

**The shocking story
of the infiltration
and subversion
of the American
nationalist movement**

The Judas Goats

The Enemy Within

By MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

THE JUDAS GOATS— THE ENEMY WITHIN

The shocking never-before-told story
of the infiltration and subversion of
the American nationalist movement

“The use of double, even triple, agents is as old as history. Most notable in the 20th Century, and perhaps of all time, was the Soviet bloc creation and manipulation of false ‘opposition’ movements in Soviet bloc countries, movements that one generation after another of Western covert operators was drawn into supporting.”

—Professor Roy Godson
Dirty Tricks or Trump Cards

Note: As a consequence of a court order resolving civil litigation between the publisher of this book and another party, 50 pages of THE JUDAS GOATS—five full chapters—were excised prior to publication. The censored material described in detail a successful conspiracy (led by an operative with ties to the CIA and Israel’s intelligence service, the Mossad) to infiltrate a revisionist group and to destroy a nationalist lobby that, working together, stood as a threat to the Zionist agenda. The author, however, is free to discuss and write about the censored material in other venues beyond the control of the publisher of this book. He is eager to do so.



This is a grotesque but accurate representation of the vile, ugly and brutal Bolshevik revolutionary, Leon Trotsky, whose intellectual disciples evolved into the ruling elite in hard-line Zionist “neo-conservative” circles in America today. How “left wing” Trotskyite elements rose to power in the United States by infiltrating the “right wing”—while working to eviscerate traditional American nationalism—is part of the amazing panorama outlined in *The Judas Goats*.

*Meet the Judas Goats . . . **

The two-legged kind are far worse than the four-legged kind . . .

“A Judas Goat is a term used to describe a trained goat used at a slaughterhouse and in general animal herding. The Judas goat is trained to associate with sheep or cattle, leading them to a specific destination.

“In stockyards, a Judas goat will lead sheep to slaughter, while its own life is spared. Judas goats are also used to lead other animals to specific pens and onto trucks. The term Judas Goat is derived from a biblical reference to Judas Iscariot [who betrayed Jesus Christ to the Pharisees].

“The phrase has also been used to describe a goat that is used to find feral goats that are targeted for eradication. The Judas Goat is outfitted with a transmitter, painted red and then released. The goat then finds the remaining herds of wild goats, allowing hunters to exterminate them.

—From Wikipedia, the Internet encyclopedia.

“ . . . Lambs were being led by a Judas goat into the chute. Two workers stood at the end, jolting the animals with enough electricity to render them brain dead. In an instant, prongs at the sheep's brains and in the fleece near their hearts delivered a zap that collapsed them, after which they were handed through . . . to the kill floor. The Judas goats . . . then returned to the pens, where they collected another batch of sheep.”

—From: “A Slaughter House Tour” at karlschatz.com



*With a special apology to the four-legged goats from the author—who loves all four-legged animals, including goats—for using this fitting term in the title of this book, which focuses on the two-legged Judas Goats.



“Let the open enemy to [the United States of America] be regarded as a Pandora with her box opened; and the disguised one, as a serpent creeping with his wiles into Paradise.”

**—President James Madison
“Advice to My Country”**

THE JUDAS GOATS— THE ENEMY WITHIN

The shocking never-before-told story
of the infiltration and subversion of
the American nationalist movement

By **MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER**

AMERICAN FREE PRESS
Washington, DC
Americanfreepress.net

The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within:

By Michael Collins Piper

Copyright 2006 by Michael Collins Piper

Published by:

American Free Press
645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, #101
Washington, DC 20003
Americanfreepress.net
1-888-699-6397
(202) 544-5977

To contact the author:

Michael Collins Piper
PO Box 15728
Washington, DC 20003
(202) 544-5977
(messages)
Email: piper@lycos.com



By UNA WOODRUFF

DEDICATION

To Leonard Joseph Snyder, Jr.

One of 3,000 Americans who died on September 11, 2001, all of whom were ultimately victims of Zionist intrigues that had nothing to do with America's interests. The "official" version of "what happened" that day is a Big Lie. For the rest of my life (God willing) I will fight to avenge his death and bring those *truly* responsible to the bar of justice.

To the Honorable Cynthia McKinney Democratic Congresswoman from Georgia

For daring to speak out and raise questions about what really happened on 9-11 and about the dangerous U.S. policy toward Israel and the Arab world—a policy that has made America many enemies around the globe—Cynthia McKinney was driven from the U.S. Congress in 2002.

A Judas Goat—a former Republican, no less—was recruited to run against Miss McKinney in the Democratic Party primary. GOP organizers moved into the Democratic Party to assist the Judas Goat. Tons of Zionist money poured into Georgia to help Miss McKinney's challenger. In the end, Miss McKinney was defeated.

But two years later Cynthia McKinney made a comeback and she sits in the U.S. Congress today—a voice for sane policies and one who still does not hesitate to speak the truth. And as this is written, they are moving against her once again. Her voice is one for all good people. Dear God: Let there be more like Cynthia McKinney!

To the Honorable Jim Traficant Former Democratic Congressman from Ohio

As this is written, Jim sits in a prison cell, railroaded into jail by corrupt federal prosecutors for crimes he did not commit. Jim's only crime was speaking the truth. Committed to honesty, integrity and justice, Jim paid a mighty price and saw no honesty, integrity or justice on the part of the criminals who put him where he is today. A genuine populist, a man of the people in every sense, Jim Traficant is another victim of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within.

And to my late Mother—Gloria J. Piper

—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

Here are just some of the more American soil today . . . And there

Like the four-legged Judas Goats that they mimic (in return for great profit and widespread fame), the ostensibly “human” version of The Judas Goats comes in all shapes and sizes.

Some are big and loud like “right wing” bombast king, Rush Limbaugh, and his “left wing” counterpart, Michael Moore.

Rush has been leading traditional American conservatives—the poor little lambs—to the abattoir since he first popped up out of nowhere to become the biggest, loudest and fattest voice of “conservative” talk radio ever, then branching out into TV-land.

Those who call Rush’s program to attempt to talk about such “no no” topics as Zionism, the Federal Reserve money monopoly, or such global power groups as the Trilateral Commission or the Council on Foreign Relations or the Bilderberg meetings are sure to get mocked, slandered or otherwise chased right off the air—if they even get on the air in the first place.

And although he would no doubt consider Rush Limbaugh to be “on the other side,” the truth is that Michael Moore is just as much of a Judas Goat as Rush. Moore put out his now-infamous *Fahrenheit 9-11* film that ignored all the very serious questions about the official government line as to what really happened on that tragic day on September 11, 2001 and presented audiences a phony “cover story” that implied that the Saudi royal family were ultimately behind 9-11, twisting and distorting very real facts and misdirecting attention away from where the ultimate guilt for that crime really lies. Moore is not only distasteful, but his propaganda and disinformation are as well.

Other Judas Goats are devilishly good looking, albeit a bit smarmy themselves, like Sean Hannity, Laura Ingraham and Anne Coulter, all of whose views on the issues mirror those of big, fat Rush. They are all tried-and-true promoters of international Zionism and its global agenda.

For his part, Hannity once went out of his busy way to personally call the national office of *The Spotlight* newspaper to tell the editor, a fellow Irishman, Vince Ryan, that Hannity absolutely hated the nationalist newsweekly. Hannity told Ryan, “I’m a big supporter of Israel and I



RUSH LIMBAUGH



MICHAEL MOORE

*obvious Judas Goats operating on
are many, many more . . .*



SEAN HANNITY



LAURA INGRAHAM



ANNE COULTER



BILL O'REILLY

don't like your paper. Take me off your subscription list immediately."

Hannity has a daily talk show on 500 affiliates on the ABC Radio Network and a daily one-hour television show on Fox News, reaching millions of people four hours every day with his pro-Zionist message. And he's been rewarded with two *New York Times* best-sellers.

Laura Ingraham gets lots of ink—perhaps befitting the good-looking blonde that she is. And her rise to fame may be no coincidence, considering the fact that she started out as an attorney with the powerful Wall Street law firm of Skadden, Arps, one of whose ruling partners was Kenneth Bialkin, longtime chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, one of the primary forces for the Israeli lobby in America.

Anne Coulter, who has been bestowed the honor of being a nationally syndicated columnist, has four *New York Times* best-sellers to her name, certainly more evidence that so-called "conservative" writers who shill for the Zionist cause have no trouble getting their books published and widely promoted by the major book distribution centers.

And then there's Bill O'Reilly—another "talking head" promoted by Zionist billionaire Rupert Murdoch's Fox News—whose "O'Reilly Factor" is staple viewing for a lot of good patriotic Americans who don't know that they are being led to the slaughter by a Judas Goat.

O'Reilly has two *New York Times* best-sellers to his name, again, as we've said, proving that the establishment publishing industry will definitely promote "conservative" books if they toe the Zionist line on the issues that really count to those who reign supreme in America.

So it is that these are just a handful of modern-day Judas Goats of the more obvious type. In *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within*, we will meet many, many more, including those more insidious types who are not so blatant in their displays of loyalty to the powers-that-be.

And there *are* many, many more . . .



“What are you doing here?” the Republican Elephant and the Democratic Donkey inquire of each other as they arrive on Wall Street to collect contributions flowing from the coffers of “The Trusts” into the campaign funds of both major political parties. This classic 1904 cartoon demonstrates that, by the turn of the century, international financial interests—especially agents of the European-based Rothschild banking dynasty—had already gained a clear stranglehold on the American political and economic process.

Masters Need Serfs

The masters of the global plantation need serfs who are willing to donate their first-born to assorted foreign military adventures. Otherwise, nationalism—which is often a response to oppression, both perceived and real—cannot be suppressed. And that means markets cannot be exploited. Since the war in Vietnam, all is not well back at the Republic.

Real folks are watching real earnings decline, at the same time that Wall Street gushes over the corporate downsizing that has stock prices soaring. “Losing your job is good for us,” they’re basically saying.

Even militia members now salute the anti-war protesters of the Sixties, and regret that they weren’t listening at the time.

Without the “communists” to kick around anymore, some of those who once underwrote Wall Street’s global interests by donating their first-born are now describing themselves as patriots and populists.

Many of them have taken a fresh look at the international ruling class, and resurrected a long but gnarly tradition of anti-establishment, isolationist nationalism. Much of the political thinking among these new patriots is immature, and is short on both research and scholarship.

Even so, it still describes the world better than what’s left of the Left, with its self-interested insistence on multiculturalism and political correctness.

The conspiracy theories peddled by patriots make more objective sense today, than the reasons they were given for our involvement in Vietnam did in the Sixties. That’s progress of sorts.

—Daniel Brandt
NameBase Newsline
July-September 1995

The purpose of this book . . .

There will be those who read this book and will still say . . .

Well, Mr. Piper, you wrote a really good book, and I think you are absolutely right about these Judas Goats who are misleading good patriotic Americans.

However, on pages such-and-such you accused So-and-So of being a Judas Goat and I think you are absolutely wrong about that. He's one of our finest patriots. Why I read his essay in This-and-That magazine and he said some awfully good things.

I find it hard to believe if So-and-So were a Judas Goat that he would have written such wonderful words. I mean, really, I think you're mistaken here.

Those who say such things are lambs ripe for the slaughter.

This is not a book for the faint-hearted.

If what you are about to read will disturb you and you are unable to recognize that many whom you may consider to be your friends and allies are really Judas Goats—The Enemy Within—*then read no further.*

This book is for those with open minds, those who can absorb difficult concepts, those who are able to recognize that all is not as it seems, those who are ready for the big battle ahead.

And, hopefully, a few such folks who previously may have been inclined to be misled by The Judas Goats will finally come around and see the error of their ways . . . before it's too late.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Eric Piper". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style. Below the signature is a thick, horizontal black line that underlines the name.

A very personal note from the author . . .

It's difficult to admit, but in two of my most important endeavors, I've failed. Since my school days, I predicted repeatedly that because of our biased U.S. Middle East policy, favoring imperial Israel over the Arab states and the beleaguered Palestinians, our nation would ultimately be the victim of a terrorist attack. On September 11, 2001 it finally happened. I had worked relentlessly to reform Middle East policy, but no one heeded my warnings and 3,000 Americans died.

For years I was also working to prevent America from getting involved in a senseless Middle East war on behalf of Israel. I saw no national interest in our kids being butchered defending Israel. Yet, America is now embroiled in Iraq and it's likely we'll send our boys and girls to fight and die against other Arab states and against the Islamic Republic of Iran. So, again, I failed.

Now, as a consequence of revulsion toward U.S. policy (recognized as being directed by the powerful Zionist lobby), more and more people worldwide are turning against America. Meanwhile, many of my fellow Americans—particularly the loved ones of our troops—are coming to realize it was Zionist influence that led to U.S. involvement in Iraq.

For years there have been concerns a global uprising against the Jewish people could happen. Many have warned of the rise of “the new anti-Semitism.” Americans and people across the planet are angry at the power of the wealthy Zionist elite and their drive for a international imperium using U.S. resources (and lives) to achieve their aim. As such, it is possible there could be a worldwide anti-Jewish rebellion.

And if it does happen I want to be remembered afterward as “The American Schindler” who rescued good Jewish folks who opposed Israeli misdeeds and all manner of Zionist intrigue. And those corrupt and venal non-Jewish politicians, journalists, educators and others who supported Israel, because they were paid to, or blackmailed, or because it was a “good career move,” will hang their heads in shame.

Rather than allowing Jewish folks to continue on the dangerous racist supremacist course of calling themselves “God's Chosen People,” Americans should join those of us who've been working to bring the Jewish people into the community of nations.

Let us break the back of the Zionist lobby. Let us change U.S. policy. I hope to have just one success, even if I've otherwise failed! This book is an endeavor toward preventing tragedy and it's my hope that all good people can learn something about the very real dangers presented by The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within.

—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

THE JUDAS GOATS—
THE ENEMY WITHIN



The occultic Baphomet symbol—an all-too familiar goat-headed figure often used in Satanic rites—is also known as the Judas Goat. Here the Judas Goat is shown iconically reigning over a 19th Century Scottish Rite Freemasonic initiation ceremony that seems to be deifying this Evil Force.

Table of Contents

Preface

The Subversive Forces That
Brought America to Where It is Today . . .
Page 23

Foreword

The Strange World of The Judas Goats
Page 25

Introduction

Nationalism: The Wave of the Future—
The Prime Target of Zionism and Internationalism
Page 29

PART I

An Introduction:

An Ugly and Sordid History
Page 41

Chapter One

The Return of COINTELPRO
Page 42

Chapter Two

“Controlled Opposition”
The Soviet “Trust” Model for Infiltration and Manipulation
Page 64

Chapter Three

J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI and The Enemy Within
Page 67

Chapter Four

John Roy Carlson—
The First Notorious Judas Goat of the 20th Century
Page 73

Chapter Five

The Great Sedition Trial of 1944:
Early Collaboration Between the ADL and the FBI—
Accusing Patriots of Being “Traitors”
Page 78

Chapter Six

Walter Winchell and The Enemy Within:
Media Front Man for Zionist and British Interests
Page 102

Chapter Seven

Capitol Hill Judas Goat:
A Zionist Spy for Soviet Intelligence
Page 108

Chapter Eight

The ADL's Secret Role in Determining Who Got Hired
By United States Federal Agencies
Page 110

Chapter Nine

The Anti-Defamation League:
U.S.-based Spy Agency and Lobby for Israel
Page 113

Chapter Ten

“Charming, Skilled and Clever”
First-Hand Encounters with the ADL's #1 Spy: Roy Bullock
Page 119

Chapter Eleven

The ADL Spy Scandal
Page 128

PART II

An Introduction:

Cold War Intrigue
Page 143

Chapter Twelve

The Little-Understood Struggle Between
Stalin-Era Soviet Communism and Zionism:
Page 144

Chapter Thirteen

Zionist Infiltration of the Soviet KGB
and the Impact on the U.S. Intelligence Services:
The Secret Foundation of Neo-Conservatism in America
Page 155

Chapter Fourteen

Trotskyite Communism—Now Called “Neo-Conservatism”—
And the Story Behind Senator Joseph R. McCarthy
Page 159

Chapter Fifteen

The FBI and the Communist Party USA:
The Truth About “The Communist “Threat”
Page 172

Chapter Sixteen

The Cold War and the Trotskyite “Neo-Conservatives”
As the Zionist Vanguard of The Enemy Within
Page 176

PART III

An Introduction:

The Rise of the “Responsible Conservatives”
(And Some “Irresponsible” Conservatives, Too)
Page 179

Chapter Seventeen

Early Zionist Corruption of the Nationalist Cause
Page 181

Chapter Eighteen

William F. Buckley, Jr.
Self-Appointed “Responsible Conservative”
Page 185

Chapter Nineteen

The Vatican’s Own Enemy Within:
Malachi Martin’s Secret Role as a Subversive
Page 188

Chapter Twenty

The “Conservative” Fund-Raising Racket:
Looting American Patriots
on Behalf of The Enemy Within
Page 192

Chapter Twenty-One

Manipulation of the “Anti-Communist” Cause
To Advance the Zionist Agenda
Page 195

Chapter Twenty-Two

The John Birch Society:
A Premier Case Study of The Judas Goat
Page 199

Chapter Twenty-Three

The Rise and Fall of *Human Events*:
Self-Styled “Responsible Conservatives”
Who Helped Destroy America’s Traditional Conservatism
Page 206

PART IV

An Introduction:

The CIA’s Central Role
Working for The Enemy Within
Page 211

Chapter Twenty-Four

Intelligence Agency Manipulation
of the Science of Mind Control
And Exploitation of the Cult Phenomenon:
A Very Real Tactic of The Enemy Within
Page 212

Chapter Twenty-Five

Korean Cult Leader Sun Myung Moon:
Rockefeller Empire Front Man and
Moneybags for the Zionist Network
Page 219

Chapter Twenty-Six

A Major American Media Outlet:
A Willing Propaganda Tool for The Enemy Within
Page 223

Chapter Twenty-Seven

Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson—
Media Shills for the Anti-Defamation League:
Page 226

Chapter Twenty-Eight

A Frightening First-Hand Account:
How The Enemy Within Recruits “Right Wing” Patsies
For Political Assassinations
Page 229

Chapter Twenty-Nine

The CIA's Infiltration of the Anti-Vietnam War Movement
Bill and Hillary Clinton and John Kerry
as Judas Goats for The Enemy Within
Page 232

Chapter Thirty

The Fix Was In:
How Zionist Judas Goats Led the GOP to Defeat in 1940
And the Democrats to Defeat in 2004
Page 240

PART V

Introduction:

Two Big Names—Two Bad Records
Page 245

Chapter Thirty-One

The Sad Story of Jesse Helms:
Page 246

Chapter Thirty-Two

Newt Gingrich: A Judas Goat From the Beginning:
Page 252

PART VI

An Introduction:

Explosive Events in Recent History
Page 257

Chapter Thirty-Three

The FBI-ADL-Mossad Nexus
In the First Attack on the World Trade Center:
Page 258

Chapter Thirty-Four

The FBI-ADL Nexus and the Waco Holocaust
Page 263

Chapter Thirty-Five

Andreas Strassmeir, Kirk Lyons
and a Sordid Cast of Other Enemies Within
Linked to the Oklahoma City Bombing
Page 267

Chapter Thirty-Six

Timothy McVeigh and the ADL:
The Untold Story
Page 275

Chapter Thirty-Seven

Disinformation Central:
Neo-Conservative Zionist Propaganda
Regarding the Oklahoma City Bombing
Page 279

Chapter Thirty-Eight

What Really Happened in Oklahoma City?
A Scenario That Does Make Sense
Page 284

Chapter Thirty-Nine

Talmudic Justice . . .
The Criminal Misdeeds of Michael Chertoff
Chief Tactician in the Zionist Campaign
To Crucify Jim Traficant and David Duke
Page 292

PART VII

An Introduction:

What Could Lie Ahead . . .
Page 299

Chapter Forty

The Fox News Phenomenon:
How Zionist Plutocrats Created a “Media Alternative”
To the Garbage of the Established Liberal Media in America
Page 300

Chapter Forty-One

The Past, Present and Future Agenda of The Enemy Within:
Declaring American Patriots to be the “Real” Enemy Within
Page 305

Chapter Forty-Two

Modern-Day “Thought Police” Conspired
To Censor Campus Criticism of Israel and Zionism:
Two “Conservative” Shills for the Zionist Cause
Page 311

Chapter Forty-Three

The Zionist Take-Over and Manipulation
of Local Law Enforcement in America:
Using Police Power to Strike Down American Patriots
Page 316

Chapter Forty-Four

“If it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck . . .”
Jared Taylor’s New “Zionist-Friendly Nationalism”
Page 320

CONCLUSION

The “Israelization” of America
Page 324

A FINAL WORD . . .

Nationalism is the wave of the future—
And there’s no way to stop it.
Page 340

About the Sources

Page 345

Acknowledgements

Page 346

Index

Page 348

Photo Section

Page 351

More Best-Sellers by Michael Collins Piper

Page 367

A Letter From the Author

Page 376



This 1898 French caricature of a crowned Alphonse de Rothschild as a greedy, predator grasping the globe in his talon-like clutches, accurately portrays the way in which Europe's Rothschild banking dynasty expanded its imperial hegemony. In America today, Rothschild influence—while paramount—is largely hidden, with some “respected” families and financial institutions—not all of them Jewish—acting as Rothschild “fronts.” Americans (and others) who dare to challenge the Rothschild empire (and the Zionist cause) are subjected to dirty tricks, economic boycott, harassment, persecution—even criminal prosecution.



When the Rothschilds recognized the benefit of a strategically-placed Jewish state (in Palestine) as a base for global machinations, they became the greatest patrons of Zionism. Now hailed as “The Father of Israel,” Edmond Rothschild is honored on Israeli currency.

A preface . . .

The Who, What, When, Where, Why—and How—of the Subversive Forces That Have Brought America to Where It Is Today . . .

It has been said that Napoleon's defeat led to the rise of the international banking dynasty of the House of Rothschild. It may also rightly be said that Hitler's defeat led not only to the consolidation of the global power of the House of Rothschild, but also to the corresponding diminution of nationalism, with the notable exception of Jewish nationalism—known as “Zionism”—which received its strongest push forward in the days following the end of World War II.

In fact, since World War II there has been a fervent drive by the Zionist movement to eviscerate the nationalist movement in America and other nationalist forces around the globe. The truth is that, in America at least, since the middle half of the 20th century, those who called themselves “conservatives” have seen the conservative movement (the traditional base of American nationalism) infiltrated and destroyed from within. The process was long in the making, but ultimately successful, as recent history and current events demonstrate.

While many writers have thoroughly explored the tentacles of the Rothschild empire as it encircled the planet, creating war, economic havoc and revolution (profiting therefrom), there has never been—until now—a comprehensive review of the manner in which this dynasty (and the Zionist movement which it nurtured) worked to destroy the American nationalists who stood in the way of their ultimate goal of achieving a global imperium—the so-called “New World Order.”

Today, the self-styled “neo-conservatives”—the leaders being old-line Trotskyite communists who've retooled their philosophy for modern-day propaganda requirements—are the vanguard of the international Zionist movement that dominates the highest levels of policy-making in the United States, the most powerful nation on the planet.

These Zionist forces maintain a stranglehold over the Republican Party, thanks to their influence within the administration of George W. Bush, who brought them into governing positions, and through their domination of GOP-oriented foundations, think tanks and other institutions that impact on public policy and Republican Party affairs.

Of course, for many years prior to the rise of the Bush-era “neo-conservatives,” Zionism (and Rothschild influence) was already well entrenched within the Democratic Party, going back to the mid-19th century when Rothschild agent August Belmont actually served as Democratic Party national chairman.

In any case, today, as a direct consequence of this unholy monopoly, international Zionism reigns supreme within (or rather, over) both major political parties in America, not to mention also holding sway over many, many other political entities, journals of opinion, think tanks and other forces in the public arena.

Only a small handful of people dare to raise questions about the domination of the American system by an alien force that has no regard for American interests whatsoever.

However, the process of infiltration and destruction of the “conservative” movement—which, historically, at least until the mid-20th century, was the foundation for American opposition to the intrigue of the international plutocratic elite—involved much more than the corruption of the conservative philosophy.

In fact, this ugly scenario also included the utilization of U.S. government-paid *agents provocateurs*, acting in concert with professional infiltrators and subversives working for “independent” (that is, foreign) intelligence agencies operating on American soil.

What effectively took place was a classic “pincer movement” scenario that left traditional American nationalism gutted and eviscerated, hardly more than a remnant of a philosophy that was first set forth by American giants such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson and a host of others who followed in their footsteps.

This book is the first-ever study of its kind, providing a framework for understanding the tactics of the Judas Goats, these Enemies Within, and how and why they were able to advance the Zionist dream goal of claiming dominance of the American system and making it their military and economic tool for world conquest.

So while the traditional “conservative” movement has been subverted and made into a force for internationalism (as opposed to nationalism), there are still those stalwart nationalists—even including some self-described “progressives” and “liberals”—who continue to fight the good fight. This volume is a handbook for all true nationalists who want to know the way of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within.

Ultimately, if there is one thing this book should make absolutely clear, it is precisely this: the old labels of “left” and “right” and “liberal” and “conservative” must be abandoned forever.

These archaic labels are not only divisive and troublesome, but they are part and parcel of a Grand Design to split the American people—and the peoples of the world—and ensure that the control of our America—and the nations of this planet—remains in the hands of a grasping, greedy, self-interested global Zionist plutocracy.

Foreword . . .

The Strange World of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within

Even many politically astute Americans fail to understand how U.S. government intelligence agencies and allied private spy organizations not only infiltrate undercover agents into “dissident” organizations of both the “left” and the “right,” but also even *create* “dissident” groups in order to monitor the dissenters. Government infiltration, manipulation and outright creation of political movements in America has a long and sordid history—and one that did not begin in America.

In addition, in a somewhat different—although very much related—realm, the infiltration, manipulation and outright creation of political movements in America by established politico-religious forces such as Zionism and its interlocking allies in Trotskyite Bolshevism has played a significant part in shaping modern-day global realities, particularly in the realm of impacting upon the American political system.

In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that the Zionist and Trotskyite elements have, for all intents and purposes, over a period of some 50 years, gained a stranglehold on what was once the traditional populist and nationalist element historically known as the “conservative” movement in America.

More often than not—as we shall see—the Zionist and Trotskyite elements have worked hand-in-glove with U.S. federal intelligence and law enforcement agencies in a “pincer” movement to contain dissident voices in America. Throughout the 20th century, these subversive elements have infiltrated U.S. policy-making, intelligence and law enforcement and used those agencies for their own agenda.

This volume is a wide-ranging historical overview of these insidious efforts to control and/or destroy legitimate grass-roots American political endeavors—particularly within what might loosely be described as “the nationalist movement”—by the use of JUDAS GOATS: phony leaders, false prophets, greedy racketeers and enemy *agents provocateurs*, all of whom serve the interests of their behind-the-scenes handlers at the highest levels of the international plutocratic elite.

The bottom line is that the long-secret role of high-level forces manipulating “dissident” voices is an explosive story that the guilty parties would rather be left untold. And it is a story that is, frankly, rather frightening for many Americans, particularly on the “right,” who have long been quite correctly concerned about the possibility of infiltrators within their midst. There are many Americans who have spent more than a few sleepless nights wondering if that nice man who always attends the meetings of the local “patriot” group is actually an informant

for the ADL or the FBI or even the CIA. As we shall see, such fears have solid foundation.

In the wake of the Oklahoma City bombing more people became aware of government agents inside the “right wing.” For example, those who have investigated are fully convinced that German immigrant Andreas Strassmeir was an undercover agent operating around convicted bomber Timothy McVeigh. And this, too, raised questions as to why self-styled “nationalist” attorney Kirk Lyons continued to defend Strassmeir, leading many to conclude Lyons was also a Judas Goat. (We will examine the Strassmeir-Lyons intrigues in these pages).

The point is this: Judas Goats often, as ‘cover,’ say and do “the right thing” in order to win friends and influence people. Infiltrators and informants are not necessarily on the scene for the purpose of disrupting an organization. Sometimes—more often than not—their purpose is to find out what the organization is up to; with whom its leaders have contact; to keep a running watch on its mailing list and its internal operations. On occasion, infiltrators successfully use their influence inside Organization A, for example, to use its resources to target or disrupt Organization B.

Some of the best agents actually contribute a great deal to the work of the organization being infiltrated, providing ideas and input and other services. After all, what better way to insinuate oneself into a targeted organization than to actually help the organization?

Infiltrators do and say the “right” things: they wouldn’t be good infiltrators if they didn’t. They have to blend in. They have to appear to be “on the same page” as the people they are mixing with. They have to appear to share the same beliefs. The last thing an infiltrator wants to do is to seem to be going against the grain or otherwise objecting to the point of view of the group that he is targeting.

Sometimes infiltrators will even go out of their way to appear “extreme” in order to convince their targets of their sincerity—and on occasion the infiltrators go overboard, inadvertently tipping off their targets to the fact that things might not be as they seem. Infiltrators are often very good and generous regular financial contributors to the organizations they are targeting, thereby making themselves valuable (in a very basic sense) to the organization.

In fact, during the period of the initial COINTELPRO infiltrations of the FBI, the old joke was that the only KKK members who paid their dues on time were the FBI and ADL informants inside the Klan.

On the other hand, as Dr. Edward R. Fields, a veteran American nationalist, once revealed in his popular journal, *The Thunderbolt*, when the FBI did have infiltrators inside the KKK, the FBI instructed its

informants that while it was permissible for them to make anti-Black public utterances, they should avoid making anti-Jewish remarks, an interesting revelation indeed.

But make no mistake about the following important point: although we will focus at length on the activities of the FBI and the CIA and the ADL in particular (precisely because these entities played such a major part in doing the work of *The Enemy Within*), the problem of infiltration and manipulation and destruction of American nationalist and dissident movements has deeply-grounded historical and philosophical antecedents.

Rooted in the byzantine conflicts between the diverse elements that have promulgated the twin (albeit often conflicting) forces of Zionism and Bolshevism, particularly its Trotskyite brand that remains so influential today, some would say these evil forces are Satanic in nature, at the very root of evil in our world today. In short, ancient (and not so ancient) battles originally fought out on foreign soil flowed over onto the American continent and are now being replayed within (and around) the traditional American nationalist movement.

That said, let it be noted that for the purposes of this panoramic study which we are about to undertake, *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within* are not simply those infiltrators and informants for an assortment of private and public intelligence agencies.

The Enemy Within also infest media outlets (newspapers and broadcasting entities alike). There are so-called “journalists” who do the propaganda dirty work for the ADL and other high-level power blocs in the world today. In these pages we will meet some bought-and-paid-for hack writers who have fashioned lucrative careers out of working to disrupt and destroy political dissidents in America. Some of them have posed as “conservatives”—some have not—but all have one thing in common: they are the media’s front men for their Zionist sponsors.

In addition, we also define *The Enemy Within* as those subversive ideological forces that have corrupted and twisted and reshaped, for their own insidious aims, the traditional “conservative” movement in the United States. Most notably, of course, we refer to the so-called “neo-conservatives” of our present day who are no more than Trotskyite communists of the old school who re-tooled and re-configured their own philosophy in order to adapt it to the needs of the modern period.

In short: Trotskyite Communism—“neo-conservatism”—is now the leading philosophical strand in global Zionist thinking, at least certainly its most influential, by virtue of its power in the United States today.

With all of this in mind, let us then move forward into the strange world of *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within*.



Russian-born hard-line Jewish nationalist Vladimir “Ze’ev” Jabotinsky (1880-1940)—often called “The Jewish Fascist”—is revered by the Trotskyite “neo-conservatives” who are the most pivotal forces in global Zionism today, exploiting U.S. military power in the drive for a planetary imperium: the New World Order. In the 1920s Jabotinsky emerged as one of the most popular and influential Zionist leaders and is today commemorated on Israeli currency (inset). Many young graduates of Jabotinsky’s militaristic Betar brigades (above) became members of the infamous Irgun, which pioneered modern-day terrorism in brutal attacks on British forces and Arab civilians in Palestine. Later, the Irgun and their allies became the foundation of the modern-day “right wing” Likud faction in Israel. Although the American media glorifies Jewish nationalism, *all other forms of nationalism are vilified as a cause of war and oppression.*

By Way of an Introduction:

Nationalism: The Wave of the Future— The Prime Target of the Global Forces of Zionism and Internationalism

THE JUDAS GOATS—THE ENEMY WITHIN examines the manner in which internationalist forces have worked to take over and/or destroy legitimate, genuine, traditional nationalist movements in the United States during the 20th century. As such, it seems appropriate to begin our journey into this shadowy netherworld of spies and subversion by first defining precisely what constitutes “nationalism” in the American sense.

Nationalism—in its various incarnations throughout history and all across the globe—has always been and certainly always will be a pre-eminent factor in dictating the course of mankind’s direction. Nationalism and the counter-force of internationalism together form the axis around which the events of our world today revolve. There is hardly any conflict anywhere on the face of the planet that does not hinge upon the struggle between nationalism and internationalism. So what then is nationalism?

In America alone, the word nationalism means many different things to many different people—including those who consider themselves to be nationalists or rank themselves as part of “the nationalist movement.”

The “nationalist movement” in America has always been quite internally quarrelsome, at times so philosophically disjointed that it almost seems a double misnomer to dare describe the phenomenon as either “nationalist” or as a “movement” at all.

There are many (albeit naïve) classic “rock-ribbed Republicans” who would call themselves nationalists—however inappropriately—revering the “Big Stick” philosophy of Theodore Roosevelt, reveling in the idea that Uncle Sam should make his presence and his considerable military might felt ‘round the globe—America right or wrong. This, to these folks, is “nationalism”—but, of course, it isn’t, although the modern-day “neo-conservatives” who relish the thought of using America to advance the worldwide Zionist agenda have been quite ready to exploit “TR” as almost one of their own.

In marked contrast to these “neo-conservatives,” there are many other Americans—who truly are nationalists in the classic sense of the word—who question the very idea that the United States should act as a world policeman, putting out brushfire wars and advancing some undefined dream of “democracy,” which has now become the rallying cry of the neo-conservative (that is, Zionist-Trotskyite) schemers.

In fact, the genuine American nationalists, as opposed to the “neo-cons” (who truly are “cons” in every sense of that word), are the modern-day heirs of a traditional American (and, ironically, largely Republican Party-based) philosophy heralded by the late Sen. Arthur Vandenberg (R-Mich.) when he affirmed: “Nationalism—not internationalism—is the indispensable bulwark of American independence.”

In his now long-forgotten, but still quite timely, volume, *The Trail of a Tradition* (G. P. Putnam’s Sons, New York, 1926), Vandenberg sought to define the American nationalist tradition in the context of U.S. engagement with the world at large—from the days of our Founding Fathers through the era of Woodrow Wilson and the attempt to enforce a world regime through the engine of the failed League of Nations.

In the end, of course, Vandenberg himself underwent a remarkable transformation—thanks largely, it appears, to having been blackmailed and otherwise “influenced” by British intelligence operatives—and shifted into the internationalist camp—acting as an outspoken advocate of free-wheeling U.S. involvement in global affairs. However, in his early years, Vandenberg was indeed very much a part of what we might rightly call the genuine “nationalist” camp—one that occupied quite a large bit of territory in the land of American political thought.

Another area where self-described “nationalists” seem to part company is on the ever-important issue of trade. There, the conflict between real nationalism and the internationalist, imperial perversion of “nationalism” is critical to the debate. Free trade versus protectionism (as advocated by traditional nationalists) presents a very real dilemma for self-styled “conservatives” within Republican Party ranks, for example, who, on the one hand, consider themselves “nationalists” and say they are for America First, but who—on the altar of free trade—are actually working to sacrifice American sovereignty to multinational trade organizations and global financial conglomerates. So there is a very basic divergence between free trade and national sovereignty.

