

SOCIAL SCIENCES
PHILOSOPHY & RELIGION

SEP 09 1996

Los Angeles Public Library

AMERICAN EXTREMISTS

MILITIAS, SUPREMACISTS,
KLANSMEN, COMMUNISTS, & OTHERS

JOHN GEORGE & LAIRD WILCOX

329 G348 1996



Prometheus Books

59 John Glenn Drive
Amherst, New York 14228-2197

Cover photo courtesy AP/Wide World Photos

Published 1996 by Prometheus Books

American Extremists: Militias, Supremacists, Klansmen, Communists, and Others.
Copyright © 1996 by John George and Laird Wilcox. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews. Inquiries should be addressed to Prometheus Books, 59 John Glenn Drive, Amherst, New York 14228-2197, 716-691-0133. FAX: 716-691-0137.

00 99 98 97 96 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

George, John, 1936-

[Nazis, communists, klansmen, and others on the fringe]

American extremists : militias, supremacists, klansmen, communists, & others / John George, Laird Wilcox.

p. cm.

Originally published: Nazis, communists, klansmen, and others on the fringe, 1992.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-57392-058-4 (pbk.)

1. Political clubs—United States. 2. Political parties—United States.
3. Radicalism—United States. 4. Left-wing extremists—United States.
5. Right-wing extremists—United States. I. Wilcox, Laird M. II. Title.

HS2325.G46 1996]

24.273—dc20

96-16425
CIP

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper

Contents

Preface 7

Part I. Background, Characteristics, Motivations, and Other Considerations

1. It's Not New: Historical Perspective on American Extremism Prior to 1960 15
2. What Is Extremism? Style and Tactics Matter More Than Goals 54
3. Motivations: Why They Join, Stay, Leave 63

Part II: The Far Left

4. Communist Party USA 97
5. Socialist Workers Party 108
6. Black Panther Party 114
7. Students for a Democratic Society 125
8. Progressive Labor Party 147
9. Workers World Party 153
10. Revolutionary Action Movement 156
11. Revolutionary Communist Party 159
12. Communist Workers Party 163

Part III: The Far Right

13. Reverend Billy James Hargis and His Christian Crusade	173
14. The John Birch Society: A Plot to Sell Books?	186
15. The Christian Right	197
16. Willis Carto and Liberty Lobby	207
17. Robert Bolivar DePugh and the Minutemen	221
18. The Militias	246
19. Gerald L. K. Smith and Christian Nationalist Crusade	275
20. The LaRouche Network	283
21. Jewish Defense League	298
22. The Nation of Islam	317
23. Assorted Neo-Nazis	323
24. National States Rights Party	354
25. Ku Klux Klans	362
Appendix I. Fake Quotes and Fabricated Documents: A Common Extremist Tactic	383
Appendix II. Principal Characteristics of the Extremes and the Mainstream in America: A Handy Guide for Extremist Watchers	421
Index	425

Preface

We are always asked: "How did you get interested in political extremism?" This is a reasonable question because the subject admittedly is somewhat arcane. Yet political extremism has a mystique all its own, combining elements of superstition, urban legend, and political utopianism. While, by definition, extremists roam about the fringes of our culture, they also pay close attention to our culture. Agreeing with them little, nonetheless, we can learn a lot from them and their social and political concerns.

For John George, it was the blustering of Soviet dictator Nikita Khrushchev in the late 1950s and commensurate praise for this behavior by Communist Party USA members and their fellow travelers that piqued his interest. How, he wondered, could they admire one such as Khrushchev? Further study answered the question: For the alienated and "ideologically prone," identification with a figure like Khrushchev or any other power figure plays an important psychological role. It frees one from the anxieties of reflection and doubt, at least for a while. For American Communists, the leader of the Soviet Union (the "great socialist motherland") embodied all their fantasies, utopian ideals, and hopes for the future. This phenomenon is repeated over and over with other causes, figures, and followers.

In the early 1960s, when it became known that John Birch Society founder Robert Welch had written that President Dwight Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles were Communist agents and part of a master conspiracy to subvert the American way of life, it was as if a door had been opened into a strange and fascinating world. For not only do extremists tend to believe things supported by little or no evidence, but many of them have a strong proclivity toward "conspiracy theories," that is, the belief that events are controlled by a small group of insiders who, with the assistance of their allies throughout society, are working for their advantage and our doom.

John George found that extremists tend to regard those who disagree with them as enemies, or worse. This is well-illustrated by former Italian Communist party leader Ignazio Silone's complaint about Lenin, Trotsky, and other important early Soviet officials. Silone wrote of their

utter incapacity to be fair in discussing opinions that conflicted with their own. The adversary, simply for daring to contradict, became a traitor, an opportunist, a hireling. An adversary in good faith is inconceivable . . .¹

The impetus for Laird Wilcox's interest came from another source. He grew up in a family that included a wide range of political tendencies, Communist and staunch Republican. He listened in on their discussions and arguments, watching passions ignite and tempers flare over ideological abstractions. At age fourteen he encountered Eric Hoffer's book *The True Believer*,² which he now regards as a "virtual owner's manual to all the nuttiness and fanaticism" he had observed. Later, he read John Howard Griffin's *Black Like Me*,³ an account of a white man who moved freely in the black community, having had his skin cosmetically treated so that he could pass for black. It was by reading Griffin that Laird Wilcox developed his modus operandi: Get to know and mingle freely with extremists of all kinds. That's the way to get to understand the ideas and feelings that motivate them.

Laird became active in the antiwar and radical student movements of the 1960s, but he became disturbed by the increasing violence and intolerance, so he dropped out in 1966 and began developing what has become one of the largest collections on U.S. extremist movements (now housed at the University of Kansas the Kenneth Spencer Research Library).

* * *

This book discusses American political extremism in some detail with the discussion centered, naturally, through our experiences with hundreds of people who fall into the extremist "category," such as it is. We have talked with them in their homes and at public meetings, demonstrations, and debates; in restaurants over coffee; in the classroom; and sometimes while just walking along a busy thoroughfare. Some of our contacts have been deep and very personal and have extended over many years, while others were more on the order of single interview situations. Over the years we have encountered approximately six hundred individual extremists between us, and it is from this pool of experience that we draw our conclusions, which are necessarily tentative and subject to further evidence.

In our study of extremism we have become very aware that all human beings have biases and tend to see events from certain perspectives. We recognize the "ashomon" principle, whereby individuals tend to interpret, and even distort, events in order to preserve their own integrity and sense of self-esteem. We found considerable support for Leon Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance⁴ in this regard. According to Festinger:

This theory centers around the idea that if a person knows various things that are not psychologically consistent with one another, he will, in a variety of ways, try to make them more consistent. Two items of information that psychologically do not fit together are said to be in a dissonant relationship to each other. The items of information may be about behavior, feelings, opinions, things in the environment and so on . . .

Such items can of course be changed. A person can change his opinion; he can

change his behavior, thereby changing the information he has about it; he can even distort his perception and his information about the world around him.⁵

Political extremists tend to be very prone to both conscious and unconscious distortions of various kinds. Simply put, they prefer to believe what they prefer to be true. The extremist tends to be the ideologue in purest form, i.e., the a priori thinker who believes what he "must" believe, regardless of evidence to the contrary. Extremists usually attempt to deduce the facts of an issue from a set of principles, often in the form of a political ideology, rather than determine the facts of an issue and then induce the principles that necessarily derive from them. It is this primacy of belief over knowledge that accounts for the often bizarre and impractical systems they create.

Largely because of the nature of their reasoning processes, extremists are often, but not always, "wrong" in terms of their understanding of the facts of an issue. Simply put, they seldom think things through clearly and objectively, their concept of logic and rationality is often under-developed, and they usually have poor insight into their psychological motives. Sometimes there are situations in which there is no "right" or "wrong," but rather positions or solutions which favor this interest group or that. "Right" or "wrong" in this case involves compromise and give and take, another area where extremists have difficulty.

The difference between the average person and the political extremist is largely one of degree and not of kind. If one is conscious of the problems and issues involved, the tendency toward bias and distortion can be tempered considerably, but not completely. We regard human beings as fallible, including ourselves. Consequently, while we cannot claim anything approaching complete objectivity, we make an honest and diligent attempt to be fair and even-handed in our treatment of this subject.

There are many books covering "extremism" or "extremists" on the market today, and not a few of them have their own agenda—often to provide a rationale for persecuting or doing away with certain "extremists." This is not our goal. We hope to provide understanding of a human problem, not a basis for one more round of persecutions. So, if you're an ideologue looking for another hate book to confirm your prejudices about "enemies" on the left or the right, this isn't it. Still, we hope you'll hear us out, because we have some insights that might make a difference for you.

Other tactics we hope to avoid are the "guilt-by-association," ad hominem techniques refined by the now discredited House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), which actively persecuted extremists (primarily on the far left) until its demise in 1974. This is not to say that associations are unimportant, but merely that of themselves they may mean relatively little. If substantial evidence of extremism exists, the case should be made on the basis of direct evidence and primary material, not on questionable inferences based upon acquaintances, hearsay, or presumed alliances and associations. Indeed, it is a characteristic of extremists themselves to attempt to make the case for their conspiracy theories by developing complex networks of "links" and "ties" among individuals,

ganizations, and beliefs.

On the other hand, where extremists are in the business of accusing other extremists of various kinds of perfidy on the basis of ad hominem, we feel free to mention their own "links" and "ties" simply to illustrate how weak and hypocritical these arguments frequently are. Also, it is often necessary to relate an organization to a person with another in order to develop a context in which to explain the ins and outs of various "splinter groups" and the like. We caution you not to take this for more than it is, and to remember these associations may be circumstantial and fleeting. Alliances and agreements among extremists are quite often transient, and to assume that A must agree with B as evidenced by the fact that they both know C, or any variation of this kind of reasoning may very well be unwarranted.

