil*, *Trud*, *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, and some half dozen more of the most important publications in the worldwide Communist empire, have devoted more space and attention to smearing The John Birch Society than the total Moscow press has ever before given to any non-official opposition, in

the whole forty years of their lying propaganda.

It is also significant that no matter what the specific theme of these articles may be, the main purpose of them all is simply to apply the adjective "fascist" to the society, and to describe it as "fascist," on every feasible occasion throughout every page. So that when you see or hear The John Birch Society being condemned as "fascist" anywhere in the United States, somebody is helping the Communist strategy which Moscow thinks will be most effective in damaging or destroying us, whether or not our critic has the slightest idea that he is following the Communist line.

And it further seems to us most significant of all that the Kremlin and its Moscow press think we deserve so much attention.