The fact is that free trade has historical ties not only to British imperialism and global super-capitalism, but also even with the great bugaboo of American conservatives: communism itself. In 1848, Karl Marx, the father of communism, advocated free trade because, he said, “it breaks up old nationalities and carries antagonisms of proletariat [workers] and bourgeoisie [small businessmen] to the uttermost point.”

According to Marx, “the free trade system hastens the social revolution.” In short, modern day conservatives who support free trade are actually supporting a central tenet of Marxism. So, are these “conservatives” truly “nationalist” in the classic sense? It seems not.

Which brings us to the definition of nationalism . . .

The word “nationalism”—and the general knowledge of the history surrounding the concept of nationalism—raises negative images in the minds of those people—largely educated people, largely politicized people—who bother to think about the subject.

For the average student (at either the high school or college level) who devotes little of his academic energies toward the realms of history or political science—the quite sensible would-be rocket scientist, architect or accountant who has no desire to dabble in political endeavor—the word “nationalism” may even conjure up the absolute, all-encompassing definition of evil as perceived by today’s society and culture and repeated endlessly in the mass media:

NATIONALISM: Adolf Hitler, the Third Reich, German militarism, concentration camps, six million innocent Jews—maybe as many as seven or eight million, possibly eleven million—marched off to the gas chambers, later to be incinerated in gas ovens. And don't forget Japanese kamikaze fighter pilots—and Tojo, too.

Taken right from the comics or a Hollywood drama, that in essence, sums up the common-place perception—indeed, really, the more or less “official” definition—of what constitutes “nationalism.”

And this is no accident. The writing of both popular and academic history and the authority and power to define what “nationalism” was co-opted and has since been dominated—at least throughout the second half of the 20th century, and in the Anglo-American world, in particular—by persons and institutions distinctly hostile to nationalism in all its varieties and forms.

This is a direct consequence of the growing concentration of media ownership in the hands of an elite few—closely connected families and financial groups—who benefit from internationalist policies. This is no “conspiracy theory,” by any means. Prominent media critic Professor Ben Bagdikian, in his book *The Media Monopoly*, summarizes the situation well:

The [media] lords of the global village have their own political agenda. All resist economic changes that do not support their own financial interests. Together, they exert a homogenizing power over ideas, culture and commerce that affects populations larger than any in history. Neither Caesar nor Hitler, Franklin Roosevelt nor any Pope, has commanded as much power to shape the information on which so

many people depend to make decisions about everything from whom to vote for to what to eat . . .

Monopolistic power dominates many other industries and most of them enjoy special treatment by the government. But media giants have two enormous advantages: They control the public image of national leaders who, as a result, fear and favor the media magnates' political agendas; and they control the information and entertainment that help establish the social, political and cultural attitudes of increasingly larger populations . . .

Now, in the wake of this most unfortunate phenomenon—this monopolization of the power to educate and inform—the actual nature and substance of what truly constitutes “nationalism” has been distorted. As such, more modern-day efforts to not only understand and define and advance the cause of nationalism have been relegated to what the Masters of the Media loosely call “the fringe.”

During the mid-20th century, the one notable independent effort to define nationalism—at least in the American historical context—came through the work of one Willis A. Carto, the Indiana-born founder of a Washington-based institution known as Liberty Lobby, the publisher of a widely-read national weekly newspaper, *The Spotlight*.

Although driven into bankruptcy and destroyed in 2001 by a politically-motivated lawsuit that was affirmed by a federal judge, *The Spotlight* emerged, during its heyday, as perhaps the largest and most effective voice for traditional American nationalism—the very reason that the maverick newspaper was targeted for evisceration.

A survivor of wounds inflicted upon him by the Japanese during brutal combat in the Pacific theater during World War II, Liberty Lobby's future founder, Carto, returned home and—unlike many veterans who believed the official propaganda—began his own personal journey of investigation, seeking the answers to the “how” and the “why” of American involvement in that genocidal world conflagration.

Ultimately, Carto came to question the necessity of U.S. involvement not only in World War II but in virtually all of the wars of the 20th century. In fact, long before it became politically popular to do so—and certainly unlike many on the traditional “right”—Carto raised questions about the U.S. intervention in Southeast Asia, while conventional “Cold War Liberals” were still pushing for deeper American entanglement in the region, ultimately leading to the Vietnam debacle.

Never considering himself anything but a nationalist, Carto made a conscious effort to draw the lines and distinctions between American

“conservatism” of the Republican stripe and traditional nationalism. Rejecting what he considered to be the tired and worn and thoroughly inadequate concepts of “right” and “left,” Carto worked energetically through Liberty Lobby to develop a thriving nationalist movement, specifically focusing on the dangers of internationalism, placing nationalism as central to the overall framework of an American populist philosophy exemplified by Thomas Jefferson and an approach toward foreign relations (in particular) as laid out by George Washington in his Farewell Address.

Carto’s book, *Populism vs. Plutocracy: The Universal Struggle*, captured the essence of Carto’s nationalist point of view, reflecting on the monumental figures of American populism and their particular contributions to nationalist thought: ranging from statesmen such as Jefferson and Jackson to progressive firebrands as Robert LaFollette and Burton Wheeler to famed radio priest, Father Charles Coughlin, America First Committee spokesman Charles Lindbergh, nationalist Sen. Robert Taft, and such intellectual giants as Lawrence Dennis, undoubtedly the premier American nationalist theoretician of the 20th century.

The views of these men—plus many other giants—taken together comprised a basis for the nationalist philosophy that Carto put forth in every way possible through a wide variety of media at his disposal over some 50 years of active involvement in the American public arena.

Carto insisted that adherence to Washington’s words of wisdom provided not only the means to ensure America’s tranquil relations with its neighbors—near and far—but also a foundation for building a strong nation capable of ensuring its own domestic stability.

Perhaps more than any other American—including Washington himself—Carto utilized the considerable media outreach at his disposal to repeat, time and time again, Washington’s warnings:

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It also leads to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained and by exciting jealousy, ill will and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal

privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption or infatuation.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it.

Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they acuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other.

Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world.

In the spirit of Washington, Carto contended that true nationalists—of all nations—believed in developing and strengthening their nation from within, maintaining the integrity of its cultural heritage and historic sovereign borders and placing their own nation’s interests first. Nationalists did not start wars of imperialism, he said, but respected the nationalist instincts of others.

Profiteering internationalist plutocrats, Carto charged, condemned nationalism because it interfered with their goal of profit and their aim to submerge all nations in a “Global Plantation” under their domination.

In Carto’s estimation, internationalism was a dream of naive ideal-

ists that the eradication of all national and racial borders will usher in world peace in which everyone will live happily ever after— a chimerical dream of poets and religious leaders for millennia.

In actual application, Carto averred, internationalism could only produce mass confusion, tension, anarchy and violence. Plutocrats used internationalism to break down national boundaries and promote multiculturalism, an essential step to complete their conquest of the world and the formal erection of their world super state, the Global Plantation, often called a “New World Order”—by both the nationalists and the internationalists.

Carto put it simply: the concept of a New World Order is no less than the drive for a world government directed by the plutocrats who see it as a way to capture all of the natural resources of the globe and to effectively enslave all of the people under an international bureaucracy chosen and controlled by the financial elite.

In any event, Carto’s influence in shaping the philosophical foundation of the American nationalist movement was (and is) beyond question. In fact, when longtime Republican Party figure Pat Buchanan—the syndicated columnist—began emerging as a serious, high-profile critic—from a nationalist perspective—of the growing internationalist bent within Republican ranks, major media voices throughout the land acknowledged—albeit grudgingly—that it had been Carto and Liberty Lobby that helped pave the way for Buchanan’s ascension.

It was Pat Buchanan—formerly a “mainstream” figure—who began echoing the rhetoric and historical foundation that had been preserved through Carto’s earlier work, and thereby brought at least a Buchanan version of “nationalism” into the American political arena as he made successive bids for the Republican Party’s presidential nomination. As early as June 26, 1995, the progressive weekly, *The Nation*, began taking note of the new populism and nationalism that was driving the Buchanan campaign. Describing a Buchanan rally in New Hampshire, *The Nation* pointed out that:

When asked to cite what issue most moves them about Buchanan, a number of [them] referred to the economic nationalism of his crusades against NAFTA and GATT. Buchanan has howled about trade pacts that benefit transnational corporations at the expense of American workers and surrender U.S. sovereignty to a not-to-be-trusted international establishment, thus melding populism of the left and right.

The Nation explored Buchanan's new emphasis further:

It was in New Hampshire that Buchanan's economic populism first stirred. When he campaigned in the state in 1992, he encountered people socked by recession.

Buchanan had been propelled into that race by his far-right disgust at President Bush's decision to sign a civil rights measure and to renege on the read-my-lips declaration [against new taxes]. But while trudging through the Granite State, Buchanan discovered economic dislocation—hard-working Americans hurled out of well-paying jobs. The fault, he concluded, lay with globalization and U.S. trade policies.

Since then he has assailed the big banks and corporations that seek these jobs-exporting trade agreements and that finance a slew of lobbyists who guarantee that the trade deals slide through Congress. He is the only Republican contender to acknowledge and address the decline in real wages that has hit middle-income America.

In doing so, Buchanan adds fresh troops to the social conservatives in his "Buchanan Brigades." Mad at the Japanese? Outraged your child can't pray in school? Buchanan is out there welding constituencies.

Alone in the GOP, he attacks Washington as both the Establishment that promotes a liberal secular order and the Establishment that pushes the corporatist New World Order. Though also a fierce Catholic foot soldier in service to a conservative social and religious Establishment, Buchanan is the closest thing to a genuine populist in the 1996 race so far.

The political "right" also stood up and took notice of Buchanan's apparent shift. On November 27, 1995 the "conservative" *Weekly Standard*—financed by billionaire Rupert Murdoch, and edited by one William Kristol, leader of the self-styled clique of "neo-conservatives" enamored with nothing less than advancing a Zionist-dominated American imperialism—raised its own concerns about Buchanan's nationalist broadsides against the power elite. *The Standard* asserted:

In an increasingly conservative America, one political figure defiantly resists the historical tide. This man still denounces big banks and multinational corporations. Still unabashedly puts the interests of the American factory worker ahead of those of the so-called international trading

system. Still refuses even to contemplate any cuts in the generosity of big middle-class spending programs like Medicare and Social Security. This man is Patrick J. Buchanan, America's last leftist . . .

Noting that Buchanan retained his traditional stance on social issues, *The Standard* then pointed out that:

His campaign speeches stress arresting new themes: the imminent menace of world government, the greed of international banks, the power of tariffs to stop the deterioration in blue-collar wages, the urgency of preserving Medicare in something close to its present form.

This isn't anything remotely like the conservative Republicanism of the Reagan era. What it sounds very much like instead is the militant, resentful rhetoric roared by populist Democrats from William Jennings Bryan onward. The revulsion contemporary Democrats feel for Buchanan only exposes how far that party has drifted from its own past.

The Standard charged that Buchanan had abandoned the "traditional" stands of conservative Republicans and had begun to shift (or at least *attempt* to shift) the Republican Party in a nationalist direction:

The important question for traditional conservative Republicans is how far Mr. Buchanan should be permitted to take the party. The success of Buchanan's 1992 campaign has already begun to redirect the Republican Party to a more restrictive position on immigration and a much harder line on affirmative action . . .

Should he be welcomed or not? In 1992, many conservatives suffered excruciating difficulty in deciding . . . This time, though, the choice ought to be easier. Conservatives need to recognize that Buchanan's politics is . . . something new: a populism formed to seize the political opportunities presented by strident multiculturalism and stagnating wages for less-skilled workers . . .

As things are going, it is likely only a matter of time before Buchanan himself recognizes the rapidly mounting distance between his politics and those of mainstream conservatism. His friend and fellow columnist Sam Francis, whose ideas Mr. Buchanan has increasingly echoed, has

already dropped the word “conservative” outright. The danger is not so much that Buchanan will hijack conservatism as that, even after he charges out of it on his way toward some unscouted ideological destination of his own, his statist and populist ideas will seep backward into it . . .

At this juncture, the Murdoch-financed voice for internationalism formally declared war on Buchanan and read him out of the ranks of “conservative” Republicans:

Buchanan has never shied from a fight, and neither should those Republicans who oppose him. Republicans who hold fast to the traditions of postwar conservatism that Buchanan is rejecting—small government and American global leadership—should make clear that they understand as well as Buchanan does the immense difference between his politics and theirs. He has turned his back on the fundamental convictions that have defined American conservatism for 40 years, and conservatives shouldn’t be afraid to say so. After all, to paraphrase Ronald Reagan, it isn’t we who have left Pat Buchanan; it is Pat Buchanan who is leaving us.

In other words, Pat Buchanan, if elected president, would take the Republican Party out of the internationalist camp and that’s the last thing this “conservative” voice wanted to happen.

Ultimately, of course, Buchanan left the Republican Party and opted to run—in 2000—as the candidate of the Reform Party. However, when all was said and done, the Buchanan Movement failed—and failed badly. The American nationalist movement was dealt a harsh electoral blow with Buchanan’s devastatingly poor showing in that election. Nationalists were left holding the bag as Buchanan moved back into the world of big-time media punditry. In the meantime, the nationalist movement—the real nationalist movement—seeks not only rejuvenation, but leadership.

Ironically, the greatest force standing against traditional American nationalism happens to be Zionism. Although Zionism is, in itself, defined as Jewish Nationalism, aimed at the establishment of a Jewish State, which, in fact, ultimately emerged in 1948 with the founding of Israel, the truth is that Zionism is essentially an international movement of vast scope and power with Israel serving as hardly more than its spiritual (albeit geographically specific) capital.

In that regard, in this author's previous work, *The New Jerusalem*, we explored the striking reality that, for all intents and purposes, the Zionist movement has essentially adopted the United States—through sheer force of financial and political power—as its primary base of operations, using the American military (generally against the wishes of the military leadership) to enforce a global imperium designed to advance the power of Israel (and the Zionist agenda) on the world stage.

So it is that a relatively small group of intriguers—the so-called “neo-conservatives” (explored in detail in this author's other previous volume, *The High Priests of War*)—have come to power in America and have done all in their vast reach to advance the Zionist cause.

As it stands, even many of the harshest critics of Zionism and Israeli misdeeds fail to understand it, but the truth is that the conflict in the Middle East between Israel and the Arab world is but a portion of the overall Zionist agenda which is boundless in scope: it is, you see, no coincidence that Zionist philosophy teaches that Israel—in the sense of the Jewish people—has no boundaries.

It is also no coincidence that the American neo-conservatives are intellectual disciples of hard-line Zionist ideologue, Vladimir Jabotinsky—often called “The Jewish Fascist”—who candidly declared in a 1935 interview: “We want a Jewish Empire.” Although Jabotinsky died in 1940, his ideological heirs carry his torch forward, more forcefully perhaps than Jabotinsky would have ever dreamed possible.

The intrigues by Zionism on American soil have been extraordinarily well-calculated, operating on multiple levels and through multiple mechanisms. In the pages of *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within* we will be examining the ugly history of the Zionist drive to infiltrate, undermine, subvert and/or otherwise grab control of the American nationalist movement in order to suppress and thereby destroy it.

But rest assured that Americans are not standing alone in the face of this menace. There are other nationalist movements across the face of the planet that are rising up in opposition to Zionist power—from Moscow to Caracas, from Kiev to Kuala Lumpur: in every place where informed people dare to think freely and to continue to speak out.

Therefore, let us note this: the enemies of nationalism might as well face one basic fact: Like it or not, both here in America and around the globe, nationalism is the wave of the future.

There's no way to stop it.

Let us now move forward and examine precisely who The Judas Goats are—and have been—and how they truly are America's Enemy Within. Prepare yourself for a very ugly—though fascinating—story.

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : The Director, ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED DATE: June 2, 1959

FROM : A. Rosen *AR* DATE *1-21-81* BY *SP1SSK/ML*

SUBJECT: EUSTACE CLARENCE MULLINS, JR.
RACIAL MATTERS

Tolson _____
Boardman _____
Belmont _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Ladd _____
Nichols _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
W.C. Sullivan _____
Tele. Room _____
Holloman _____
Gandy _____

The Director has inquired, "Who is Mullins? If he really exists we should make him put up or shut up."

Eustace Mullins is identical with Eustace Clarence Mullins, Jr., subject of a current Racial Matters investigation. He is an alleged [redacted] and he is known to be a prolific writer of extremely vicious [redacted] propaganda. He has associated with the principal suspects in the Atlanta bombing case. Mullins has previously been critical of the Bureau in his writings, and letters he has written to the Bureau in the past have not been acknowledged.

In February, 1959, Mullins wrote three letters to the Director, criticizing the investigation of his activities and engaging in a tirade against the Director and the Bureau. The vicious material [redacted]

[redacted] does not appear in them and the letters were not acknowledged.

Mullins is a warped, degenerate and depraved individual. His [redacted] writings show a complete disregard for the [redacted] and he has authored propaganda which he apparently knows to be [redacted]

ACTION TAKEN


The Chicago Office has been instructed to immediately interview Mullins to demand that he put up or shut up. Mullins will be forcefully admonished to refrain from making such reckless and baseless charges in the future. Chicago was also instructed to determine whether there is any basis upon which the local authorities could arrange for the commitment of Mullins to an institution.

WLM:aco
(6)

we should give this top priority and see that some action is taken right off

Does he have any criminal record? 42

REC-55 105-15727-7-2-59



In 1981 highly-regarded American author Eustace Mullins (left) obtained 500 pages of previously classified files the FBI had kept on Mullins—a patriotic American—going as far back as 1951. While many pages were redacted—blacked out—supposedly for reasons of “national security,” the amazing files made it clear that the FBI targeted Mullins for destruction precisely because he criticized Zionist power in America, particularly his pivotal exposé of the control of the U.S. Federal Reserve System by the Rothschild banking dynasty. The files revealed the FBI had even pondered a scheme to silence Mullins by having him committed to a lunatic asylum. This 1959 memo (above) to FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover—from his Jewish deputy, Alex Rosen—shows a scribbled note from Hoover, saying the Mullins case was “top priority” and that FBI agents should “see that some action is taken.” In the pages of *The Judas Goats* we will learn much more about such secret police and spying operations and other efforts to crush political dissent in America.

An Introduction to Part I

Some basic historical background . . .

An Ugly and Sordid History

The breadth and scope of the intrigues of *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within* are ultimately quite staggering. However the initial chapters that follow in this section are designed to provide a primer on the nature of the efforts by these enemies of American nationalism to infiltrate and destroy (or otherwise manipulate and control) their political opposition in America. This historical overview lays the groundwork for understanding much of what follows.

So, although, for example, the FBI's notorious COINTELPRO infiltration operations were actually officially instituted in the early 1960s, the historical record shows that going back to the years preceding World War II, groups such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith were already manipulating the FBI in a terror campaign against American nationalists.

Therefore, we shall see the name of the ADL pop up again and again, not only in this section, but throughout the pages of this book. And although the FBI (and other federal agencies, such as the CIA) will often appear as what might be described as "villains" in these pages, there are many good folks within those agencies who reject the machinations of The Enemy Within and who have actually sought to dislodge some Zionist troublemakers when given the opportunity.

That said, let's look at the facts . . .

Chapter One:

The Return of COINTELPRO: Recalling an Ugly History of Infiltration and Subversion That Once Again Reigns on American Soil

On May 31, 2002—in the name of “fighting terrorism”—then-Attorney General John Ashcroft trashed thirty-year-old restrictions on the FBI’s ability to conduct domestic spying on religious and political organizations in the United States. Ashcroft’s move was the effective reinvigoration of the FBI’s infamous COINTELPRO (i.e. “counterintelligence program”) of the 1960s. Under COINTELPRO, the FBI—in active collaboration with the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith—infiltrated and spied upon (and disrupted, when deemed necessary) a wide variety of dissident American political organizations.

Although the ADL, as we shall see, was initially founded ostensibly as an organization dedicated to fighting bigotry against the Jewish people, it soon evolved into a power in and of itself and then, following the founding of state of Israel in 1948, emerged as a hard-line lobby for Israel, acting as an intelligence and propaganda conduit for Israel’s clandestine services agency, the Mossad.

Thus, when the COINTELPRO venture was first operational, the ADL (and its handlers in the Mossad) became effectively intertwined with the FBI. And during the COINTELPRO years, the names and personal data of some 62,000 Americans ended up in the FBI’s files.

Although the media frequently admits that “civil rights” groups were a target of COINTELPRO, the fact is that the FBI spent much of its efforts focusing on “right wing” organizations and individuals.

The guidelines rendered moot by Ashcroft were instituted in the mid-1970s after widespread outrage upon the discovery of COINTELPRO—following the death of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

The truth is that, beginning in the 1930’s, Hoover’s FBI worked closely with the ADL in “monitoring” American political dissidents, well before COINTELPRO was officially instituted.

And as we shall see—although it remains largely forgotten—the ADL was the primary source for much of the fallacious information that the FBI utilized to cook up a subsequently discredited “sedition” case against some 30 Americans whose sole crime was to stand in favor of American nationalism and oppose intervention in the war in Europe during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Under the previous guidelines instituted to curtail FBI abuses rampant under COINTELPRO, the FBI was permitted to deploy undercover operatives in churches and mosques or political organizations *only* if investigators had first found “probable cause” or other evidence suggesting that persons in those groups may have committed a

crime. However, to circumvent the guidelines, the FBI relied on the ADL (as a private organization unhindered by the official rules) to fill the void, doing the spying the FBI was prohibited from doing

The ADL enthusiastically did the dirty work, turning its spy data over to the FBI. As a result, the illicit fruits of the ADL's intelligence ventures ended up in the hands of the FBI, the BATF, the CIA, the IRS and other federal agencies with which the ADL maintained (and still maintains) close contact.

The Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) of Morris Dees—another outfit operating in a sordid fashion similar to the ADL—has also functioned as an FBI conduit. And, if truth be told, there are probably many such similar organizations operating, although with less high profile than the ADL and the SPLC.

Now, however, Attorney General Ashcroft had formally brought the old COINTELPRO back to life, raising concerns among Americans who valued old-fashioned civil liberties.

Writing in the July-September 1995 issue of *NameBase NewsLine*, Daniel Brandt provided interesting background on COINTELPRO:

The existence of COINTELPRO was first revealed when every document in the Media, Pennsylvania office of the FBI was stolen by unknown persons on March 8, 1971. Some sixty documents were then mailed to selected publications, and others were sent directly to the people and groups named.

These documents broke down as follows: 30 percent were manuals, routine forms, and similar procedural materials. Of the remainder, 40 percent were political surveillance and other investigation of political activity (2 were right-wing, 10 concerned immigrants, and over 200 were on left or liberal groups), 25 percent concerned bank robberies, 20 percent were murder, rape, and interstate theft, 7 percent were draft resistance, another 7 percent were military desertion, and 1 percent organized crime, mostly gambling.

However, it was not just the FBI that was carrying out such domestic operations of this sort. The CIA stands equally to be indicted for the same misdeeds. According to an account by Verne Lyon, a former CIA undercover operative, writing in the Summer 1990 issue of *Covert Action Information Bulletin*, the CIA's most widespread domestic spying operations began in 1959.

Under Project RESISTANCE and later Project MERRIMAC, the CIA

infiltrated agents into domestic groups of all types and activities. Later, the CIA incorporated all domestic intelligence operations into Operation CHAOS. Perhaps not surprisingly, the individual placed in charge of CHAOS was veteran CIA officer Richard Ober, a deputy to the Israeli Mossad's longtime loyalist at Langley, James Jesus Angleton.

(A detailed account of Angleton's bizarre and sordid career, particularly his role as a key player in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, can be found in this author's previous work: *Final Judgment: The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy*.)

According to the Center for National Security Studies, Ober and his operatives in CHAOS had accumulated personality files on over 13,000 individuals, including more than 7,000 U.S. citizens and had assembled files on over 1,000 domestic political organizations.

In addition, it seems, the CIA had also shared information on more than 300,000 people with other agencies including the FBI and the Defense Intelligence Agency.

(For its own part, as we've already noted, the FBI's Domestic Intelligence Division had 62,000 Americans—presumed “subversives”—under investigation via its own COINTELPRO operation. How many names overlapped between the CIA's various domestic spying operations and those of the FBI will probably never be known.)

On May 13, 1985 *The Spotlight*, the weekly newspaper then published by Liberty Lobby, the longtime populist institution on Capitol Hill in Washington, revealed that famed “liberal” activist Allard Lowenstein—who served in Congress from 1969 to 1971—had actually been a long-time undercover CIA operative.

The liberal idol had been shot to death in 1980 (purportedly as a consequence of a personal dispute), but the facts about his covert career did not emerge until afterward.

Lowenstein began working as a paid CIA informant in 1949, a few months before the spell-binding young campus left-wing orator was elected to the presidency of the National Student Association (NaStA). Although the “student” association took a pugnacious “left-radical” stand on major issues, no one knew then that it had been set up as a CIA front by senior officers from the CIA's clandestine services division, including Cord Meyer who is later believed, as the CIA's London station chief, to have recruited young Oxford scholar Bill Clinton in the CIA's controlled “anti-war movement” opposition.

As one of the nation's best known student leaders, Lowenstein moved comfortably in circles critical of the CIA, all the while on the CIA's “pad,” finking on his friends for the CIA. Thus, during the Vietnam War era, the American taxpayers paid not only for the cost of the war —

but also for the funding of the “anti-war movement” in which Lowenstein’s successors in NaStA leaders were major players. Meanwhile, Lowenstein himself advanced to more “senior” status as one of the nation’s (and, secretly, the CIA’s) leading anti-war voices.

Later, Allard Lowenstein doubled as an operative for Israel’s intelligence agency, the Mossad. In 1979, while serving as a delegate to the United Nations, Lowenstein helped engineer the Mossad surveillance operation that tripped up Lowenstein’s boss, then-UN Ambassador Andrew Young, who was caught holding secret conversations with Arab diplomats. Then-President Carter was pressured into firing Young and Lowenstein actually left the UN with Young, but the Mossad’s purpose (catching Young collaborating with the hated Arabs) had been served.

So while the FBI was spending some \$10 million over a period of years to investigate the anti-war movement, many of the very people the FBI were investigating were secretly on the CIA payroll although the FBI was never told the truth.

Many of the idealistic young leftists recruited into the CIA activity didn’t learn until after they joined NaStA that they had become enmeshed in a CIA front, but quickly realized that they could gain many favors and advance their careers by cooperating after they had been let in on the secret.

Similar methods were used to co-opt “right wing” groups with CIA and FBI operatives providing “hot tips” and financing from “patriots high in the government who support what you’re doing.” More than a few have been co-opted this way.

Recently, another former top figure in the CIA-funded NaStA, John Foster “Chip” Berlet, objected to being described as “a reputed CIA informant.” Berlet asserted: “I am not a ‘CIA’ informant nor an informant or agent for any intelligence agency.” He said this was a “false claim.”

For years, such prominent non-CIA figures in the “New Left” as Daniel Brandt and the late Ace Hayes, among others, publicly scored Berlet as a covert government operative. They also pinpointed Berlet’s relationship with the Mossad-sponsored Anti-Defamation League (ADL) which does provide information to the FBI, the CIA, the BATF and other government agencies.

In 1993 associates of New York-based African-American political activist Lenora Fulani documented Berlet’s activities, pointing out that a top ADL official had publicly declared that “the information [Berlet] has shared with us has been very useful.”

In recent years Berlet’s primary purpose has been fighting the successful forging of precisely the “left-right” populist alliance against the plutocratic elite. Perhaps not surprisingly, Berlet has a personal link to

the plutocratic elite. He was named after his father's friend, former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles (in turn, the brother of the CIA Director Allen Dulles, who was fired by President Kennedy). This might explain why Berlet operated throughout his adulthood in the sphere of CIA-affiliated institutions.

Another example of federal informants at work: In a series of exclusives published in the 1980s, *The Spotlight* exposed the role of federal undercover agents for the BATF and the FBI in instigating events leading to a 1979 shoot-out in Greensboro, North Carolina between members of the Communist Workers Party and a group of Ku Klux Klansmen and members of an American "Nazi" group. Five communists died and another person was wounded.

At least five government informants posing as "right wing patriots," were implicated and identified: Bernard Butkovich, a full-time BATF undercover operative, and Ed Dawson, a paid FBI fink. Both skillfully mouthed "right wing" rhetoric with the best of them, all the while working for the government.

Two other BATF undercover agents and a female undercover agent for the North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation were also "regulars" at meetings of "right wing" groups involved in the Greensboro tragedy.

But there are even more examples. Take, for instance, the case of the infamous and violence-prone terrorist group known as the Jewish Defense League (JDL). The facts suggest there's much more to the JDL than meets the eye:

The JDL was founded in 1968 by its long-time leader, Brooklyn-born Meir Kahane, who is best-remembered as the "militant rabbi" gunned down after being elected to the Israeli parliament. However, the truth is that for many years Kahane had actually been an asset of both the FBI and the CIA, including a stint for the CIA in Africa, posing as a "news correspondent."

In 1965, under the name "Michael King" (which apparently was his legitimate birth name), Kahane and one Joseph Churba formed a group to mobilize campus support for the Vietnam war, a venture that was part of a CIA operation "working both sides" of the Vietnam war issue, with the CIA funding anti-war groups at the very same time.

In 1968 Kahane shed his "Michael King" persona and evolved into the Meir Kahane we remember today. His colleague Churba (also a rabbi) rose to power as an influential behind-the-scenes asset for Israeli intelligence in U.S. foreign policy-making circles, promoted by the John Birch Society, and funded by the CIA-backed empire of Korean cult leader Sun Myung Moon. (Later in these pages, we will review the murky background of both the John Birch Society and the increasingly influ-

ential “conservative” publishing empire of Sun Myung Moon.)

We also now know, based on the work of the late Jewish-American journalist, Robert I. Friedman, that the JDL was also being directed from the highest levels of Israel’s intelligence agency, the Mossad. So Kahane was literally working for not only different agencies of American intelligence, but Israeli intelligence as well.

But the fine hand of Israeli intelligence has also played a much bigger role in creating Judas Goats and other elements among America’s Enemy Within. In fact, Israeli intelligence has its own unit operating on American soil, conducting illicit surveillance of tens of thousands of American citizens of both the political “left” and the political “right.”

And, ironically, although many people have heard that the FBI, through its COINTELPRO program, and the CIA, through OPERATION CHAOS, were spying on Americans, it is not widely known that this Israeli intelligence unit on American soil was not just conducting its own ventures but was also functioning, in many instances, as a *de facto* arm of both COINTELPRO and OPERATION CHAOS.

This Israeli intelligence division is, of course, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith, to which we referred earlier in these pages. Since 1913, when it was first launched, functioning essentially as a “Jewish Gestapo” aimed at curtailing criticisms of the burgeoning Jewish role in the American underworld crime syndicate, the ADL has been an active player in the American arena.

And then, of course, as we’ve noted, following the establishment of the state of Israel, it became a *de facto* foreign agent for the government of Israel, an arm of Israel’s Mossad.

Former Mossad operative Victor Ostrovsky reported in his book, *The Other Side of Deception*, that when he was writing his earlier book, *By Way of Deception*, he had hesitated in reporting “the direct links the Mossad had with . . . the Anti-Defamation League of the B’nai B’rith . . .” precisely because he feared that Americans might rise up against the ADL (and the American Jewish community which the ADL purports to represent) in outrage at the violent and hateful activities of the Mossad.

The ADL’s method of operation has been ruthless, to say the least, and because it has generally operated in the sphere of officially-authorized U.S. law enforcement and intelligence agencies, the ADL has had a virtual free hand to carry out its mayhem.

The names of people who took public positions on any political issues—including even writing a letter to the editor of a newspaper—were catalogued and reports about their activities were placed on file. Some particularly outspoken persons were dealt “special” treatment: their garbage cans were rifled through; their telephones were tapped;

their homes were broken into and their personal files were photographed or purloined outright.

Targeted over the years by the ADL were not only those whom the liberal media calls “extremists.” Also victimized were a wide variety of organizations representing everyone from African-Americans to Native Americans to Asian-Americans and homosexual advocacy groups.

Most people have heard the ADL described by the media as a “respected civil rights organization.” However, clearly, there is much more to the ADL than the media might suggest.

And while there has been much public furor, over the years, about the FBI and the CIA and their domestic spying and illegal efforts to destroy American political dissidents, the role of the ADL in these same matters has been carefully suppressed.

A case in point: after Attorney General Ashcroft called for reinvigorating the FBI’s domestic spying capabilities, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) rushed out a retrospective “case study” on “the dangers of domestic spying by federal law enforcement.”

The ACLU study focused on the FBI’s now-widely known (but then quite secret) surveillance in the 1960s of the late Martin Luther King, Jr., and described this as “an ignominious chapter in America’s past.” The ACLU report concluded: “As a nation, we must make sure that we monitor the actions of the FBI and Attorney General Ashcroft to ensure that what happened to Dr. King never happens again.”

While the ACLU report did demonstrate the dangers of the FBI being used for politically-motivated domestic surveillance of American citizens, the report failed to mention one particularly interesting item: the fact that much of the “ignominious” FBI surveillance of King and others of both the political “right” and the “left” was actually being carried out on behalf of the FBI by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL).

The fact that the ADL was targeting King surprised both many of King’s admirers and his detractors, particularly since King has often been praised publicly by the ADL, particularly in its publications that are aimed at Black audiences. The first public revelation that the ADL had been spying on King came in the April 28, 1993 issue of *The San Francisco Weekly*—a liberal “alternative” journal—which reported:

During the civil rights movement, when many Jews were taking the lead in fighting against racism, the ADL was spying on Martin Luther King and passing on the information to J. Edgar Hoover, a former ADL employee said.

“It was common and casually accepted knowledge,” said Henry Schwarzschild, who worked in the publications

department of the ADL between 1962 and 1964.

"They thought King was sort of a loose cannon," said Schwarzschild. "He was a Baptist preacher and nobody could be quite sure what he would do next. The ADL was very anxious about having an unguided missile out there."

It turns out, though, that the ADL was also engaged in heavy-duty spying on other Black civil rights leaders, not just King. The 1995 release of previously classified FBI documents relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and the Warren Commission investigation which followed unveiled other ADL intrigue against famed Black comic and political activist Dick Gregory who had, as a sideline, become involved as an independent investigator into the JFK assassination.

There are at least two documents citing ADL actions aimed at Gregory. Document #124-10027-10233 is dated February 2, 1965. It is from the Special Agent in Charge of the Atlanta office of the FBI to FBI Director Hoover. It reads as follows:

Enclosed herewith is a 5 page document received on 2/1/65 from SHERMAN HARRIS, Investigator, Anti-Defamation League, 41 Exchange Place, Atlanta, Georgia. HARRIS stated that the enclosed document reflects results of an interview by an ADL employee in Miami, Florida with Negro comedian DICK GREGORY.

HARRIS did not reveal the name of the ADL employee in Miami who interviewed GREGORY. He stated that the charges made by GREGORY as reflected in the enclosed document are so ridiculous that he is embarrassed that an ADL employee would forward the material to the Atlanta Regional Office.

He stated he was furnishing this material to the Bureau so that the Bureau will be aware of the activities of GREGORY in this regard. He requested that no one outside the Bureau be advised that he had furnished the Bureau this material.

So, on the one hand, while the ADL official, Harris, told the FBI that he was "embarrassed" that one of his associates had even passed the "ridiculous" information on to the ADL's regional office, he was nonetheless still passing it on to the FBI so that it would be aware of Gregory's activities. Note also the fact that the ADL asked that the FBI keep quiet about the fact that the ADL was providing the spy data to the FBI. That,

of course, would have been quite embarrassing to the ADL, which was then—as now—busy masquerading as an ally of Black activists in the civil rights movement.

Why was the ADL keeping tabs on Gregory? It involved much more than the fact that he was an outspoken black figure. The evidence shows that the ADL was also concerned about Gregory's effort to dig out the truth about who really killed President Kennedy—and why.