* * *

A common error in dealing with extremists is to assume that if two or more extremists are alike in some respects, they must be alike in all or at least most respects. This fallacy of stereotyping is structurally similar to ethnic or religious prejudice, where an observation that "they're all alike" is a recognizable slur. We take the case that extremists only tend to have certain behavioral traits in common, and that these represent *relative* inclinations. By no means are they absolute criteria. Most of us have found surprising exceptions to virtually any generalization we might make. We have known extremists who were miserable, hateful individuals, who were virtually everything their enemies might say they were, and who would not only fulfill the stereotype of the hate-filled bigot or the wild-eyed revolutionary idealist. But we have also known extremists who we felt were basically good people struggling with issues and problems, and who, once they were outside their conflict areas, were decent and well-meaning. Generalizations may have a certain limited validity, but it must constantly be borne in mind that extremists are individual human beings.

Although the characteristics we have mentioned are hardly exclusive to extremists and are found widely in the general population to a certain extent, among extremists they may seem more strikingly evident. None of these traits, which can be profoundly distressing to many people, means that extremists are deserving of civil liberties less than the rest of us. They should have the same protections, privileges, and respect as those of us who are more often, but not always, "right."

* * *

Who defines the terms wins the argument," the old axiom goes. In dealing with the subject of "extremism," an arbitrary and unfair definition can have far-reaching effects. We can see from observing dictatorships of the left and right that concepts like "justice," "freedom," and "equality" can be distorted and twisted to mean quite nearly the opposite of what the words actually denote. This is

also the case with "extremism." We will propose a definition that will go a long way toward eliminating these abuses.

There are several different ways of looking at "extremism." The normative or "statistical" way is to frame the spectrum on a linear scale, as in a Gallup poll, and arbitrarily determine that beyond a certain point on each end of the spectrum lie the "extremists"; that is, the 2 percent, say, on the far "left" and far "right" of the political spectrum are the "extremists." This has a kind of utility and makes a kind of sense. Visualize a "bell curve," with the great mass toward the center and the "extremes" on the fringes. The problem is that there are too many examples of beliefs or behavior that most of us would agree are "extremist" and yet they are held by a considerable percentage of the population. Many dictators, for example, have a large following. When an "extreme" belief originally held by a small minority becomes popular, does it cease to be "extreme"? If a Nazi won an election is he no longer an "extremist"? Conversely, is a belief "extreme" simply because it is unpopular? We don't think the unpopularity of a particular belief is sufficient to prove its "extreme" nature.

Another view of "extremism" is that it is essentially a social definition agreed upon by collective fiat, i.e., what is "extreme" is what the masses collectively decide is "extreme." This is the "popularity contest" theory of extremism, and one that reeks of an intolerance that allows a majority to gang up on the minority, whoever that happens to be—people who dress funny, have dark skin or a strange religion, have subversive ideas, or are just "different." This approach places excessive power in social and political elites, particularly in the opinion-molding sector. It's also the perennial temptation of the newly empowered to use their position to marginalize those who they feel are responsible for their own former marginalization.

Finally, there's the behavioral model of "extremism," defined in terms of certain behaviors, particularly behavior toward other human beings. This is the model we prefer, and it is explained in some detail in chapter 2, "What Is Extremism?" We feel that this approach best preserves the integrity of individuals and the values of an open and democratic system. It also helps to define our social responsibilities to one another and protects against the dangers inherent in the other models we have described.

There is a certain danger in the notion that we should be "intolerant of intolerance." It is almost always those who are definitionally "intolerant" who are most often targets of persecution themselves. Advocacy of *any* strident position implies intolerance—intolerance, perhaps, of persecution, unfairness, double standards, denial of due process, or prejudice, as seen through the eye of the beholder. "Intolerance of intolerance" has a kind of "death to fanatics" character, and it reminds one of Thomas Bailey Aldrich's statement in the *Pongkapog Papers* where he speaks of the person who "is opposed to the death penalty but . . . would willingly have any electrocuted who disagreed with him on the subject." It also smacks of Orwellian "doublethink" in that it consists of two mutually exclusive values, a way of reframing the concept of tolerance so that it justifies intolerance.

* * *

In a book concerned with politics, it is fair for the reader to ask where on the political spectrum the authors fit. Our positions are a bit difficult to pin down. Temperamentally, we're more or less "liberals," and this is evident in the way we approach our subject. The necessity of pragmatism is apparent to both of us, although we each have a touch of the idealist as well. Both of us have been attached to the civil rights movement and both of us are considered strong civil libertarians and champions of the underdog. At one time these traits would have put us on the moderate left, but this is less clear today. Because we have a very wide range of friends and associations, it would be possible to find bits of evidence to "link" us with any position on the political spectrum, only to have these canceled out by other "links" in the opposing direction. Right-wingers tend to view us as leftists, and many left-wingers think we're rightists. We often differ with one another on various issues, but our mutual respect and tolerance make this collaboration possible. Perhaps we might be most accurately described as pragmatists with libertarian tendencies.

We hope that, similarly, the tone of our book could be called "pragmatic with a touch of idealism." In this work we will attempt to delineate the characteristics of extremism and extremists *as we have experienced them* and give many examples. We will also try to summarize the pre-1960 historical background of American extremist movements, discuss conspiracy theories and their validity, offer our insight on what motivates extremists, and discuss a number of contemporary groups on the "far left" and "far right" based principally on our personal contacts and their own writings.

So, we invite you to accompany us on our summary of what we have learned about political extremism. If you're open to it, it can be an enlightening experience and may well alter the way you've thought about this issue. If your position is fixed, you'll find much in this book to get your juices flowing, and we welcome that, too.

John George
Laird Wilcox

Notes

1. Richard Crossman, ed. *The God That Failed* (New York: Harper & Row, 1949), 101.
2. Eric Hoffer, *The True Believer* (New York: Harper & Row, 1951).
3. John Howard Griffin, *Black Like Me* (New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961).
4. Leon Festinger, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1957).
5. Leon Festinger, "Cognitive Dissonance," in *Readings About the Social Animal*, Elliot Aronson, ed. (San Francisco: Freeman, 1973), 100-101.

Part I. **Background, Characteristics, Motivations, and Other Considerations**

the FBI's COINTELPRO activities against the far right, Finch notes its actions against the Minutemen:

Some were petty disruptions—like mailing 850 copies of a faked letter, apparently from the national office of the Minutemen, requesting that members of the group withhold their dues and contributions because of a security leak.²⁵

The Minutemen, in fact, were among the most thoroughly infiltrated of all domestic far right groups. According to Eric Norden, in his long essay on the paramilitary right appearing in the June 1969 issue of *Playboy* magazine, virtually all of the major Minutemen cases were cracked with the assistance of government infiltrators and informants.

One of these informants was a nightmare named Roy Frankhauser, a professional government infiltrator whose alliance with DePugh began in the early 1960s, shortly after the organization was formed. Frankhauser was well-known for having taken the Fifth Amendment thirty-three times when questioned about his Ku Klux Klan involvement by the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1965. Unaware of Frankhauser's role, Norden interviewed him extensively for his article. Frankhauser, whom DePugh had made a regional coordinator, portrayed the Minutemen to Norden as a neo-Nazi organization to be feared and reckoned with:

Hitler had the Jews; we've got the niggers. We have to put our main stress on the nigger question, of course, because that's what preoccupies the masses—but we're not forgetting the Jew. If the Jews knew what was coming—and believe me, it's coming as surely as the dawn—they'd realize that what's going to happen in America will make Nazi Germany look like a Sunday-school picnic. We'll build better gas chambers, and more of them, and this time there won't be any refugees.²⁶

Norden notes that Frankhauser, having made this statement, "paused and seemed to brood for a few seconds," and then continued:

Of course, there are some good Jews, you know, Jews like Dan Burros, who was a friend of mine. Yeah, print that some of my best friends are Jews. Dan Burros was one of the most patriotic, dedicated Americans you'll ever meet in your life.

Norden commented:

Frankhauser fell silent. Burros was a fanatic American Nazi who served as [George Lincoln] Rockwell's [American Nazi party] lieutenant for years, then resigned in 1962 to edit a magazine called *Kill!*²⁷ and finally became a Klan leader. He had rushed into Frankhauser's house in October 1965 brandishing an issue of the *New York Times* that exposed his Jewish ancestry, snatched a loaded pistol from the wall and blew his brains out.²⁸

What Norden did not say is that some conspiracy buffs believe that Frankhauser may have had more than a casual involvement in the killing, although

no determination of that fact was ever made and the death was ruled a suicide. Another theory, also not confirmed, is that Frankhauser may have encouraged Burros's suicide inasmuch as his cover had been blown. Burros died from three bullet wounds, unusual in a bona fide suicide. DePugh, who examined the gun, said it was unlikely that Burros killed himself. Other Frankhauser associates have ventured related opinions. What is also possible is that in 1965 Frankhauser was working as a government informant and that Dan Burros was too, perhaps reporting to Frankhauser. At the time of this writing Frankhauser still resides in the Reading, Pennsylvania, house where the death occurred; blood stains are still imbedded in the ceiling.²⁹

But was Frankhauser a government informant and agent provocateur so early in his career? Frankhauser denies it, but his own U.S. Army records suggest otherwise. During an extensive interview under oath that took place during the period July 13 to 18, 1957, Army records reveal the following:

(FRANKHAUSER) made a decision to infiltrate organizations such as the Neo-Nazi Party, the Communist Party, and the Ku Klux Klan, to determine their motives, identify the leaders, and report this information to the proper intelligence agency of the United States Government if their aims were ascertained to be inimical to the interest of the United States. FRANKHAUSER advised he had created a cover story which included causing people to think he was a true Communist or Nazi and the creation of an organization which was to be a large, well-organized unit, but which was composed of only one man—FRANKHAUSER. FRANKHAUSER'S aim at Fort Bragg was to get the Klans of the North together with the Klans of the South to give the United States government the opportunity to destroy these organizations.³⁰

During the 1960s, Minutemen were involved in three major terrorist acts in which Frankhauser was the possible informant, directly or indirectly, who tipped off the FBI. According to Norden:

In the predawn hours of October 30, 1966, 19 heavily armed Minutemen, divided into three bands, were intercepted by staked-out police (tipped off by an FBI informant) as they zeroed in on left-wing camps in a three-state area. Targets of the coordinated forays were Camp Webatuck at Wingdale, New York, where fire bombs with detonators had already been set in place; Camp Midvale in New Jersey; and a pacifist community at Voluntown, Connecticut, established by the New England Committee for Nonviolent Action.³¹

In June 1967, five New York City Minutemen organized an assassination attempt against Herbert Aptheker, director of the American Institute of Marxist Studies and a member of the U.S. Communist Party, whose Brooklyn headquarters had already been the target of an abortive Minuteman fire-bombing. . . . The Minuteman plotters were swiftly apprehended.³²

In 1968 six Minutemen attempted a second attack on the pacifist encampment in Voluntown. According to Norden:

Once again, FBI infiltrators in their ranks had tipped off local authorities—but this time the warning came too late. . . . The Minutemen opened fire and a brief gun battle ensued before they threw down their weapons and surrendered. Six people were shot in the melee—one state trooper, four raiders and one of the women residents, who was wounded in the hip when a trooper's shotgun discharged as he sidestepped a Minuteman's bayonet thrust.³³

In 1973, after DePugh was released from prison, Frankhauser became head of Minutemen intelligence. An article in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* describes Frankhauser's "discovery" of a piece of fake dog feces with a hidden listening device embedded in it. The article, by John Hilferty, begins:

A few weeks ago a member of the ultra-right Minutemen was mowing the lawn of the organization's training camp hidden in the woods of the Blue Mountains in Schuylkill County.

With a clang, the blade struck what appeared to be the leavings of a dog. But why the clang?

Close examination showed that what appeared to be the work of a dog was actually a man-made replica. Inside the four-inch object was a tiny electronic listening device.

Two more similar devices were found on the grounds, each containing three tiny batteries, a small microphone, and a small antenna. The transmitters had a range of up to six miles and a life of three months. Hilferty continued:

Last week in his home in Reading, national Minuteman Intelligence chief Roy Frankhauser acknowledged that the three devices were found at the Schuylkill County camp but refused to comment or speculate on their origin.

"I don't know who put them there," said Frankhauser, 32, a widely-known extremist who also doubles as Grand Kockard, or second in command of the Pennsylvania Ku Klux Klan.

However, a source close to Frankhauser said the belief among Minutemen is that the devices were planted by either the FBI or the U.S. Treasury Department's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), which has conducted at least two futile searches for arms and ammunition at the deeply wooded camp.

A search warrant issued on September 9, 1970, on the Schuylkill County Minuteman location revealed an unsuccessful raid by the ATF to find material for making hand grenades.³⁴

In fact, Frankhauser was instrumental in placing the listening devices on the property himself, in cooperation with the Alcohol, Firearms and Tobacco office in Reading, Pennsylvania.

* * *

During October 1973 DePugh was a featured speaker at Liberty Lobby's annual Board of Policy meeting in Kansas City, Missouri. He had been released from prison six months earlier. Frankhauser, as security director, was his constant

companion and lived with the DePugh family in Norborne for several weeks—all the time working for the ATF as an undercover informant.

Interestingly, Frankhauser and DePugh were both discharged from military service for somewhat similar psychiatric problems—problems that have a bearing on their extremist political tendencies.

J. Harry Jones confirmed that during DePugh's 1966 arraignment the government made a motion to have him examined by a psychiatrist to determine whether he was mentally able to stand trial:

The government said he had been discharged on August 31, 1944, for "medical" reasons after a board of medical examiners had concluded he was unfit for military service because he suffered from "psychoneurosis, mixed type, severe, manifested by anxiety and depressive features and schizoid personality."

"Soldier is unable to perform duty due to anxiety, nervousness and mental depression," the report said. "This condition is chronic and for three years has been attended with vague hallucinations and mild ideas of reference."³⁵

According to Jones, a more detailed report said, "There is a paranoid trend in his thinking." DePugh's response to this report was to state that the examination in question had only lasted ten minutes and was routine for anyone discharged for medical reasons. Judge Elmo B. Hunter found that DePugh was competent to stand trial in spite of these findings.

Roy Frankhauser's background is much more convoluted. According to U.S. Army documents released under the Freedom of Information Act in 1988, Frankhauser was enmeshed in deep personal problems long before he entered the army. The victim of a broken home and an alcoholic mother, and regarded by school officials and various employers as emotionally unstable and unreliable, he enlisted in the U.S. Army on November 6, 1956. Long a collector of Nazi memorabilia and a Ku Klux Klan sympathizer even as a young man, he was engaged in a number of half-baked plots that immediately brought him to the attention of army authorities.

Military reports specified that Frankhauser joined the army and volunteered for airborne duty in order to be assigned to Germany. He developed a scheme to have himself declared officially dead so he could leave the army and join the neo-Nazi movement, hoping to rise to a position of prominence. On July 2, 1957, Frankhauser stated that he planned to desert the U.S. Army and join the revolutionary forces in Cuba. In fact, he went AWOL and arrived in Miami, Florida, on July 5, 1957, to do precisely that. He was taken into custody shortly thereafter and returned to his military unit.³⁶ Army records reflect that Frankhauser was discharged on November 18, 1957, under the provisions of AR-635-209 (unfit for military service).³⁷

Frankhauser's rather incredible role as a government informant is well-documented. It first came to light in July 1975 when the *Washington Star* reported on his role in an undercover operation in Canada authorized by the top-secret National Security Council.³⁸ Frankhauser was assigned to infiltrate the "Black

September" terrorist organization. The "CBS Evening News" of July 28, 1975, did a feature on Frankhauser during which announcer Fred Graham noted that:

Sworn testimony by federal agents [maintains] that Frankhauser has carried out a series of undercover missions for the government, including one approved by the National Security Council in the White House.

One government source said Frankhauser had an uncanny ability to penetrate both right- and left-wing groups, that he could still help convict those who supplied the explosives that blew up school buses in Pontiac, Michigan, in 1971.

Frankhauser eventually ran afoul of his ATF superiors by going too far with his entrapment schemes and not clearing them with the ATF beforehand. This brought about his eventual indictment on February 28, 1974, on charges of stealing explosives, at which time he used his relationship with the agency as a defense. He was eventually convicted and sentenced to a period of probation, after which the ATF had a way of enforcing his cooperation and curbing his erratic behavior (or so it thought). An FBI teletype dated June 17, 1974, revealed:

Frankhauser has proposed through his attorney that if allowed to plead guilty and receive probation on current bombing charges he will introduce federal agents to individuals who have approached him regarding his activities.³⁹

Frankhauser's ATF "handler," Edward N. Slamon, had written several internal memos describing Frankhauser as "an excellent infiltrator and confidential informant," according to the *Washington Star*. The article described other undercover activities in which Frankhauser participated:

Frankhauser spied—on behalf of government prosecutors—on Robert Miles, a Ku Klux Klansman and fundamentalist preacher who was convicted of bombing school buses to prevent school integration in Pontiac, Michigan, four years ago.⁴⁰

Miles had been an associate of DePugh, who had regular correspondence and other contacts with him. According to Frankhauser, in his 403-page affidavit in his case:

Affiant [Frankhauser] was directed by agents of said Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Bureau to monitor conversations by means of a tape recorder between Robert Miles and four other defendants in the Pontiac bus bombing conspiracy . . . between said defendants and their attorney, James E. Wells, and that affiant did further understand that such information was given to . . . the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the United States Department of Justice.⁴¹

Other accounts of Frankhauser's role as an informant abound. Patsy Sims's 1978 book *The Klax* discusses his undercover work.⁴² Frank Donner, in his 1981 work on domestic political spying, *The Age of Surveillance*, refers to Frankhauser thusly:

The uncrowned king of ATF informers is surely Roy E. Frankhauser, former Pennsylvania Grand Dragon of the United Klans of America, organizer of the National States Rights Party, a Minutemen activist, and a member of more than thirty other right-wing groups. Frankhauser reveled in spookery and claimed he was in fact a double agent, using his role as an ATF informer to obtain access to intelligence in the agency's files about his right-wing associates.⁴³

Roy Frankhauser's involvement as a government undercover operative and agent provocateur began in the 1960s and continued sporadically until 1986, when he was indicted along with Lyndon LaRouche and several other defendants in the Boston LaRouche case involving credit card fraud and other charges. Frankhauser, who made his first contact with the LaRouche organization in 1975, had become their director of security!⁴⁴ On December 10, 1987, Frankhauser was convicted of plotting to obstruct a federal investigation of the group. This is covered in depth in the chapter on Lyndon LaRouche, although a couple of points have bearing with respect to the Minutemen period.