That Gregory's JFK inquiries were of interest to the ADL is quite revealing. *Why the ADL was monitoring an independent investigation of the JFK assassination is a question that the ADL would prefer never be asked or answered.*

The second declassified FBI document sheds light on how the ADL was reporting back to the FBI on Gregory's JFK assassination inquiries. Document #124-10027-10232 is dated Feb. 5, 1965 and evidently refers to the same ADL surveillance of Gregory referred to in the previously referenced Feb. 2, 1965 document. It is a memorandum from "A. Rosen" to "Mr. Belmont" (two top-level FBI officials in Washington).

The memo describes how on Feb. 1, 1965, the aforementioned ADL investigator in Atlanta, Sherman Harris, furnished information to the FBI that Harris had received from an unidentified ADL employee in Miami who had, in turn, gleaned information from Gregory (described as "the rabble rousing Negro comedian") when the ADL employee spoke with Gregory on January 18, 1965. The FBI summary of the ADL investigator's report to the FBI read in part:

In the letter to Harris, it was reported Gregory stated that the assassination of President Kennedy was masterminded by J. Edgar Hoover and [Texas oilman] H. L. Hunt. Gregory allegedly tried to substantiate these charges by displaying photostatic copies of affidavits and fallacious and misleading press releases and public statements. The ADL employee noted Gregory did not display any concrete facts to support his charges according to employee.

Gregory claimed the Warren Commission had two reports on the assassination and knew of [Hoover's] and Hunt's participation; however, they did not release the true facts as "chaos" would result. Gregory alleged [Hoover] was one of the plotters due to a falling out with the Kennedys and the former Attorney General had been appointed to "watch over him" and slowly "ease him out" of the FBI.

Gregory claimed to have positive proof H. L. Hunt financed the Black Muslims but such proof was "confiden-

tial.” Gregory also alleges the FBI has him under constant surveillance and will someday in the near future put an end to his life. Further, that prior to the assassination President Johnson was aware of the plot but was powerless to stop it because to do so would admit the FBI and the “intelligence hierarchy” controlled the country.

But Dr. King and Dick Gregory were just two—among many—who were targets of the ADL. Even Black nationalist leader Malcolm X was known to have complained to his mentor, Nation of Islam leader Elijah Muhammed, about the ADL’s malicious spying operations.

One of the most precise descriptions of the ADL’s methods appeared in *American Jewish Organizations and Israel*. The author, Lee O’Brien, provided a capsule study of the ADL’s *modus operandi*:

In its early decades, the ADL would approach persons or institutions considered to be anti-Semitic and privately attempt to persuade or reason them into retracting abusive statements and correcting offensive behavior. In later years, ADL has turned to more public and aggressive measures, which it classifies as “Educational,” “Vigilance Work,” and “Legislation.”

In fact, “Vigilance Work” has become outright surveillance of individuals and groups, the results of which are fed into both the Israeli intelligence-gathering apparatus, via their consulates and embassy, and American domestic intelligence, via the FBI. Top ADL officials have admitted the use of clandestine surveillance techniques.

Today the ADL is much more active than other community relations organizations in the use of its regional offices and constituency for information gathering, and dissemination. The central headquarters in New York City provides regional offices with analysis sheets, sample letters to the editor to be placed in local media, biographies of Israeli leaders and anti-Zionist speakers, and directives on how to deal with topical issues.

The regional offices in turn monitor all Israel-related or Middle East-related activities in their areas, such as the media, campus speakers, and films.

By bringing the local events to the attention of the central headquarters, they play a pivotal role in ADL’s overall supervision of the national scene.

O'Brien described one instance which is typical of the ADL's activities in attacking its opponents:

One Jewish activist critical of Israeli policies [said to be famed linguist Noam Chomsky] discovered in 1983 that the ADL maintained a file on him going back to 1970; it included information on the subject gathered from local newspapers, talks on campuses, interoffice memos (from the institution where the subject teaches), business meetings, talk on radio and TV, and press and other miscellaneous materials. As the file revealed, specific individuals had been assigned to monitor this person's lectures, either by tape recordings and verbatim transcriptions, or by detailed summaries of what the subject spoke about, the context of the lecture, other participants, size of audience, questions from the floor, mood of the audience, and so forth.

In some cases, these observers successfully penetrated closed meetings in which the subject participated. Subsequently, the ADL prepared and disseminated a short primer on this person, following the "myth" and "fact" format, and distributed it to their agents for use at future speaking engagements.

It's worth pointing out another little known fact: the ADL has long had a history of financing "anti-Semitic" and "neo-Nazi" hate groups. The earliest documented evidence of such activity was presented in 1955 by veteran populist writer Joseph P. Kamp.

In his newsletter, *Headlines*, Kamp exposed the activities of the ADL's then-top spy, Sanford Griffith, the prime mover behind ADL sponsorship of a "neo-Nazi" organization that received widespread publicity in the media at the time.

In the years preceding and during World War II, Griffith was a leading American asset of British intelligence, working to destroy the grassroots American opposition to U.S. involvement in the war in Europe and then, after the war began, working to undermine those good Americans who still opposed the policies of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Griffith's intrigues have been documented by Professor Thomas Maul in his study of British intelligence intrigue on American soil, *Desperate Deception*. But what Maul doesn't mention—probably for his own good—is that much of Griffith's disruptive activities on behalf of British intelligence were also carried out in conjunction with the ADL.

Following World War II and well into the 1950s and early 1960s,

Griffith operated out of New York City, as a key ADL trouble-maker and informant, keeping close watch on groups considered “subversive” by this powerful Zionist spy network.

Or, as we’ve said, actually helping such groups along for the ADL’s own purposes. In one notable instance, acting under the alias, “Al Scheffer,” the ubiquitous Griffith came to the aid of a one-man political party in New York City and turned it into a “Nazi menace.”

The ADL provided the party not only a headquarters, but also financial backing, Nazi-like uniforms, swastika-bedecked tie pins and other accoutrements. What’s more, the ADL also made sure that the new “Nazi menace” received media attention, timed, of course, to coincide with ADL fund-raising across the country.

In fact, the ADL was so successful in its campaign of deception that it convinced a member of Congress, Rep. Harold Velde (R-III.) to issue a “Preliminary Report on Neo-Fascist and Hate Groups” which specifically cited the ADL-created “Nazi menace” as one of the very hate groups that were a danger to American democracy.

(Velde, of course, didn’t realize that he’d been taken to the cleaners by the ADL until Joe Kamp exposed the ADL’s machinations.)

Needless to say, when members of Congress considered looking into the activities of the hate groups further, the ADL quickly distanced itself from the affair, announcing that the ADL-financed operation was “a pipsqueak organization of little importance or effectiveness.”

Obviously, a full investigation of the party would have exposed the ADL’s activities behind the scenes and that’s the last thing that the ADL wanted. So, facing exposure, the ADL withdrew its backing for the “party” which quickly faded into obscurity.

The facts about the ADL’s hate group racket were actually publicized by a crusading Jewish journalist, Lyle Stuart, in his now-defunct magazine, *Expose*.

As a consequence, the ADL sought to drive Stuart out of business but Stuart counterattacked by suing the ADL. The ADL failed to destroy Stuart who later became a wildly successful maverick book publisher whose firm remains in operation to this day.

Among modern-day American nationalists, the much-admired author and lecturer Eustace Mullins is one of the last to recall Griffith, noting that Griffith spent a great deal of time working to infiltrate the nationalist movement—but by that time Mullins and others had figured out Griffith’s game.

So although Griffith is long gone there are many more Judas Goats—Enemies Within—who continue to carry out his same type of dirty deeds on behalf of the ADL and other spy agencies.

Now, what follow are a handful of capsule descriptions of some more notable instances of the COINTELPRO-style tactics of the FBI and its longtime ally, the Anti-Defamation League. We've also thrown in an intriguing case of one FBI snitch who also did some work for the CIA—and there are more than a few of those type characters operating today. This list is by no means complete, but these are good examples that demonstrate how insidious The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within truly are.

**The ADL-FBI Murder of
Schoolteacher Kathy Ainsworth:
COINTELPRO at its Worst**

Perhaps the most infamous example of FBI-ADL collaboration in a COINTELPRO operation—one which resulted in the murder of an innocent young woman—is the Kathy Ainsworth affair. Lest any reader think that this is some sort of “conspiracy theory” cooked up by “an anti-Semitic hate-monger,” we will allow the story to be told by the distinguished, albeit now-defunct, *Washington Star* newspaper in a story dated February 13, 1970, reprinting an Associated Press report describing a report from the even more distinguished *Los Angeles Times*.

Paper Claims FBI Payoff
In Fatal Trap for Klan

LOS ANGELES (AP) — The FBI and Meridian, Miss., police paid two Ku Klux Klan informants \$36,500 to set a trap for Klan terrorists in which one person was killed and three wounded, the *Los Angeles Times* reported today [February 13, 1970].

Meridian's Jewish community provided funds for the trap at the attempted bombing of a Jewish businessman's home, the *Times* reported. The action came after a series of 17 unsolved bombings and burnings in Jewish and Negro communities in the Jackson and Meridian areas of Mississippi, the paper stated. The FBI and police declined official comment.

The newspaper published a new account of circumstances about the incident, in which Klanswoman Kathy Ainsworth, a 26-year-old schoolteacher, was killed on June 30, 1968, in a gun battle with law officers. “Evidence strongly indicates that the Klansmen who made the bombing

attempt, Thomas Albert Tarrants III, 21 at the time, and his companion, Mrs. Kathy Ainsworth, 26, a schoolteacher, were lured into the bombing attempt by two other Klansmen who were paid a total of \$36,500," the *Times* said. "A former FBI agent who acted as an intermediary was paid \$2,000."

"Policemen who sprang the trap say they expected a gun battle and never thought either Klan member would be taken alive," the *Times* said. "They had expected two men to attempt the bombing and did not know a woman would be involved until 45 minutes before it was carried out."

Gunfire at the home of the businessman, Meyer Davidson, killed Mrs. Ainsworth and wounded a policeman, a bystander and Tarrants, who later was sentenced to 30 years in prison.

The *Times* said A. I. Botnick, director of the Anti-Defamation League regional office in New Orleans, acknowledged helping execute the trap. But in a second interview with him, the *Times* said, Botnick termed his recorded statements of the first interview "incorrect."

The *Times* said it "has documented the arrangements for the trap through police records and statements by some of the police officers involved." The paper reported that Meridian detective L L. Scarbrough helped it uncover the information, but that he later said only the FBI or his police chief should release the information.

The *Times* quoted its sources of information as saying they would deny telling the names of the two Klan informants [the Roberts brothers] if the two informants ever sued for libel because their names were made public.

The two informants received \$36,500 and "demanded and got written assurance that they would be given immunity from prosecution in several cases of church bombings," the *Times* said.

But there was much more to this ugly story. Jack Nelson of *The Los Angeles Times* reported in his shocking exposé that Detective Scarbrough had told him that the ADL's man, Botnick, had also told the informants, the Roberts brothers, that he (Botnick) could raise an additional \$150,000 more from the Jewish community for what he described as more "assistance" if the Roberts brothers would provide testimony linking another KKK leader, Sam Bowers of Tupelo, Mississippi to the so-called terrorist attacks. In other words, Botnick was

essentially asking the Roberts brothers to lie under oath to provide any form of evidence that could be used to send Bowers to jail.

In another instance, Nelson reported that Kenneth Dean, a Mississippi-based civil rights activist, had said that Botnick had also talked of making out a contract to have two Klansmen in a northern state “liquidated,” and promised that he could arrange for this and be assured that there would be no investigation.

One can only imagine the howl of international outrage if it were revealed that someone had arranged to have a Jewish leader such as Botnick “liquidated.” Yet, Botnick was never charged for any of his criminal behavior, although he should have certainly been marched off to be gassed, shot, or hanged, which was conventionally the treatment accorded murderers in the United States.

**GARY THOMAS ROWE:
Another COINTELPRO
“Man in the Klan”**

Although we often hear about “KKK violence” what is not so well known is that during the stormy years of the civil rights struggles of the 1960s, some of the worst perpetrators of violence in the name of the Ku Klux Klan were FBI informers inside the Klan. For a brief overview of one of the most notorious FBI informants in the Klan—Gary Thomas Rowe—let us turn to no less than Howell Raines, famed journalist for *The New York Times*, who reported in the *Times*, on July 17, 1978:

Inquiries Link Informer for FBI
To Major Klan Terrorism in 1960s

Renewed investigations into the activities of Gary Thomas Rowe, Jr., the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s chief paid informer in the Ku Klux Klan, have produced a portrait of Mr. Rowe as a man who “loved violence” and who could be linked to most major incidents of Klan terrorism that occurred in Alabama while he was on the bureau’s payroll.

While receiving FBI money, Mr. Rowe, by his own account, was directly involved in racial violence beginning with the assault on the Freedom Riders in Birmingham, Ala., in 1961 and extending to the shooting of Viola G. Liuzzo, a participant in the Selma-to-Montgomery march in 1965.

Federal pay records introduced in a trial at which Mr. Rowe testified 13 years ago showed that the bureau paid

him over \$12,000 from 1960 to 1965 for undercover activities that are now the subject of a Justice Department inquiry. He has also said that the FBI gave him \$10,000 more to finance his relocation under a new name.

The *New York Times* report went on at some length describing other outrages to which Rowe either admitted directly or was otherwise suspected of having been involved in. But four years after the *Times* report, on October 30, 1982, *The San Diego Tribune* carried an interesting Associated Press report which added further details to the story. The report stated:

Files Show FBI 'Covered'
For Key Klan Informant

The Justice Department has revealed that FBI agents covered up the violent activities of Gary Thomas Rowe Jr., its key informant who infiltrated the Ku Klux Klan in Alabama in the early 1960s. In a report made public late yesterday, department investigators said the agents protected Rowe because "he was simply too valuable to abandon."

Alabama authorities later accused Rowe of murder in the 1965 killing of a civil rights worker [Viola Liuzzo], but a federal appeals court barred him from being brought to trial The report also said . . . "When agents learned that Rowe had taken part in Klan beatings, they apparently never reported him to local authorities or terminated him as an informant."

Rowe himself wrote a book entitled *My Undercover Years with the Ku Klux Klan* and in 2005 the Yale University Press published Professor Gary May's book on the Rowe affair entitled: *The Informant: The FBI, the Ku Klux Klan, and the Murder of Viola Liuzzo*.

JAMES MITCHELL ROSENBERG:
The ADL's Favorite Jewish "Nazi"

One of the most outspoken and outrageous American "right wing extremists" of the late 1970s and early 1980s was a ubiquitous figure once known as "Jimmy Anderson." Garbed in Nazi uniforms and Klan regalia, "Anderson" became a familiar figure in racial hotspots in the New York and New Jersey area, popularly known as an official of the Queens,

New York chapter of the Christian Defense League.

“Anderson” was continually attempting to stir up violence in one form or another and, on one occasion, was calling for the bombing of a New Jersey office of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. On Dec. 7, 1981 Anderson was featured in a television documentary broadcast over WCCO TV in Minneapolis, entitled “Armies of the Right.” And, as per usual, “Anderson” was the most provocative of the “right wing extremists” featured, making violent, racist remarks. Quite a character indeed.

However, the truth is that “Anderson” was really a New York Jewish boy named James Mitchell Rosenberg who had spent some time in Israel as a member of the Israeli Defense Forces and who—upon his return from Israel—went to work as an undercover informant for the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith. Ultimately, of course, his “cover” was exposed and the ADL’s “Nazi” was unmasked.

Although Rosenberg seems to have faded from the scene, so far as anyone knows, he did cut quite a figure “on the right” during his years as an ADL undercover informant.

But the fact remains that there are—to this day—many Americans who recall “Jimmy Anderson” as a “violent neo-Nazi working to stir up racial turmoil in America.” What they don’t know is that he was a Judas Goat—an Enemy Within—working for the ADL.

MORDECHAI LEVY:

Another of the ADL’s Jewish “Nazis”

But don’t think that Jimmy Rosenberg was the only “nice Jewish boy” posing as a “hater” and causing trouble. In 1979 young Mordechai Levy, an ADL informant who was also a member of the terroristic Jewish Defense League (JDL), adopted the moniker “James Guttman” and applied for a permit to organize a “white power” demonstration in front of Independence Hall in Philadelphia that would feature American Nazi and Ku Klux Klan members. Levy announced that he was a “coordinator” for a neo-Nazi organization and made strenuous efforts to invite Philadelphia and New Jersey branches of the Ku Klux Klan to participate. (In the meantime, the aforementioned ADL informant, Jimmy Rosenberg, just happened to be a key ADL operative inside the New Jersey KKK affiliate!)

To make matters all the more interesting, Mordechai Levy’s pals at the JDL were planning a “counter rally” against the “white power” rally organized by their own man Levy. So while the major media in the Philadelphia area and the Anti-Defamation League were raising a hue

and cry about “the rise of Nazism in America,” in news reports about the affair, the whole business was actually the work of two longtime ADL operatives. And to make it even more interesting is the fact that, for years, the ADL had officially and publicly “condemned” the JDL, even as the JDL was effectively functioning as the ADL’s terrorist arm, attacking—even wounding and killing—targets of the ADL’s wrath. But, of course, the ADL was officially “non-violent” and always went to great lengths to denounce the violent activities of its secret operatives.

Labor Snitch Turned CIA Informant: A Cog in the Scheme to “Get” Lyndon LaRouche

Love him or hate him, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. has been one of the most controversial and widely publicized so-called “fringe” political figures in America. The founder of the National Caucus of Labor Committees and a bevy of other organizations and publications that have been widely circulated in American dissident circles, LaRouche, not surprisingly, emerged as a major target of the ADL due to his overt opposition to many of the intrigues of the Israeli lobby in America.

After a concerted campaign by the ADL—in league with the CIA and the FBI and a host of other agencies and individuals—LaRouche ultimately ended up spending time in prison on what many, including former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, believe were trumped-up “corruption” charges.

In any event, as part of his defense, LaRouche and his attorneys, not to mention his hard-working associates, began investigating the “deep cover” nature of the “Get LaRouche” campaign and found that, indeed, there were many undercover informants acting COINTELPRO-style against LaRouche. One instance, in particular, is quite illustrative.

For ten years, it seems, one Ronald Fino, the former president of the Buffalo Laborers Union Local 210, had spied on LaRouche while pretending to support LaRouche’s efforts. It turns out that Fino had been working for years as a government informant on his fellow laborers, ostensibly reporting back organized crime links to the FBI. However, when the CIA needed a man to get close to the LaRouche organization as an informant, they turned to Fino.

Apparently, Fino started out as a government informant going back to the 1960s when as a student at the State University of New York at Buffalo he worked for the CIA spying on the anti-war movement there.

In any case, as LaRouche and his associates have documented time and time again in numerous books and magazine articles, the fine hands of the CIA and the FBI—not to mention the ADL—have played a major

part in the campaign against LaRouche as well as many other political dissidents in America. The Fino case is just one example uncovered by LaRouche.

The FBI's Man Inside the Skinhead Movement

In the late 1980s, one “Rev.” Joe Allen popped up in Southern California and began to ingratiate himself with so-called “white supremacist” and “skinhead” groups that were becoming prominent there. He said he was a minister with the Church of the Creator and was quick to start spreading around cash and favors among young white racist political dissidents. However, one white racist leader, Tom Metzger, of the White Aryan Resistance, was suspicious of Allen from the beginning and spread the word among his compatriots that Allen was one to be watched. Nonetheless, Allen continued his efforts to make himself a prominent force in the white racist movement. According to a report in *The Los Angeles Times*:

Allen rented a three-bedroom Newport Beach apartment just a few paces off the beach. He also settled into office space in a nearby light industrial area, converting it into what he called a “training center,” installing a whirlpool bath, weightlifting equipment and video cameras. Flashing rolls of money and gold jewelry, Allen invited local skinheads to work out for free at his training center, which skinheads say he decorated with Nazi paraphernalia and guns. They say Allen offered hospitality—thick steaks and beer for barbecues—as well as money, including \$500 used to bail out two or three young white supremacists in Canada.

Meanwhile, although many did heed Metzger’s warnings about Allen, more than a few young people were snared in Allen’s insidious web. But Metzger and his associates continued to investigate Allen and—just before they were about to go public and formally blow the whistle and expose Allen—the FBI moved in and moved Allen out, admitting that, yes, in fact, Allen was an informant.

A handful of young men were taken in on trumped-up charges of plotting to incite a race war by attacking a black church and plotting to kill Rodney King, the famed “black motorist” whose beating by police officers had sparked a major national outrage, thanks to the efforts by the “mainstream” media to inflame the black community in Los Angeles, causing riots and all manner of public unrest. Although the young men

were convicted, having been railroaded by Allen's intrigues, the case was clearly another instance of a Judas Goat of the first order causing problems and instigating a so-called "conspiracy" that would have never occurred in the first place had he not been on the scene.

DELMAR DENNIS

The John Birch Society's Beloved Judas Goat in the KKK

Delmar Dennis was a Methodist minister in Meridian, Mississippi in the early 1960s who was hailed as a loyal member of the state Ku Klux Klan. In truth he was an informant for the FBI as part of COINTELPRO, apparently paid some \$15,000 over a period of time for his services. At the same time, Dennis was highly active in the John Birch Society, but there was never any evidence (or suggestion) Dennis was informing on the Birchers as he was on the KKK.

After Dennis was ultimately exposed in 1967 as an FBI "snitch" in the KKK, Dennis nonetheless went on to become a popular speaker on behalf of the John Birch Society which utilized Dennis and his rhetoric to popularize, among some naïve American patriots, the theory that the Ku Klux Klan and its "anti-Semitic" point of view was actually a "communist plot" to stir up racial turmoil in America.

Later, Dr. Edward Fields of *The Thunderbolt* newspaper, based in Marietta, Georgia, wrote of Dennis and his ties to the John Birch Society and its founder, Robert Welch, who had been an enthusiastic supporter of Dennis. Fields wrote:

This, of course, puts the loyalty of Robert Welch in doubt because his organization seems to have been turned into a refuge for former FBI undercover agents. We must also remember that the organization was named after a CIA agent, John Birch, who was killed while trying to get the Chinese communists to work with the Nationalists to form a coalition government. Such governments always end up going communist as we [saw] in Czechoslovakia and Laos.

Some time afterward, a "conservative" writer wrote a laudatory book about Dennis entitled *Klandestine* repeating the claim that the KKK was a Soviet "front." Perhaps not surprisingly, this book was published by a firm with long-standing ties to "former" CIA officer William F. Buckley, Jr., who, as we shall see, played a major role in working to destroy grass-roots nationalist movements in America. Despite Dennis' record as a Judas Goat, he rose in the ranks of the "conservative"

American Party and in 1984 and 1988 was its presidential candidate! It is thus no surprise the American Party is long gone from the scene.

BILL WILKINSON

Klan Leader Exposed as FBI Informant

As early as 1974, young David Duke, then a rising star in the white racist movement in America, spotted one of his lieutenants, Bill Wilkinson, as being “trouble.” In fact, precisely as Duke suspected, for the final eight months of his membership in Duke’s Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, Wilkinson was acting as a paid informant for the FBI.

And although Duke warned people Wilkinson was not to be trusted, Wilkinson went on to found his own Invisible Empire of the Ku Klux Klan after splitting with Duke. And for eight years that followed, Wilkinson managed to dupe many innocent folks in the “Empire” who had no idea that Wilkinson was actually working for the FBI.

Young Duke was attempting to “reform” the KKK movement, so to speak, and “clean up its image” and to counter the media stereotype that KKK members were violent haters. However, once Wilkinson was ensconced as leader of his own (FBI-sponsored) Klan group, Wilkinson worked assiduously to build up a public profile as a KKK leader spouting angry rhetoric and hinting of violence through such slogans as “Guns, Guts and Bullets,” thereby stirring up increased racial tension.

Wilkinson’s antics thus assisted fundraising efforts by the ADL which pointed to Wilkinson as a growing “threat,” when, in fact, he was under the thumb of the ADL’s allies at the FBI.

Writing in *The Thunderbolt*, Dr. Edward Fields described one thing about Wilkinson’s FBI-sponsored Klan which demonstrates precisely how Wilkinson was also working on behalf of the ADL:

Another interesting item is that the FBI urges all of its informers to do their best to protect Jews by urging patriots not to criticize them. When Bill Wilkinson sought to hire the professional right-wing writer Bill Grimstad, he first insisted that Grimstad promise to stay off the Jewish issue.

Grimstad refused and said in that case he didn’t want the job as editor of Wilkinson’s paper. At the same time, Wilkinson has time and again urged guest speakers at his rallies not to criticize Jews.

So although the FBI tolerated anti-Black rhetoric, anti-Jewish rhetoric was “off limits.” In any event, in 1981 Wilkinson’s role as an FBI

informer while “leading” his own KKK was publicly revealed, effectively ending Wilkinson’s career in the “right wing,” but the revelations finally convinced many that there were indeed Judas Goats within the ranks of American dissident groups, a bitter pill for many to swallow, but a warning that many still seem to have failed to properly heed.

Thus, as we have seen—in just these few brief examples—there is a very real and very sordid history of infiltration and disruption of American dissident groups by agents of governments, both foreign and domestic, not to mention the unseemly and frequent alliance between our own FBI and the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), which is, obviously, an agent of a foreign government: Israel.

In any event, in light of the similar role that both the FBI and the ADL (together and individually) have played in infiltrating and disrupting dissident groups, the formal link-up between the FBI and the ADL is particularly disconcerting, since much of the growing emphasis on “combatting terrorism” may lead to a new wave of FBI-ADL orchestrated acts of provocation designed to create public demand for a crack-down on freedom of speech and assembly.

In fact, according to Edward S. Herman of the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Pennsylvania, writing in his book: *The “Terrorism” Industry: The Experts and Institutions That Shape Our View of Terror*: “In the United States, the FBI has long engaged in *agents provocateurs* actions, urging violence on penetrated dissident organizations and carrying out direct acts of violence, then attributed to the individuals and organizations under attack.”

While this may come as a shock to the average American, it is a fact not subject to debate. And in the pages of this volume, we will learn much more about the subversive activity by Judas Goats who have led many American lambs to the slaughter.

In the meantime, in the chapter which follows, we will take a brief—but critical—digression and explore the strange history of the so-called “Trust,” a bizarre Soviet model for not only monitoring its opposition, but also for the actual purpose of creating a phony opposition.

To understand how The Judas Goats have operated on American soil, it is appropriate to see how a similar phenomenon took place in early 20th century history. And, in the end, the Soviet “trust” model, as we shall see, is very much being utilized by the enemies of legitimate American nationalism today.

Chapter Two:

“Controlled Opposition”

The Soviet “Trust” Model for Infiltration and Manipulation —Even the Actual Creation—of Opposing Forces: Utilized Today in America by The Enemy Within

The early 20th century so-called "Trust" model utilized by the Soviet Union to infiltrate and destroy its enemies is the foundation for the very techniques often used both by American intelligence agencies—along with Israel's clandestine service, Mossad and its conduits such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith—to infiltrate and destroy (or otherwise control the activities of) domestic dissident movements deemed hostile to the interests of Zionism and Globalism.

Those who fail to understand this age-old tactic will never be able to fathom the extent to which the American political system has been manipulated by these alien forces.

Although—even today—there are persons and organizations active within the so-called “nationalist” and “revisionist” and “patriotic” movements in America, who seem to “say the right things,” the truth is that many of those in question are actually witting—sometimes unwitting—agents of discord, being used for the purposes of intelligence gathering, propaganda and disinformation, all designed to establish further influence upon the American system for the purpose of consolidating the power of The Enemy Within.

Let us examine the Soviet “Trust” and how it operated. This little-known counterintelligence operation known as "the Trust" was established by the Cheka, the predecessor to the Soviet KGB, as a means through which to set up and control a "phony opposition" in order to flush out genuine opponents of the Bolshevik regime which, as historians know, was under the control of non-Russians—mostly Jews.

When reading the following materials relating to the workings of the "Trust," simply substitute the word "Israeli" for the word "Soviet" and the word "Mossad" for the names "Cheka" and "KGB" and you will understand how the "Trust" technique has been applied by the Mossad, in manipulating groups that “seem” to be opposing Israeli interests. (Likewise, a similar formula can be used substituting the terms “CIA” or “FBI” as it may be appropriate.)

A brief description of the operation of "The Trust" appears in *Chekisty: A History of the KGB* by John J. Dziak:

Where no genuine internal opposition organization exists [a security service might] invent one—both to infiltrate the more dangerous . . . organizations abroad in order to blunt or channel their actions, and to surface real or

potential internal dissidents. If an internal opposition already exists, it will be infiltrated in an attempt to control it, to provoke opponents into exposing themselves, and to cause the movement to serve state interests.

A more comprehensive account of "The Trust" appears in *Dirty Tricks or Trump Cards: U.S. Covert Action and Counterintelligence*, by Georgetown University Professor Roy Godson who is known for his close ties to the Israeli lobby in Washington:

Sometimes, if circumstances allow and the practitioners are skillful, counterintelligence can target its deception not only at the internal and emigre opposition but also at the intelligence services and governments of foreign adversaries. The Soviet Trust was such an operation.

The Trust was created in the early 1920s and completely controlled by the Soviet secret service, the Cheka. Believing they were operating in league with an active and effective anti-Bolshevik movement, opponents of the regime within the USSR and in exile were lured by the Trust into exposing themselves and became targets of Soviet state security.

Using that information and controlling communications between Western intelligence agencies, the Russian emigre community, and Russian dissidents inside the country, the Cheka expertly neutralized anti-Communist opposition at home and abroad.

The Trust was also able to use its contacts with Western intelligence services to pass along misleading and false information on the internal state of the Soviet regime to those same services' foreign ministries and governments. Essentially, the West was being told by its intelligence "assets" within the Soviet Union that support for the Bolshevik regime was weakening, and that the Soviet leaders were at heart nationalists who, if left in peace by the West, would gradually turn a state dedicated to revolution at home and abroad into one that would behave in a more traditional and predictable fashion . . .

The organization's actual name was the Moscow Municipal Credit Association—thus, the Trust. It posed as a financial institution operating within the liberal economic environment of Lenin's New Economic Policy. The bogus

group's clandestine name was the Monarchist Association of Central Russia. One ironic aspect of the Trust operation was that British and French intelligence services were paying the Russian emigres for the disinformation being supplied them by the Cheka through the Trust. Allegedly, at one point, money paid to these sources by the West was used to cover the expenses of the deception operation itself. In short, the West was paying to be deceived . . .

Given the fact that several generations of young KGB officers were shown that Trust operations were successful, it is not surprising that such operations were continued from the 1920s to the 1980s.

The "Trust" model for infiltration has been applied by the Mossad and its allies in the CIA and the FBI in this country to other dissident movements targeted for infiltration and take-over. Intelligence units such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) are often part of the operation.

Careful study of recent ADL and SPLC bulletins will frequently (but not always) reveal precisely which "dissident" groups and leaders are being utilized (and promoted) to collect names and assemble dossiers on perceived or potential threats. The ADL and SPLC give a big "build-up" to their own controlled agents so as to give them "credibility." In other words, the average person will assume that because the ADL and SPLC happen to be attacking an individual or organization, that is somehow "proof" that the individual or organization is legitimate, as evidenced by the ADL or SPLC attacks. Those who affiliate themselves with such "trust" operations do so at their own risk.

In the pages of *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within* we will learn much more about the actions of Soviet-style "Trust" intrigues on American soil. We will name those who lead phony opposition groups. We will demonstrate that there has been a concerted effort to control—or destroy—genuine grass-roots American political opposition that threatens the power of Zionism and its (often-uneasy) allies in the global corporate elite. We will meet some of the more infamous media shills who use their influence to defame those who stand in the way of the internationalist agenda. We will survey the way in which traditional American political movements have been infiltrated and taken over, subverted in their otherwise pro-American agenda.

None of this is going to be a pleasant story as it unfolds, but *it is a story that must be told if Americans are going to reclaim their nation and their heritage . . .*

Chapter Three:

J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI and The Enemy Within

Ruby Ridge, Waco, Oklahoma City, the raid on the Indianapolis Baptist Temple under the direction of Attorney General John Ashcroft in the opening days of the Bush administration, and then the events of Sept. 11 all combined to cause many patriots who had been longtime admirers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to ask whether the FBI really is “on our side.”

The truth is that for more than half a century, the FBI, in many respects, has been working, behind the scenes, against the interests of American patriots. The amazing thing is that it took so long for many American patriots to begin to realize that the FBI has—more often than not—been on what might be loosely be termed “the wrong side” and has effectively functioned as a domestic police state apparatus doing the bidding of the plutocratic powers-that-be.

Notably, one former high-ranking FBI official, Ted Gunderson, has added his own voice to the cacophony of critics who have raised serious questions about the propriety of the FBI’s modus operandi.

With all of this in mind, it is appropriate to recall a thought-provoking editorial first published in the May 1959 issue of a long-defunct newsletter, *Right*, that even then—almost half a century ago—reflected on ominous signs the FBI was not necessarily all it was cracked up to be. The editorial was written by Willis Carto, who was associated with *Right* some years before he founded Liberty Lobby, the Washington-based populist Institution that published *The Spotlight* and which was, itself, crucified and destroyed by a federal judge who was a former high-ranking Justice Department official (more about which later in these pages). About the *Right* editorial, Carto said, in reflection in 2006, “I wouldn’t change a line.” Here is what Carto wrote in 1959.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Many forward-thinking nationalists have wondered with apprehension what might become of the FBI should its present director, J. Edgar Hoover, retire.

It has long been recognized by intelligent people that the FBI is potentially very dangerous. Mr. Hoover himself has shown an acute awareness of this. The fact that it is totally subservient to the President and to the Attorney General makes it so in the nature of things, for both these men are, in turn, subservient to the ruthless pressure groups which elect politicians.

We must thank our lucky stars that Hoover has shown

an unusual degree of public responsibility, and that he has fought off most attempts to use the FBI as a political weapon. The fact that he has been unable to fight off all such attempts should make every conscientious American soberly ponder what the future holds, however.

The history of Europe is abundant with examples of the way governments use secret police. The now-non-existent Gestapo of the Nazis and the very-much alive KGB (once called OGPU) of the Soviet Union are two examples of the way that callous men use force to snuff out liberty, using methods so brutal and vile that it takes a strong stomach to even read about them.

It must be admitted by all honest men that the FBI gives signs of drifting into the greatly-feared category of a State secret police without even the departure of Mr. Hoover. The gratuitous laudations he gave to the subversive Anti-Defamation League and the Communist front NAACP in his highly-touted book, *Masters of Deceit*, gave one warning of this process. Then, the shameful conduct of the FBI in the despicable attempt in Atlanta to frame and murder five innocent patriots, as a warning to all who might be too frank about the forces behind American-style communism, is a black mark which cannot be soon forgotten.

Now, however, that an honest jury has acquitted one of the lads involved, and the others appear to have been freed, the FBI seems to have suddenly lost all interest in the identity of the real bombers. Could this be because its own paid agent—L. E. Rogers—is the real criminal?

The purpose of this editorial is not to bemoan the saddening loss of status of the FBI so much as it is to warn patriots and “conservatives” that we have unwittingly allowed the FBI to grow into a dangerous Frankenstein which—in hands far worse than those of Mr. Hoover—could be—and unquestionably will be—used to enforce the totalitarian dictatorship that is now in the final stages of preparation by the invisible world conspiracy.

Nationalists must begin to shed their awe of the once-respected FBI. And they should begin to wonder what is in store for the country and the Constitution after Mr. Hoover retires and the President appoints a successor. For the successor almost certainly will be far worse.

[End of *Right's* editorial]

In fact, as we have seen, the ADL-FBI nexus went as far back as the years prior to World War II. And at this juncture it seems appropriate to raise a disturbing question. Did the ADL blackmail former FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover? Stories about organized crime having a hold over Hoover have been bandied about in the national press, but the central role of the ADL in the Hoover blackmail caper was carefully ignored.