According to Dennis King, author of *Lyndon LaRouche and the New American Fascism*, much of Frankhauser's work as an informant against Robert Miles, the Michigan Ku Klux Klan leader convicted of the 1971 Pontiac school bus bombings, was for Miles's benefit. According to King:

Although Roy's maneuverings during this period are extremely murky, the best bet is that he was fishing for information about the Miles case and trying to compromise the feds so Miles could charge federal misconduct. Miles himself certainly believes this.⁴⁵

* * *

Frankhauser was not the only FBI or ATF informant in the Minutemen. Michael Sadewhite, an ATF informant in both the KKK and the Minutemen, was well-known to Frankhauser and is dealt with at length by Jones.⁴⁶ Another was Jerry Milton Brooks, also discussed by Jones. Among Brooks's allegations was the celebrated plot to put cyanide in the air conditioning system at the United Nations building. Brooks told Eric Norden that the idea developed during a training session in the summer of 1965.⁴⁷ In fact, it was entirely Brooks's idea and was suggested to another member while they were washing an automobile. Brooks, who had worked for a licensed exterminator, began relating the story over and over, embellishing it with more detail and seriousness each time, until it found its way into the literature on the Minutemen. Yet another Brooks fabrication was that DePugh sent him on a bus trip around the country with three vials of strychnine to knock off "Communists."⁴⁸ He was sent on a \$99 bus tour but it was to gather "intelligence," Brooks said later, and no such strychnine ever existed.

Former FBI agent William Turner interviewed Brooks in 1966. The subsequent story, which appeared in *Ramparts* magazine in January 1967, relates Brooks's claim that he was "DePugh's intelligence officer until he became squeamish over

People might go once to hear Smith out of curiosity, but he could not compete with television to lure people out of their homes on a regular basis. Political oratory in general was waning because of competition from television, and Smith never learned to exploit the medium. His rambling speeches were too long and disorganized for an effective television presentation. At his best among screaming zealots, he was out of his element before more sophisticated audiences. The more he raved, the more ridiculous he appeared; even his homilies seemed corny.⁴

Jeansonne commented at length on Smith's personality and what he thought was the driving force behind his fanaticism. Some of his observations:

Despite his obvious gifts, Smith was a troubled individual, tortured by guilt and his own desire for importance. As to sources of his guilt we can only conjecture. . . .

To give meaning to his life and to overcome the tremendous guilt he felt, Smith created out of his own imagination his mission to save civilization and give it God's stamp of approval.

By exaggerating the strength of his enemies and imagining conspiracies against himself, Smith elevated his own importance and that of his movement.

Because he manipulated others, it was easy for Smith to believe that others plotted to manipulate him. He used the "ruthlessness" of his enemies to justify his own.⁵

What appears obvious to us is that Smith had much in common with extremist fanatics all over the political spectrum. Jeansonne's general description of Smith's personality could account for dozens of extremists we have known from the far left and far right. This reminds us of Eric Hoffer's admonition that the real goal of the fanatic is to give meaning to an otherwise threadbare life—to feel worthwhile and important in spite of deep-seated feelings of worthlessness.

As with nearly all American political extremists, the net effect of Smith's life work was essentially zero. His projects in Eureka Springs will be seen predominantly as a novelty for tourists. If Smith is remembered at all, it will be as an example of what not to be. Even without the sometimes heavy-handed efforts to contain his influence, he probably would have ultimately been no more successful than he was. He remains a curiosity of American history.

Notes

1. Keith Thompson, "A Survey of the Right Wing," *The Independent* (August 1962): 10.
2. *The Cross and the Flag* (October 1970): 9.
3. Gerald L. K. Smith, *Besieged Patriot* (Eureka Springs, Ark.: Elna M. Smith Foundation, 1978).
4. Glen Jeansonne, "The Case of Gerald L. K. Smith," in David A. Gerber, ed., *Anti-Semitism in American History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 161.
5. Glen Jeansonne, *Gerald L. K. Smith: Minister of Hate* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1988), 172-73.

20. The LaRouche Network

During the 1970s and 1980s it often seemed that the media had given the man two extra names. Most common references to him began: "Political extremist Lyndon H. LaRouche." Few would deny that the label was warranted—LaRouche's pronouncements and demeanor, as well as those of his associates, virtually personify the extremist style. He is one of the most accomplished and inventive conspiracy theorists on the entire political spectrum, and his organization has a well-deserved reputation for conducting smear campaigns against various targets, among whom have been Walter Mondale, Henry Kissinger, David Rockefeller, and the queen of England.

Other appellations applied to LaRouche have included "Communist," "Trotskyist," "former leftist," "neo-Nazi," "Stalinist," "Democratic candidate," "Marxist-Leninist," "cult leader," "small-time Hitler," "demagogue," "kook," "Hitlerian hate-monger," and "anti-Semite." (Ironically, most of these labels came from LaRouche opponents who object to his penchant for name-calling.) Depending upon what one focuses on and what one ignores it would be possible to make a case for each of the above epithets. It could also be argued that to one degree or another LaRouche contains elements of all of them. One thing is very certain: Lyndon LaRouche has spent much of the past twenty years cultivating a vast array of enemies, some of them not much less "extremist" than he. On the other hand, his distorted view of the world and his demonstrated hostility toward various groups, including Jews, has produced some justifiable alarm.

Lyndon Hermyle LaRouche, Jr., was born in 1922 to Quaker parents and grew up in Lynn, Massachusetts. He entered the U.S. Army as a conscientious objector in World War II, during which he served as a medic in Burma. While in Calcutta, India, he joined the Communist party. After the war he was a Communist Party USA (CPUSA) member for a few years; in 1949 he joined the Socialist Workers party (SWP), the principal U.S. Trotskyist group. He used the party name, Lyn Marcus. In all, he spent seventeen years in the SWP. His first wife, Janice Neuberger, was also a member. After their divorce he lived with another SWP member, Carol Schnitzer, who was still with him during the early years of his National Caucus of Labor Committees.¹

Although a committed Marxist-Leninist, LaRouche was always contentious and restless. He was secretly involved with embittered former SWP members, including Tim Wohlforth and his American Committee for the Fourth International, a small Trotskyist splinter group. In 1966 LaRouche was expelled from the SWP for working to organize a schism in the Trotskyist movement with Gerald Healy,

leader of the (British) Socialist Labor League. Typically, LaRouche later broke with Healy and Wohlforth and went his own way. He began teaching Marxist economics at the Free School of New York, where he organized a following of young new leftists, including members of the Columbia University chapter of the Progressive Labor party (PLP), a Maoist group founded by former members of the CPUSA. During the student strike in 1968 LaRouche and his followers—many of whom were in the PLP—organized their own faction within Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which they called the SDS Labor Committee.

During the 1968–69 period, the SDS national office found itself increasingly under attack by the PLP-oriented faction within SDS ranks. By the end of 1968 the LaRouche faction, now known as the National Caucus of SDS Labor Committees, was expelled over policy differences in the New York City teachers' strike. At the 1969 SDS convention in Chicago, the organization split into three factions and soon disintegrated, with the PLP-dominated Worker-Student Alliance in sharp opposition to LaRouche's group. Dennis King, author of *Lyndon LaRouche and the New American Fascism*, had been a Marxist-Leninist and a PLP member from 1963 until 1972, although he does not mention this anywhere in his book.² His bitterness at LaRouche is suggested in his comments:

The main cause of the split was the sectarianism and ideological extremism of the two major factions, not the actions of LaRouche's followers, who were reviled as elitists by both camps. But LaRouche's 1967–68 raid on the PLP had definitely helped to tip the balance. It was his first lesson in how a small but adroitly led group, through the right tactics at the right time and place, can help to produce a "manifold shift" in the larger political arena.³

The NCLC remained small and little was heard from the group until 1973. Then, from May to September of that year, the NCLC engaged in what it described as "Operation Mop-Up," a series of violent confrontations with SWP and CPUSA members in which several people were injured. In the following years the NCLC began to transform itself from a more-or-less traditional—if somewhat kooky—Marxist-Leninist organization into a conspiracy-oriented political cult. LaRouche's obsession with the Rockefeller family is an example of this shift. An article from a 1975 issue of the NCLC publication, the *Campaigner*, noted:

At this moment, the human race stands closer to destruction than at any time in its history. The remaining loyal elements of the Rockefeller political-financial machine—which once bestrode the world like a colossus but now rages in the mortal terror of its impending extinction as a species—are determined to salvage what they can by bringing the world to the brink of nuclear war. Under present military-strategic circumstances, such desperate folly means the total thermonuclear destruction of North America and major destruction in Europe and the Soviet Union.⁴

The NCLC published the twice-weekly *New Solidarity* until 1986, at which time it reappeared as the *New Federalist*. In addition, it published another weekly,

Executive Intelligence Review at \$400 per year, and two monthlies, *Campaigner* and *Fusion*. In addition to these, the organization also put out numerous private "intelligence reports" (some of which sold for several hundred dollars a copy), and a selection of books on LaRouche themes, including the widely circulated *Dope, Inc.*, which blames narcotics trafficking on "Zionists" and British intelligence circles.

* * *

The LaRouche group is best known for its peculiar ideological postures. The general confusion over whether it is "right" or "left" revolves around the group's novel approach to political theory. Lewis and Oddone explain:

NCLC literature reflects LaRouche's strange theory of history, in which he posits three groups: the conspirators ("oligarchs"), LaRouche supporters ("humanists") and everyone else (variously described as "sheep" or "subhuman").

Just who the oligarchs are is never clearly stated, but the "British Monarchy" is mentioned again and again. Among their plans is "genocide," a reduction of the world's population "to as little as 1 billion persons" by the end of the century. This will be accomplished with the aid of limits-to-growth organizations like the Club of Rome, "satanic promoters of Nazi-like euthanasia and global genocide." Also supporting this or other plans of the oligarchs are said to be UNESCO, the Jesuits, the Zionists, the National Council of Churches, most leftist organizations, many conservative organizations, Great Britain, and the Women's Christian Temperance Union ("founded by bands of axe-wielding lesbians").⁵

One of the best descriptions of the LaRouche complex of conspiracy theories is found in George Johnson's *Architects of Fear*:

Not all believers in vast, apocalyptic conspiracies are right-wingers. One of the best-funded of the conspiracy-theory think tanks, the National Democratic Policy Committee, is run by conspiracy theorist Lyndon LaRouche, whose politics are so complex that he has been simultaneously accused of being funded by the KGB and the CIA. LaRouche counts among his enemies not only international bankers, the Federal Reserve System, and the Trilateralists, but also Ken Kesey, Bertrand Russell, *Playboy* magazine, Isaac Newton, the Nazis, the Jesuits, the Zionists, the Socialist International, and the Ku Klux Klan.⁶

According to Johnson, the line separating the good guys from the bad guys in the LaRouchean world is whether they are on the side of Aristotle or on the side of Plato in the battle over how one views reality. One camp has a relativistic view of the world (Aristotelian), in which reality, i.e., the evidence of the senses, is primary and empiricism reigns; the other camp embraces an absolutist view of the world (Platonic), in which ideas exist in a metaphysical realm, and idealism and utopianism reign. Because of their particular idealistic perspective, LaRouche's followers believe themselves to be the equivalent of the philosopher-kings described

in Plato's *Republic*.

LaRouche's animus against the British greatly stems from his view that Aristotelianism (as advocated by the British empiricists Hume, Locke, Bentham, Russell, Berkeley, and others) is responsible for many of the ills of society:

LaRouche believes that by emphasizing the empirical over the metaphysical, society has lost its moral bearings. Apply Aristotelianism to ethics, he says, and the results are moral relativism; in anthropology, cultural relativism; in religion, the idea that one system of belief is as valid as another—whatever works for the believer.⁷

According to LaRouche, the "oligarchs," the wealthy British families, are disciples of Aristotle and his intellectual tradition. They use his methodology in a conspiracy to keep the masses uninformed about the true nature of reality and helpless against their nefarious machinations. This bizarre conspiracy theory applies to virtually every aspect of the world and is extended and twisted to apply to situations and examples that seem ridiculous on the surface but that make "sense" if one accepts LaRouchean premises. LaRouchean thinking is profoundly ideological. Johnson says:

For LaRouche's followers, the crowning touch of their conspiracy theory is that it offers an epistemology that seeks to justify paranoid thinking. . . .

"It's done through ideas, not mechanistic control," Paul Goldstein explained. In LaRouchean Neoplatonism, causal links are unnecessary. Because ideas are more real than facts, influencing another's thinking is, by their definition, conspiracy. According to this logic, some of the weird juxtapositions in LaRouche's world view make their own kind of sense.⁸

In his early years, LaRouche had been intimately acquainted with the three largest Marxist-Leninist parties in the United States—the CPUSA, SWP, and PLP—and he had become aware that they were going nowhere. There were, he felt, serious flaws in Marxist-Leninist theory. It simply wasn't working in the United States. Further, like most political fanatics, he invested his entire ego in the drive for political power. He was a gifted and articulate, if also a somewhat cranky and contentious, ideologue. He had good persuasive skills and an almost diabolical talent for organization. He believed he *must* be a leader.

* * *

In 1973 LaRouche founded the U.S. Labor Party as the "electoral" arm of his operation. In 1976 he undertook his first presidential campaign. His platform included traditional Marxist-Leninist conspiracy theories and rhetoric, but with an added twist—LaRouche threw in some of the conspiracy slogans and buzzwords common to the far right. This marked the beginning of attempts to infiltrate and compromise rightist groups. In the process he managed to alienate the few Marxist-Leninists outside his orbit who still favored him. Some of this was prob-

ably rivalry and jealousy—because, like it or not, Lyndon LaRouche ran a tight ship. Typically, the Marxist-Leninist left began accusing him of becoming a right-winger and a fascist, as they have routinely labeled their renegades.

LaRouche has managed to pull together some of the brightest and best-credentialed young people an American extremist group had ever seen, including a disproportionate number of college-educated Jews (to the consternation of mainstream Jewish organizations). While other radical groups with roots in the left tended to idealize the working class, LaRouche and his followers concentrated on intellectuals. He demanded complete loyalty and usually got it. Many of his staffers received no pay and actually gave money to the organization. Those who needed subsistence usually received little more than that, except for a tight circle of top aides who received modest salaries. In terms of talent—the ability to write and speak, to organize and carry through projects—the LaRouche people, although fewer in number, were a considerable cut above other radical groups and on a one-to-one basis were much more efficient at their mission.

In point of fact, aware of the limited appeal of Marxist-Leninist rhetoric and principles to Americans, LaRouche wisely realized that in order to attain any success whatsoever, his program would have to embrace certain symbols and elements more congenial to the average American, whom he perceived as being on the political right. LaRouche's extremist style—strident, authoritarian, moralizing, and intolerant—was generically extremist. Given the correct "spin," it could be perceived as being either "right wing" or "left wing," depending upon what was needed. He believed, for example, that it was possible to form opportunistic alliances with right-wing groups on specific issues. According to Gregory Rose, a former NCLC member whose exposé of the organization appeared in the conservative *National Review* magazine in 1979, an NCLC "Security Memorandum" from the spring of 1975 set out LaRouche's rationale:

Right-wing organizations offer four opportunities: 1) sources for fund-raising (especially related to our organizing); 2) political contacts to circulate our perspective in anti-Rocky political-financial-military circles; 3) opportunity to expose and discredit Rocky's Buckley-FBI-CIA penetration of the Right; 4) potential USLP members and periphery.

Cadres should be firmly fixed on the politics underlying this move: the real enemy is Rocky's fascism with a democratic face, the liberals, and social fascists. We can cooperate with the right to defeat this common enemy. Once we have won this battle, eliminating our right-wing opposition will be comparatively easy.⁹

The mainstream conservative right nibbled at the bait but almost uniformly rejected it. LaRouche would occasionally reel in individuals, often the result of intensive recruiting campaigns targeting them on the basis of a shared hatred for drug peddlers, for example. In 1981 the conservative tabloid *Human Events* ran an extensive exposé of the LaRouche operation:

In a series of lectures given in 1976, "What Only Communists Know," LaRouche described his network as a part of the "world's Marxist labor movement" which together

with "allied Communist forces within the capitalist sector generally are working overnight, constantly, to bring into being a new Communist international."

In that same year, however, LaRouche appeared to reverse course, ordering his followers to pursue "tactical alliances" with conservatives. LaRouche became critical of the drug lobby, the anti-nuclear movement, and the left-wing Institute for Policy Studies.

LaRouche also concocted conspiracy theories involving the Trilateral Commission, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Rockefellers, the British, and "Zionist agents."¹⁰

The article noted, with chagrin, that the Conservative Book Club had taken out advertisements in LaRouche's *Fusion* magazine and that the Freedoms Foundation had given an award to *Fusion* for a series of pro-nuclear articles. (It also noted that after learning of LaRouche's connection with *Fusion*, the foundation acknowledged making a mistake.)

Of particular interest was a *Human Events* account of the brief involvement of the far-right Liberty Lobby with the LaRouche operation. Acknowledging that Liberty Lobby and its publication *Spotlight* happen to share LaRouche's fascination with the Rockefellers and various conspiracy theories, the article told of their disillusionment with LaRouche's views, particularly his softness on "the major Zionist groups." Their common interest in certain conspiracy theories motivated *Spotlight* to comment that the USLP was "probably the only 'honest' Marxist group in the U.S. because it is not controlled by Rockefeller money, as are all similar groups."¹¹

Gregory Rose had been an FBI informant within the USLP. His previously mentioned article in *National Review* was in retaliation for a series on the Buckley family in the *Campaigner*, which attempted to link the Buckyleys to the "Rockefeller-CIA conspiracy." Rose responded with some heavy linking of his own and charged that there was extensive collaboration between LaRouche and Willis Carto:

Carto was a conduit for extremist right-wing contributions to LaRouche's USLP campaign for the presidency, including part of the more than \$90,000 used to purchase a half-hour prime-time commercial on NBC on the eve of the 1976 elections.¹²

On the other hand, Rose also linked the LaRouchies to the Soviets, stating: "The NCLC is avowedly pro-Soviet, as even a cursory examination of *New Solidarity* will show." Rose asserted:

The NCLC is in a position to promote a pro-Soviet line on such issues as U.S. defense posture within certain conservative circles, whereas the Soviets could not make such an approach directly. It is equally obvious that information on conservative attitudes and personalities gained from NCLC contacts would be helpful to Soviet intelligence.

Much of the Left regards the NCLC as a police-provocateur organization. There is little evidence, if any, to support such a hypothesis. However, the evidence of a Soviet connection is extensive and well-founded.¹³

In retrospect, we now know that LaRouche was definitely not a Soviet agent and also went nowhere with either the conservatives or the radical right.

* * *

The relationship, such as it was, between the USLP and Willis Carto's Liberty Lobby was marked by a good deal of mutual suspicion. Carto found LaRouche's writings too obscure and convoluted for his liking. Put simply, he was no more adept at understanding them than anyone else. Nor was he particularly happy with the large number of Jews associated with the USLP. The LaRouche people, on the other hand, regarded the Liberty Lobby crowd as "red-necks" and "idiots." Carto acknowledged some exploratory talks with LaRouche, particularly concerning his proposal that LaRouche

assist us in fighting the IRS, pushing for legislation against the IRS and putting his organization in a more populist stance, and they refused that. Their derivations are entirely different from ours. They've never dropped their basic socialist positions. Every socialist likes high taxes and every populist hates high taxes. There's a fundamental difference there.

I think they've gone very far afield by, for instance, their support of Alexander Hamilton. That's an anomaly. I just can't feature that. Alexander-Hamilton was a royalist, he was a pro-aristocrat, he was for a central bank. For Christ's sake, this is anathema as far as I'm concerned. We are pro-Jackson and pro-Thomas Jefferson. To us central banking is really the core of the evil so I can't go along with that.¹⁴

Although the transient relationship is frequently mentioned to illustrate "links" and "ties" between LaRouche and the extreme right, it was brief and fleeting. Given their respective personalities, a union of LaRouche and Carto would be a miracle under any circumstances.