Noted author Anthony Summers created a media sensation when he alleged in a new book and on the PBS series "Frontline" that organized crime boss Meyer Lansky blackmailed FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover with supposed photos of Hoover engaged in homosexual activity. Although such rumors about Hoover had been commonplace for years, no well-known author had affixed his own name to the charge.

Citing numerous sources—some suspect and virtually all of them unsavory—Summers has claimed that not only Lansky, but also several others had access to similar photos (which Summers is apparently unable to produce). Summers reports that none other than former CIA counterintelligence chief, James Jesus Angleton also had control of the Hoover photos.

That both Lansky and Angleton were in possession of such evidence is quite interesting for one particular reason:

Lansky was a long-time devotee of Israel and a financial angel of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, an illegally unregistered foreign agent for Israel. In his later years Lansky even settled in Israel.

Angleton, who, while in charge of covert activities at the CIA, had been directly involved with the Lansky crime syndicate through the CIA's dealings with Lansky's drug-smuggling allies in the Corsican and Sicilian Mafias, was also Israel's patron at the CIA. Angleton, who headed the Israeli desk at the CIA, was the individual at the CIA who was closest to Israel, so much so that he was often accused by critics of being a "co-opted agent of Israel."

In fact, Angleton is so revered in Israel that upon his death several monuments were established in Israel in his memory—the only known such public memorials to any American intelligence officer anywhere in the world. (He truly was a devoted friend of Israel.)

The relevance of this is quite provocative when one considers the strange relationship between J. Edgar Hoover and the ADL—a relationship which has been the subject of controversy among anti-communists for many years. Hoover's coziness with the ADL became apparent when the aforementioned book entitled *Masters of Deceit*, a critique of communism, written by a Hoover ghost-writer, and published under Hoover's name, appeared.

In *Masters of Deceit*, Hoover's ghost-writer wrote, "Some of the

most effective opposition to communism in the United States has come from Jewish organizations such as B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish League against Communism, the Anti-Defamation League, and a host of other Jewish groups."

This, for obvious reasons, created a stir among Hoover's many anti-communist admirers who knew full well that the ADL, in particular, was rife with long-time communists, socialists and Communist Party-liners. Hoover himself, whatever his failings, was not stupid and certainly no communist, by any means.

When Hoover's book was released, singling out the ADL for praise, many patriots recalled that Dr. Bella Dodd (now deceased) had told associates that during her days in the Communist Party USA that when the party was short of funds or needed direction, the leaders of the ADL, ensconced in a luxurious suite at the Waldorf-Astoria, could always be relied upon for assistance. In short, the ADL, in league with the Soviet Kremlin, was propping up the American Communist movement.

(One volume, written by Robert Williams, a former army intelligence officer entitled, *The Anti-Defamation League and Its Use in the World Communist Offensive*, explained—in detail—the ADL's communist and leftist antics.)

Hoover's own connections to the Lansky Crime Syndicate and its allies in the ADL had been the subject of rumors for many years, well before Anthony Summers came along, since it was the ADL that was largely responsible for the establishment of the J. Edgar Hoover Foundation in 1947. The Hoover Foundation's first president was none other than Rabbi Paul Richman, Washington director of the ADL.

Hoover's long-time associate, Louis B. Nichols, the FBI's Assistant Director in charge of the Records and Communications Division of the Bureau, was the FBI's key contact with the ADL when the ADL helped orchestrate mass sedition trials against key critics of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's foreign policy.

Nichols went on to serve as president of the J. Edgar Hoover Foundation, but only after he left the FBI. Upon retirement from the bureau he signed on as Executive Vice President of Schenley Industries, a major liquor firm run by ex-bootlegger and Lansky associate Lewis R. Rosenstiel, about whom we will learn more later in this volume.

In any case, the origins of the ADL are quite interesting. The organization's initial impetus came not so much from a desire to defend members of the Jewish faith, generally, but rather Jewish mobsters. In the early part of the 20th Century New York City Police Commissioner Thomas Bingham had begun an intensive investigation of organized crime in his city. By 1908 Bingham was under fire and accused of being

“anti-Semitic” for pointing out the role of certain Jewish gangsters in organized crime.

Ultimately, Bingham was forced out of office and organized crime took hold in New York City. One of the immediate beneficiaries of Bingham’s departure was none other than mobster Arnold Rothstein, Lansky’s mentor and the undisputed Jewish underworld leader prior to the younger Lansky’s rise to power.

The source of the attacks on Bingham was a public relations committee formed by a corporate attorney named Sigmund Livingston. By 1913 Livingston’s committee had formally incorporated as the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith.

So it was that Hoover was himself a beneficiary of ADL largesse—a large portion of which came from the coffers of Lansky and his criminal syndicate. Hoover was also apparently a victim of its unsavory blackmail tactics, evidently through its financial angel, Meyer Lansky, and his organized crime associates.

That author Anthony Summers would choose to ignore any role by the ADL in such a monstrous conspiracy is no surprise. In his own memoirs, Gary Wean, a former intelligence officer for the Los Angeles District Attorney’s office, has revealed that Summers chose not to publish information that Wean provided him when Summers was writing a book, later published, on the life and death of actress Marilyn Monroe.

What Wean told Summers was this: it was none other than Mickey Cohen, Lansky’s West Coast henchman, who had arranged for Miss Monroe to be introduced to John F. Kennedy. Cohen hoped to obtain information about the then-President elect’s intentions regarding Israel.

Cohen had been close to the Israelis for many years, having run guns to the Jewish underground in Palestine, maintaining an intimate relationship with terrorist-turned-diplomat, Menachem Begin (later Israeli prime minister).

Wean charged that Miss Monroe was murdered on Cohen’s orders to prevent her from revealing the truth about how the Israelis were attempting to manipulate her relationship with President Kennedy. Miss Monroe, apparently, rebelled against Cohen and refused to play his spy game. In any case, Summers chose not to use this information and instead laid the death of Miss Monroe at the hands of President Kennedy and his brother Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

Clearly, Summers had no desire to upset the Israelis or their adherents at the ADL. As a consequence if Summers had any knowledge of the ADL blackmailing Hoover, it is not likely he would have mentioned it for fear of becoming an ADL victim himself.

The bottom line is this: the incestuous relationship between the

FBI and the ADL is a prime example of how The Enemy Within has achieved a special status in American intelligence and law enforcement, manipulating federal agencies (and private spy organizations) to advance its own agenda.

Although, to this day, there are undoubtedly good, solid patriotic elements inside the FBI (and the Justice Department of which it is the investigative arm)—as evidenced by recent (2005-2006) criminal indictments of a variety of hard-line pro-Israel elements—the historical record shows, sadly, that the FBI, on the whole, has been manipulated and used to a great degree by The Enemy Within.

In our next chapter we shall review the sordid career of one man—largely forgotten today—who perhaps exemplifies, from a historic standpoint, one of the worst of The Judas Goats.

Chapter Four:

John Roy Carlson— The Grand Old Man of the Enemies Within: The First Notorious Judas Goat of the 20th Century

In the years preceding World War II—and for several years that followed—one man received national fame for his role as the first widely publicized undercover informant inside the American nationalist movement. His name—or least the pseudonym he was known by—was John Roy Carlson. Virtually every public library in America today has—or did have—a copy of the famous (many would say, infamous) World War II-era best-seller, *Under Cover*, purportedly authored by Carlson. The book can still be found quite readily in many second-hand bookstores.

The book's subtitle gives one the flavor of the book: "My Four Years in the Nazi Underworld of America—The Amazing Revelation of How Axis Agents and Our Enemies Within Are Now Plotting to Destroy the United States."

Although *Under Cover* is, frankly, a thoroughly entertaining volume, rife with fascinating real-life characters portrayed in colorful prose, the fact is that most modern-day readers (unless they happen upon this present volume) will unfortunately never know that the author and the book were thoroughly repudiated in a libel trial in federal court in Chicago, three years after the book was published.

Here's some background information that provides an answer to the question: Whatever happened to John Roy Carlson?

First of all, the author's real name was not "John Roy Carlson." That was just one of numerous aliases adopted over the years by one Arthur (Avedis) Derounian. Born in Greece in 1909, Derounian came to the New York at age 12, and entered into a career in journalism. Many critics said Derounian was of Jewish extraction, although he denied it.

In the years prior to American entry into World War II, during the war itself, and thereafter, Derounian became active in some 30 different political organizations, using names ranging from "George Pagnanelli" to "Robert Thompson, Jr." to "Patricia O'Connell," among others.

Although based primarily in New York City, Derounian maintained active nationwide correspondence with leaders of what might loosely be termed "the America First movement" which was fighting to prevent President Franklin Roosevelt from bringing the United States into the war in Europe.

Derounian also traveled extensively across the country, making personal acquaintance with many of the same individuals, introducing himself as a sympathizer with their cause, often using letters of introduction (obtained from others whom he had previously ingratiated himself with) to make their acquaintance.

In addition, under the name “George Pagnanelli,” Derounian published a crude anti-Jewish hate sheet he titled *The Christian Defender* which he distributed throughout New York City and mailed to people nationwide.

During this time, however, Derounian was not the lone, brave investigative journalist that he portrayed himself in *Under Cover*. In fact, he was not only on the payroll of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith—a group in the forefront of the pro-war movement backing the Roosevelt administration—but he also had the financial backing of an ADL “mirror” group, the self-styled “Friends of Democracy,” run by one Leon Birkhead.

In 1943, well after the United States had finally entered the war, the prominent New York publishing house, E. P. Dutton, released Derounian’s book, which created a national sensation. The book was heavily promoted by columnist and radio broadcaster Walter Winchell, who himself was known to be a propaganda conduit for the ADL, and it soon sold more than 600,000 copies.

Credulous patriotic Americans, fearful of Axis spies under every bed, believed that Derounian (still known as “Carlson”) had uncovered a major nationwide network of Nazi agents and American sympathizers of the Nazi cause, ranging from street agitators to respectable housewives to members of Congress. Derounian’s book named names (and lots of them) and recited, practically verbatim, alleged conversations between “Pagnanelli” and dozens of purported Nazi agents and others.

Many of those named in the book were outraged, claiming that they had been maliciously libeled, but most declined to take any action, perhaps believing that to bring a lawsuit against Derounian and his publisher would only draw attention to the claims that were being made.

However, the book very much helped set the stage for the infamous “Great Sedition Trial” held in Washington, D.C. in 1944, having laid the propaganda groundwork for the Roosevelt administration’s charges of sedition that were handed down against some 30 Americans alleged to have collaborated with the war-time enemy.

The widespread circulation of the book gave a certain credibility (however undeserved) to the Justice Department’s case which, in the end, suffered an ignominious defeat. (For a full account of the affair, see a later chapter in this volume). So no matter how unreliable the book was in the first place, coupled with the trumped-up nature of the sedition charges, the damage had been done.

In 1946, puffed up with the success of the first book, Dutton released yet another “Carlson” concoction, *The Plotters*, which was, effectively, a sequel to Derounian’s previous venture, featuring many of

the same villains and some new ones, too.

This book told Derounian's tales of posing as a returning Army veteran, "Robert Thompson, Jr." who became, like "Pagnanelli," a joiner of a variety of political organizations, most of which were hostile to the policies of the Roosevelt administration and, later, those of President Truman. Derounian also wrote of pretending, during wartime, to be the wife and/or mother of an American soldier-at-war, and corresponding with "mother's" groups, investigating their activities.

All in all, *The Plotters* was an equally malicious reprise of the same kind of smears and guilt-by-association that appeared in *Under Cover*, although "Carlson" felt the need, this time, to say a few uncomplimentary things about left-wing groups that were agitating among veterans in a lame effort to prove that he was not strictly biased against "conservative" or "right wing" causes and that he was not a communist sympathizer as many of his critics contended.

However, by the time *The Plotters* was released, Derounian and his publishers found themselves caught up in court as a result of *Under Cover*. In the first instance, one Conrad Chapman of Massachusetts objected to Derounian's accusations that he was some sort of Nazi agent and brought suit. Dutton and Derounian settled out of court and issued a retraction of the charges made in *Under Cover*.

In the second instance, in which Derounian came under fire for his misdeeds, George Washington Robnett, the executive secretary of the Chicago-based Church League of America, filed suit against Derounian and his publisher in federal court in Chicago.

The first jury in the Robnett case failed to reach a verdict. Then, the second jury was ultimately dismissed because members of that jury had received possibly prejudicial material mailed to them.

Finally, the third jury reached a judgment in Robnett's favor and against Derounian and his publisher on September 25, 1946. Unfortunately for Robnett, the jury awarded him only a symbolic \$1 judgment, but it was a moral victory nonetheless.

Members of the jury subsequently told the press that there had been great debate within the jury about how much to award Robnett, with 10 of the 12 jurors inclined to levy heavy damages against Derounian. But because two jurors held out and refused to find against Derounian, the majority agreed to compromise in order to resolve the matter, and levy only a \$1 judgment in order to bring in the guilty verdict that they believed so strongly was warranted.

One jury member, Mrs. Beatrice Fountain, told *The Chicago Daily Tribune* on September 27: "I thought Robnett was entitled to at least \$50,000. The publishing company was unquestionably guilty of a gross

libel. I wanted this jury to return a verdict which would put an end forever to smear campaigns; to put an end to such a contagion as this book anywhere in America from now on.”

Although Robnett asked for a new trial in hopes of winning a bigger judgment, federal Judge John P. Barnes refused to order a new trial but made it clear that if it had been up to him, that he would have awarded Robnett “a very substantial sum.” The judge minced no words in summarizing what he had discovered during the course of Robnett’s presentation of his case against Derounian and his publisher:

This book charges the plaintiff was disloyal, anti-Semitic, and a Nazi agent. During the entire course of the trial I never heard any evidence to sustain any of these charges. I think this book was written by a wholly irresponsible person who would write anything for a dollar. I think the book was published by a publisher who would do anything for a dollar.

I don’t believe any investigation of this author was made by the publishers, to the extent they say there was, because they cared for the dollar more than they did for the almighty truth. I wouldn’t believe this author if he was under oath, and I think he and the publisher are as guilty as anyone who ever was found guilty in this court before.

During the trial itself, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on September 24 that Derounian admitted on the stand that he was, in the *Tribune’s* words, “employed by the Anti-Defamation League in New York,” at the very time he was circulating his anti-Jewish hate-sheet, *The Christian Defender*, ostensibly published by “George Pagnanelli.”

Although Derounian’s attorneys tried to prevent copies of the hate sheet from being introduced as evidence, the judge over-ruled the defense and commented, “These papers reveal this author was working both sides of the street. They look like anti-Semitic literature to me,” and added, pointedly, that “Each one of these things is infinitely worse than anything you called to my attention in Robnett’s writings.”

Judge Barnes also took issue with Derounian’s claim that he was justified in calling Robnett “anti-Semitic” because Robnett had pointed out the Jewish heritage of certain communists. The judge said:

In our efforts to refrain from persecution, we must not establish meaningless taboos. We must not establish the taboo that under no condition must we mention a person is

a Jew. That will not stop persecution. If persons are Jews and are Communists they will have to carry that burden and it will not benefit them or their religion to set up a taboo against mentioning that fact.

All of this, however, has become a forgotten part of history, although Derounian's smear books remain on the library shelves, being accessed by unknowing researchers who, sadly, will probably never know of this powerful judgment against Derounian and his publisher.

In addition, there's a great irony in that despite the judgment, Derounian's secret sponsors, at the ADL, largely escaped notice. In 1995 respected American historian Richard Gid Powers, in his book, *Not Without Honor: The History of American Anticommunism* (New York: Free Press) pulled no punches when he noted that "*Under Cover* and *The Plotters* were probably written (or at least edited) by ADL ghosts."

Despite Derounian's run-ins with libel laws, yet another publisher was willing to publish and be damned. In 1951 Alfred Knopf released Derounian's third and last book *Cairo to Damascus*. This book is largely forgotten and hardly known to even those who are familiar with his earlier propaganda efforts. Written in the same vein as "Carlson's" previous works, this volume focused on Derounian's ventures in the Middle East during the period surrounding the establishment of Israel. Needless to say, "Carlson" managed to find a host of Nazi war criminals, anti-Jewish agitators and others working hand-in-glove with the Arab natives of Palestine to prevent the establishment of a Zionist state. The book never reached any substantial audience and the few copies that remain are hardly more than curious relics.

Derounian himself faded from public view, although his brother, Stephen, became a liberal Republican congressman from New York, serving from 1953 to 1967.

On April 23, 1991 Derounian dropped dead at age 82, while doing research at the American Jewish Committee's headquarters in Manhattan. On Oct. 28, 1999 New York's *Daily News* (owned by Zionist tycoon Mort Zuckerman) published a puff piece remembering "The Joiner: John Roy Carlson" as part of its series: "Big Town Biography: Lives and Times of the Century's Classic New Yorkers," but carefully avoided mentioning Derounian's repudiation in the federal courts.

Derounian's ugly record, however, has easily been eclipsed by a host of other Enemies Within and in the pages that follow, we will meet more than a few of them. But remembering the duplicity of "John Roy Carlson" is a perfect introduction to the murky world of the Judas Goats.

Chapter Five:

The Great Sedition Trial of 1944: Early Collaboration Between the ADL and the FBI— How The Enemy Within Accuses Patriots of Being “Traitors”

In our post-9/11 modern era, when repressive legislation such as the misnamed “PATRIOT” Act rules the land—a direct result of legislative manipulation of Congress by groups such as the Anti-Defamation League and others who constitute key factions among The Enemy Within—it is important to remember one instance in the mid-20th century when law-abiding Americans—whose only crime was to speak out in opposition to the war policies of the administration of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt—were railroaded into jail and charged and tried on trumped-up sedition charges.

The story of the “Great Sedition Trial of 1944” is one that provides an important case study of how our republican form of government can be misused (that is, abused) by The Enemy Within. The story of the trial is clear-cut proof of the collaboration by the ADL and the FBI in carrying out an alien agenda, that of The Enemy Within. The following essay, written by the author of this volume, originally appeared in the November-December 1999 issue of *The Barnes Review*, the bimonthly historical journal published in Washington . . .

“Judges and lawyers alike will tell you the mass sedition trial of World War II will go down in legal history as one of the blackest marks on the record of American jurisprudence. In the legal world, none can recall a case where so many Americans were brought to trial for political persecution and were so arrogantly denied the rights granted an American citizen under the Constitution.”

This is how *The Chicago Tribune*, then a voice for America First in a media world brimming with New Deal-style internationalism, described the infamous war-time “show trial” and its aftermath, finally put to an end on June 30, 1947.

At that time, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia upheld the dismissal of the charges against the defendants in the trial that had been handed down on November 22, 1946 by Judge Bolitha Laws of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

Having declared that to allow the case to continue would be “a travesty on justice,” Judge Laws ordered the charges against the American citizens dismissed, ending some five long years of harassment and, for many of them, lengthy periods of imprisonment.

Although “The Great Sedition Trial” had formally come to an unexpected halt (nearly three years previously) on November 30, 1944, fol-

lowing a mistrial upon the death of the presiding judge, Edward C. Eicher, the case had continued to hang in limbo with Justice Department prosecutors angling for a retrial.

However, the aptly-named Judge Laws had called a halt to this Soviet-style attack on American liberty. Sanity prevailed—perhaps largely because FDR was now dead and the war had ended—and the case was shelved forever.

According to historian Harry Elmer Barnes, who was one of FDR’s leading critics from the academic arena, the trial’s purpose was to make the Roosevelt administration “seem opposed to fascism” when, in fact, the administration was pursuing totalitarian policies.

Apparently, President Roosevelt himself was the individual largely responsible for promoting the Justice Department investigation that led to the ultimate indictments.

According to historian Ronald Radosh, a self-styled “progressive” who has written somewhat sympathetically of the pre-World War II critics of the Roosevelt administration, “FDR had prodded Attorney General Francis Biddle for months, asking him when he would indict the seditionists.” Biddle himself later pointed out that FDR “was not much interested . . . in the constitutional right to criticize the government in wartime.” However, as we shall see, there were powerful forces at work behind the scenes prodding FDR. And they, more so than even FDR, played a major role in facilitating the actual investigation that Attorney General Biddle himself was not so enthusiastic to undertake.

Although there was a grand total of 42 people (and one newspaper) indicted—over the course of three separate indictments, beginning with the first indictment which was handed down on July 21, 1942, the final number of those who actually went on trial was thirty (and several among them were severed from the trial during its proceedings).

Roosevelt’s biographer, James McGregor Burns, waggishly called the trial “a grand rally of all the fanatic Roosevelt haters.” But there’s much more to the story than that.

In fact, there were a handful of influential figures among those indicted, including:

- Noted German-American poet, essayist and social critic, George Sylvester Viereck (a well-known foreign publicist for the German government as far back as World War I);
- Former American diplomat and economist Lawrence Dennis, an informal behind-the-scenes advisor to some of the more prominent congressional critics of the Roosevelt administration;
- Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling of Chicago, an outspoken and highly articulate author and lecturer who was well-regarded and widely-known

nationally as a leader of the anti-communist movement and a fierce opponent of the administration;

- Rev. Gerald Winrod of Kansas. With a national following and wide-ranging connections among Christian ministers and lay leaders throughout the country, Winrod had emerged as a force to be reckoned with. In 1938 he had run a strong race for the U.S. Senate. (One of Winrod's proteges, by the way, was none other than evangelist Billy Graham, who is said to have "learned much but kept quiet publicly about what he learned privately" as a young man traveling with Winrod.); and

- William Griffin, a New York-based publisher with strong connections in the Catholic Church. Many American Catholics were strongly anti-communist and Irish Catholics, in particular, were generally skeptical of FDR's war policies at a time when, it will be remembered, the free Irish Republic had remained neutral and refused to ally with the United States in the war against Germany.

However, most of those who finally went to trial were little known, and hardly influential on a national level, with the exceptions of those noted above. Among the defendants was a sign painter who was eighty percent deaf, a Detroit factory worker, a waiter and a woman who was doing housecleaning for a living when she was taken into custody.

In short, they were "average" Americans without the means or the opportunity to conduct the kind of seditious and internationally-connected conspiracy that the government had charged. In many cases, the defendants were, for all intents and purposes, penniless. Many of them were "one-man" publishers, reaching small audiences—hardly a threat to the powerful forces that controlled the New Deal. Several were quite elderly. Indeed, few of the indictees actually knew each other to begin with, despite the fact the indictments charged them with being part of a grand conspiracy orchestrated by Adolf Hitler himself to undermine the morale of the American military during wartime.

Lawrence Dennis commented later that: "One of the most significant features of the trial was the utter insignificance of the defendants in relation to the great importance which the government sought to give to the trial by all sorts of publicity seeking devices."

Unfortunately, in this brief study of the tangled circumstances surrounding the great sedition trial, we will be unable to provide all of the defendants the recognition they deserve. But let it be said here that by virtue of having been targeted for destruction by the Roosevelt administration and its behind-the-scenes allies, this handful of "insignificant" Americans are all heroes in their own right. Thanks to their more articulate compatriots—most notably Lawrence Dennis—we are able to review and commemorate the details of their plight today.

In the judgment of Dennis, it was the design of the sedition trial to target not the big-name critics of the Roosevelt war policies, but instead to use the publicity surrounding the sedition trial to frighten the vast numbers of (potential) grass-roots critics of the administration into silence, essentially showing them that, they too, could end up in the dock if they were to dare to speak out (as the defendants had) in opposition to the administration. According to Dennis:

The crack-pots, so-called, or the agitators, are never intimidated by sedition trials. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church.

The people who are intimidated by sedition trials are the people who have not enough courage or enough indiscretion ever to say or do anything that would get them involved in a sedition trial. And it is mainly for the purpose of intimidating these more prudent citizens that sedition trials are held . . .

A government seeking to suppress certain dangerous ideas and tendencies and certain types of feared opposition will not, if its leaders are smart, indict men like Colonel [Charles] Lindbergh or Senators [Burton] Wheeler [D-Mont.], [Robert] Taft [R-Ohio] and Gerald Nye [R-N.D.], who did far more along the line of helping the Nazis by opposing Roosevelt's foreign policy as charged against the defendants than any of the defendants.

The chances of conviction would be nil and the cry of persecution would resound throughout the land.

It is the weak, obscure and indiscreet who are singled out by an astute politician for a legalized witch hunt. The political purpose of intimidating the more cautious and respectable is best served in this country by picking for a trick indictment and a propaganda mass trial the most vulnerable rather than the most dangerous critics; the poorest rather than the richest; the least popular rather than the most popular; the least rather than the most important and influential.

This is the smart way to get at the more influential and the more dangerous. The latter see what is done to the less influential and less important and they govern themselves accordingly. The chances of convicting the weaker are better than of convicting the stronger . . ."

One of the defendants—one of the “weaker, less influential and less important,” one of those “insignificant” Americans targeted by FDR—was Elmer J. Garner of Wichita, Kansas. This aged American patriot actually died three weeks after the trial began. Senator William Langer (R-N.D.), an angry critic of the trial, described Garner in a speech on the floor of the Senate. Garner, he said, was:

A little old gentleman of eighty-three, almost stone deaf, with three great grandchildren. After he lost the mailing permit for his little weekly paper, he lived with his aged wife through small donations, keeping a goat and a few chickens and raising vegetables on his small home plot.

Held in the [Washington, D.C.] jail for several weeks for lack of bond fees, and finally impoverished by three indictments and forced trips and stays in Washington, he died alone in a Washington rooming house early in this trial with forty cents in his pocket.

His body was shipped naked in a wooden box to his ailing, impoverished widow, his two suits and typewriter being held, so that clothing had to be purchased for his funeral. That is one of the dangerous men about whom we have been hearing so much.

According to attorney Henry Klein, an American Jew—who defied the ADL by boldly serving as defense counsel for another of the defendants—Garner (who was a first cousin of FDR’s first vice president, John Nance Garner) actually died at his typewriter in a tiny hallway bedroom in a Washington, D.C. flophouse, typing out his own defense.

Who was it, then, who actually orchestrated the series of events that led to the indictment of old Garner and his fellow “seditionists”?

It was, of course, Franklin D. Roosevelt who ordered the Justice Department investigation. Attorney General Francis Biddle (who actually opposed this blatantly political prosecution) followed the president’s orders. And Assistant Attorney General William Power Maloney handled the day-to-day details of the investigation that won the indictments before a federal grand jury in Washington. But behind the scenes there were other forces at work. These were the power-brokers who, in fact, dictated the overall grand design of the Roosevelt administration and its foreign and domestic policies.

In *A Trial on Trial*, his sharply-written critique of the trial—a veritable dissection of the fraud that the trial represented—Lawrence Dennis and his co-author, Maximilian St. George (who was Dennis’ coun-

sel during the trial, although Dennis—not an attorney—ably represented himself), concluded—based upon very readily available evidence in the public record—that the three prime movers behind the trial were—in his words—extreme leftists, organized Jewish groups, and internationalists in general, all of whom were loud and persistent advocates of the trial, editorializing in favor of the investigation and indictments in their newspapers and through media voices such as radio personality Walter Winchell.

However, Dennis pointed out, “the internationalists behind the trial are not as easy to link with definite agitation for this prosecution as are the leftists and the Jewish groups.” In fact, Dennis stated unequivocally: “One of the most important Jewish organizations behind the sedition trial was the B’nai B’rith [referring, specifically, to the B’nai B’rith adjunct known as the Anti-Defamation League or ADL].”

According to Dennis: “Getting the federal government to stage such a trial, like getting America into the war, was a ‘must’ on the agenda of the fighters against isolationism and anti-Semitism.”

Essentially, according to Dennis, “What the people behind the trial wanted to have judicially certified to the world was that anti-Semitism is a Nazi idea and that anyone holding this idea is a Nazi who is thereby violating the law—in this instance, by causing insubordination in the armed forces—through his belief in or advocacy of this idea.”

This was not just Dennis’s conclusion by any means. One of the other defendants, David Baxter, later pointed out that even a United Press report published in 1943 said that: “Under pressure from Jewish organizations, to judge from articles appearing in publications put out by Jews for Jews, the [indictment] . . . was drawn to include criticisms of Jews as ‘sedition.’

“It appeared that a main purpose of the whole procedure, along with outlawing unfavorable comments on the administration, was to set a legal precedent of judicial interpretations and severe penalties which would serve to exempt Jews in America from all public mention except praise, in contrast to the traditional American viewpoint which holds that all who take part in public affairs must be ready to accept full free public discussion, either pro or con.”

“In a word,” commented Dennis, “the sedition trial as politics was smart. It was good politics,” in order to win the votes and the institutional support of the hard-core of those groups behind the trial.

Baxter himself determined in later years that, in fact, Jewish groups—most specifically the ADL—had actually been prime mover behind the Justice Department investigation that resulted in the ultimate indictments of the defendants in the sedition trial.

According to Baxter, commenting many years later:

I demanded, through the Freedom of Information Act, that the FBI turn over to me its investigation records of my activities during the early 1940s leading up to the Sedition Trial. I learned that the investigation had extended over several years and covered hundreds of pages . . .

The FBI blocked out the names of those who had given information about me, much of it as false as anything could be. I was never given a chance to face these people and make them prove their accusations. Yet everything they said went into the investigation records.

Oddly enough, in a great many cases, it wasn't the FBI that conducted the investigation, but the Anti-Defamation League, with the FBI merely receiving the reports of the ADL investigators. One can hardly tell from the reports whether a given person was an FBI or an ADL agent. But at the time all this was so hush-hush that I didn't even suspect the web-spinning going on around me. I hadn't considered myself that important.

For his own part, commenting on the way that the FBI had been used by the ADL, for example, Lawrence Dennis pointed out: "The FBI, like the atomic bomb and so many other useful and dangerous tools, is an instrument around the use of which new safeguards against abuse by unscrupulous interests must soon be created." Writing in his 1999 book, *Montana's Lost Cause*, a study of Sen. Burton Wheeler and other members of Montana's congressional delegation who opposed the Roosevelt administration's war in Europe, Roger Roots points out another cog in the behind-the-scenes maneuvering that led to the sedition trial:

The Jewish-owned *Washington Post* assisted in the detective work of the Justice Department from the beginning. Dillard Stokes, the [*Post*] columnist who was most conspicuous in his insider reporting of the sedition grand jury proceedings, actually became part of the Justice Department's case against the isolationists when he wrote requests to numerous of the defendants to send their literature to him under an assumed name. It was this that allowed defendants to be brought from the farthest reaches of the country into the jurisdiction of the federal district court in Washington, D.C.

David Baxter elaborated on the role played by the *Post* columnist Stokes, who used the pseudonym "Jefferson Breem" in order to obtain some of the allegedly seditious literature that had been published by some of the defendants:

In order to try us in Washington as a group, it was necessary to establish that a crime had been committed in the District of Columbia, thus giving jurisdiction to the federal courts there. So the grand jury, which was obviously controlled by the prosecutor, charged us with the crime of sedition, and then established District of Columbia jurisdiction to try us on the grounds that a District of Columbia resident, "Jefferson Breem," had received the allegedly seditious literature. Thus was the alleged "crime" committed in the capital. The defendants were charged with having conspired in the District, despite the fact that I had never been in Washington in my life until ordered there by the grand jury.

Kirkpatrick Dilling, then a young man in uniform and the son of one of the more prominent defendants, Elizabeth Dilling, pointed out in a letter to Willis Carto, publisher of the bimonthly historical journal, *The Barnes Review*, that: "My mother was indicted with many others, most of whom she had never had any contact with whatsoever. For example, some of such co-indictees were members of the German-American Bund. My mother said they were included to give the case a 'Sauerkraut Flavor.'" (In other words, to add fuel to the prosecution's theory that the defendants were actively collaborating with "Nazis.")

Later, during the trial itself, the aforementioned Senator Langer scored what he described as: "the idea of bringing together for one trial in Washington thirty people who never saw each other, who never wrote to each other, some of whom did not know that the others existed, with some of them allegedly insane, and the majority of them unable to hire a lawyer.

"And remember," Langer pointed out, the defendants "were brought to Washington from California and Chicago and other states a long way from Washington, placed in one room and all tried at the same time, with the twenty-nine sitting idly by while the testimony against one of them may go on for weeks and weeks and weeks, the testimony of a man or woman other defendants never saw before in their lives. That is what is taking place in Washington today," he said.

As mentioned previously, there were actually three indictments handed down. The first indictment came on July 21, 1942. The indict-

ments came as a surprise to more than a few people, including the defendants. As David Baxter pointed out, "Actually, at that time I was simply a New Deal Democrat interested in what was going on in the country politically." But now, as a consequence of the indictment, he was being accused of sedition by the regime he had once supported.

Elizabeth Dilling learned of her indictment on the radio. The nature of one of the charges against Mrs. Dilling exposes precisely how trumped up the sedition trial was from the start. The indictment charged that Mrs. Dilling had committed "sedition" by reprinting, in the pages of her newsletter, a speech in Congress by Rep. Clare Hoffman (R-Mich.), an administration critic, in which the congressman quoted an American soldier in the Philippines who complained his outfit lacked bombers because the planes had been given to Britain. This ostensibly was dangerous to military morale. But Mrs. Dilling's many supporters around the country rose to her defense, raising money through dances, dinners and bake sales. Mrs. Dilling, ever courageous, would not let even a federal criminal indictment silence her. She still continued to speak out.

On August 17, 1942 Senator Robert A. Taft spoke out against the indictment. "I am deeply alarmed," he said, "by the growing tendency to smear loyal citizens who are critical of the national administration and of the conduct of the war . . . Something very close to fanaticism exists in certain circles," said Taft. "I cannot understand it—cannot grasp it. But I am sure of this: Freedom of speech itself is at stake, unless the general methods pursued by the Department of Justice are changed."

Taft pointed out that the indictment, in his words, was "adroitly drawn" and that it claimed that groups such as the Coalition of Patriotic Societies were linked to the accused conspirators. The coalition, Taft noted, included among its member organizations such groups as The Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, the General Society of Mayflower Descendants, and the Sons of the American Revolution, among others.

On the basis of the way in which the indictment was drawn up, Taft said, a considerable number of members of both the House and the Senate could also be indicted, along with many of the nation's newspaper editors who were critical of FDR's war policies.

The second indictment came on January 4, 1943. Lawrence Dennis summarized the nature of the indictments: "The first indictment charged conspiracy to violate the seditious propaganda sections of both the wartime Espionage Act of 1917 and the peacetime Smith Act of 1940, sometimes called the Alien Registration Act. This indictment . . . was that the defendants had conspired to spread Nazi propaganda for the purpose of violating the just-mentioned laws. The government case consist-

ed of showing the similarity between the propaganda themes of the Nazis and the defendants."

However, as Dennis pointed out, for a conviction on such an indictment to stand under the law, it is necessary to prove similarity of intent of the persons accused rather than similarity of content of what they said. Dennis noted:

The weaknesses of these first two indictments were that they fitted neither the law nor the evidence. The government's difficulty was that, to please the people behind the trial, it had had to indict persons whose only crime was isolationism, anti-Semitism and anti-communism when there was no law on the statute books against these isms. The two laws chosen for the first two indictments penalized advocacy of the overthrow of the government by force and of insubordination in the armed forces.

Several new defendants were added with the second indictment. Among them was Frank Clark. Considering the charge that Clark (and the others) had been conspiring to undermine the morale of the American military, it is worth noting that Clark was "a highly decorated veteran of World War I, who was wounded eight times in action. Returning home a hero, Clark had been an organizer of the famous Bonus March of World War I veterans to Washington in the 1920s. He had lobbied for early payment of bonuses that had been promised to the war's veterans. When this war hero was arrested for 'sedition,' he lacked enough money to hire a lawyer."

All of this, however, meant nothing in the course of the ongoing effort by the Roosevelt administration to silence its critics and to prevent more Americans from speaking out.