There was, however, one legitimate and enduring "link" between the LaRouche group and the racist, anti-Semitic right. This was the "Typhoid Mary" of political extremism, Roy Frankhauser, whom we dealt with extensively in the chapter on the Minutemen. A talented informant and con man, Frankhauser pulled off one of the biggest hoaxes in the annals of political extremism on LaRouche and his staff. This would not have been possible had it not been for LaRouche's obsession with conspiracy theories and his relentless foraging for "intelligence" information on his enemies—who by this time had become legion.

Roy Frankhauser had been an informant for one government entity or another since the early 1960s. During the early 1970s he worked for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms of the U.S. Treasury Department on cases involving right-wing extremists. In addition, he proved a prolific source for journalists and others who traded information. He affected the demeanor of a self-made master spy, albeit a rather dissheveled and unorthodox one, and always regarded his activities as "intelligence work."

Frankhauser came to the attention of LaRouche after he was indicted on

charges of stealing explosives in 1974. Frankhauser's defense was that he was acting as an ATF informant at the time. He wound up being sentenced to a period of probation instead of the several years in prison that was customary in cases like his. In July 1975 the *Washington Star* reported on his role in a Canadian undercover operation authorized by the top-secret National Security Council.¹⁵ Frankhauser was assigned to infiltrate the notorious "Black September" terrorist organization on grounds that it was plotting to kidnap Jewish Americans. On July 28, 1975, he gave an interview arranged by the USLP that was covered by *CBS Evening News*. During that program, CBS newsman Fred Graham revealed:

One government source said Frankhauser had an uncanny ability to penetrate both right- and left-wing groups, that he could still help convict those who supplied the explosives that blew up school buses in Pontiac, Michigan in 1971.¹⁶

The occasion for the interview was a press conference arranged by LaRouche's USLP. The LaRouche people were thrilled to have an actual government agent in their clutches. They assisted Frankhauser in the preparation of a long, rambling "Press Statement" in which he made the following claims:

From my experience as an undercover agent for the following agencies of the Federal Government—the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) division of the U.S. Treasury—I have concluded that the wide spectrum of terrorist and criminal activity in this country is the creation of the National Security Council and the covert intelligence community which functions under NSC control.

It became obvious to me as a result of my investigation that various Maoist, Anarchist, and right-wing extremist groups in this operation were under the control of the FBI, LEAA (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration) and other Federal Agencies.¹⁷

Frankhauser's disjointed 3,500-word statement continued with several implausible and fantastic allegations implicating numerous law enforcement officials, politicians, and political activists in one form of perfidy after another. Included was an account of his own "brainwashing," in which he said:

Drugs were put into my food and I was taken to an interrogation room where more drugs were given to me through injections. The effect of the drug was to promote a sensation of receding into a tunnel. I also experienced at other points a cessation of breathing and also an overwhelming sense of drowning and loss of consciousness. While I was strapped in the medical chair I was asked questions relating to Canada in the form of: "Do you remember? That didn't happen, this happened," etc.

I know beyond a doubt that I was subjected to "behavior modification" or, as it is more commonly known, "brainwashing" during my incarceration. There could have been no purpose for this other than the fear on the part of the CIA and the National Security Council that I possessed incriminating evidence as to the nature of the so-called Black September terrorist venture.¹⁸

Following this encounter with the LaRouche operation, Frankhauser gradually worked his way into its "intelligence" and "security" apparatus. Far from being put off by his associations (with racist and anti-Semitic groups ranging from the Ku Klux Klan to the American Nazi party), they simply regarded it as part of his cover as an intelligence operative. Referring to the LaRoucheans as the "comrades," he soon acquired a reputation as a reliable source with LaRouche security officers Jeff Steinberg and Paul Goldstein. They paid his fare and expenses to travel to New York City for consultations. In time Frankhauser was a handsomely paid full-time security consultant.

Beginning in 1977 Frankhauser started his imposture as the conduit for "Mr. Ed," allegedly a CIA contact who was funneling information and advice to LaRouche. Over the years until 1984 Frankhauser created dozens of memos from "Mr. Ed" to LaRouche, all seemingly well-informed and authentic. So realistic did the memos appear that when their existence leaked out of LaRouche circles through defectors from the security staff, there was speculation among journalists and others about who "Mr. Ed" might be, and a number of past and present CIA figures were suggested. "Mr. Ed" was actually the skillful creation of Roy Frankhauser.

Frankhauser brought in a confederate, Forrest Lee Fick, whom he had known in KKK circles. Fick was placed on the LaRouche payroll and the two of them worked closely to continue the deception. Although intelligent and cagey, Frankhauser always had a very difficult time writing. He would dictate material to Fick, who would dutifully transcribe it for him. Among their many deceptions were the weekly "COMSTA-C" reports. These, like the messages from "Mr. Ed," were entirely the product of Roy Frankhauser, who had learned from years of observation exactly what the LaRouche people wanted to hear. In addition, Frankhauser cultivated a relationship with a media source in New York City so he would have access to wire service information before it was printed or broadcast. Hence he was able to give "tips" to LaRouche that something was imminent just prior to its being reported—a rather impressive trick that "confirmed" his intelligence ties as far as the NCLC security staff was concerned.

Many of LaRouche's alleged "links" to right-wingers were made at the suggestion of Frankhauser. One of these was Mitchell WerBell, a former contract CIA agent and arms manufacturer with a flair for self-promotion. WerBell, an acquaintance of Willis Carto, operated Cobray International, a counterterrorism training school. Dennis King alludes to this in the following observation:

It was Roy who first suggested that the LaRoucheans should link up with Mitch WerBell. Claiming to have worked with WerBell on CIA assignments, Roy helped them compile a detailed dossier on him.¹⁹

King also notes that it was a warning from Frankhauser's "Mr. Ed" on August 1, 1977, that LaRouche was being considered for assassination, which prompted LaRouche to hire WerBell as his security leader. After a period of observation, WerBell learned that the key to keeping LaRouche on the hook was to feed

his monstrous ego while jerking on his paranoia chain from time to time. LaRouche, on the other hand, dealt with WerBell in characteristic fashion, by jerking *him* around on fees for services performed.

Frankhauser was also responsible for the meetings between Robert Miles (whom he had earlier informed on for the ATF) and the LaRouche staff. They were led to believe that Miles had "intelligence" connections. When it finally dawned on them that Miles was a real neo-Nazi, they broke contact. Dennis King acknowledges Frankhauser's role in deceiving the LaRouche people:

There was a good reason for Roy's success as a secret agent: He was making up most of it. "It was bullshit," Fick said. "Roy would make up a source A, then a Source B, C, and D. I'd be sitting right beside him when he did it." Internal reports from LaRouche's security staff in 1984 confirmed Fick's story.²⁰

Although LaRouche and his staff must assume full legal responsibility for their actions, King acknowledges that Frankhauser's assurances that their (illegal) activities would be protected by the CIA did encourage their endeavors.

Meanwhile the LaRoucheans blithely continued with their credit-card and loan schemes. They believed Roy's assurances of support from "down the way," the cumulative faith built up by a decade of transmissions from Mister Ed and the Source. When almost four hundred federal agents and state and local police officers swooped down on the NCLC's Leesburg headquarters in October, 1986, the LaRoucheans could blame it in no small part on the misleading advice of their Ku Klux Klan scout.²¹

By the time LaRouche was running for president in 1984 he was referring to himself as a "conservative Democrat" and claiming he had never been a leftist, but was merely opposed to the excesses of Wisconsin Senator Joseph McCarthy. In typical LaRouche fashion, he had "forgotten" previous references to himself as the American Lenin.

A February 1988 broadcast by his campaign organization over CBS TV claimed that LaRouche had played a key role in gaining support among America's allies and neutral nations for President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. The LaRouche broadcast claimed that the Soviets declared the former "American Lenin" to be "Soviet public enemy number one." Ironically, this "Soviet public enemy" had previously characterized the dissident Andrei Sakharov as a KGB agent whose job it was to manipulate the United States.²²

* * *

Dennis King goes to considerable lengths to paint LaRouche as a neo-Nazi, even engaging in a little conspiracy-mongering of his own. King maintains, for example, that words like "British" were really code words for "Jew." Obviously, people of good will can disagree on the relative "threat" LaRouche and his crew have represented to the republic, but we feel that King goes too far. There are numerous

LaRouchean political indiscretions and the courts will take care of the criminal matters. Questionable assertions are unnecessary.

In a review of King's book which appeared in the *New Republic*, John Judis says that King overrated LaRouche. Judis notes historian Richard Hofstadter's observation that "populist anti-Semitism functioned in America as a rhetorical style, not a tactic or program." He also observes, "If there is to be a 'new American fascism,' it will probably not come from a crackpot like LaRouche."²³

Ricky Cooper, publisher of *NSV Report*, organ of the neo-Nazi National Socialist Vanguard, has been active in groups of that nature for some twenty years. Cooper has a reputation for being highly critical of his own movement and also as a reliable media source. He knows of no instance where LaRouche "ever cooperated with or had any positive relationship with anyone that could be considered neo-Nazi besides Roy Frankhauser." Cooper did mention a positive comment on LaRouche in Robert Miles's newsletter, *From the Mountain*.²⁴ Miles—a former Ku Klux Klansman, acquitted defendant in the 1988 Fort Smith sedition trial, and neo-Nazi guru—acknowledged having talked to LaRouche but confirmed that there was "no tie and no sympathy whatsoever" between himself and the man.²⁵ Miles's praise of LaRouche for causing consternation in Jewish circles was simply an application of the principle of "The enemy of my enemy is my friend" (and a momentary friend at that).