Throughout this period, the major media was rife with reports of how a group of Americans, in league with Hitler and the Nazis, were trying to destroy America from within and how the Roosevelt administration was bravely taking on this conspiracy.

However, the Justice Department had made a misstep and the second indictment, like the first, was thrown out. Roger Roots noted, "The indictment was unlawful. It was discarded due to the obvious absence of evidence for conviction, among other flaws. Past Supreme Court decisions clearly showed that a conviction for advocating the overthrow of the government by violent force must include some evidence of actual plans to use violence, not just political literature. Again, the indictment was never dismissed formally but simply retired."

Senator Burton Wheeler, in particular, was a harsh critic of the Justice Department and publicly made clear his intention, as new head of the Senate Judiciary Committee following the 1942 elections, to keep a close watch on the affair as it unfolded. As far as the legal procedures used in the first two indictments, he declared: "If it happened in most jurisdictions of this country, the prosecuting attorneys would be held for contempt of court."

Thus, despite all the determined efforts of the Justice Department and its allies in the Anti-Defamation League and at *The Washington Post*, the first two indictments were indeed thrown out as defective.

On March 5, 1943 Judge Jesse C. Adkins dismissed the count in the indictment that accused the defendants of conspiring together "on or about the first day of January 1933, and continuously thereafter up to and including the date of the filing" of the indictment since, as the judge held, the law which the defendants were accused of conspiring to violate had not been enacted until 1940. At this juncture, under pressure from Senator Wheeler, Attorney General Biddle agreed to remove prosecutor William Power Maloney as the chief "nazi hunter."

Thus, a new Justice Department prosecutor entered into the case, O. John Rogge. As defendant David Baxter pointed out, Rogge was a fitting choice for the administration's chief point man in this politically-driven Soviet-style show trial:

It later turned out that Rogge had been a good friend of Soviet dictator Josef Stalin, was involved in numerous Communist front groups, and had visited Russia where he spoke in the Kremlin and laid a wreath at the grave of American Communist Party co-founder John Reed in Red Square. His wreath was inscribed: "In loving memory from grateful Americans" . . . Rogge was an American delegate to a world Communist "peace conference" in Paris and was a lawyer for many Communists in trouble with the law.

He was the attorney for David Greenglass, the atomic spy who saved his own life by turning state's evidence against his sister and brother-in-law, Ethel and Julius Rosenberg [who] went to the electric chair for turning over U.S. atomic secrets to the Soviets. [Rogge] was thus eventually exposed for what he was. No wonder he was so fanatical in his hatred against the Sedition Trial defendants, all of whom were anti-Communists.

Rogge was an ideal choice, for the Roosevelt administration and its

allies were determined to pursue the prosecution, one way or the other. He moved forward relentlessly. As Roger Roots points out: "Not wishing to waste momentum, the government re-convened another grand jury, re-submitted the same pamphlets, publications, and materials that the previous grand jury had already seen, re-called the same (recorded) testimony of the witnesses, and once again pleaded the grand jury to return yet another indictment"

The third and final indictment was handed down on January 3, 1944. In fact, Rogge and his Justice Department allies had decided to take a new tack and added eight new names (including Lawrence Dennis) and dismissed twelve defendants who had been named.

Among those whose names were dismissed were: influential New York Catholic lay leader William Griffin and his newspaper, *The New York Evening Enquirer* (the only publication officially indicted); former American diplomat Ralph Townsend of Washington, D.C. and Paquita (Mady) deShishmareff, the well-to-do and articulate American-born widow of a former Russian Czarist military figure, later best known as the author (under the name "L. Fry") of *Waters Flowing Eastward*, a history of the infamous *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*.

Townsend, who had enraged the Roosevelt administration by opposing its anti-Japanese policies in the Pacific, had written an explosive book, *Ways That Are Dark*, highly critical of imperial China. But although he was now "free," he and his family had been broken financially by the indictment and, according to his wife, Janet, many of their close friends deserted them in this time of crisis.

"It was a very difficult period in our lives," she later recalled, "but it didn't prevent Ralph from continuing to speak out." Indeed, Townsend did continue to speak out, and in later years he became a friend of Liberty Lobby's founder, Willis A. Carto.

Tony Blizzard, who was research director for Liberty Lobby in Washington, was a protegee—in the 1960's—of Paquita deShishmareff and he commented on the circumstances surrounding the decision to drop the indictment against her, along with some fascinating details about this remarkable woman. In Blizzard's estimation:

One of the reasons they dropped the indictment against Mady was precisely because they knew they were dealing with a very sharp lady with a great deal of brain power. A woman of the old school, Mady would never put herself in the forefront, but she knew how to use the strengths of the men around her. She also was a woman of some means—unlike most of the other defendants—and

was a formidable opponent.

The government clearly decided that it was in their best interests to dismiss the case against her. There was no way they could ever make “Nazis” out of all of these defendant—whose only real “crime” was exposing Jewish power—as long as Mady was on the dock with the rest of them. The prosecutors knew quite well (although it was not widely known then nor is it widely known today) that it was Mady who had supplied Henry Ford virtually all of the information that Ford had published in his controversial series about Jewish power in *The Dearborn Independent*.

With her wide-ranging high-level connections, Mady was an encyclopedic storehouse of inside information about the power elite. The last thing the prosecution wanted was for Mady to take the stand. By releasing her as a defendant, they eliminated what (to them) what was a very frightening possibility.

But there were 30 others who were not so lucky as Paquita DeShishmareff: those who were on trial facing prison for their purported “sedition.” Their trial commenced on April 17, 1944 in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

Kirkpatrick Dilling, son of defendant Elizabeth Dilling, captured the essence of the indictment. According to Dilling, “The indictment was premised on an alleged ‘conspiracy to undermine the morale of the armed forces.’ Thus criticizing President Roosevelt, who was armed forces commander in chief, was an alleged overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy. Denouncing our ally, Communist Soviet Russia, was a further alleged overt act. Opposing Communism was an alleged overt act because our enemy Hitler had also opposed Communists.”

Ironically, while his mother was on trial, facing prison, for her alleged participation in this “conspiracy to undermine the morale of the armed forces,” Kirkpatrick Dilling was promoted from corporal to second lieutenant in the U.S. Army.

Other defendants, including George Sylvester Viereck, George Deatherage, Robert Noble and Reverend Gerald Winrod, also had sons in the U.S. Armed Forces during this period. And Viereck’s son, in fact, died in combat while his father was on trial and in prison.

Presiding as judge at the trial was ex-Iowa Democratic Congressman Edward C. Eicher, a New Deal stalwart who had served a brief period as chairman of FDR’s Securities and Exchange Commission after being defeated for re-election to Congress. After Eicher’s term at

the SEC, FDR then appointed Eicher to the judgeship. And serving as prosecutor was Eicher's former legal counsel at the SEC, the aforementioned O. John Rogge.

It seemed that, in many ways, the case was "fixed" from top to bottom. Rumor even had it that Judge Eicher was promised a Supreme Court appointment if he were to be able to ensure a conviction.

Albert Dilling, the attorney who represented his wife Elizabeth Dilling, called for a congressional investigation of the trial on the grounds that it was impossible for such a trial to be fair during wartime. But the trial was under way.

Although proving "sedition" was the ostensible purpose of the prosecution, Lawrence Dennis reached other conclusions about the actual political basis for the trial: "The trial," he said, "was conceived and staged as a political instrument of propaganda and intimidation against certain ideas and tendencies which are popularly spoken of as isolationism, anti-communism and anti-Semitism. The biggest single idea of the trial was that of linking Nazism with isolationism, anti-Semitism and anti-communism." However, as Dennis (correctly) pointed out:

- "American isolationism was born with George Washington's Farewell Address, not with anything the Nazis ever penned.

- "As for anti-Semitism, it has flourished since the dawn of Jewish history. It is as old and widespread as the Jews . . .

- "As for anti-communism, while it was one of Hitler's two or three biggest ideas, it is in no way peculiar to Hitler or the Nazis, any more than anti-capitalism is peculiar to the Russian communists."

To add shock value to the indictment, the government—in an accompanying bill of particulars that was basically a rehash of the history of the Nazi Party in Germany—actually named German leader Adolf Hitler as a "co-conspirator" with the defendants.

During the trial itself, the prosecutor, Rogge, actually charged that Hitler himself had picked the defendants to head a Nazi occupation government in the United States once Germany won the war in Europe!

What the prosecutor was essentially trying to do, according to Lawrence Dennis, was "to perfect a formula to convict people for doing what was against no law. It boiled down to choosing a crime which the Department of Justice would undertake to prove equaled anti-Semitism, anti-communism and isolationism. The crime chosen was causing insubordination in the armed forces. The law was the Smith Act [which had been enacted in 1940]."

In fact, as Dennis pointed out, "one of the many ironies of the mass sedition trial was that the defendants were charged with conspiring to violate a law aimed at the communists and a communist tactic—that of

trying to undermine the loyalty of the armed forces. What makes this so ironical is the fact that many of the defendants, being fanatical anti-communists, had openly supported the enactment of this law." All of this was no small irony to defendant David Baxter, who later recalled:

After Hitler and Stalin concluded a treaty, American Communists enthusiastically endorsed those of us who opposed getting into the European war between Germany and the British-French alliance. The Communists even stomached the Jewish issue that some of us raised and many Jewish Communists, who wanted the United States to join the war against Hitler, left their party. All that changed overnight, however, when war broke out between Germany and Russia. The Communists then turned against us with a vengeance and eagerly backed FDR and American participation in the war to save the Soviets.

Lawrence Dennis' assessment of the government's case is reminiscent of that of Kirkpatrick Dilling. Dennis wrote:

"The pattern of the prosecution gradually emerged something like this: Our country is at war; Russia is our ally; the Russian government is Communist; these defendants fight Communism; they're therefore weakening the ties between the two countries; this is interfering with the war efforts; this in turn is injuring the morale of the armed forces; the indictees should therefore be sent to prison."

Attorney Henry H. Klein represented defendant Eugene Sanctuary and he took issue with the very Constitutionality of the trial. "This alleged indictment," thundered Klein in his opening address to the jury, "is under the peacetime statute, not under the wartime act, and the writings and speeches of these defendants were made when this nation was at peace, and under a Constitution which guarantees free press and free speech at all times including during wartime, until the Constitution is suspended, and it has not yet been suspended. These people believed in the guarantees set forth in the Constitution and they criticized various acts of the administration."

About his own client, Klein noted: "He is seventy-three years old and devoutly religious. He and his wife ran the Presbyterian foreign mission office in New York City for many years, and he has written and published several hundred sacred and patriotic songs." One of those songs, was "Uncle Sam We Are Standing By You" and was published in June of 1942, well after the war had begun—hardly the action of the seditionist the prosecution and its supporters in the press painted Sanctuary to be.

As far as Lawrence Dennis's purported sedition was concerned, "the prosecution had attempted to prove its case exclusively by placing in evidence seven excerpts from his public writings, reprinted in the publication of the German-American Bund rather than as originally published." In other words, the "evidence" that Dennis had committed sedition was that he had written something (published and freely available to the public) that was later reprinted by a group sympathetic to Nazi Germany—not that Dennis himself had actively done anything to stir dissent within the American armed forces. According to Dennis:

The government's prosecution theory said, in effect: "We postulate a world conspiracy, the members of which all conspired to Nazify the entire world by using the unlawful means of undermining the loyalty of the armed forces. We ask the jury to infer the existence of such a conspiracy from such evidence as we shall submit about the Nazis. We shall then ask the jury to infer that the defendants joined this conspiracy from the nature of the things they said and did. We do not need to show that the defendants ever did or said anything that directly constituted the crime of impairing the morale or loyalty of the armed forces. Our thesis is that Nazism was a world movement which by definition was also a conspiracy to undermine the loyalty of the armed forces and that the defendants were members of the Nazi world movement."

In fact, said Dennis, "There was no more reason to bring out—in a charge of conspiracy to cause military insubordination—the facts that most of the defendants were anti-Semites, isolationists or anti-communists than there would have been in a trial of a group of New York City contractors on a charge of conspiring to defraud the city to bring out the facts that the defendants were all Irish or Jews and had always voted the Democratic ticket."

Eugene Sanctuary's attorney, Henry Klein, pulled no punches when he laid out the defense, declaring:

We will prove that this persecution and prosecution was undertaken to cover the crimes of government—remember that.

We will prove that [this persecution and prosecution] was undertaken by order of the president, in spite of the opposition of Attorney General Biddle.

We will prove that Mr. Rogge was selected for this job of punishing these defendants because no one else in the Department of Justice felt that he could find sufficient grounds to spell out a crime against these defendants.

We will prove that the Communists control not only our government but our politics, our labor organizations, our agriculture, our mines, our industries, our war plants and our armed encampments.

We will prove that the law under which these defendants are being tried was enacted at the repeated demands of the heads of our armed forces to prevent Communists from destroying the morale of our soldiers, sailors, marine and air forces [and that this prosecution] was undertaken to protect Communists who were and are guilty of the very crimes charged against these defendants who are utterly innocent and have been made the victims of this law.

And although Klein himself, as noted previously, was Jewish, he minced no words when he told the jury that Jewish organizations were using the trial for their own ends.

We will prove that this persecution was instigated by so-called professional Jews who make a business of preying on other Jews by scaring them into the belief that their lives and their property are in danger through threatened pogroms in the United States [and that] anti-Semitism charged in this so-called indictment, is a racket, that is being run by racketeers for graft purposes.

Klein also forcefully made the allegation that FBI agents themselves had been acting as *agents provocateurs*, attempting to stir up acts of sedition. He said:

We will show that the most vicious written attack on Jews and on the Roosevelt administration emanated from the office of the FBI by one of its agents, and that the purpose of this attack was to provoke others to do likewise. We will show that this agent also drilled his underlings in New York with broomsticks preparatory to "killing Jews."

Klein also put forth a rather interesting allegation about the source of certain funds purportedly supplied by Nazi Germany to no less than

Franklin D. Roosevelt himself. According to Klein: "We will show that large sums of Hitler money helped finance Mr. Roosevelt's campaign for re-election in 1936 and that right at this moment, British, American and German capital and industry are cooperating together in South America and other parts of the world."

(In fact, what Klein alleged about international collaboration of high-finance capitalism has been part of the lore of both the populist right and the populist left for over a century and has been analyzed in scores of books, monographs and other literature, but largely ignored in the so-called academic mainstream.)

According to Lawrence Reilly's account of the sedition trial, Klein's speech was a critical turning point in the defense: "Klein did much in his brief speech to torpedo Rogge's case by bringing to light the hidden agencies responsible for its existence."

However, noted Reilly, even many of the daily newspapers that opposed the trial editorially were afraid to discuss this hidden aspect of the case that Klein had dared bring forth in open court. Reilly said that readers were often left "confused" because the papers never touched on the real factors involved. Some of these friendly papers, Reilly noted, insisted on referring to the defendants as crackpots.

But the fact is that, as a direct consequence of his offensive against the ADL and the other Jewish groups that had played a part in orchestrating the trial, Klein was targeted, specifically because he was Jewish, by organized Jewish groups that resented Klein's defense of the purported "anti-Semites" and "seditionists."

For his own part, Lawrence Dennis stood up in court to take on his own defense and delivered what even liberal writer Charles Higham was forced to acknowledge was "a high-powered address" calling Rogge's outline of the government case "corny, false, fantastic, untrue, unprovable and unsound [describing the trial as] a Roosevelt administration fourth-term conspiracy [and] another Dreyfus case [in which the government was] trying to write history in the heat of battle." To the loud applause of his fellow defendants, Dennis declared: "Pearl Harbor did not suspend the Bill of Rights."

A critical juncture in the case came when one of the defense attorneys, James Laughlin (a public defender representing Ernest Elmhurst) said in open court that it would be impossible for the trial to continue unless the private files of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith could be impounded and introduced as evidence.

It was clear that much of the prosecution was based on the ADL's "fact finding" and Laughlin concluded that it would be necessary to determine precisely what the ADL had provided the government if the

defendants were to be able to put on an effective defense.

The judge seemed prepared to ignore Laughlin's motion, but the attorney had already prepared copies of his motion in advance and distributed copies of the motion to the press. As a direct consequence, Washington newspapers reported that the ADL files had been made an issue in the case. As Reilly summarized the situation: "Laughlin had placed the spotlight upon the big secret of the case." This, according to Reilly, was "a bomb which some have said had more to do with demoralizing [the prosecution's] case than any other single [thing]."

At that point, there seemed to be a strange turnabout in the way that the press supporting the trial began looking at the case. Even *The Washington Post* (which had played a part in orchestrating the trial by lending the services of its reporter, Dillard Stokes, to the joint ADL-FBI investigation) "completely reversed itself," according to Reilly, "and started demanding that the case be brought to a quick conclusion."

In short, *The Post* wanted to keep "the big secret" of the case—behind-the-scenes orchestration of the case by the ADL—under wraps and now seemed to be calling to bring the trial to a rapid conclusion before the truth came out. *The Post* even commented editorially (and quite correctly, it might be added) that "We fear that whatever may be the outcome of this trial it will stand as a black mark against American justice for many years to come." However, as former defendant David Baxter later remarked, "Such were the remarkable words of the very paper whose own reporter had plotted with the original prosecutor to entrap the defendants and bring them to trial in Washington."

Despite these concerns, the prosecutor, Rogge, seemed to intensify his efforts. There was clearly a great deal of behind-the-scenes maneuvering by the prosecutor and his backers as to how to deal with the challenge that had been presented. But since the judge, of course, never ordered the ADL's files impounded, Rogge was free to move forward. He was determined to carry the trial to conclusion, and he had many more witnesses to present. Roger Roots described the course of events:

Day after day, the trial wore on. Page after page of publications authored by the defendants was introduced into evidence, giving rise to all in attendance to the idea that it was their writings which were really on trial.

The government announced that it intended to introduce 32,000 exhibits. It became obvious that what the defendants were really being prosecuted for was 'Jew-baiting' which gave an indication of one principal source of the prosecution's support. It became one of the longest and

most expensive trials in U.S. history. In essence, the trial was little more than an assault against free speech.

As the trial proceeded, outspoken trial critic Sen. William Langer himself visited defendants in jail and defied the media and its allies in the prosecution by publicly escorting defendant Elizabeth Dilling in and out of court and around Washington while she was out on bail.

According to Roots: "The government worked with unlimited funds, unlimited personnel, and unlimited access to intelligence information. The defense had to work with mostly court appointed lawyers who were unacquainted with the defendants and the arguments of the case." What is particularly interesting, as pointed out by liberal historian Glenn Jeansonne, is that:

"Many of the defense attorneys were liberals unsympathetic with the clients' beliefs. But they came to see the defendants' side on a human basis, and instead of conducting a perfunctory defense, as many observers had expected, they put up a vigorous defense."

Even Zionist sympathizer, popular writer Charles Higham, who, writing retrospectively, was an enthusiastic advocate of the trial, pointed out that "after two and a half months, neither defendants nor prosecution had managed to present a satisfactory case" and, ultimately, "both press and public were beginning to lose interest in the case."

At the same time, according to former defendant Paquita deShishmareff's confidant, Tony Blizzard, the defendants had managed to survive and develop their own way of dealing with their predicament: "Their physical lives were made almost impossible. They got little to eat and were hamstrung in every way possible. But when they got into court, it was such a farce they just really just enjoyed themselves."

At one point when the prosecutor was solemnly reading off a list of names of individuals—allies of the Roosevelt administration who had been attacked in some way by the defendants—defendant Edward James Smythe shouted out "And Eleanor Roosevelt!" resulting in laughter from the courtroom. Smythe didn't want Mrs. Roosevelt's name to go unrecorded in the pantheon of villainy.

This, by the way, was only one of many amusing events that took place during this circus. In many respects, the sedition trial could be the basis for a genuine Hollywood slapstick comedy, the serious nature of this reprehensible scandal notwithstanding. But this is not to suggest that the sedition trial was all a lot of merriment for the attorneys and the defendants. Far from it. Two of the attorneys were shot at while driving. One of those attorneys lost a twelve year law association. Another was beaten by five Jewish thugs and was hospitalized for five days.

The aforementioned attorney, Henry Klein, was harassed relentlessly, held in contempt of court for his audacious defense of his client, and, then, ultimately, driven from the case altogether (although the contempt of court charges were eventually overturned on appeal.) In addition, strenuous efforts were made to keep the defendants from holding jobs during the course of the trial, a particular problem for those who were not of independent means (and that included most of them).

One defendant, Ernest Elmhurst, even got a job as a headwaiter in a Washington hotel in order to make ends meet during the trial, but the ADL's leading broadcasting voice, Walter Winchell, learned of Elmhurst's employment and agitated on his widely-heard radio show for Elmhurst's firing, resulting in Elmhurst's dismissal! (This might lend credence to the theory that there is such a thing as "Jewish power" in America.)

As the trial dragged on, however, the government began to realize that its efforts were going nowhere. Roger Roots points out: "The prosecution had undoubtedly expected one or more of the defendants to break and testify against the others . . . [Yet] not one defendant gave any indication of such an inclination. Though they disagreed and some even disliked each other, they came together as a cohesive unit . . ."

David Baxter had the delight to learn that he was going to be severed from the trial and the charges dismissed. His increasing deafness made it impossible for Baxter to have a fair trial. Baxter recalls that Judge Eicher actually called Baxter into his chamber, smiled, held out his hand, and said: "Go back to California and forget about it, Dave."

The judge later even told Baxter that if he and his wife wanted to buy a car to return to California that he would help and handed Baxter a whole roll of gasoline coupons (which, during wartime, were severely rationed). Despite everything, it seems, even the judge realized what a farce the trial really was.

It was something totally unexpected that brought the trial to a halt: Judge Eicher's sudden death on November 29, 1944. The judge's demise came at a point where Rogge was not even halfway through the prosecution's case. At this point he had brought thirty-nine witnesses to the stand, and expected to present sixty-seven more. The defense had not even yet begun.

David Baxter later reflected on his own friendly personal experience with the judge: "That trial could have killed any judge with a Christian conscience and any semblance of fairness. I felt genuinely sorry about Judge Eicher's death." In fact, Rogge accused the defense of having effectively killed the judge by having put up such a defense that it made the judge's life (and that of the prosecutor) most uncomfortable.

Whether Eicher's death was a reward from heaven for his person-

al decency toward David Baxter will never be known, but under the circumstances, it was apparent that there was no way that the case could continue on a fair basis.

As a consequence, after a period of legal haggling on both sides (with one defendant, Prescott Dennett, actually asking for the trial to continue, determined to present his defense in open court after having been tried and convicted in the media), a mistrial was declared.

Prodded primarily by Jewish groups, Prosecutor Rogge hoped to be able to keep the case alive and set a new trial in motion. But by the spring of 1945, the trial's chief instigator, President Roosevelt, was dead, and the war had come to a close. Rogge, however, continued to ask for delays in setting a new trial date. Since Germany had fallen, Rogge claimed, he was confident that he could find "evidence" in the German archives that the sedition trial defendants had been Nazi collaborators. However, according to historian Glen Jeansonne—no friend of the purported seditionists—"nothing Rogge found proved the existence of a conspiracy" between the German government and the defendants.

Undaunted, however, Rogge launched a nationwide lecture tour that was, not surprisingly, conducted under the auspices of B'nai B'rith. The combative and loquacious Rogge, prodded by his sponsors, could not contain himself in his enthusiastic recounting of the events of the trial and of the personalities involved and, in the end, was fired on October 25, 1946, for leaking information to the press. At that time Rogge was ordered to hand over all Justice Department and FBI documents in his possession. The Justice Department had apparently decided that Rogge had outlived his usefulness.

Less than a month later, District Judge Bolitha Laws dismissed the charges altogether, declaring that the defendants had not received a speedy trial as guaranteed by the Constitution. Although the Justice Department appealed, the dismissal was upheld on June 30, 1947 by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. The "great sedition trial" thus came to a close. As even defendant Lawrence Dennis was moved to comment:

Some or all may even have been guilty of conspiring to undermine the loyalty of the armed forces, but not as charged by the [government] . . . Nothing in the evidence brought out during the trial proved or even suggested that any one of the defendants was ever guilty of any such conspiracy, except on the prosecution theory. And on that theory, opponents of President Roosevelt's pre-Pearl Harbor foreign policy and steps in foreign affairs, such as Colonel Lindbergh, Senator Taft, Senator Nye or Senator Wheeler, and

Colonel McCormick, publisher of *The Chicago Tribune*, would be equally guilty.

Indeed, the prosecution case, according to the prosecution theory, would have been much stronger against these prominent isolationists than it ever could be against the less important defendants in the Sedition Trial.

Many years in retrospect it is rather amusing to note that organized Jewish groups and Jewish newspapers attacked the attorney general, Francis Biddle, for having failed to see the sedition trial through to the end: the conviction of the defendants. Lawrence Dennis wryly commented that all of this showed a great deal of ingratitude on their part.

According to Dennis: "It shows what a public servant gets for attempting to do dirty work to the satisfaction of minority pressure groups. Biddle did the best anyone in his position could do to carry out the wishes of the people behind the trial. They simply did not appreciate the difficulties of railroading to jail their political enemies without evidence of any acts in violation of the law."

Dennis added a further warning for those who would allow themselves to be caught up in promoting "show trials" such as that which was effected in the great sedition trial of 1944: "What the government does today to a crack-pot, so-called," Dennis said, "it may do to an elder statesman of the opposition the day after tomorrow."

"The trial made history," Dennis said, "but not as the government had planned. It made history as a government experiment which went wrong. It was a Department of Justice experiment in imitation of a Moscow political propaganda trial."

There are at least five definitive conclusions which can be drawn about this trial, based upon all that is in the historical record:

1) The defendants charged were largely on trial for having expressed views that were either anti-Jewish or anti-Communist or both. The actions of the defendants had little or nothing to do with actual encouragement of dissension or insurrection within the U.S. armed forces. In short, the "sedition" trial was a fraud from the start.

2) The prime movers behind the prosecution were private special interest groups representing powerful Jewish organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith that were closely allied with the Roosevelt regime.

3) As a consequence, high-level politicians (including the president himself) and bureaucrats beholden to those private interests used their influence to ensure that the police powers of the government were used to advance the demands of those private pressure groups agitating

for the sedition trial.

4) Major media voices (such as *The Washington Post*), working with the ADL and allied with the ruling regime, were prime players in promoting and facilitating the events that led to the trial.

5) The police powers of government can be used (and abused) and innocent citizens (despite Constitutional protections) can be persecuted and prosecuted under the law, their innocence notwithstanding.

Although hardly even a decade after the great sedition trial had come to a close the major media in America began devoting much energy to denouncing so-called anti-communist "witch hunts" in the 1950s the media (not to mention "mainstream" historians) never drew the obvious parallel with the precedent for such witch-hunting that had been set by the activities of the ADL and its allies in the Roosevelt administration who had orchestrated the sedition trial.

The events of "The Great Sedition Trial" are now a part of history (and little known at that), but self-professed civil libertarians should indeed take note. There is very much a bottom-line lesson to be learned: *It can happen here ... and it did.*

Chapter Six:

Walter Winchell and The Enemy Within: How a Powerful Radio Broadcaster and Newspaper Columnist Acted as a Front Man for Zionist and British Interests

Walter Winchell died in 1972 just short of his 75th birthday. His career had sputtered to a halt many years before.

In his heyday, however, Winchell was one of the most powerful figures in the American press. Upon his death, *The New York Times* said he was “the country’s best-known and most widely read journalist as well as its most influential.”

(All quotations cited in this chapter are taken from the authoritative Winchell biography, *Winchell: Gossip, Power and the Culture of Celebrity*, by Neal Gabler.)

Gabler himself summarized Winchell’s immense media clout: “For more than four decades Walter Winchell had been an American institution, and arguably one of the principal architects of the culture. By one estimate, 50 million Americans—out of an adult population of roughly 75 million—either listened to his weekly radio broadcast or read his daily column, which, at its height in the late thirties and forties, was syndicated in more than 2,000 newspapers; it was, according to one observer, the ‘largest continuous audience ever possessed by a man who was neither politician nor divine.’”

What impact did Winchell have upon that massive audience? After Winchell’s death a friend said, “Historians will be unable to explain the 20th century without understanding Winchell.” This eulogy does not appear to be an understatement. The evidence, put forth by Gabler in his authoritative Winchell biography, suggests the columnist was a key player in what may well be the most dramatic event of the 20th century—U.S. intervention in what became the Second World War.

Although the flamboyant and combative Winchell “would be remembered spewing bile, picking fights, destroying lives through his column,”—all of which was true—there was much more to Walter Winchell “the gossip columnist” than is generally known.

Gabler has assembled a mass of information about Winchell that proves beyond question—although Gabler never flatly suggests it (nor, perhaps, would he) that Walter Winchell—who touted himself as the consummate patriot—often functioned as nothing more than a booming radio and newspaper voice for foreign propaganda.

The columnist who had once told one of his subordinates, “Get me a good murder or a train wreck so I can get off to a good start,” soon was being called “the most rabid anti-Hitlerite in America.” Winchell was so

shrill that in 1934 the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith named him as one of five honorees for its Hall of Fame of American Jewry, claiming that no one had “contributed as much as this gentleman gossip and columnist toward laughing Nazism off the map.”

The grandson of a Russian-born Jewish rabbi named Chaim Weinschel who established his family in America, Winchell—according to his longtime associate Herman Klurfeld—had a “radar-like sensitivity to any form of anti-Semitism.

“If there was one consistent thread in his crazy-quilt life, it was his Jewishness,” said Klurfeld. Another Winchell intimate, Arnold Forster, a top “Nazi-hunter” for the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, said that Winchell “thought as a Jew . . . He was self-conscious about his Jewishness.”

Thus, it was perhaps natural that Winchell would be opposed to Hitler and his National Socialism. However, Winchell's opposition led him into frenzied attacks on American patriots who themselves were opposed to United States intervention in the troubles in Europe. The American opponents of intervention, called “isolationists” by their critics, were a prime target for Winchell's attacks.

According to Winchell's biographer: “To Walter isolationism had now become unconscionable, a form of treason. He was determined to prove that the isolationists were not, as they claimed, patriotic Americans who happened to hold a different point of view from his own; they were Nazi collaborators, anti-Semites and racists who cared far less about saving American lives than about ensuring Hitler's victory. . . . Every week brought new charges from Walter linking the radical right to Nazi Germany.”

At the time it was generally assumed that Winchell's prime source for many of his sensational claims was the FBI. This, according to Gabler, was not the case. Instead, Winchell himself was one of the FBI's prime sources of intelligence information about “Nazis” and “Nazi sympathizers,” and others targeted by Winchell.

Where did Winchell get this wealth of intelligence that he, in turn, fed to the FBI? According to Gabler, Winchell's “most important source” for this information was the aforementioned Arnold Forster, the New York counsel for the ADL. Gabler reports that: “When it came to the radical right, Forster had one of the best intelligence-gathering operations in the country, with spies everywhere.”

By mid-1942, Gabler noted, “Forster was devoting between ten and fifteen hours to Walter each week [and had joined] the columnist's inner circle.” Herman Klurfeld, Winchell's associate, remembered that “We got mountains of stuff,” from Forster which Klurfeld then boiled down for

Winchell's columns. However, noted Gabler, "Occasionally Forster himself drafted whole columns for Walter" and then, every Sunday, appeared at the radio studio "to lend his expertise to the broadcast and vet the anti-fascist portions of the script, which kept growing larger and larger."

Winchell thus played a key role as a conduit between J. Edgar Hoover's FBI and the ADL, cementing a close relationship that lasts to this day. The ADL fed information to Winchell, who then used it for his radio broadcasts and newspaper columns but also funneled it to the FBI (essentially acting as a "cover" for the ADL).

The FBI likewise reciprocated and took advantage of this unusual covert relationship with Winchell and the ADL. According to longtime FBI Assistant Director William Sullivan: "Winchell was probably the first nationally known radio commentator developed by the FBI. We sent Winchell information regularly. He was our mouthpiece."

Needless to say, the ADL's tentacles, as we have seen, spread far and wide and played a major part in pushing America toward intervention and war, and functioned, in many ways, as an adjunct of British intelligence (with which the ADL did work closely). However, the ADL's devoted media voice, Winchell, was also serving as a conduit for pro-intervention propaganda coming directly from British intelligence.

The British had dispatched a Canadian businessman, one William Stephenson—code-named "Intrepid"—to the United States to set up liaison with American intelligence. Stephenson approached Ernest Cuneo, a Democratic Party attorney who was not only a member of FDR's inner circle but also the president's liaison to Winchell himself and, as a consequence, also a member of Winchell's inner circle.

In the preceding years, Winchell had cemented a close relationship with the Roosevelt administration. In 1936 Winchell played such a critical propaganda role in promoting FDR for a third term that Cuneo said later that he wanted to tell Winchell: "Look, Walter, you are the third term campaign."

In many ways, Winchell had become the media voice not only of the ADL, but also of FDR himself. According to Gabler, "What his audience didn't know was that in shaping American attitudes toward the war, Winchell was often speaking for the Roosevelt administration just as he had in areas of domestic policy."

The central positioning of Cuneo between FDR and British intelligence operative Stephenson put Winchell in the very midst of Britain's intelligence and propaganda operations in the United States. Working out of Rockefeller Center in New York, Stephenson set up liaison among British intelligence, the FBI and (later) the Office of the Coordinator of Information.

According to Gabler, “Stephenson essentially gathered information on enemy activities and routed it to these sister agencies, but that was not all he was doing. He was also running a covert operation the mandate of which, according to an official history of British wartime intelligence, was ‘to do all that was not being done, and could not be done by overt means to ensure sufficient aid for Britain and eventually to bring America into the war.’ To this end Stephenson planted stories in sympathetic papers to discredit isolationists and harass America First rallies.”

Winchell, according to Gabler, was “one of the most important components” of the British spy master’s scheme. “On the one hand, Cuneo was feeding Walter information at the behest of the White House, which was coming to believe in the inevitability of America’s entrance into the war. On the other hand, he was secretly feeding [Winchell] British propaganda and top-level intelligence through Stephenson. The effect . . . was to destroy the opposition to preparedness and soften the public toward intervention.” According to Cuneo himself: “Winchell became the fire point. His rolling barrages could and did clear the way for the president and the preparation of war.”

In the meantime, allied with FDR, J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI had likewise taken up combat against American non-interventionists who were fighting U.S. involvement abroad—and according to Gabler, Winchell “sent Hoover reams of material on possible subversives, some of it simply gossip, more of it from Forster’s ADL files. Hoover in turn funneled information to Walter in long, plain white envelopes.”

Winchell’s sources at the ADL and in British intelligence made him almost a one-man intelligence agency, to such an extent, Gabler wrote, that “Hoover’s own internal FBI communications confirmed the fact that Walter frequently knew more than Hoover did, and Hoover was soon assigning agents to monitor the broadcast each week and list items the bureau might find of interest. There was even the possibility that he was tapping Walter’s phones.”

Interestingly, there’s yet another peculiar twist to the relationship between the FBI’s Hoover and Winchell, who, one Hoover biographer has said, “did more than any other man to perpetuate the myths of J. Edgar Hoover and his G-men,”—promoting the Hoover mythos, making the FBI director a legend in his own time.

That Winchell should have functioned as a “PR” man for Hoover is interesting. Winchell himself had moved for years in underworld circles and was on a first-name basis with a wide variety of mob kingpins. More than one published account has suggested it was Winchell who first introduced Hoover to New York Mafia figure Frank Costello. According to the legend it was Winchell’s pal Costello who provided profitable

inside tips on fixed races for Hoover (a dedicated fan of the horse races) as a payoff for “looking the other way” as far as the mob was concerned.

In fact, for years Hoover heatedly denied the very existence of organized crime in America, preferring to hunt down bank robbers like John Dillinger and “Baby Face” Nelson and chase “subversives” as defined by the Roosevelt administration.

Winchell himself, incidentally, had good reason to be so chummy with organized crime. Winchell’s uncle by marriage, one Billy Koch, was a high-ranking henchman in the gambling operations of Meyer Lansky, who, by the 1940s, was emerging as the de facto “chairman of the board” of the national crime syndicate.

In any event, America did go to war and along with FDR and the ADL and British intelligence, Winchell had cause to celebrate.

Later, Winchell, along with Washington-based columnist Drew Pearson, played a major part in a coordinated smear campaign against then-Secretary of Defense James Forrestal.

The defense secretary’s “crime” in the eyes of Winchell and Pearson (who was, incidentally, half Jewish) was having encouraged President Harry Truman to avoid pressure from the ADL and other elements in the pro-Israel lobby to recognize the state of Israel which, in the end, came into existence on May 14, 1948. Forrestal had argued that a Jewish state would antagonize the Arab states, threaten Western oil supplies and create a potential for ongoing crisis in coming years (all of which has proven true). Forrestal suggested that the uprooted European-born Jewish survivors of World War II should migrate to Peru.

Prodded by his “sources” at the ADL and driven by his own demons, Winchell’s attacks on Forrestal were vintage Winchell. One Palestinian Arab official described Winchell as “the most vicious Zionist writer”—outclassing even Drew Pearson. However, even after Winchell and Pearson and their foreign sponsors prevailed and Israel became a state and was recognized (even against his own judgment) by President Harry Truman, the two columnists “maintained a steady tattoo of abuse,” according to Winchell’s biographer.

The president himself was no real fan of Forrestal, but he resented the Winchell-Pearson onslaught and perceived it to be a showdown. Another columnist, populist Westbrook Pegler—no fan of Forrestal himself—was equally perturbed by the propaganda ravings of Winchell and Pearson. “If our press is worth a damn, it ought to destroy these bastards,” Pegler wrote Forrestal.

Winchell won. On May 22, 1949, Forrestal died. He fell or jumped—some still say he was pushed—from his hospital room at the Bethesda Naval Medical near Washington where he had gone for rest, deeply dis-

traught by the media campaign against him.

Winchell himself said, years later, that one of Forrester's advisors had told him that Forrester had been thrown out the hospital window to prevent him from writing his memoirs—which, of course, could very well be true. Forrester's memoirs would have exposed much and would have put Winchell and his foreign propaganda sponsors in their place.

On February 20, 1972, after a bout with cancer, Walter Winchell died. In the preceding years, he had lost his radio show, circulation for his column had been on the decline, and Winchell himself sometimes seemed an anachronism, which in many ways he was.

Yet, at his zenith, Winchell had been a power to contend with—a major player in the political intrigue of the 20th century, a definitive media voice for *The Enemy Within*.

In our current day, of course, there are many purveyors of Zionist propaganda and other forms of political garbage emanating from the ranks of the international plutocratic elite.

Forums such as Fox News—which we will examine in a later chapter—provide an outlet for this material. And in newspapers and magazines across the nation, as well as on websites such as *WorldNetDaily* there may be found Judas Goats promoting the so-called “neo-conservative agenda” (more about which later).

These Judas Goats are following in the footsteps of Walter Winchell, hyping alien propaganda as “news.” The list could go on and on—it is extensive—but among the more egregious propagandists include the following: Mona Charen, Suzanne Fields, Clifford May, David Horowitz, Joseph Farah, Jonah Goldberg, Dennis Prager, Diana West, Helle Dale, Arnold Beichman, Linda Chavez, Frank Gaffney, Cal Thomas, and, of course, former Marine Colonel Oliver North, a central figure in the Israeli-connected arms-and-drugs-smuggling and money laundering affair known as “Iran-contra.”

And these are just a few. There are others, including George F. Will, Charles Krauthammer, Michael Ledeen, Robert Kagan, and many, many more. And the one thread that binds them all is their fealty—like that of their ideological forefather, keyhole peeping journalist Walter Winchell—to the cause of international Zionism.

Although Winchell's crimes against humanity were carried out during his World War II-era heyday, his same type of treachery can be found in the works of these modern-day Judas Goats.

But Judas Goats can be found in all walks of life and in many venues—including the United States Congress—as we shall now see . . .

Chapter Seven

Capitol Hill Judas Goat: A Zionist Spy for Soviet Intelligence Serving in the U.S. Congress

While the late Rep. Samuel Dickstein (D-N.Y.) is remembered today as one of “the great liberals” and as one of America’s most distinguished Jewish leaders, in the late 1930s—just prior to the advent of U.S. involvement in World War II—he was best known as the first figure in Congress to promote “Nazi-hunting” and “fighting fascism” as one of America’s top priorities. Dickstein crusaded as the ultimate advocate of “Americanism.” In fact, however, he was the ultimate Judas Goat. He was an enemy agent: a spy controlled by the Soviet Union’s secret intelligence service.

Although Dickstein has been memorialized as a “statesman” and “humanitarian” and other such high-sounding tributes in the American Jewish press, other assessments of the congressman—who served 11 terms, beginning in 1923—have not been so friendly. One critic called Dickstein “a smooth infiltrator, corrupt, greedy, and utterly amoral,” an early role model for many of the Judas Goats who populate the ranks of America’s Enemy Within today.

The truth about Dickstein’s role as a Soviet agent came out in the late 1990s in long-secret Soviet intelligence messages and files that are now accessible to American historians. In fact, Stephen Gettinger, an editor of the eminently “mainstream” and thoroughly non-partisan *Congressional Quarterly* said that the Dickstein affair was probably “the first clear-cut case of congressional spying in history.”

The record shows that Dickstein—who represented a famously “Jewish” congressional district on Manhattan’s Lower East Side—was recruited as a Soviet agent in 1937 by Peter Gutzeit, a gentleman who shared Dickstein’s religion and who also happened to be the New York station chief of the NKVD, the Soviet secret police. For a fee of \$1,250 a month, Dickstein stole reams of secret documents from Congress and the War Department which he turned over to his Soviet handlers.

In addition, and perhaps even more importantly, Dickstein served as Moscow’s agent of influence in Washington by loudly attacking the nationalist European powers of Germany and Italy for their resolute opposition to Soviet Communism. Dickstein was perhaps one of the loudest and earliest among those agitating for U.S. pressure on Germany, with the intention of sparking U.S. military intervention in the war in Europe that later became World War II. Dickstein made headlines by accusing Americans who refused to support his war-like intentions of being “un-American”—a charge that, even today, Zionist elements use against good patriotic Americans who refuse to support endless American intervention in the Middle East on behalf of Israel.

And while there were many who simply attributed Dickstein's hysteria to the fact that he was Jewish, and therefore an obvious foe of Adolf Hitler's rule in Germany, the fact is, as we have seen, that Dickstein was also a quite greedy paid agent of the Soviet Union.

And what is particularly interesting is that Dickstein was among the early promoters of the establishment of what became known as the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). *The New York Times* even called Dickstein "the founder of HUAC." However, when HUAC began its inquiries it soon discovered that the real subversives on American soil were Soviet agents and that many real patriots in America simply saw no need for U.S. intervention in Europe in a war against Germany, Dickstein did an about-face and denounced the very committee that he had helped establish in the first place.

It ultimately turned out that Dickstein's financial demands on his Soviet handlers were so endless that the NKVD assigned Dickstein the code name "Crook" in their internal memoranda and intelligence traffic. By 1938, Dickstein's New York-based conduit to the NKVD, Peter Gutzeit, was warning his superiors in a memo that "'Crook' is completely justifying his code name. This is an unscrupulous type, greedy for money . . . a very cunning swindler." (And this assessment was hardly the kind of favorable commentary about Dickstein that was appearing in the media at the time.)

In any case, by late 1940, Dickstein and his Soviet handlers parted company, but Dickstein had already done an immense amount of quite effective dirty work on behalf of his foreign sponsors. Dickstein left Congress following the 1944 election and became a judge on the New York State Supreme Court, dying in 1954 a very wealthy and honored man. This traitor's papers—although not the evidence of his treason—are lovingly and respectfully preserved in the American Jewish Archives at the distinguished Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati.

Obviously, Dickstein would have probably been very pro-Soviet and anti-Nazi even without the financial support of his Soviet handlers, but the fact that he was prepared to secretly lend his efforts on behalf of secret Soviet agents—for money—says quite a lot about this so-called "statesman." In fact, Dickstein is a classic model of one of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within who have done so much damage to America. And for this, if for no other reason, we must recall his sordid record.

The truth is that there are many more like him in Congress today. The record of politicians "on the take" from the Israeli lobby is equally sordid but these politicians brag of being on the receiving end of foreign money, whereas Dickstein, of course, kept his treason close to his vest. *And that says very much about how far off course America has gone.*

Chapter Eight:

The ADL's Secret Role in Determining Who Got Hired By U.S. Federal Agencies

Although the influence of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith in shaping such scandalous and divisive activities as the behavior of the FBI and the Justice Department in the infamous "Sedition Case" and in slanting media coverage of American dissidents who opposed the Zionist agenda before and during World War II (through the use of such willing, ADL-connected trouble-makers as columnist Walter Winchell), the fact is that the ADL's activities continued to expand in the years following the war. But—in those days—there were still some highly-placed genuine patriots, even in Congress, who were prepared to take on the ADL.

In 1947 a Congressional committee investigated one segment of the national spy network of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith. In this particular instance congressional investigators were inquiring into the way in which the ADL and one of its front groups, the so-called "Friends of Democracy," had managed to penetrate a federal agency and place false, malicious and defamatory information about ADL targets in the agency's files.

On October 3, 6 and 7, 1947, then-Rep. Clare E. Hoffman (R-Mich.), chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, convened a subcommittee to investigate the U.S. Civil Service Commission (CSC), the agency which oversees federal personnel. Joining Hoffman as a member of this subcommittee was Rep. Porter Hardy, Jr. (D-Va.).

Hoffman and others had learned that there were CSC files containing statements bearing upon the views, opinions and activities of certain members of Congress and their wives as well as a number of other prominent Americans, most of whom had never actually sought a position through the CSC.

According to Hoffman, much of the information—some of it derogatory—appeared to be "largely rumor, hearsay" that had been entered onto file cards kept in the CSC's offices. Hoffman revealed during the hearing that investigators had determined that there was a notation on many of these cards that read as follows:

The above was copied from the subversive file in the possession of Attorneys Mintzer & Levy, 39 Broadway, NYC, Room 3305. These files were made up in cooperation with the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League. The sources of this information must not be dis-

closed under any circumstances nor be quoted. However, further information concerning above may be secured by contacting offices of Mintzer & Levy.

According to Hoffman, "That notation is on the bottom of cards which carry information to the effect that the individuals named, Senators and Congressmen, were disloyal, belonged to subversive groups, engaged perhaps in traitorous activities."

What was especially shocking, of course, is that the federal agency was obviously saying in its private notation was that although the agency was including the ADL's defamations among its own files, the individuals targeted by the ADL did not have the right to know the source of the libelous accusations, a flagrant violation of the traditional right of every person to be able to face his accuser.

Interestingly, several CSC commissioners who were called to testify, including James E. Hatcher, chief of the central office, investigations division of the CSC, acknowledged that they had no knowledge of how the ADL's propaganda had been inserted into the commission's files.

What's more, according to Hatcher, "I not only think, I am sure, I am positive that they did it without authority from the commission." Hatcher added, "I think that as an American I feel that it is highly improper. And definitely I feel such things should not be in the files." This statement, of course, was from an officer responsible for seeking the facts—not malicious lies—about prospective public servants.

All of this suggests that it was an ADL "plant" in the offices of the CSC who had inserted the derogatory information into the files. The ADL, of course, is known to have penetrated more than one government agency over the years, not to mention perhaps hundreds of private associations, publishing enterprises and other entities.

In resolving the matter, committee member Rep. Fred Busbey (R-Ill.) asked another witness, Harry Mitchell, president of the CSC, "What is going to be the attitude of the Civil Service Commission in the future regarding names being put in its files by the Anti-Defamation League or Friends of Democracy, out of the files of those organizations?"

Mitchell responded, "They will not go in the files." When asked by Busbey whether he considered the information to be "unquestionably reliable" Mitchell answered, "I would not think so. I presume they are Communist organizations; I do not really know."

Although Busbey commented that to his knowledge the ADL and its front group were not communist organizations, the congressman was commenting without the knowledge that history has bequeathed us:

In fact, the ADL was one of the primary controllers, along with the

Soviet Kremlin, of the Communist Party U.S.A, even at the same time the Communist Party was controlled at the top by an asset of ADL-allied FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover (more about which later in these pages).

However, the ADL's particular influence over the Communist Party USA has largely been ignored or forgotten. The ADL's special influence was reported by the late Dr. Bella Dodd, a former CPUSA leader, who told intimates—after leaving the red orbit—that whenever the American communists needed financing or strategic advice they had instructions to visit ADL bigwigs in Manhattan.

Certain conservatives, who are under the discipline of the ADL or who have otherwise been afraid to mention anything that might be perceived as harmful to the ADL, have frequently quoted Dr. Dodd's intriguing revelation, but have always been careful to delete her reference to the ADL, reporting only that the ADL operatives were "extremely wealthy American capitalists." Very clearly, then, the ADL was, as the CSC commissioner presumed, a communist organization.

In any case, committee Chairman Hoffman stated flatly and correctly about the ADL and the Friends of Democracy: "I will tell you that they are smear artists."

A historical footnote: In the 1992 U.S. Senate campaign in Pennsylvania, the ADL got its revenge against the deceased Rep. Porter Hardy who had boldly joined Rep. Hoffman in investigating the ADL's spy activities. When Hardy's daughter, Lynn Hardy Yeakel, a successful businesswoman, challenged incumbent Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Penn.) for reelection, one of the ADL's leading advocates in Congress, a whispering campaign was unleashed accusing Mrs. Yeakel of being "anti-Semitic." Specter won re-election.

This is just one example of how the ADL—representing The Enemy Within—has played a pivotal behind-the-scenes role in impacting upon American public policy, literally positioned to determine who could get employment in the American government.

If anyone truly believes that the ADL does not yet still play a similar role—particularly in this day of computerization and high-tech spying—that person is truly naïve.

All of this is just the tip of the iceberg regarding the activities of the ADL, and in the chapters that follow, we will learn much more about the ADL and its destructive part in distorting the American agenda.

Chapter Nine:

The Anti-Defamation League: Both a Foreign Lobby for Israel and a Private Spy Agency For The Enemy Within

For years, Liberty Lobby, the Washington-based populist Institution that published *The Spotlight*, charged that the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith functioned as an unregistered—and therefore illegal—foreign agent for the state of Israel. All of this, of course, was in addition to the ADL's special longstanding role functioning, for example, alongside the FBI as a key conduit for spy data and as sponsor of malicious covert activities designed to infiltrate and disrupt legitimate (and quite patriotic) American dissident groups. The ADL, as a particular institution—and a disreputable one at that—exemplifies in many respects the evil of The Enemy Within.

But the ADL's role as a foreign agent for Israel—a role that evolved after the founding of the state of Israel in 1948—is one that must be thoroughly analyzed in order to fully understand the immense power that the ADL has accumulated in shaping both foreign and domestic policy in America.

That a tool of a foreign government has achieved such influence upon (and literally within) such American law enforcement agencies as the FBI, for one example, is a remarkable and frightening fact indeed.

It was in June of 1981 that Liberty Lobby issued its comprehensive *White Paper on the Anti-Defamation League [ADL] of B'nai B'rith*. The white paper was issued with the express purpose of bringing to light facts that would force the ADL to register with the U.S. Justice Department as an agent of the government of Israel.

By refusing to register with the Justice Department, the ADL was—and is, to this day—violating the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, which requires the registration of all foreign agents.

According to an admission by the Justice Department after it reviewed the white paper, Liberty Lobby had, in fact, “establishe[d] a mutuality of interests between the ADL and the government of Israel.” This admission by the Justice Department came in response to a congressional inquiry into the status of the ADL, an inquiry launched following a letter from members of Liberty Lobby who urged Congress to investigate the ADL's status as an unregistered agent of a foreign government. The Justice Department told the concerned congressman that “if sufficient evidence is developed from this or other sources to establish a violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act” the department guaranteed it would initiate enforcement action against the ADL.

The Justice Department said that evidence of a “contractual” rela-

tionship between the ADL and the government of Israel is necessary before any “appropriate action” can be taken. This Justice Department claim was not true. In fact, it contradicted federal law.

According to the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA), any organization acting as an agent of a foreign power, “whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship,” is a “foreign agent” as defined by the act. Section 1, Subsection (c) of the act defines an agent of a foreign government as:

(1) Any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee or servant, or any person who acts in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control, of a foreign principal or of a person any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised directed, controlled, financed or subsidized in whole or in major part by a foreign principal, and who directly or through any other person—

(i) Engages within the U.S. in political activities for or in the interests of such foreign principal:

(ii) Acts within the U.S. as a public relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee or political consultant for or in the interests of such foreign principal;

(iii) Within the U.S. solicits, collects, disburses, or dispenses contributions, loans, money, or other things of value for or in the interests of such foreign principal: or

(iv) Within the U.S. represents the interests of such foreign principal before any agency or official of the government of the U.S.; and

(2) Any person who agrees, consents, assumes or purports to act as, or who is or holds himself out to be, whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, an agent of a foreign principal as defined in Clause (1) of this subsection.

In every sense, the ADL carries out each of the actions of a foreign agent as defined in the FARA. In fact, a proposed amendment to the act, passed by the Senate in 1964, restated the provision of the original 1938 law, which declared that an agency relationship exists “where the agent acts other than pursuant to contractual agreement, or merely holds himself out as an agent of a foreign principal.”

Again, the law flies in the face of Justice Department claims to the contrary; By merely holding itself out as a representative of the government of Israel, the ADL establishes itself as an agent of a foreign power—and should thus be registered with the Justice Department.

In response to a request by a citizen that the ADL be investigated by the Justice Department, the department again rushed to the defense of the ADL, claiming that the ADL is exempt from registration as a foreign agent because the ADL is not acting “at the order, request, or under the direction . . . of a foreign principal.”

The department said “Specifically, without proof that the ADL is operating at the request or under the direction or control of that government [Israel], no obligation to register under the [Foreign Agents Registration] Act arises.”

Despite all this, the Justice Department knows quite well that the ADL is an agent of the government of Israel and that its operations are illegal by reason of its unregistered status.

This was not just a biased conclusion on the part of Liberty Lobby, but the opinion of a high-ranking Justice Department official who met with representatives of Liberty Lobby.

During one of the many private sessions that Liberty Lobby held with Justice Department officials, one department counselor asked, “Why is Liberty Lobby so concerned about all of this?” Liberty Lobby’s spokesman responded, “Because it’s against the law” (referring, of course, to the ADL’s activities). The Justice Department official replied, “Everybody knows that.”

That, of course, was not the official Justice Department position, but it certainly was the opinion of one influential and knowledgeable Justice Department official speaking off the record (and therefore safe from ADL reprisals).

What follows is an annotated series of quotations from ADL sources and materials that illustrate, beyond question, that the ADL does function (by definition of existing federal law) as a foreign agent of the government of Israel.

Thus, because the ADL does indeed function in this capacity, and because it is unregistered with the Justice Department, it is in violation of U.S. federal law.

- In the December, 1973 issue of the “ADL Bulletin,” celebrating the ADL’s 60th anniversary, the pressure group announced its plan to launch “a nationwide educational campaign in behalf of Israel’s survival as a secure, free state and to counter anti-Semitic reaction in this country to problems emanating from the Arab-Israeli conflict.” (Here, the ADL “holds [itself] out to be . . . an agent of a foreign principal,” as defined in the Foreign Agents Registration Act.)

- In the minutes of the January, 1969 plenary session of the B’nai B’rith International Council can be found evidence of a public request by the government of Israel that the ADL work on its behalf. The presi-

dent of B'nai B'rith (of which the ADL is the key political arm) declared that Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban had stated that Israel's public relations budget was so little that Israel needed assistance from outside sources. Said the B'nai B'rith president: "He [Eban] implored [the ADL] to emphasize his need for funds so that Israel's position may be accurately interpreted throughout the world." The ADL, of course, responded wholeheartedly to Eban's request.

- In a "confidential" report, dated May 15, 1978, the ADL provided an inside look at how the ADL has not only lobbied publicly on behalf of Israel, but how the group has also represented Israel's interests in Washington at the direction of the government of Israel itself. The report detailed various aspects of a series of meetings between ADL officials and Israeli government leaders. These meetings culminated in the ADL representatives returning to the United States and carrying the Israeli message directly to President Jimmy Carter, Vice President Walter Mondale and other top administration officials. The ADL concluded the report by bragging that its "suggestions" to the U.S. government must have "borne fruit" in view of the subsequent actions taken by the United States in favor of Israeli interests. (Here, alone, is the ultimate proof that the ADL is working "at the order, request, or under the direction or control, of a foreign principal." Therefore, the ADL is, by definition, a foreign agent—but one which remains unregistered, contrary to the law.

- In the December, 1976 issue of the "ADL Bulletin," Israeli Foreign Minister Yigal Allon was quoted as having told an ADL reception (in speaking of the ADL and its relationship to Israel), "We are one, and thanks to our oneness, we shall win the battle for peace."

In the same bulletin, President Ephraim Katzir of Israel is quoted as saying; "ADL protects Israel. It is a most noble task, which you know how to do and do well." Further, Avraham Harmon, president of Israel's Hebrew University, was quoted by the ADL as having said accurately enough, that the ADL "performs better" than any other organization on behalf of Israel.

It was also revealed in this bulletin that the ADL had been responsible for a series of radio and TV programs entitled "Dateline Israel," narrated by the ADL's own Arnold Forster. This series is produced by the ADL in Israel and is designed to spread "a positive image of Jews and understanding of Jewish concerns, particularly Israel."

- In the November, 1977 issue of the "ADL Bulletin," the ADL announced the opening of a branch office in Jerusalem. According to the ADL: "The Jerusalem office was established to achieve better understanding between the American Jewish community and the Israeli public and to assist ADL's Middle Eastern Affairs Department and 26 region-

al offices in the U.S. in interpreting Israel's policies, problems, and needs."

- Postal service records as far back as June 26 and July 20, 1967 indicated upon examination that the ADL has mailed out official Israeli propaganda publications, invoking the ADL's "non-profit" status in order to utilize U.S. tax-subsidized bulk mailing services. (If the ADL were to register as a foreign agent, it would not have this tax-exempt status.)

- The ADL and its parent organization, B'nai B'rith, have also played a major role in channeling funds to the government of Israel. According to a memorandum to the board of governors of B'nai B'rith from Maurice Bisgyer, executive vice president of B'nai B'rith, a total of \$425,000 was allocated to Israel by B'nai B'rith.

What is significant about this sum is that it came from the German government in the form of reparations payments meant for Jewish survivors of the so-called holocaust. B'nai B'rith, apparently, had already decided that it would be the channel through which German reparations payments would be directed, and in coming years began to recognize the ramifications of this action: The ADL and B'nai B'rith were obviously violating not only the Foreign Agents Registration Act, but most likely, U.S. tax laws as well.

In a confidential letter to Joseph Sklover of B'nai B'rith, Benjamin Ferenz, an attorney associated with the ADL, declared: "I have been giving further thought to the matter [of reparations] and now feel that we might be able to persuade the Germans to give preferential status to B'nai B'rith without first going directly to the U.S. treasury."

In effect, the ADL sought to establish itself as an international government, lobbying with German officials, avoiding U.S. laws, collecting and distributing funds to Israel, and assisting in the effort to prop up the aggressive Middle Eastern state.

This evidence of ADL maneuvering marks the ADL quite clearly as a foreign agent of Israel, nominally tied to the United States, but in reality concerned with the interests of Israel, and of Israel alone.

- Lastly, the ADL admitted publicly in its bulletin that the ADL "has become sole American distributor of general interest films produced by Israel Film Service." (Here was indisputable proof that the ADL had established a de jure agency relationship with the government of Israel, thereby fulfilling even the requirements that the U.S. Justice Department says need to be proved before the department could investigate Liberty Lobby's charges against the ADL. Here was the contractual relationship the department was "unable" to find.)

Remember, all of this information is not taken from "anti-Semitic" or "anti-Israel" sources (as the ADL might try to contend) but from pub-

lications of the ADL itself.

Not only is the ADL holding itself out as an agent of Israeli government, at Israel's direction and on Israel's behalf, soliciting funds, spreading propaganda and lobbying at the highest levels of our government, but it is also involved in a direct agency relationship with the growing Middle Eastern state.

The ADL is an agent of a foreign government. There can be no disputing this fact. It is a fact, as we have seen, that even the U.S. Justice Department recognizes. Still, the Justice Department refused to act, then or now. Instead, the Justice Department—and, in particular, the FBI—forged an almost incestuous relationship with this foreign agent, allowing the ADL to literally direct the FBI's internal operations in targeting patriotic Americans for "special treatment."

However, in the closing days of the year 1992, a remarkable thing happened: the ADL itself came under investigation by a local law enforcement agency working in tandem with the FBI itself. And this is an amazing story we will review in some detail in the chapters ahead. But for the present, we will take a close look at the author's own personal experiences with the ADL's top longtime undercover operative, Roy Edward Bullock.

Chapter Ten:

“Charming, Skilled and Clever” —First-Hand Encounters With the ADL’s Number One Spy: Roy Bullock

I once knew a spy for Israel’s intelligence agency, the Mossad. His name was Roy Edward Bullock. Although he wasn’t even Jewish, for many, many years Roy was an undercover informant for the Mossad’s chief American domestic intelligence and propaganda conduit, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith.

In the end, I played—I’m proud to say—a pivotal role in exposing Bullock’s activities, although in some ways I regretted having to do so. You see, I liked Roy Bullock personally, but I don’t like what he did.

Although there’s nothing more I detest than having an author inserting himself into the narrative of his own non-autobiographical book, which is what I am doing right now, it’s simply impossible to tell the whole story of Roy Bullock and the ADL spy scandal that enmeshed him, without telling my own part in the story. And so I must. I think the readers will find my account informative and even entertaining.

My first encounter with Roy Bullock, as best I can recall, came sometime probably in 1983. As the junior staffer in the editorial department of the national populist weekly newspaper, *The Spotlight*, published on Capitol Hill in Washington by Liberty Lobby, I was frequently delegated to attend to visiting *Spotlight* readers who ventured to Liberty Lobby headquarters. Through this, of course, I had occasion to meet many hundreds of *Spotlight* readers of all sizes, shapes and colors. And one of them, it turned out, was a likeable and engaging chap from San Francisco named Roy Bullock.

A middle-aged man with thinning dark hair and a flamboyant handlebar mustache, Bullock spoke in a measured baritone voice, with an inherent hint of cynicism. Short, stocky, barrel-chested and powerfully built with the shoulders of a professional wrestler, the bull-necked Bullock carried himself with an erect military bearing. Although an art dealer by trade, Bullock, ironically, could easily be cast by a Hollywood director as a soldier of fortune fighting in some far corner of the world.

A witty conversationalist with a merry smile, a twinkle in his eyes and a hearty laugh, Bullock was highly inquisitive and would be the life of any party. A teetotaler, Bullock was a vegetarian and very much a health enthusiast. Once when having lunch with Bullock and another of my *Spotlight* colleagues, I noticed that Bullock carried a large amount of cash in big bills. His expenses, of course, were provided by his ADL paymasters. He always insisted on paying the dinner bill for his prey, certainly a benefit for me, considering my own pathetic pay scale.

As I recall, when I first met Bullock, he mentioned that he was in town for some meeting or other of an Arab-American group. In early 1984 Bullock returned to Washington and made a visit to Liberty Lobby once again. This time he asked for me and I was pleased to renew our acquaintance. Bullock was very much interested in the newly-founded Populist Party which had been established by Liberty Lobby.

Roy was full of questions—a lot of them. It was at that point I realized that he was unusually full of questions, more so than most “regular” *Spotlight* readers.

Now this is an important point: as a Liberty Lobby staff member, I had regular occasion over the years to meet with hundreds—if not thousands—of Liberty Lobby supporters. They were always full of questions and comments and I expected that. Liberty Lobby’s supporters were intelligent people who were looking for answers.

But 99.999% of them—unlike Roy Bullock—weren’t looking for “gossip.” I realized that the kinds of prying questions that Bullock was asking had nothing to do with facts about political events, the populist position on issues of the day, or any other such matters.

Bullock, in fact, was looking for gossip—garbage—dirt about people in the populist movement.

It was at that juncture that it passed through my mind that Roy Bullock may well have been an informant for the ADL. And so, in my own way, I thought I would have some fun with him. I mentioned the ADL. I actually complained to him that the ADL never mentioned me.

“After all I have done to fight the ADL,” I commented, “they don’t pay me any notice!” Bullock chuckled with delight. After a short visit, he went on his merry way.

It wasn’t long after that—perhaps several months later—that Bullock turned up again. I was called to the front office to see a visitor. Sitting on the divan in the lobby was none other than Roy Bullock. I greeted him cheerfully, shook his hand and welcomed him back to Washington. “I have something that will interest you,” said Bullock. “Hot off the press,” he said, handing me a sheath of papers. “I just picked it up in New York.”

It was an ADL report on the Populist Party and there was my name mentioned among other Liberty Lobby personnel who were involved in the party’s affairs.

I shouted with pleasure: “The sons of bitches have finally mentioned my name.” It was a badge of distinction, I thought then—and still do. (The epithet I applied to the ADL, I might note, is rather tame, to say the least.) Bullock, I noticed, was watching me carefully. Very carefully. It was at this moment that I realized that my suspicions might be on the

mark: Roy Bullock was an agent of the ADL! If he wasn't, I thought, he should have been.

Frankly, at that moment, I wasn't sure just how to react, but I once again expressed my delight. “The last time I saw you,” Roy said, “you were complaining that the ADL hadn't ever mentioned your name. Well, now they have.” *At this point I was certain that Bullock was most likely an ADL operative.*

I didn't see Bullock again, as best I can recall, until the early part of 1985. I had been invited to attend, along with Populist Party National Chairman Bill Baker and our colleague, *Spotlight* correspondent Trisha Katson, a meeting sponsored by the Washington-based Libyan Students Association. It promised to be an entertaining evening. Strolling into the banquet hall, I heard the sound of exotic Arabic music in the background. There—already—was Trish Katson and Bill Baker and an assortment of other friends and acquaintances, including a fellow by the name of Matthew Peter Balic, about whom more later.

Bill Baker was eagerly introducing several American Indian leaders to the gathering. I joined the party, taking a seat at the table where Baker was holding court. As Baker entertained his listeners with an amusing anecdote, I saw a familiar face entering the room. It was none other than Roy Bullock. I stood up and beckoned him to the table, pleased by his arrival, but intrigued nonetheless. Bullock was everywhere. Everywhere that an ADL agent should be.

He spotted me and strolled over. “Somehow I thought I might find the Liberty Lobby crowd here,” he chortled, shaking hands. “I could feel the vibrations,” he noted, raising his eyebrows as he glanced from left to right, affecting a comic shiver. He joined us at the table and the conversation, inevitably—considering the occasion—turned to the Middle East question.

I watched Bullock carefully. I sensed something “not right.” He was listening, laughing at the appropriate moments, watching the others as carefully as I watched him.

At one point I interjected what I hoped was a rather biting witticism that cast aspersions upon the state of Israel and its leaders. As the others laughed in amused agreement, Bullock joined in the laughter. But his laughter was not sincere. “Yessss . . .” he said in agreement.

But it was obvious that he didn't agree. In fact, I realized, Bullock was being quietly—but very clearly—sarcastic. And he couldn't contain himself. I saw the flash of distaste in his eyes. He was playing a role—just barely. No one else noticed, but I did.

And by now it was increasingly clear to me that there was indeed a lot more to Roy Bullock than met the eye. I had no firm evidence, of

course, but I was more convinced than ever: Roy Bullock was indeed an agent of the ADL.

As best I can recall, I saw Bullock next in September of 1985, again in Washington. Bullock stopped by Liberty Lobby and advised me that he was going to be attending a meeting of the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee and it just so happened that an Arab-American friend of mine had given me two tickets to a breakfast being held during that conference.

And so it was that my colleague and dear friend, the late Lois Petersen, and I sat with Bullock and several others at that breakfast gathering at the Arab-American meeting.

(It was only years later I also found out that sitting at our table was an American spy for Saudi Arabian intelligence (!) although, at that time, he had no idea that Roy Bullock was working for the ADL.

(In 2005, in a personal letter to me from the Saudi spy, he told me of his affiliatin and that he recalled dining with Bullock and Mrs. Petersen and me.)

In any case, following the breakfast, we parted company. Roy had been his ebullient self—as always—but I was ever more convinced that I was dealing with the Devil!

Of course, it was only my gut instinct and at the time I was still relatively young and hardly any veteran in dealing with The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within. I was in no position to make any accusations about Bullock but my suspicions were strong.

It was in the late part of 1985 or early in 1986 that Bullock next made contact with me when in Washington. He wanted to attend the annual conference of a California-based historical organization (which had been founded by Willis Carto of Liberty Lobby) and his application had been rejected. He asked if he could use my name as a reference. I told him “Go right ahead,” since, after all, I did not want to rouse his suspicions by saying, “no,” because, obviously, he and I had always had friendly contact up until that time.

What I did not know, at that time, was that Willis Carto had already been informed, by Dr. Edward R. Fields of *The Thunderbolt* newspaper, that Bullock was an ADL agent. And it was for this reason that Bullock’s application to attend the historical conference had been rejected. I didn’t hear from Bullock again in regard to the matter, and Willis and I didn’t discuss it—*until later* . . .

In any case, it was sometime soon, again in the spring of 1986, that Bullock once again popped up in Washington. He called and asked if I would like to have dinner with him. Although I was wary about the matter—by now convinced in my own mind that Bullock was almost cer-

tainly an ADL agent—I agreed to meet him for dinner.

But I thought it was time to mention Bullock to Willis Carto. I was scheduled to have dinner with Bullock at 6:00 pm. So about 5:00 pm when the Liberty Lobby office was winding down for the day, I stopped in Willis's small corner office. Bullock had told me, when I first met him, that he had known Willis "for years," so I opened up the conversation with Willis, saying:

"Willis, you know Roy Bullock, don't you?"

Willis looked up, a twinkle in his eye and a hint of a smile. "Yes, how do you know him?"

"Well, he's been coming around here for the last couple of years," I said, "In fact, I'm having dinner with him tonight."

Willis was still smiling.

"Tell me about him," I prompted, sensing—no, knowing—that, yes indeed, I was right about Bullock. I knew what Willis was about to say:

"He's ADL."

That was it. I nodded my head, smiling, but inside my stomach was churning. I was alternately angered, but at the same time I was mentally patting myself on the back for having spotted the enemy in disguise.

"I thought so," I said.

At that juncture Willis asked me the same question I was asking myself: "What have you told him?"

"I don't think I've told him anything that I shouldn't have. But then," I added, honestly, "I'm not sure."

"Where is he now?" asked Willis.

"He's going to be here very shortly. We're supposed to have dinner across the street. Do you think I should cancel?" I asked, uncertain, obviously, about the situation.

"Not necessarily," he responded. "You know," said Willis, thinking aloud, "maybe this is an opportunity for us to find out precisely what he's interested in."

"What do you mean?" I asked, somewhat puzzled.

In response, Willis proposed that I do indeed have dinner with Bullock and then, frankly, tell him that I had been told that he had "connections" with "people at the ADL" and ask him, "What exactly is it that you'd like to know?"

Bullock, of course, would have been surprised by all of this—presumably—and at that point I would offer to tell him whatever he wanted to know (within limits) in return for Bullock using his connections at the ADL to determine something of particular interest to Willis: i.e. who was responsible for the July 4, 1984 bombing of Willis's office (and his warehouse of valuable historical books) in Torrance, California.