Former California KKK leader and founder of the White Aryan Resistance, Tom Metzger (see neo-Nazi chapter), has asserted that charges of Nazism against LaRouche are "ridiculous." According to Metzger, no one in the neo-Nazi movement has regarded LaRouche as even vaguely sympathetic, and those who have paid him any attention have been suspicious of the large number of Jews and other minorities in his organization.²⁶ Other professional neo-Nazis say essentially the same thing. If Lyndon LaRouche is a neo-Nazi, that fact is apparently unknown to leaders of the American neo-Nazi movement.

On the other hand, LaRouche's general antiestablishment views, often expressed with nastiness and stridency, clearly have been designed to defame, degrade, and offend. To the extent that this has included Zionism, Israel, the "Zionist lobby," and Jews as a class of people, hostility toward Jews has been plainly evident.

The charge of racism against LaRouche is similarly problematic. On October 24, 1984, the leader of the Congress of Racial Equality, Roy Innis, took the stand as a character witness for LaRouche in his slander suit against NBC News. Innis stated under oath that LaRouche's attitude toward racism was consistent with his own. In response to the question, "Have you seen any indication of any racism at all in Mr. LaRouche's associates?" Innis replied, "I have not." When asked whether he had seen any indication that LaRouche or his associates were anti-Semitic, Innis replied: "I have seen no such evidence."²⁷ Numerous black and other candidates "of color" have appeared on election ballots under the LaRouche banner over the years and Reverend James Bevel, a former Martin Luther King, Jr., associate, has written for the *New Federalist*.

Other prominent black figures who have identified with LaRouche include

Amelia Robinson Boynton, a leader in the original civil rights movement who took part in the historic 1965 march in Selma, Alabama. She currently works with LaRouche's Schiller Institute, which recently published her autobiography, *A Bridge Across Jordan*. Another is the late Hulan Jack, the first black elected president of the borough of Manhattan. Jack worked closely with the National Democratic Policy Committee, a LaRouche operation, and nominated LaRouche for president of the United States in 1980.

* * *

A Mike Royko column in April 1986 addresses the confusion surrounding LaRouche and his strange ideology. He asks, "Are they right-wingers or left-wingers or just plain nuts? How can they be anti-Semitic when so many of them are Jews?" He concludes that "they still function more like Stalin-era communists than anything else." Why the appeal to the far right? Royko says: "The answer is that there's not much of a market in this country for communism. But there are a lot of people on the far right. So they tailored their pitch to that market."²⁸

Whatever can be said about the ideological basis of the LaRouche phenomenon, one action put him on the wrong side of virtually everyone: the credit card and loan fraud schemes. Beginning in the 1970s LaRouche fundraisers were resorting to unsavory pressure tactics to get money for their leader's increasingly expensive election campaigns and burgeoning intelligence-gathering apparatus. These tactics quickly escalated to fraud in the form of raising the amounts charged for subscriptions to LaRouche publications paid for by credit card. When subscribers complained about a ten- or hundredfold increase in their charges, LaRouche fundraisers would attempt to negotiate the overcharge into a contribution or, if all else failed, a loan. They were successful in a surprising number of cases. Literally hundreds of thousands of dollars were "raised" this way.

John Mintz, writing in the *Washington Post* in October 1987, commented on the mentality that permitted this kind of thing to occur. Quoting former NCLC Member Charles Tate, he said:

"Outsiders are considered morally inferior to people inside the group," ex-member Tate said. "It's [seen as] practically a favor [to outsiders] if they're made instrumentalities of the organization. If you have \$20,000 in your bank account, you're better off if you give it to the group to use for an important purpose. You'd probably just do something self-degrading with it anyway, like go off to Hawaii."

That kind of attitude, investigators and ex-members charge, led the group to stall interminably when people complained about not getting their money. . . .

Former LaRouche associates say that because the organization got away with so much for so long, group members believed they would never be held responsible.²⁹

Gradually, however, victims of this fraud began filing complaints with various agencies, and a few even initiated lawsuits to recover their funds. These complaints reached a flood stage and several states began undertaking investigations and

issuing indictments. In December 1986 LaRouche and six of his aides went on trial in Boston for a massive credit card scam. The case, however, became so muddled when evidence of government misdeeds began cropping up that the judge declared a mistrial. In 1988, however, LaRouche et al. were tried in federal court in Virginia and convicted on several similar counts. LaRouche and some of his associates are currently in federal prison. State prosecutions also resulted in convictions of other LaRouche officials.

In analyzing the failings of the LaRouche group, it becomes woefully apparent that this organization has been prone to the problem of "groupthink," a behavior described by Irving L. Janis as:

a mode of thinking that people engage in when they are deeply involved in a cohesive in-group, when the members' strivings for unanimity override their motivation to realistically appraise alternative ways of action.

Groupthink refers to a deterioration of mental efficiency, reality testing, and moral judgment that results from ingroup pressures.³⁰

A case can be made that the LaRouche organization represents a certain level of "danger" to society, but how much? As much as drunk drivers in Cleveland last July, or as much as dope dealers in New York City on any given weekend? As emphasized throughout this book, we believe that indiscriminate or unfair repression of this and other extremist groups also represents a danger. It's probably true that LaRouche could not have happened in an authoritarian state. The price we pay for a free society is that some people will behave badly. Another aspect of that freedom is that other individuals and groups are free to organize and propagandize against the LaRouche operation, and in this way contain its influence.

Although mainstream figures are legitimately concerned with the LaRouche organization, a good number of his harshest detractors come from extremist ranks themselves. A writer who has spent considerable time on LaRouche is John Foster "Chip" Berlet, of Political Research Associates (PRA) in Boston. His articles on LaRouche go back into the 1970s. Berlet is also a veteran of the 1960s student left, and currently serves as the National Lawyers Guild (NLG) representative to the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation. Harvey Klehr confirms:

The NLG is an affiliate of the Soviet-controlled International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), founded in 1946. Expelled from France in 1949, the IADL is now headquartered in Brussels. Over the years it has supported every twist and turn in Soviet foreign policy, including the invasions of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Afghanistan. The American Association of Jurists, the regional affiliate of the IADL, is headquartered in Havana. Its president, Ann Fagan Ginger, is a long-time NLG activist.³¹

In 1987, when Berlet moved with his organization to Boston from Chicago, the Chicago Area Friends of Albania gave him a special sendoff, noting that, "Chip was one of our founding members, and a steadfast friend of Albania through

hick and thin." King gives Berlet credit for considerable assistance, and Berlet in turn reviewed King's book for the Marxist-Leninist *Guardian*.³²

The primary evil of the LaRouche organization and groups like it lies not so much in their particular ideological pronouncements or the positions they take on various issues, but in how they treat their opponents and in the vision they maintain of the civil liberties of all Americans. Here the antidemocratic and anti-civil libertarian nature of LaRouche and his followers is manifest, and it is primarily on these grounds that they should be opposed.

Notes

1. Biographical information on LaRouche comes from a variety of sources including: Dennis King, *Lyndon LaRouche and the New American Fascism* (New York: Doubleday, 1989); Chip Berlet and Joel Bellman, "Who Is This Guy?" *Reader* (December 12, 1986); and Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., *The Power of Reason: A Kind of an Autobiography* (New York: New Benjamin Franklin Publishing House, 1979).
2. Dennis King says he has not concealed his past PLP membership and has spoken of it on a number of occasions but did not think it was relevant for his book. We disagree.
3. King, 16.
4. *Campaigner* (December 1975).
5. Sasha Lewis and Mareen Oddone, "The Strange History and Curious Persecution of Lyndon LaRouche and the U.S. Labor Party, Lately Arrived in California," *New West* (March 24, 1980): 76.
6. George Johnson, *Architects of Fear: Conspiracy Theories and Paranoia in American Politics* (Los Angeles: Jeremy Thatcher, 1982), 22.
7. Johnson, 195.
8. Johnson, 198.
9. Quoted in Gregory Rose, "The Swarmy Life and Times of the NCLC," *National Review* (March 30, 1979): 409-413.
10. "Who and What Is Lyndon LaRouche?" *Human Events* (February 7, 1981): 5-6.
11. Ibid.
12. Rose, 411.
13. Rose, 413.
14. Willis Carto telephone interview (September, 11, 1991).
15. John Hilferty, "Man in Jackboots, Swastika Was Secret Agent for U.S.," *Washington Star* (July 20, 1975), A-6.
16. Fred Graham, "CBS Evening News" (July 28, 1975).
17. Roy Frankhauser, "Press Statement" (July 1975).
18. Ibid.
19. King, 201.
20. King, 204.
21. King, 206.
22. *Richmond Times Dispatch* (October 5, 1984).
23. John Judis, "The Making of a Madman," review of *Lyndon LaRouche and the New American Fascism*, by Dennis King, *New Republic* (May 29, 1991), 39.
24. Ricky Cooper telephone interview (September 11, 1991).

25. Robert Miles telephone interview (September 11, 1991).
26. Tom Metzger telephone interview (September 11, 1991).
27. William Bastone, "Runnin' Scared," *Village Voice* (July 12, 1986), 11.
28. Mike Royko, "LaRouchites Are More Like Stalin-Era Communists Than Anything Else," *Tribune Media Services* (April 17, 1986).
29. John Mintz, "A New Menace in the Demon-Filled World," *Washington Post National Weekly Edition* (October 5, 1987), 24-25.
30. Irving L. Janis, *Victims of Groupthink* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1972).
31. Harvey Klehr, *Far Left of Center: The American Radical Left Today* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1991), 161.
32. Berlet and Bellman, op. cit.; Chip Berlet, "LaRouche's Bizarre Brand of Fascism," *Guardian* (August 2, 1989).

its *Preliminary Report on Neo-Fascist and Hate Groups*.² It read much like HCUA reports on leftist groups, utilizing many of the same rhetorical devices leftists complained about—exposure for exposure's sake, “linking” of individuals with various organizations, and lots of names.³ There was a bit of irony in the report: for years right-wing extremists had successfully used HCUA to attack and vilify leftists, and now it was their turn.