Willis' proposal made good sense to me, and I thought that, at the very least, it would be a very good learning experience for me—facing down the Devil, literally across the dinner table.

So it was that I jaunted off to my dinner with Roy.

We went to a popular Capitol Hill nightspot known as the Tune Inn, perhaps best internationally known for having been hailed by *Esquire* magazine as one of the “best” bars in the nation (in Washington, D.C. in particular).

A narrow, old-fashioned barroom, complete with stuffed animals and other formerly living beings decorating its walls, along with a few choice pieces of weaponry, the Tune Inn had been a rough-and-tumble “joint” that evolved into a yuppie favorite, filled in the evenings with Capitol Hill staffers eagerly spending their taxpayer-financed salaries on some of the lowest-priced drinks in the nation’s capital.

Roy and I took a table at the rear of the inn, ordered drinks and dinner and settled down for what I knew would be an interesting evening. Roy, of course, ordered a soda.

A two-fisted drinker, I ordered something much stronger, thinking, still, that I would have to keep my wits about me. But I did need to relax.

Staring across the table at Roy Bullock, I saw him in a different light. He wasn’t the jovial, friendly, amusing and likeable acquaintance of several years. Instead, he was the Devil incarnate. “My God,” I remember thinking, “Here’s Mike Piper having dinner at the ADL’s expense, in the company of one of its covert operatives.”

Only moments after the drinks arrived Bullock began quizzing me. It was quizzing. Not friendly chat. Now there was no doubt in my mind. “Tell me,” he asked, raising the name of another individual who—like Bullock—was quite ubiquitous, showing up at various and sundry political events of the same type. “Who is this chap? He’s a rather interesting sort. Where is he coming from?”

Bullock was referring to one Matthew Peter Balic, an unusual figure, mentioned earlier, who had periodically popped up at Liberty Lobby headquarters over the years, and, like Bullock, he had an affinity for attending Arab-American meetings.

(In fact, I still have in my possession a photograph taken of Bullock and myself in the presence of none other than that same Mr. Balic at the aforementioned Libyan Students Association meeting.)

“Oh, him? I’ve always suspected he might be an ADL operative,” I said, quite seriously. (Inwardly I was surprised at my own brass. I had actually broached the subject of the ADL!)

“Oh? Do you think so?” said Bullock.

“I think it’s a good possibility,” I said. “He’s always showing up, mix-

ing with the Arabs. He travels a lot. Spends a lot of money." (I realized, of course, that this precise description fit Bullock.)

Either Balic was an ADL agent or an agent of some sort and Bullock knew it—and was trying to find out if I had any suspicions—or perhaps the ADL really wondered who Balic really was.

Alternatively, I was thinking that perhaps Balic was an ADL agent whose Bullock's ADL superiors had never told him about. That seemed wholly possible in the clandestine so-called "wilderness of mirrors" that permeates the strange world of the ADL.

In any case, Bullock was definitely interested in Balic and I had given him a choice morsel to report to his Mossad-sponsored superiors at ADL headquarters in New York—that Liberty Lobby's Mike Piper suspected Balic of being an ADL agent!

The conversation continued. Bullock got down to business. "This bombing [of Carto's office] was a rather interesting affair," he said.

I practically jumped out of my seat. I could feel my blood boiling. I was certain that Bullock must have seen my reaction—or was it my imagination? Somehow—was it an accident?—Bullock had brought up the very topic of my own covert assignment. Finding out what Bullock knew—or could find out—about the bombing of Willis Carto's office.

("My God," I thought. "Is the Liberty Lobby office bugged? Did the ADL hear the conversation that Willis and I had engaged in earlier? Did the ADL tip off Bullock as to what was afoot?")

We chatted about the bombing, but in my own mind, Bullock had thrown up a roadblock. It was as though he had deliberately preempted me—and he knew it. I resolved that it wasn't the time to spring Willis's proposal on Bullock. I was ill-prepared, I felt—unskilled, unlike Bullock—to engage in this game of cat-and-mouse, not knowing what Bullock did or didn't know about what I knew, or suspected.

We concluded the evening after dinner with several drinks at a restaurant down the street where I encountered a congressman of casual acquaintance. I introduced him to Bullock and vice-versa, knowing full well that Bullock was making a mental note to tell his boss at ADL headquarters in New York, Irwin Suall, that "Mike Piper is personally acquainted with Congressman So-and-So."

(I've always felt guilty about that. There's no question in my mind that, in the unlikely event the ADL didn't have a file on that congressman, a harmless soul who has since left office, they certainly do now!)

Bullock and I parted company, shaking hands and agreeing to "keep in touch." ("Indeed," I thought, wondering when I would next hear from Roy Edward Bullock, ADL agent extraordinaire.)

In fact, I did not hear from Bullock for some time, and then under

circumstances which will shortly be detailed. But finally the time came when it seemed appropriate to publicly blow the whistle on Bullock's ADL affiliation.

It came at a time when the Populist Party—which Liberty Lobby had played a part in establishing in 1984—had been split down the middle through the ruthless and destructive activities of a long-time trouble-maker in third party affairs, one William K. Shearer of Lemon Grove, California.

Shearer himself had long been suspected of being an ADL asset or in the employ of the CIA or the FBI—even the Republican Party, some guessed. Whether the real truth about Shearer will ever be known remains to be seen.

However, on June 30, 1986 in an article in *The Spotlight*, I detailed Bullock's ties to Shearer, boss of the basically defunct American Independent Party, then the Golden State affiliate of the Populist Party. The relevant portion of the story read in part:

At the so-called 'national committee meeting' of the Populist Party conducted by Shearer in Los Angeles . . . one delegate, who goes by the name of Roy Bullock, was invited to serve on the agriculture committee.

Bullock has long been known, among leaders in the populist movement, to be a charming, skilled and clever full-time professional operative for the ADL. Posing as a populist, Bullock has, over the years, wormed his way into dozens of different organizations, collecting information he reports to Irwin Suall, his superior at ADL headquarters in New York.

Shearer's wife was warned at the meeting by California Populist Charles Ulmschneider that Bullock was a known ADL operative. But instead of showing Bullock the door, she approached him and told him of the charge. Bullock was permitted to remain.

Not long after the *Spotlight* article unmasking Bullock as an ADL operative, I received a call from someone who identified himself to the switchboard operator as "CSC." Taking the call, I recognized Bullock's voice immediately—and I was startled, needless to say—but was even more somewhat mystified by the acronym he used to identify himself.

Recovering from my momentary jolt, I said, "Well, hello Roy, I'm surprised to hear from you. But what does 'CSC' mean?" He laughed, saying, "CSC—that's for charming, skilled and clever." I laughed. "Oh yes, Roy, that you are. I thought you might appreciate that compliment."

He said, “Well, I have to tell you that what you said about me, being an ADL agent, is not true. In fact, I swear on a stack of *Mein Kampfs* [Adolf Hitler’s famous volume] that I’m not an ADL spy.”

I chuckled about Roy’s reference to Hitler. But he continued in a more serious tone, saying, “I’ve talked to a lawyer about this.”

“Well, Roy, if you want to file a lawsuit,” I responded, “you’ll have to go ahead and do it, because I stand behind the article and I know that my source on that is reliable. In addition, I had suspected it myself for some time, a long time, prior to the time that it was published. We sat on that for a long time.”

He responded, asking, “Well, who was your source?” I responded, truthfully, “Willis Carto.” Bullock chuckled, making a remark to the effect that Willis was not the most reliable source. I replied, “Well, I wouldn’t expect the ADL to consider Willis a reliable source. But I’ve always found him reliable.”

Bullock said, “I’m sorry that you wrote that. I’ve always liked you. I thought we were friends.” I said, “Well, Roy, I’ve always liked you, but I do believe that you are an ADL agent.”

After Bullock commented laughingly, “Oh, and by the way, my name really is Roy Bullock. I don’t just travel about under that name,” we closed the conversation and it ended at that. No lawsuit was ever filed. A few folks around the country were upset that I had dared to call “a fine patriot like Roy Bullock” an ADL agent. And so it remained.

It took nearly eight years before that passing reference in *The Spotlight* to Bullock’s ADL affiliation was proved accurate—that Bullock truly was a paid agent of The Enemy Within.

And the story of Bullock’s ultimate exposure is what follows . . .

Chapter Eleven:

The San Francisco Earthquake: The ADL Spy Scandal Unmasks The Enemy Within

It was in mid-December of 1992 that I first learned that the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) was in trouble. A phone call came in to Liberty Lobby headquarters in Washington. The caller was an Arab-American living in San Francisco. He told one of our editors that a scandal was brewing involving a San Francisco police officer named Tom Gerard who was reportedly suspected of having provided classified police information to the ADL. On December 10, the San Francisco papers reported, raids had been conducted by the San Francisco Police Department—along with the FBI—on the offices of the ADL in both San Francisco and Los Angeles.

The fact that the scandal was erupting in San Francisco rang a bell in my mind. I wondered if my old friend Roy Bullock was involved.

I called the Arab-American, introduced myself and told him of my interest. I explained my past connection with his fellow San Franciscan, Bullock, whose name he did not recognize. He did say, however, that Gerard was reported to have a regular contact at the ADL.

“Just wait,” I said, “and see if I’m not right. Watch for the name ‘Roy Bullock;’” I told him. “I’d be willing to bet money that Bullock is Gerard’s ADL contact.”

So it was that several days later the Arab-American gentleman called me at *Spotlight* headquarters. “You were right,” he said. “Tom Gerard’s ADL contact is Roy Bullock.”

By that time, however, I already knew the details. Yet another *Spotlight* reader from San Francisco had called earlier and given us the news: Roy Bullock’s name was now very much a part of the public record and had been published that day in the San Francisco papers. The same Roy Bullock—ADL super-spy—first exposed by *The Spotlight*.

The *San Francisco Examiner* confirmed what *The Spotlight* first reported on June 30, 1986—that Bullock was indeed an ADL operative, although Bullock had, of course, hotly denied the report at the time.

Many folks who had called *The Spotlight* “crazy” for saying that a “good patriot” like Roy Bullock was an ADL agent were red-faced with embarrassment.

At this juncture, it is probably worth reflecting on what seemed like a highly unexpected situation that had developed. How was it that the FBI—which had collaborated for years with the ADL—had allowed itself to become placed in a hostile stance against its longtime ally?

Insiders told *The Spotlight* early on that the raids on the ADL offices in both Los Angeles and San Francisco, were first approved at the very highest levels—and not just at the Justice Department.

In short, they seemed to have come from the Oval Office, suggesting that it was President George Bush himself who gave the approval for the controversial move. Bush's move against the ADL came hardly more than a month after he had been defeated for re-election by Bill Clinton.

"This was George Bush's way of sticking it to the ADL and the Israeli lobby in the final days of his lame duck administration," a retired career diplomat, Stephen A. Koczak, who served in the Middle East both during Republican and Democratic administrations, told *The Spotlight*:

Although Bush had made the Israelis happy with his war against Saddam Hussein, the Israeli lobby turned on him like a mad dog after he dared to challenge their power over the issue of loan credit guarantees to Israel. The president was fed up with the Israeli lobby's pressure and he certainly knew about the allegations by former Mossad operative Victor Ostrovsky that a faction in the Mossad had plotted Bush's assassination after Bush dared to challenge the power of the Israeli lobby in Washington. When Bush saw his opening, he took it with gusto. Thus the raid.

Obviously, though, there was much more to be told. The ADL, caught red-handed, tried desperately to put a positive spin on its involvement by proclaiming that it was cooperating with the investigation. One ADL attorney, Jerrold Ladar, amused many people when he claimed with a straight face that the ADL had no ties to Israeli intelligence.

Christine Botah, a Arab-American active in Democratic Party politics, said, "We want the ADL to come clean. What is an organization that is supposed to be advocating human rights doing collecting information on another group?"

Richard Hirschautt, ADL regional director in San Francisco, claimed that "Under no circumstances whatsoever does the ADL maintain files on Arab-American individuals or organizations in this country. Our investigations and fact-finding work is related strictly to extremist groups and organizations who would do harm to Jews and other minorities, including Arab-Americans."

This, of course, is another bold-faced lie, since the ADL issued, under its own imprint, an innuendo-packed attack on Arab-Americans and Arab-American organizations. This scurrilous volume was based, obviously, upon material from the ADL's own files, much of it gleaned by none other than Roy Bullock.

Some Jewish American critics of Israel, including the late Haviv Schieber and civil libertarian attorney Mark Lane, were also singled out

for attack. In fact, an ADL official admitted as much under oath in a sworn deposition conducted by Lane on one occasion.

Although the ADL had, since the founding of Israel in 1948, functioned as an unregistered—and therefore, illegal—foreign agent, propaganda and intelligence arm for the government of Israel, it was not until the eruption of the San Francisco spy scandal that the ADL's criminal activities in the realm of illegal domestic spying received in-depth public scrutiny.

Yes, the spy scandal in San Francisco implicating the ADL was "just the tip of the iceberg of a nationwide network of domestic spying and security leaks," according to Phillip Matier and Andrew Ross, columnists for the *San Francisco Chronicle*. The *Chronicle* and its rival, the *San Francisco Examiner*, had jumped on the ADL spy scandal and were reporting it in detail as new facts began to emerge.

Matier and Ross reported that "Authorities believe that cops from at least a half dozen other federal and big-city police departments were also involved in trading or selling confidential police files" to a national spy network set up by the ADL.

The *Examiner* reported that an official close to the investigation, speaking on condition of anonymity, told the *Examiner* that "There's probably six or eight Roy Bullocks" operating around the country on behalf of the ADL. The *Examiner* noted that the official confirmed, as the newspaper put it, "a small group of undercover operatives throughout the nation" was being paid by the ADL to spy on ADL targets. According to the *Examiner*, "The operatives rely on local police and sheriff's deputies to provide access to confidential law enforcement and motor vehicle information, in probable violation of criminal law."

Capt. John Willett of the SFPD's special investigations division told reporters that evidence indicated there were files from up to 20 police departments and other law enforcement agencies throughout California alone. What's more, additional information had been illegally intercepted from national police computer intelligence networks. All of this had then been turned over to the ADL.

Investigators were astounded to discover the names and personal information about some 12,000 people, largely from California, but from all across the country, all of whom, for whatever reason, the ADL had determined belonged on its own in-house "watch list."

As *The Spotlight* pointed out: in light of the fact that the ADL maintained some 30 regional headquarters in virtually all of the major cities, it was not an exaggeration to extrapolate and suggest that there may well have been the names of some 360,000 Americans listed in the ADL's files, based on the figures discovered on the West Coast.

In the wake of new and growing revelations about the ADL's activities, the ADL spy scandal in San Francisco began receiving attention in the Establishment media throughout the country. The ADL's masquerade as a "civil rights" organization had effectively now been debunked.

The illegal spying operations of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith were finally exposed in daily newspapers coast to coast.

A *San Francisco Examiner* article outlining the outrageous spy scandal was reprinted in a number of newspapers across the country, including even the Little Rock, Arkansas *Democrat-Gazette*, President Bill Clinton's hometown newspaper. Prior to this, the only national coverage the spy scandal received was in the San Francisco press and in the pages of *The Spotlight*.

(However, as of this point, neither *The Washington Post* nor *The New York Times*, both of which vie for the sobriquet "the national newspaper of record" had yet to publish any details regarding the scandal.)

The *Examiner* article, which was reprinted across the country, noted that Liberty Lobby was one of the targets of the ADL's criminal surveillance through its paid informant Roy Bullock.

For its own part, the ADL smeared the San Francisco press for reporting the truth about its criminal operations. In seeking to prevent the release of ADL intelligence files seized by the SFPD and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the ADL decried what it called "sensationalized and inaccurate reports in the San Francisco press."

To make matters even more embarrassing for the ADL, syndicated columnist Lars-Erik Nelson, a devout liberal, published an article condemning the ADL's spy tactics. His column also appeared in various newspapers around the country.

Noting that he was aware that the ADL had been keeping tabs on various targets, Nelson commented, "Indeed, I have never questioned it until now. Then I wondered how I would feel if the tables were turned: Suppose right-wing or black nationalist groups were maintaining intelligence dossiers on Jews and sharing them with sympathetic newspapers and the police. Suddenly I get the willies."

According to Nelson, it was the ADL and several other pro-Israel groups that blocked a prominent Black liberal, Johnetta Cole, president of the predominantly Black Spelman College in Georgia, from being appointed secretary of education in the Clinton administration. Miss Cole's sole crime was having written articles for an organization that advocates justice for the Palestinian people who were uprooted from their ancestral homeland and sent into exile.

The targeting of Miss Cole illustrated clearly what the ADL's chief target of enmity—Liberty Lobby—had long contended: the ADL, an

unregistered—and therefore illegal—foreign agent for the state of Israel—moves to destroy any and all institutions or individuals perceived (rightly or wrongly) to be a threat to Israel's domination of U.S. Middle East policy-making.

After a week or two of observing the reportage by the San Francisco papers, joined by even *The Los Angeles Times*, I felt it was time to call Roy Bullock directly. And so I did.

"Hello, is this Roy Bullock?" I said, somewhat hesitantly, when I heard the familiar baritone at the other end of the telephone.

"Speaking," he responded quite confidently.

"Hello, Roy," I said. "Are you still as charming, skilled and clever as you were when I knew you?"

"I'd like to think so," he responded.

"Do you know who this is, Roy?" I asked. "It's Mike Piper."

"Oh yes," he acknowledged. "I recognized your voice immediately. How have you been?"

"Oh very busy and I guess you have been, too. I've been reading quite a bit about you in the papers lately," I said, not sarcastically, just frankly.

"Oh yes," he sighed. "But not all of it is true."

"I didn't think so," I commented in agreement, recognizing that the Establishment media has a flair for falling short of the truth.

"It seemed to me," I told Bullock, "as though there was a lot of supposition, a lot of guessing, that the full story hasn't been told."

"That's certainly true," he said. Then, after a pause, Bullock remarked in a wry tone with a hint of some resignation: "Well, Willis was right about one thing, anyway," referring, of course, to Willis's allegation regarding Bullock's status as a long-time covert ADL operative.

"Actually, Roy," I pointed out, rather proudly, I suppose, "I figured you out even before Willis tipped me off."

"Ohhhh? You did, did you?" purred Bullock, just a bit sarcastically.

"You know," I told him, "my feeling was that you were primarily interested in Arab groups."

"Oh no," he said. "Not at all." (Which, of course, proved to be very, very true. Bullock and the ADL, in fact, were interested in everybody.)

"I figured that you were interested in finding out if we had any connections to the Arabs, which, of course, we don't," I added. "I have to tell you, Roy, I always had this feeling that you rather enjoyed wallowing with people of my ilk, so to speak."

"On the contrary," he interjected. "Although," he added, "I must say you were always a bright spot in an otherwise dismal group of people. I always enjoyed your company. I had hoped that perhaps you would jet-

tison all that schlock and do something positive with your life.”

I chortled at Bullock’s comments. “No, Roy, I do think I’m doing something positive,” I said in response. “I entered this arena knowing what it entailed and I don’t have any regrets.”

“Well, no hard feelings I hope?” he said, sincerely, I felt, even hoped, having been rather kindly disposed toward Roy.

“Not at all,” I said. “Not at all. You were doing your job, and I was doing mine.” (Which was quite true.)

“It’s been good talking to you again after all these years,” he said. “I’m actually glad you called.”

“Yes, I’ve enjoyed it,” I said. “It’s been fun. So I guess maybe I should close for now. I hope,” (I added, in my own way, not insincerely) “you won’t be getting in trouble over all of this.”

“I don’t think I will,” he said. But it was clear that Bullock was not enjoying the situation.

“Well, good luck to you, Roy. It’s been interesting,” I concluded.

“You take care,” he closed. “It’s been good talking with you.”

It had been interesting. I hung up the phone and pondered the situation. Roy Bullock was indeed an ADL operative and I had been in his clutches. Talking the matter over—sorting out the truth, so to speak—had been a form of therapy for me. I had confronted the enemy.

The next day I informed Willis Carto that I had called Bullock. “No kidding?” he asked, laughing, somewhat amused at my audacity. “What did he have to say?” I related the conversation as Willis chuckled.

Clearly there was a lot more to come. Thus far we had only learned what ultimately proved to be the tip of the proverbial iceberg.

As the ADL scandal continued to grow—very much a public affair, heavily publicized in the San Francisco papers—declassified San Francisco Police Department documents revealed that *The Spotlight* and its publisher, Liberty Lobby, had actually played the key role in unmasking the illegal espionage and dirty tricks network of the ADL. Roy Bullock informed the FBI while being interrogated that it was *The Spotlight* (in its June 30, 1986 issue) that first exposed Bullock as an agent of the ADL’s criminal spy apparatus. In fact, *The Spotlight’s* expose set in motion the process which not only began unraveling the ADL’s spy network, but which also led to what Bullock described as his current “imbroglio.”

(As noted previously, *The Spotlight* had revealed how self-styled “California statesman” William K. Shearer allowed Bullock to infiltrate the Populist Party’s national convention even though Shearer had been warned Bullock was an ADL *agent provocateur*.)

Under questioning by the FBI, Bullock also confessed it was one of the ADL's attempts to sabotage Liberty Lobby that forged the chain of events that led Bullock and his partner in crime, fugitive former San Francisco police officer Tom Gerard, into selling stolen police intelligence files to agents of South Africa. Bullock revealed under interrogation that when he learned a South African diplomat was speaking at a meeting he believed to have been organized by Liberty Lobby founder Willis A. Carto, he arranged for his police contact, Gerard, to warn away the diplomat. The diplomat, in fact, canceled his scheduled appearance.

Ironically, however, Bullock was wrong: Liberty Lobby had nothing to do with arranging the event. Instead, it was the late Robert White of *Duck Book* fame who sponsored the event.

It was some months after Gerard initiated this contact with the South Africans that they, in turn, asked him to arrange a direct link from them to Bullock. From this emerged a lucrative and ongoing pay-off deal involving the ADL informant, the policeman and the South Africans. It was the contact between Bullock and the South Africans that ultimately led to the two-year-long FBI investigation, including a wiretap on Bullock's phone. Thus it was the ADL's campaign against Liberty Lobby that backfired and led to the events that ensnared the ADL in a criminal inquiry that threatened to send top ADL officials to jail.

The sale of this information by the ADL, Bullock, and Gerard to agents of Israel and South Africa was yet another aspect of the scandal. South African intelligence is long known to have maintained an intimate working relationship with Israel's secret police, the Mossad.

By this time, *The Spotlight* had obtained some 700 pages of declassified San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and FBI investigative files relating to the activities of Bullock; Gerard; and Bullock's superiors at the ADL—Irwin Suall, the former labor racketeer who headed the ADL's so-called fact finding (i.e., dirty tricks) division; and Mira Lansky Boland, the ADL's Washington spy chief.

What emerged from the most cursory review of the SFPD documents on the ADL was a chilling portrait of a massive national—and international—racketeering enterprise organized for the purpose of secretly and illegally obtaining classified data from a wide-ranging array of official government archives: criminal records, department of motor vehicle registrations, police intelligence files etc.

Although Bullock's own computerized files and those of the ADL—seized in two consecutive police and FBI raids—were not yet publicly released, a complete list of the titles of the various files Bullock kept indicates Liberty Lobby was very much a target of the ADL's illegal spy operations.

According to the SFPD documents, Bullock kept more than 20 different files on Liberty Lobby and affiliated organizations such as the Populist Action Committee under the special classification “RIGHT.”

There were also several Populist Party files listed. On February 15, 1993 *The Spotlight* had already reported that a Bullock conduit, the late David McCalden, had opened up a line of contact with the national office of the Populist Party in Ford City, Pennsylvania, then under the direction of one Don Wassall who later admitted having spoken several times with McCalden, despite having been warned about him

Meanwhile, as the ADL was reeling in embarrassment at the exposure of its criminal activities, a highly aggressive in-house ADL damage control team led by Barbara Wahl, a Washington attorney, rushed to the West Coast in a desperate last-minute cover-up attempt. Miss Wahl publicly denounced the San Francisco law enforcement officials, rightly infuriating the police who had been doing their job investigating criminal activity. The ADL attorney, however, charged that the real issue was police misconduct—not ADL misconduct.

Although district attorney and SFPD investigators initially viewed the case as strictly local in nature, they now realized—and had publicly stated—that the case was national in scope. The authorities also realized the ADL was the prime mover behind the entire operation, not Bullock or Gerard.

San Francisco Assistant District Attorney John Dwyer said: “People have been calling this the Gerard case. Now it’s the ADL case. Gerard was just their guy in San Francisco. The ADL is doing the same thing all over the country. This case just gets bigger every day. The more we look, the more people we find are involved.”

Miss Wahl also tried to distance the ADL from its loyal, thorough, capable and highly regarded 40-year informant, Bullock, saying he was “the classic independent contractor”—this despite the fact that the authorities had an in-house ADL document in which Bullock is proudly described by ADL spymaster Suall as “our No. 1 investigator.”

The ADL bosses knew Bullock had information that could send them to jail, and Bullock, unlike the ADL, was cooperating with the police. Although the ADL repeatedly claimed that it, too, was “cooperating” with the investigation and falsely announced it was not a target of the inquiry, San Francisco police official Ron Roth stated in an affidavit that “ADL employees were apparently less than truthful” in their dealings with the police. In short, the ADL lied.

On April 8, 1993 the story of the illegal spying operations of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith was finally reported in surprising detail by one of the major television news networks.

ABC TV's "Nightly News," with Sam Donaldson sitting in for anchor Peter Jennings, broadcast a lengthy—and detailed—report on the scandal which first erupted in San Francisco but which clearly had national implications.

What amazed many viewers, interviewed by *The Spotlight* afterward, is that ABC's report left the ADL in a very bad light—something to which the ADL was not accustomed.

ABC News reporter James Walker brought millions of TV viewers a story that, in essence, had been told by *The Spotlight* and its publisher, Liberty Lobby, since 1955—decades earlier: that the ADL had been operating a massive ongoing clandestine spying and espionage apparatus throughout the United States, functioning as a foreign intelligence agency providing information to the government of Israel.

Interestingly, according to the police, it was not only patriotic groups such as Liberty Lobby and Black nationalist groups such as the Nation of Islam that were targeted by the ADL.

The ADL even sent operatives into the ranks of such traditionally liberal organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the United Farm Workers.

Also targeted were the anti-abortion group, Operation Rescue, the environmentalist group Greenpeace and, interestingly, the board of directors of station KQED, a San Francisco public TV station. These, however, were just a handful of the ADL's victims.

The televised report on ABC news was significant in that it included film footage of not only ADL informant Roy Bullock, but also very rare, somewhat blurry film footage of the elusive Irwin Suall, the "ex-Marxist" who ran the ADL's spy division out of his offices at the United Nations plaza in Manhattan.

ABC reported that it had received information that Bullock—whose code name was "Cal"—had been hailed by Suall as being the ADL's "number one" spy.

The Establishment network also reported that a former ADL official in Los Angeles told ABC that, in addition to Bullock, he was aware that the ADL had at least three key spies operating in Chicago and at least one in Atlanta. The ADL official also admitted that his own job was to maintain the ADL's spy files at the ADL office where he was employed.

Other evidence indicated that the ADL also maintained operatives in Washington, St. Louis, and New York, among other major cities. These operatives could be deployed elsewhere as the need arose.

ABC reporter Walker went all the way to a remote Philippine island and obtained an interview with fugitive former cop, Tom Gerard, the ADL's contact in the San Francisco police who was stealing police files

and turning them over to the ADL.

However, here in this country, officials of the ADL refused to be interviewed by ABC. This was no surprise. Historically, when confronted with the truth, the ADL had always refused to face questioning or to participate in any form of debate. (That remains true to this day.)

To make matters for the ADL even worse, the ABC report came on the heels of yet a second police raid on the offices of the ADL in both San Francisco and Los Angeles. This raid, carried out under the order of search warrants, was a follow-up prompted by discoveries at ADL headquarters in the previous raids (assisted by the FBI) in December of 1992.

The *Los Angeles Times* reported on April 9, 1993 that the ADL was not only being investigated for illegally obtaining classified police intelligence files. The spy organization also faced a total of 48 felony counts for not properly reporting the employment of its spy, Bullock.

According to the *Times*, the ADL disguised payments to Bullock for more than 25 years by funneling \$550 each week to a Beverly Hills, California attorney, one Bruce I. Hochman, who then turned the money over to Bullock. (No doubt the ADL wrote this off as a "legal expense.")

(Attorney Hochman, a prominent ADL figure, was one of the major tax attorneys in California and a former U.S. prosecutor. He was also a member of a panel appointed by former U.S. Senator (and then Governor, at that time) Pete Wilson to secretly make recommendations on new federal judges in the Golden State.)

The *Times* also reported that David Lehrer, regional director of the ADL office in Los Angeles, maintained a secret slush fund used to pay for the ADL's spy operations. He signed checks from the account under the name "L. Patterson" to pay for the clandestine activities.

An ADL official was reported to have claimed that the account was used to pay for subscriptions to magazines and newspapers issued by groups targeted by the ADL's "fact finding" (i.e. dirty tricks) division.

By this point, however, the *New York Times* (which promotes itself as America's "newspaper of record") had published only a brief, cursory item about the scandal, buried at the bottom of the back section of the newspaper. The "liberal" internationalist *Washington Post* and its rival, the "conservative" internationalist *Washington Times*, had not yet published a single word.

As the ADL scandal continued to unfold, the truth became clear: officials of the ADL might face criminal charges for their illegal "intelligence gathering" activities. "What we're looking at is the violation of the statute that prohibits the sale, use and dispersal of confidential information," said San Francisco District Attorney Arlo Smith.

The FBI and San Francisco police department searches of the ADL

office had, of course, revealed the until-then-unknown fact that the ADL's agents had also apparently purloined material from not only the SFPD files, but also the Portland, Oregon Police Department and the Los Angeles Police Department files as well. Ironically, however, the Los Angeles Police Department refused to cooperate with the San Francisco authorities, refusing to assist in the search for stolen documents in the ADL office in Los Angeles. According to San Francisco's Assistant District Attorney, John Dwyer, who was overseeing the case, "[The Los Angeles police] felt it was a sensitive matter and they didn't wish to cooperate. It's the first I've seen that happen in my career."

One member of the Los Angeles city police commission, Stanley K. Sheinbaum, however, took issue with the police department's refusal to look into the ADL's criminal activities. "I want to find out what is the basis for the department's reaction not to cooperate," Sheinbaum said. "Unless I'm given a good explanation why we shouldn't cooperate, I think we should," he said.

The *Los Angeles Times* reported that the ADL's investigator, Bullock "worked closely with police officers from various departments and collected such confidential information as criminal records, intelligence files, driver's license photographs, home addresses and car registrations. Some of the information could have been helpful in staking out individual homes and conducting surveillance. Other confidential information could have been valuable to foreign governments concerned about the political activities of visitors from the United States."

San Francisco Assistant District Attorney Dwyer, immediate supervisor of the ADL investigation, came down hard on the ADL's criminal activities. According to Dwyer, "People talk about whether in the computer age privacy is being done away with, but you don't think about the department of motor vehicles giving your driver's license to some police officer who gives it to an organization that doesn't like you. This practice has to stop. You can't let the government collect all this information and give it to whomever they choose."

San Francisco Police Captain John Willett also came down hard on the collaboration by his brother officer with the criminal conspiracy operated up by the ADL. "The activities of Tom Gerard stepped over the line," said Willett. "They were illegal. He should not have been doing what he was doing for a private party."

In the meantime, Richard Hirschhaut, director of the ADL office in San Francisco, was busy trying to cover up the ugly truth about his outfit's crime spree. "It has always been our understanding and our credo in conducting our fact-finding work that we conduct our work from a high ethical plateau and in conjunction with the law," said Hirschhaut.

The "high ethical plateau" of which Hirschaut bragged included entering people's homes surreptitiously and photographing their personal files. In his book, *Square One*, ADL bigwig Arnold Forster boasted how one of his henchmen had violated the privacy of long-time *Spotlight* correspondent Joseph P. Kamp's home and rifled through his correspondence and made copies for the ADL.

But, as time passed, it seemed the ADL was going to get off the hook in San Francisco—at least as far as criminal charges were concerned. While the scandal continued to brew, there was another element at work which had helped turn events in favor of the ADL: the fact that, on January 20, 1993, George H. W. Bush—who had allowed (probably even given the order for) the raid on the ADL offices some six weeks earlier—left office. And he was succeeded by Bill Clinton.

Under the new Clinton administration, a war against the ADL was not part of the agenda, even if the outgoing Bush administration had used its power to send a lightning bolt in the ADL's direction, using the very offices of the FBI which had long so closely collaborated with the ADL. Under the new regime, the FBI did an interesting turn-about and refused to continue to collaborate with San Francisco District Attorney Arlo Smith in Smith's own inquiry into the ADL's illicit spying.

Writing in the January 19, 1994 edition of *The San Francisco Bay Guardian*, independent journalist Jane Hunter pointed out that "The FBI started the investigation against police spy Tom Gerard, but now it's blocking his prosecution," and asked the simple and logical question: "Why?" Although Miss Hunter speculated on various theories as to why the FBI had done this turn-about, it was precisely because the new administration had already turned a "thumbs down" on continuing FBI involvement in the inquiry—again, an order directly from the White House, but this time from the new president, William Jefferson Clinton.

In the face of all of this, the San Francisco District Attorney's office decided not to present a grand jury with evidence of the ADL's illegal domestic spying operations in return for an agreement by the ADL that it would not continue to use criminal means to spy on others. However, the ADL continued to face a growing number of civil lawsuits brought by a wide variety of groups and individuals who had been victims of the ADL's criminal perfidy.

Assistant District Attorney John Dwyer, who had been pressing for an indictment of the ADL, said "If you present the case to a grand jury and you convict them, you'd have them on probation for three years. This is a permanent injunction." ADL officials claimed victory saying that "The agreement we have reached confirms our consistent position that ADL has engaged in no misconduct of any kind," despite substantial evi-

dence to the contrary.

The ADL's chief undercover operative, Roy Edward Bullock, likewise would not be prosecuted, although his partner-in-crime, former San Francisco police officer Tom Gerard, was cast in the role of "patsy." Gerard still faced charges for having illegally given Bullock and the ADL confidential police information.

Incredibly (almost unbelievably), part of the district attorney's agreement with the ADL was that the ADL would spend a paltry \$25,000 (out of its \$25 million annual budget) to "train" employees of the district attorney's office in fighting "intolerance." The ADL was also setting up, as part of its agreement, a \$50,000 "hate crimes reward fund" to pay rewards to people who help the ADL target "haters." (Ironically, it was the ADL's cozy relationship with police agencies and law enforcement officials that led to the San Francisco spy scandal to begin with).

In fairness to the San Francisco authorities, however, it must be noted that insiders said the ADL and its well-heeled backers put immense pressure on the DA's office in order to settle the affair without criminal charges being leveled. It is known that in the past the ADL had used all forms of intimidation—including blackmail—to achieve its ends. Assistant District Attorney Dwyer himself contacted *The Spotlight* and requested a copy of *The Spotlight's* June 30, 1986 expose of Roy Bullock—the first nationally-published report that Bullock was indeed an undercover operative of the ADL.

There was, ultimately, a footnote to the scandal. Ex-Rep. Pete McCloskey (R-Calif.) won a \$150,000 court judgment against the ADL for its illicit spying. Acting as an attorney for three remaining plaintiffs—out of an original nineteen who first filed suit against the ADL in San Francisco Superior Court in April of 1993—McCloskey claimed victory after the ADL finally buckled and agreed to settle the case.

The Washington, D.C.-based Foundation to Defend the First Amendment (FDFA), now chaired by veteran radio talk show host Rick Adams, provided critical financial and research support for McCloskey during the course of the proceedings. "We considered this a great victory," said Adams in 2006 "and we're honored to have played a part in bringing the ADL to the bar of justice."