This *Preliminary Report* focused on two extreme right entities: a minuscule neo-Nazi organization headquartered in New York City named the National Renaissance party, and a tabloid newspaper published in Union City, New Jersey, called *Common Sense* (dealt with in another chapter). The document began:

Communism's present threat to the very survival of the United States and the rest of the free world has placed heavy burdens on the defenders of human freedom and dignity. The Committee on Un-American Activities is concerned to observe that this burden is being aggravated by certain individuals and organizations unscrupulously exploiting the menace of communism to promote other activities equally subversive and totally un-American. Such activities would destroy the very foundation work of the American Republic, if permitted to operate unnoticed or unchallenged.⁴

* * *

National Renaissance Party

The first American neo-Nazi organization to form after World War II, the National Renaissance party (NRP), was led by James Madole of Beacon, New York, from its founding in 1949 until his death in 1978. The NRP grew out of an early Madole project, the Animist party, which he organized in 1947. Although quite small, the NRP is significant because it set the pattern for the “comic book” neo-Nazi style of subsequent groups and also because several later neo-Nazis got their start in the group.

The NRP received considerable publicity in the early 1950s due both to its vociferous and outrageous demonstrations and to pamphlets containing such flagrant messages as: “You are being brainwashed by a pro-Communist, Jew-controlled press; *New York Times*—*New York Post*—*Time*—*Look*—*Coronet*—radio—TV—and decadent Hollywood movies.”

According to contemporary observers, a typical NRP event would consist of Madole haranguing a hostile crowd of a couple hundred or so while a dozen uniformed NRP members nervously protected him from being torn to shreds. The shouting and epithets would sometimes completely drown out Madole, who seemed oblivious to that fact.

The NRP brought together a strange bunch of fanatics, adventurers, and informants. With respect to the latter, one of the prime examples was Emmanuel Trujillo, who went by the name Mana Truhill. According to long-time extremist-watcher Gordon Hall, Truhill was “one of those guys like [Roy] Frankhauser . . .

in that he was all over the place. He was an informant, did some work for the ADL, and was also . . . a really way-out type himself.”⁵ Truhill was widely suspected to be an informant by other far rightists. Veteran right-wing ideologue Joseph P. Kamp attacked Truhill claiming:

By 1953 Truhill had practically taken over the Renaissance Party. His apartment became the New York headquarters. He created an “overseas office” and put himself in charge, after which he proceeded to correspond with “Nazis,” “Nationalists,” and “anti-Semites” all over the world.⁶

According to Kamp, it was Truhill who was responsible for the use of swastikas and other Nazi symbolism by the NRP, including the formation of its “elite guard,” whose job was to protect Madole. It's unlikely that this was entirely the case, for Madole obviously had neo-Nazi propensities on his own. Nevertheless, Truhill's influence was considerable and less biased sources than Kamp have arrived at similar conclusions.

Often a speaker at NRP rallies was group organizer James R. White. Although Madole had claimed that White “had already organized a fully uniformed group in his city and distributed thousands of copies of the *National Renaissance Bulletin*,” this was apparently based only on White's misrepresentations. In its *Preliminary Report*, the HCUA noted:

A youth in his early twenties, White was publisher of his own newsletter, *Reason*, in 1952. Committee information shows that several years prior to his involvement in neo-fascist activities, White had been a member of the Spartacus Club of American Youth for Democracy—a front organization of the Communist Party. It might be noted at this point that Mana Truhill, previously mentioned as head of the NRP overseas bureau, had admitted having attended the Communist-operated Jefferson School of Social Science in New York. This is another illustration of the common ground often reached by fascists on the extreme right and Communists on the extreme left.⁷

Meetings of the New York-based group drew more people than would have been expected. With regard to the NRP's size, Gordon Hall says, “If it ever got beyond 50 or 75 members I would be surprised . . . and that might be a little generous if you're talking about guys who paid dues and all that.”⁸ In its thirty years of existence, the NRP never exceeded that ceiling, and sometimes it was down to a mere dozen or so diehards.

The *National Renaissance Bulletin* was published on an irregular basis, usually in mimeographed form, and was always a typical anti-Semitic screed—except that it often had a few kind words for the Soviet Union. The rationale for this was that the Soviet Union was anti-Jewish and the Jews were trying to destroy that nation, hence it couldn't be all bad.

James Madole himself ran afoul of the law on occasion and was convicted of riot, conspiracy to riot, and illegal possession of arms. Probably the worst

The major KKK events of the sixties included the September 1963 bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama, in which four teenaged black girls were killed. Three men, two with KKK affiliations, were arrested. In June 1964, civil rights workers James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner were slain near Philadelphia, Mississippi. Seven men were eventually convicted for the crime, including Sam Bowers, head of the White Knights of the KKK, and Cecil Ray Price, chief deputy sheriff of Neshoba County. In July 1964, Lieutenant Colonel Lemuel Penn, a black Army Reserve officer, was shot and killed from a passing automobile as he was driving from Fort Benning, Georgia. Two Klansmen were tried and acquitted. In 1966 the same two were convicted in federal court of conspiracy to violate the civil rights of blacks.

In McComb, Mississippi, eighteen bombs were detonated at black churches and homes during 1964. In October, four Klansmen were arrested in connection with the bombings and they, together with five others, pleaded either guilty or "no contest." The court sentenced the nine men and then suspended the sentences. In February 1964 a black home was bombed in Jacksonville, Florida, because a six-year-old boy who lived there had entered a previously all-white school. One Klansman was convicted in the case; another five were tried but acquitted.

In March 1965 civil rights worker Viola Liuzzo was murdered on a Loundes County, Alabama, highway. Three Klansmen were convicted on federal civil rights charges and sentenced to ten years in prison. It was later learned that one of those who may have been responsible for the killing was an undercover FBI informant.¹⁵ In January 1966 Vernon Dahmer, an official of the Hattiesburg, Mississippi, chapter of the NAACP, died as a result of burns in the firebombing of his home. In March 1966 a jury found a reputed Klansman guilty.

* * *

A major blow to Klan activity occurred when the House Committee on Un-American Activities plied the talents it had used to intimidate and harass extreme leftists over the years against the hooded organization. Between October 1965 and February 1966, one hundred eighty-seven witnesses were paraded before the HCUA, and thousands of documents and other evidence were gathered by committee investigators. Officers of the seven major Klan organizations, including Robert Shelton, were interrogated. Most of these pleaded the Fifth Amendment, including Roy Frankhauser (discussed elsewhere in this book). Shelton refused to produce subpoenaed Klan records and he, along with six other Klan leaders, was subsequently convicted of contempt of Congress. Shelton and two others paid \$1,000 fines and were sentenced to a year in prison.

The final HCUA document, *The Present Day Ku Klux Klan Movement*, was released in December 1967.¹⁶ It was one of the most detailed and complete studies of the KKK ever undertaken. Among the findings were that the Klan used "front" organizations in somewhat the same fashion as the CPUSA, calling their hunting clubs, rescue squads, or even ladies sewing circles. It also detailed paramilitary training and numerous cases of improper use of Klan funds.

* * *

Klan growth was considerable until 1967, but within a few years it declined fully 75 percent. In 1967 the ADL reported KKK membership at a postwar peak of 55,000. Of these, Shelton's UKA had over 44,000, Venable's National Knights had 6,800, and independent Klans made up nearly 4,000. The total included over 16,000 in Georgia, 12,400 in Alabama, and 9,800 in North Carolina. From this point on, the KKK lost members rapidly, dwindling to a mere 5,000 by 1973.¹⁷

What caused the rapid decline in Klan membership and influence in the late 1960s? The FBI is responsible, for the most part. FBI Counterintelligence Program (COINTELPRO) activities against the Klan and other extreme right groups have received only a fraction of the attention as such actions against the extreme left. The only books to give the operation more than a passing reference have been Phillip Finch's *God, Guts and Guns: A Close Look at the Radical Right*, and Kenneth O'Reilly's *Racial Matters: The FBI's Secret File on Black America, 1960-1972*. Even Wyn Craig Wade's *The Fiery Cross* devotes only two and a half pages to the subject.¹⁸

According to several sources, it was the COINTELPRO program against the 1960s Klan that put a rapid stop to its growth and popularity. O'Reilly quotes FBI Major Case Inspector Joseph A. Sullivan as follows:

In five years we blew them to hell. . . . By the time I left the South in 1966 an entire society had resolved to suppress outiawry in racial matters. . . . Hoover did his job well.¹⁹

O'Reilly comments:

Within six months of the Liuzzo murder, the FBI operated nearly 2,000 informants, 20 percent of overall Klan and other white hate group membership, including a grand dragon in one southern state.²⁰

Phillip Finch notes that beginning in 1964 the FBI proposed over four hundred COINTELPRO actions against seventeen KKK groups and nine other white racist outfits then under investigation. Of these, 289 were actually approved. One included the publication of an issue of American Nazi party leader George Lincoln Rockwell's *Rockwell Report* exposing UKA leader Robert Shelton. Another was the formation of the bogus "National Committee for Domestic Tranquility," a nominally right-wing group with a strong anti-Klan message. According to Finch:

It was an elaborate hoax. The Bureau's exhibits section designed a letterhead, and agents in more than a dozen cities discreetly rented post office boxes. Regularly, new chapters were added to the letterhead to demonstrate the organization's rapid growth. . . . Using information developed by infiltrators, the FBI tried to target the committee's mailings to specific Klansmen who were considered receptive to its patriotic appeal. . . . The committee never held a public rally, never even called a meeting,