McCloskey's case was one of three civil lawsuits that were filed in San Francisco against the ADL after it was revealed—following the surprise raids by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and the FBI on the offices of the ADL in both San Francisco and Los Angeles—that the ADL's so-called "fact finding" division had been engaged in extensive domestic spying operations on a vast number of individuals and institutions around the country.

After the facts about the ADL's illegal activities were uncovered, a number of the ADL's victims were determined to bring the ADL to the bar and three civil suits (including McCloskey's) followed, despite the ADL's successful resolution of its legal problems with the San Francisco criminal authorities.

While the two other suits were settled, with the ADL on the losing end, the McCloskey suit continued to drag through the courts.

In the McCloskey case, the ADL agreed to pay \$50,000 each to the three plaintiffs—Jeffrey Blankfort, Steve Zeltzer and Anne Poirier—who continued to press forward alongside McCloskey against the ADL, despite a continuing series of judicial roadblocks that forced 14 of the original defendants to withdraw. (Two other defendants died during the drawn-out proceedings.)

Although the ADL continued to claim it did nothing wrong in monitoring their activities, Blankfort, Zeltzer and Poirier were taking their case against the ADL to any media forum that would listen—although there are few media outlets that are prepared to present the ADL and its activities in anything other than a favorable light.

Ironically, although the ADL represents itself as a group that defends the interests of Jewish people, two of the three ADL victims were Jewish. Blankfort and Zeltzer were targeted by the ADL because the two were critical of Israel's policies toward the Palestinian people (policies now being bared to the world in light of current events).

It turns out that the third ADL victim in the McCloskey case, Miss Poirier, was not involved in any activities even vaguely related to Israel or the Middle East. Instead, Miss Poirier ran a scholarship program for South African exiles who were fighting the apartheid system in South Africa. And this was a very interesting revelation . . .

Although the ADL liked to boast of its "alliance" with the African-American community in the United States (which was highly critical of the South African government), it was discovered that the ADL and its foreign principal, the Mossad, worked closely with the government of South Africa. And ADL operative Bullock had been busy providing ADL spy data on Miss Poirier and her associates to the South African government. As a consequence of this revelation, the ADL was hard-pressed to explain why it was secretly assisting a regime that American Blacks opposed, but few Black leaders in America dared to slam the ADL for its obvious deception and lies.

Although the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) had long made much noise about illegal domestic spying of the very type carried out by the ADL, its San Francisco office would not comment on the McCloskey case nor would it give a reason for its silence.

The conclusion of the McCloskey case did not bring an end to the ADL's legal problems, however.

On March 31, 2001 U.S. District Judge Edward Nottingham of Denver upheld most of a \$10.5 million defamation judgment that a federal jury in Denver levied against the ADL in April of 2000. The jury had stunned the ADL with the massive judgment after finding that the self-styled "civil rights organization" had falsely labeled Evergreen, Colorado residents—William and Dorothy Quigley—as "anti-Semites" because they had become involved in a dispute with neighbors who happened to be Jewish. Although the ADL appealed that initial judgment by a jury, its appeal was slapped down.

The ADL spy scandal and the subsequent lawsuits—along with the much more financially devastating Colorado case—rocked the ADL to its dirty core. Yet, the ADL persists in its wicked ways and continues to do so even as this is being written.

The ADL should be considered a criminal enterprise, which it is, and all persons associated with the ADL or who otherwise endorse its activities should likewise be considered criminals.

Any politician or public figure who lends his or her credibility should be publicly called on the carpet and any newspaper editor who allows ADL propaganda to appear in its pages should be contacted and advised of the ADL's criminal behavior.

The ADL is one of the primary forces carrying out the evil agenda of The Enemy Within. The ADL is a fully functioning foreign agent and intelligence conduit for Israel and a public relations agency and pressure group on behalf of the interests of the Rothschild dynasty and other Zionist families in the Rothschild sphere of influence.

By way of backtracking . . .

An Introduction to Part II

Cold War Intrigue

**How the Conflict Between
Stalin and the Trotskyites
Led to the Rise of The Judas Goats—
The Enemy Within on American Soil**

In the preceding chapters, we began a broad investigation and analysis of the behind-the-scenes maneuvering of The Judas Goats on American soil. However, at this point we shall make a brief but very important historical digression, for it is impossible to understand the modern-day influence of The Judas Goats without considering the Cold War-era conflicts that led to the rise of Zionist-Trotskyite “neo-conservative” elements. These groups played a major role, beginning in the mid-1950s and continuing well beyond, in infiltrating and corrupting the traditional “conservative”—or “nationalist”—movement in America.

Let the readers understand at the outset that there will be material in this section of the book that may prove surprising and unsettling to many traditional conservatives and anti-communists; but this book was never intended to withhold the truth—no matter how disturbing and unpleasant it might be.

So let us proceed . . .

Chapter Twelve:

The Struggle Between Stalin-Era Soviet Communism and Zionism: A Little Understood Political Phenomenon Which Contributes to Our Understanding of The Enemies Within as They Exist Today

The twin forces of Bolshevism and Zionism have often collaborated on many fronts throughout the 20th century—both alien forces having evolved in the closing years of the 19th century. However, there have been conflicts between the two philosophies that remain little understood even by many who have devoted much study to both forces.

While there are many who view Bolshevism and Zionism as two heads of a single snake (and a two-headed snake does, in fact, exist, as biologists have reported) the realities of 20th century geopolitical struggles suggest that there is much more to the story.

In fact, there were sharp differences between the Russian nationalists (led by Josef Stalin) and the Jewish internationalists led by Stalin's arch-enemy, Leon Trotsky.

By the time of the Cold War, following the establishment of the Zionist state of Israel in 1948, many traditional Trotskyites began a transmutation process, evolving, particularly in the United States, into the leaders of an anti-Stalinist element that emerged as the hard-line pro-Israel bloc that came to be known as today's "neo-conservatives."

This is, of course, a cursory overview of a complicated and often confusing international struggle between revolutionary elements, both of which have been hostile to American interests. A detailed history of this struggle would go far beyond the purview of this volume. However, the fact remains that the modern-day disciples of Trotskyism are key figures among The Enemy Within, twisting old-fashioned conservatism into a divisive and destructive force that is utilizing America's military might, the blood of its children, and its national treasure to enforce a global Zionist imperium—in short, a New World Order.

At the time of Stalin's death in 1953—the circumstances of which suggest that he was certainly "helped" to his death—the Soviet leader was becoming openly and actively hostile to political Zionism. According to a July 27, 1967 report published in the *American Examiner*, the Jewish Telegraph Agency reported that:

Josef Stalin died 14 years ago of a rage caused when the Politburo opposed his proposal that all Russian Jews be expelled to Siberia, *The Detroit News* has reported from Washington . . . The story alleged that Stalin called a secret Politburo meeting to announce a campaign against the

Jews. He said measures should be taken to deport Jews en masse to Biro Bidjan in Siberia . . .

Lazar Kaganovich, [the] only Jewish member of the Politburo and Stalin's brother-in-law, tore up his party card and threw the pieces in Stalin's face, said *The News*.

The report said that Stalin then turned purple with rage . . . Stalin rose from his chair, according to the account, began screaming incoherently and fell unconscious. An hour later, physicians pronounced him dead.

Although this teasingly and provocatively written news report—aimed at Jewish audiences—never said, flat out, that Stalin had been murdered, the intent of the report was very clear: in short, that Zionist interests in Russia had murdered the Soviet strongman because he was planning new offensives against Zionism.

In their 2003 book, *Stalin's Last Crime*, Jonathan Brent and Vladimir Naumov published evidence that Stalin was almost certainly murdered in 1953 after he began moving toward exorcising Zionist influence in Soviet circles of power.

Describing Stalin's moves against the Zionist elements in Russia, Brent and Naumov wrote that if Stalin had not been removed from power, "much subsequent world history might have been quite different." They added:

Many leading Kremlin figures would have been purged and probably shot; the security services and the military would have been decimated by purges; Soviet intellectuals and artists, particularly Jews, would have been mercilessly suppressed; and the surviving remnant of Soviet and Eastern European Jewry would have been gravely (perhaps mortally) imperiled, while grievous suffering would have been inflicted on all the citizens of the Soviet Union. Another Great Terror, such as occurred in the late 1930s, was averted when Stalin suddenly died on March 5, 1953. Stalin's version of a "final solution" remained unfulfilled . . .

And although even today there are those—including many legitimate and traditional American anti-communists—who believe Stalin was actually in alliance with Zionist interests, as evidenced by his immediate recognition of the State of Israel, Brent and Naumov comment that in 1948, "The Jews and Israel were not yet the enemies of the Soviet state they soon became." So the point is this: a very real rift—one long in

development—between Stalin and the Zionist (and Trotskyite) elements was very much a reality, popular legend notwithstanding.

In fact, by 1952, when Stalin was intensifying his public (and behind-the-scenes) campaign against Zionism in Russia, Brent and Naumov point out that the irony that many American Jewish spies for the Soviet Union would have found it hard to imagine that they were working for “a country whose leaders soon thereafter would turn against the entire Jewish population of the Soviet Union and, at the highest governmental levels, was seriously considering the idea of the detention and deportation of hundreds of thousands, if not millions of innocent people.”

In fact, in the Jan/Feb 2003 issue of *The Barnes Review*—the Revisionist history journal published by Willis A. Carto—Russian nationalist historian, Dr. Oleg Platonov, offered readers a fascinating history of Russia’s historic troubles with Jewish-Zionist and Jewish-Bolshevik agitation—the proverbial two-headed snake. Platonov, asserted, flat-out, that Stalin had indeed launched a major offensive against Zionism. The words of Platonov, one of the leading Russian intellectuals today, and who is in the forefront of the fight against Zionist influence in 21st Century Russia, are worth reviewing. Platonov wrote:

The Jewish-Bolshevik rule over Russia was broken by Stalin who, in the second half of the 1930s, carried out a counter-revolution and stripped the carriers of the Zionist ideology of their power. In the 1930s and 1940s, no less than 800,000 Jewish Bolsheviks were annihilated under the leadership of Stalin—the elite of the anti-Russian organization which had planned to transform Russia into a Jewish state. Nearly all Jewish leaders were purged, and the chances of the remaining ones to regain power were reduced to a minimum. The last years of Stalin’s life were dedicated to the uprooting of Zionism and the liquidation of the organizations associated with it.

Dr. Platonov added these highly relevant details:

After Stalin’s death, everything changed abruptly. The state was taken over by people bent on the restoration of Jewish Bolshevism . . . The renaissance of Zionism continued during the entire government of N. S. Khrushchev.

The situation somewhat improved under Brezhnev, who secretly limited the number of Jews in government

positions. As a matter of fact, these measures were rarely put into practice, and both secret and open Zionists found many ways to elude them.

From the 1950s to the 1970s, a powerful fifth column spearheaded by the carriers of the Zionist ideology arose in Russia. Many of its leading figures were sons or grandsons of Bolshevik revolutionaries.

These very people later became the most active elements of the so-called perestroika, which led to the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the assumption of political power by the Jews and the transfer of a considerable part of Russia's national wealth to foreign countries.

Today, of course, the fight against Zionist influence in Russia has expanded considerably, and Russia's current president, Vladimir Putin, is increasingly under the gun from American-based (and worldwide) Zionist elements who view the so-called "Russian strongman" as a potential threat. (In a later chapter, we'll discuss Putin further.)

The point that we need to focus on—and which must be emphasized—is that the break between Stalin and the Zionists, which began in the 1930s and which reached a fever pitch at the time of Stalin's assassination in 1953, led specifically to events in the United States which played a major part in behind-the-scenes intrigue in the so-called "Cold War." This led to the establishment of the power bloc that today—in the 21st century—is known as the "neo-conservative" movement: that is, the Zionist-Trotskyite globalist warmongers who are using the wealth and power of the United States to enforce their world imperium.

In 1914, no less than V. I. Lenin wrote of Trotsky: "Comrade Trotsky has never yet possessed a definite opinion on any single, earnest Marxian question: he has always crept into the breach made by this or that difference, and has oscillated from one side to another." And this reflects precisely the way so many American Trotskyites—who became the neo-conservatives—actually shifted their own agenda in order to fit with the times, particularly as elements within the Soviet government continued, behind the scenes, to agitate against Zionist influence.

So although many American anti-communists (and outright anti-Zionists and anti-Semites) were caught up in the theory that Soviet Communism (even under Stalin) had been largely a "Jewish" project, so to speak, there were a few discerning voices who recognized that the fight between Stalin and Trotsky had a definitive "Jewish slant" that needed to be examined in careful context.

In the late 1950s, John H. Monk, the American nationalist and

frankly anti-Semitic editor of the Texas-based journal, *Grass Roots*, published a remarkable essay entitled “Let Us Look Into This Thing Called ‘Trotsky Communism.’” He concluded after an extensive review of the history of the conflict between Stalin and Trotsky that, put simply: “Trotsky Communism and Soviet Communism are enemies.” In Soviet Russia, as Monk noted, beginning in the late 1930s, “top ranking Jews began at that time toppling from their high seats,” and that “Russia at last had gotten her eyes open [and that] the good work started in 1928 with the exiling of Trotsky” by Josef Stalin. He added, quite pointedly:

Just recently, the Anti-Defamation League issued a special bulletin in which it wept sorely because the Russian Jews used to fill, back in 1935, ten percent of the high seats in the empire, and now they have only “one half of one percent” and it is shaky. No wonder the American Jew-Trotsky gang invented the slogan: “Down with Communism!” They mean Russia.

Monk pointed out that the Zionist movement and affiliated groups such as the ADL had quickly aligned themselves with the Trotskyite movement that set up shop in the United States—in New York City in particular—upon Trotsky’s exile from Russia. “If we run with the Trotsky Communist slogan, ‘Down with the Communists,’ we automatically become partisans of the filthiest underground that has ever existed anywhere on this earth: Trotsky Communism.”

Monk’s essays on this controversial topic were even reprinted by famed Lyril Clark Van Hyning in her popular *Women’s Voice* newsletter, which no one ever accused of being a “communist” journal.

On September 15, 1969, writing in the popular American nationalist newspaper, *Common Sense*, which had, over the years, frequently featured the works of outspoken Jewish-born American anti-Zionist spokesman Benjamin Freedman, one Morris Horton (under his pen name “Fred Farrell”) wrote a fascinating assessment of the reality of Trotskyite Communism. Horton wrote in part:

Originally “Communism” was nothing but a tool of the wealthy American Jews of New York. In the United States, and in much of the rest of the world, it is still just that. Let us now address ourselves to a question important to anyone who really wants to understand Communism: “What is the difference between a Stalinist and a Trotskyite? Some people will tell you: “All Communists are alike.”

This is a dangerous piece of shallow misinformation. It is acceptable only if you are willing to substitute shallow sloganeering for real knowledge. A Stalinist represents primordial Russian nationalism. A Trotskyite represents the Jewish interests of New York City. The Jewish interests of New York suffered a terrific setback one day many years ago, when a taciturn hood planted an ax in Leon Trotsky's skull in a villa in Mexico.

The world Communist conspiracy is not a Russian conspiracy; it is an American Jewish conspiracy. Today it is falling into great disrepute around the world. America is being blamed for supporting communism around the world. Unhappily, the charge is true. New York is the real hub of the conspiracy. If some of our Anti-Communists would stand up four square and tell this plain truth, we might possibly yet be liberated from Jewish misrule. Few of them ever do.

Most of the Communists and many of the Anti-Communists are on the same payroll, the Jewish payroll. They carry on a sham battle with each other. The first basic rule of this sham battle is: "Never drag any real truth into the matter on either side; tell anything else you want to tell, but never tell the truth." This is the basic background of most of the phony "experts" on Communism who have been "experting" about it for forty years and haven't made a dent in it.

Horton was particularly adamant in pointing out that the American "anti-Communist" movement was increasingly falling into the hands of very real Communists—the Trotskyites—who in the guise of "fighting Communism" were actually working to introduce it into the American system. This is a point that few anti-communists understood then and even today they find it difficult to digest. Horton wrote:

These people generate the literature on Communism that is generally available to the American public. They have no interest in providing any genuinely valid information. Their aim is to manipulate public opinion.

Therefore, they seek to divide the Gentile. They seek to make the middle class believe that the working class is allied to Red Russia; All of this is, and always was, pure hallucination, generated by Jewish intellectual quacks in order to promote a minority tyranny over the American Majority.

In his essay, Horton emphasized that the age-old labels of “Right” and “Left” no longer had any real meaning—a point that even many legitimate and self-styled modern-day American “conservatives” of the 21st century have yet to realize:

There is no genuine validity in either the “Right” or “Left” positions in politics. These are artificial, Jew-invented positions. Jewish control of communications is absolutely essential to the success of this power system. Jewish political quackery would not long survive exposure.

The Right-Left Age is the Jewish Age, and it is an age which, on the world stage, is now receding into the past. If America continues to live in this Jewish past, then America has no future.

Horton’s words—written nearly 50 years ago—continue to reverberate. But to drive home the point further, it is worth reviewing a translation of an analysis of Zionism published in Spanish in the November 4, 1979 edition of *Granma*, the official newspaper voice of the communist regime of Cuba’s Fidel Castro.

(Similar versions of this had previously appeared in the Soviet Union, at a time when there were increasing public noises against Zionism, much to the dismay of the American Trotskyites who were then reinventing themselves as “the neo-conservatives.”

While this analysis from the communist point of view has been superseded by the collapse of the Soviet empire as it existed when this document was first published, it contains fascinating insights into the sources of tension between Zionism and Communism.

The Zionist movement, created by the Jewish big bourgeoisie at the end of the 19th century, was born with a decidedly counterrevolutionary purpose. From the founding of the World Zionist Organization in 1897 to the present, Zionism, as ideology and political practice, has opposed the world revolutionary process.

Zionism is counterrevolutionary in a global sense in that it acts the world over against the three major forces of revolution: the socialist community, the working class movement in capitalist countries and the movement for national liberation.

Zionist counterrevolution began by making inroads in the European working class movement. In the early years,

when the growth of monopoly capitalism and the expansion of reactionary tendencies that accompanied the establishment of the imperialist phase of capitalism demanded the unity and solidarity of the proletariat, the Zionists focused on dividing the working class.

They propagated the thesis that all non-Jews were, and would always be, anti-Semites; asserted that the only possibility for the Jewish masses' well-being and justice was to emigrate to the "promised land"; and defended class collaboration, thus diverting the Jewish proletariat away from the struggle for their real emancipation and dividing and weakening the working class movement. It's not fortuitous that in czarist police archives one finds documents calling for support for the Zionist movement as a way of stemming the tide of proletarian revolution.

Theodore Herzl, the founder of Zionism, wrote at the time in his diary: "All our youth; all those who are from 20 to 30 years old, will abandon their obscure socialist tendencies and come over to me."

However, the efforts of Zionist counterrevolution could not hold back the wheels of history. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia ushered in a period of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale. The first victory of the proletariat, the premise of future victories, was a heavy blow to Zionism.

Most of the money that filled Zionist coffers came from Russia, where czarism had humiliated and oppressed the Jews for centuries. Russia provided a million immigrants for the Zionist colonization of Palestine. When the Russian Revolution liquidated the exploitation of man by man, it also destroyed the basis for Zionism in the Soviet Union.

Leninist policy on the national question toppled all Zionist myths that the Jews could not be fully incorporated, with equal rights, into society and destroyed all the racist claims on the inevitability of anti-Semitism. The Zionists never did, and never will, forgive the Soviet state and its Leninist Party, not so much for cutting off the money flow from Russia and for the loss of workers for the colonization effort, but because the Bolsheviks implemented a correct policy that incorporated the talents and efforts of the Soviet Jews into the tasks of building a new society and thus demonstrated the class origins of discrimination and anti-

Semitism, breaking with the past and providing a genuine solution to the Jewish problem, a solution which was not and could never be a massive exodus to Palestine.

Zionist counterrevolution took on an anti-Soviet thrust. Before October 1917 the Zionists collaborated with Kerensky. Later they supported all the attempts at counterrevolution and enthusiastically participated in the different white "governments" set up in different parts of the country during the Civil War [in Russia]. They were active in all the moves against the Soviet Union from abroad, and their powerful propaganda machine spread a spate of lies about the first workers' and peasants' state in the world.

Not even the Soviet victory over German fascism, which saved so many Jewish lives, made the Zionists change their anti-Soviet stand.

With the outbreak of the cold war the Zionists collaborated in all the subversive and diversionary activities against the USSR and other socialist countries. The secret services of the Zionist state of Israel coordinated their spy activities with the CIA. Zionist agents played an active role in the counter-revolutionary attempts in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

Today Zionism seconds the hypocritical anti-Soviet campaign on presumed violations of the human rights of Jews in the Soviet Union and does all it can to put pressure on Soviet citizens of Jewish origin so they will leave their true homeland and go to Israel. This effort by Zionist counterrevolution can only lead to new failures. And to complete the picture there is the Zionist counterrevolutionary action against the national liberation movements.

Soon after World War I, Zionist settlers penetrated into Palestinian territory, acting as the spearhead of British imperialist interests in opposition to the Arab peoples' hopes for independence. Their role was clearly spelled out by the prominent Zionist leader Max Nordau in a statement to the British authorities:

"We know what you want from us: that we defend the Suez Canal. We must defend your route to India which passes through the Middle East. We are ready to take on that difficult task. But you must allow us to become powerful enough to carry out that task."

And, as a matter of fact, the Zionists became a power

and succeeded in establishing their own state in 1948: the Zionist state of Israel. Now their task is to defend oil routes, protect all the interests of U.S. imperialism and block the advance of the Arab revolution.

Backed by tremendous amounts of imperialist economic and military aid, the Zionists are constantly acting against national liberation movements.

At one time it was their mission to penetrate African and Asian independence movements, guarantee that the newly independent states followed paths acceptable to imperialism, that they not stray from the confines of neo-colonialism. Israel offered courses, advisers, all sorts of aid.

But the ploy wasn't very successful. Israel's increasing role as imperialism's policeman in the Middle East, its racism and avowed expansionism made the young African and Asian nations see the dangers of Israeli "aid," the treachery of Israeli foreign policy.

Nevertheless, the Zionist state took up a new role in the struggle of world reaction against progress. It went beyond the geographical confines of the Middle East, established friendly ties with all reactionary regimes and began to supply arms, equipment and advisers to those who were trying to suppress national liberation struggles.

The Israeli armaments industry specialized in designing and producing all sorts of weapons for urban and rural anti-guerrilla warfare.

The South African racist regime, the dictatorships of Guatemala and El Salvador, and the fascist Pinochet are among the best clients of the Israeli armaments industry. Israeli arms sales in 1978 were estimated at \$400 million. One of their best clients was the Nicaraguan dictator Anastasio Somoza.

Zionist counterrevolution was present in Somoza's Nicaragua in the form of Galil guns and Pull-push planes, but they couldn't stop the victory of the Sandinista revolutionaries.

This is a symbol of our times: neither the machinations of Zionist counterrevolution, nor Israeli arms, can hold back the victorious march of the peoples of the world.

(END OF THE *GRANMA* ARTICLE)

Whatever one thinks of Fidel Castro or of former Soviet leader Josef Stalin, the fact is that there has long been a very real split between the Trotskyites—who have (in the leadership level of the “neo-conservative” network in the United States) evolved into the tribunes of the global Zionist movement—and the nationalistically-oriented elements led in Russia by Stalin following his consolidation of power.

To understand these nuances and to recognize the part they have played in shaping the events of the last half of the 20th century it is vital to understand how and why The Enemy Within has been able to manipulate the traditional cause of “anti-communism” and bend it into a mechanism for the Zionist cause.

Where there are a few insignificant Trotskyite movements—rag-tag bands of street agitators and others—who continue to operate quite independently of (and often in opposition to) the neo-conservative Zionists, it is those “neo-conservatives” who have wrapped themselves in the American flag who are the real Enemy Within.

And in light of all this, it’s no coincidence that in Russia today, both traditional Communists (many of whom revere the memory of Josef Stalin) and anti-Communists are united in their opposition to Zionism and Jewish plutocratic power.

In the chapter which follows, we will examine some remarkable historical facts which underscore the reality of the split between the Stalinists and the Zionist Trotskyites, and will further clarify the nature of the modern-day Enemy Within.

Chapter Thirteen:

Zionist Infiltration of the Soviet KGB and the Impact on the U.S. Intelligence Services: The Little-Known Foundation for the Birth of Neo-Conservatism in America

The best known Soviet spy in history was the late British turncoat, H. A. R. “Kim” Philby. But “the rest of the story” about Philby’s intrigue was kept under wraps for nearly half a century. The truth is Philby was not just a KGB agent. He was also doubling as an agent for yet another intelligence agency—Israel’s Mossad. Only *The Spotlight*, the Washington-based populist weekly, told the amazing story—one which points to a “hidden history” of intrigue that has been deliberately suppressed by the “mainstream” media in the West.

In its June 25, 1984 issue *The Spotlight* reported on a highly-classified summary of East-bloc espionage operations compiled in April of 1984 by Defense Department analysts. (A copy of that report was provided by well-placed sources to Andrew St. George, the chief diplomatic correspondent for *The Spotlight*.)

The summary cited several instances when covert agents from the KGB, the Soviet Union’s primary intelligence agency, joined forces with agents of Israel’s intelligence service, the Mossad, to penetrate U.S. targets. Philby was among those who provided aid to the Mossad.

The study revealed that veteran CIA official William King Harvey ran afoul of the KGB and the Mossad as early as 1942 when he concluded a high-level investigation with a report denouncing Philby, then a top British counterintelligence official, as a Soviet “mole,” that is, a long-range covert Soviet penetration agent.

At the time Philby was serving in Washington as the chief liaison officer between British and American intelligence, giving him access to the U.S. government’s most closely guarded security secrets.

What the other evidence in the Pentagon summary regarding Philby revealed—but which went unreported in all of the “mainstream” media accounts of the Philby affair—was that while Philby was spying for the Soviets, he was also working as an agent for the cause of political Zionism since the early 1940s.

This was well before the emergence of Israel as a sovereign state and the formation of the Mossad, which, according to former Mossad officer Victor Ostrovsky, functions as “the real engine of policy” in Israel.

The Pentagon report revealed that in 1932 Philby was married in Vienna, Austria to Litzi Friedman, a communist organizer who was also active on behalf of the Zionist cause. Present at the nuptials were several key figures who later assumed leading roles in Israeli espionage. Among them were “Teddy” Kollek, who became much better known as

the future longtime mayor of Jerusalem, and Jacob Meridor, one of the founders and directors of the Mossad.

When Harvey exposed Philby as a Red spy, he also cast doubt on Philby's close friend, James Jesus Angleton, the CIA's director of counterintelligence who was also the CIA's liaison to the Mossad and a faithful supporter of the Zionist cause.

Angleton and the Mossad felt threatened by Harvey's unmasking of Philby as a Soviet mole. Soon enough, rumors began to circulate in Washington of Harvey's "heavy drinking" and "scandalous" behavior, with the rumors being fed directly to the White House.

In 1967, President Johnson fired Harvey from his CIA post and he retired in disgrace. As *The Spotlight* put it: "The leading American spy-master of the post-World War II era, who had exposed Philby and other major communist spies, spent his last years working for a publishing company in a dead-end job. He died in 1976 of a heart attack, obscure, poorly paid and lonely.

(Ironically, in recent years, there was a fraudulent attempt to link Harvey to the JFK assassination, with the outlandish suggestion that Harvey had worked hand-in-glove with his longtime enemy, Angleton, and Angleton's CIA lieutenants, in arranging the president's murder. Nothing, could be further from the truth.)

In reality, Harvey was right. Philby was ultimately exposed as a major Soviet penetration agent and ultimately confessed, fleeing to Moscow where he ultimately died.

Angleton's fate was somewhat similar. In a long-suppressed top-secret report (which was cited in the Pentagon summary described by *The Spotlight*) a senior CIA security official, C. Edward Petty, concluded that Angleton may have been a Soviet-Israeli penetration agent while he made his way to the top of the CIA bureaucracy.

The Petty report suggested that Angleton, throughout his career as the dominant figure in U.S. counterintelligence, had slipped vital information to both the Soviet Union and Israel. The report was submitted to President Gerald Ford in April of 1975, but a political decision was made that the evidence was not sufficient to indict and try Angleton, largely because it would have been impossible to stage a public trial of an intelligence official who was privy to as many secrets as Angleton was.

Instead, then-CIA director William Colby fired Angleton, enraging the Israeli lobby which had relied for so long on Angleton's key placement in the counterintelligence bureaucracy. Angleton retired and died a broken man on May 11, 1987.

On December 14, 1998, *The Spotlight* was the only newspaper on the planet to publish a suppressed fact about the otherwise widely-pub-

licized secrets about KGB espionage that were revealed with the release of the fabled Soviet diplomatic cables that were secretly decrypted beginning in 1946 by the U.S. Army Signals Security Agency and code-named “Venona.”

Military historian Ulick Steadman described the Venona venture as “a historic achievement,” but noted that there was “a shocking twist.” In fact, a vast majority of the alien agents unmasked by the decoded Soviet cables turned out to be active in Zionist circles rather than merely in the Communist underground. According to H. Dexter Gamage, who served as a Pentagon cryptography analyst, the Venona files revealed that Zionists “made up three-fourths of the enemy spies recruited by the Soviets” in the United States.

As a consequence, at the time the Venona project was under way, Gen. Omar Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ordered the intercepts withheld from President Truman, because—according to Steadman—Bradley was “concerned that anything known to the White House would soon become known to the Zionist insiders [surrounding the president] and subsequently to the Soviets” who would discover that their cables were being intercepted.

Beginning in 1995-1996 portions of the Venona decryptions were finally released to great fanfare. However, significant portions of those long top secret documents have never been released, nor was a list of the Kremlin’s spies, each of whom was identified by name and code name. The identity of those spies is most interesting indeed.

In the original Soviet messages, a large number of operatives were marked with the letter “K” for “KRYSY” (i.e. “Rats”). “KRYSY” was the contemporaneous Soviet code designation for the Zionist operatives under its control. In the version of these documents made public in the United States, *The Spotlight* revealed, the “K” designation was erased before release, reportedly by State Department censors.

A review by *The Spotlight’s* inimitable Andrew St. George of 35 decoded Soviet messages came up with 20 names of Zionist operatives in Moscow’s service. The same documents revealed only four Communist agents who had no apparent ethnic links to Zionism.

These more recent revelations certainly confirm other evidence we have examined that there really was a split at the highest levels between the Zionists and the Russian nationalists in the USSR during the final days of the Stalin era and well into the years that followed.

This was a major secret element in the development of the Cold War—a rift that laid the groundwork for the rise of the pro-Zionist “neo-conservative” network that has ultimately proved to be one of the most dangerous of America’s Enemies Within.

Until American patriots—real patriots—confront and understand these hidden elements within history, which cast a starkly different perspective on the events of the second half of the 20th century, it will be impossible to begin the process of winning back America—in the 21st century—from the hands of the Judas Goats: The Enemy Within.

The old labels of “liberal” and “conservative” just simply do not apply any more and a lot of the legends of the past—particularly of the Cold War era—must be recognized as precisely that: “legends.”

In the chapters that follow we will examine additional evidence pointing to the role of so-called American “anti-communists” in shifting, bending, distorting and destroying legitimate anti-communist movements for the benefit of the Zionist agenda.

As we shall see, there is much more to the story of the “McCarthy Era” and the “conservative” forces that began to align in that period than we have been led to believe.

Chapter Fourteen:

Trotskyite Communism— Now Called “Neo-Conservatism”— And the Story Behind Senator Joseph R. McCarthy

The contents of much of this chapter will come as a shock to modern-day American anti-communists (and particularly those who were active in supporting Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy, the famed communist hunter) but certain facts must be made a part of recorded history if we are to have a faithful profile of The Enemy Within.

But first, the story of a controversial figure who played a secret (and actually quite bizarre) role in helping John F. Kennedy win the presidency in 1960—one of the legendary, behind-the-scenes figures in the American nationalist movement—DeWest Hooker, who died at age 81 in Washington, D.C. on September 22, 1999.

Hooker—“West” to his friends—is now a part of history (hidden history) and his remarkable story is worth telling for the record, particularly since Hooker’s own experiences help us document the work of America’s Zionist Judas Goats.

About Hooker himself: A fascinating and memorable man who well deserves this brief tribute. Born to wealth and privilege, and later married into an immensely wealthy family, Hooker was a graduate of Cornell and a veteran of World War II—a war that he believed then and until his dying day was a war that need not and should not have been fought. Hooker devoted much of his personal fortune to fighting for the nationalist cause, a cause that he never abandoned.

In his early years, the floridly handsome Hooker was not only a Broadway actor but also an advertising model appearing in advertisements for Chesterfield cigarettes and wearing an eye patch in the famous Hathaway shirt advertisements.

However, Hooker gave up a promising career on the stage, after having been offered Henry Fonda’s lead role in the road tour of the Broadway hit, *Command Decision*, preferring to work behind the scenes in the entertainment industry.

Hooker ultimately went to work as a talent agent for the Music Corporation of America (MCA) and in the early 1950’s was one of the highest-paid talent agents in America. His focus was on the burgeoning arena of television production.

Hooker was particularly proud of his efforts to promote “black entertainment” for “black audiences,” encouraging the artistic endeavors of black singers and actors. At the same time, however, Hooker thoroughly rejected the concept that black music and black culture should be promoted to white audiences, a guiding principle of the “multi-cultural” music and motion pictures promoters of today.

(Hooker was particularly enthusiastic about the increasing prominence in the mid-1980s of Minister Louis Farrakhan, leader of the Nation of Islam, and this author first met Minister Farrakhan while accompanying Hooker to a by-invitation-only rally of the Nation of Islam in Washington, D.C. in 1985.)

For a period, one of the MCA contracts under Hooker's domain was that of a former "B" movie actor-turned-television star, Ronald Reagan—although that detail is left out of Reagan's official biographies in light of Hooker's future "infamy" and reputation as an "anti-Semite."

However, a "secret" description of Hooker's relationship with Reagan's rise to prominence appears in a little-known book entitled *The King Maker*, published in 1972—eight years before Reagan reached the presidency. Written by Henry Denker, a well-known New York writer, producer and director with wide "inside" knowledge of the show business industry, *The King Maker* was a *roman a clef* (that is, a "fictional" novel based on real-life characters and events, thinly disguised). Everyone knew it was about the behind-the-scenes story of Ronald Reagan's political and financial dealings with the MCA agency and how those dealings helped bring Reagan to the governorship of California.

The book is not easy to find in the libraries or even in second hand bookstores. That may well be precisely because of the fact that—if you read between the lines (or not even necessarily between the lines)—you'll discover some unpleasant things about Reagan and the people who made him into the American political powerhouse of the last quarter of the 20th century.

Hooker was the real-life model for one of the characters in the book, "Carl Brewster," a frankly anti-Jewish television industry executive and let it be said, frankly, that West Hooker himself was very anti-Jewish and made no effort to hide it.

In *The King Maker*, Reagan is "Jeff Jefferson," a has-been former movie actor who is catapulted into the California governorship through his association with Dr. Irwin Cone, the founder of a mob-connected booking agency, the Talent Corporation of America (TCA), which emerges a political force in its own right. Denker's "Dr. Cone" is the real-life Dr. Jules Stein, and TCA is really—you guessed it—the Music Corporation of America, better known as the media giant MCA (now a subsidiary of the ever-growing Bronfman empire). Evidently the book was too much on the mark, so much so that Dr. Stein's real life partner, Lew Wasserman, described the novel as "a piece of garbage" even though Wasserman isn't even characterized in the novel at all.

In 1986, another writer, Dan Moldea, known for his expertise in the history of organized crime, wrote his own book that was no *roman a*

clef, but was, in fact, a controversial non-fiction work that told the same story told in Denker's *The King Maker*. However, Moldea's book was more explosively—and perhaps more accurately—titled *Dark Victory: Ronald Reagan, MCA, and the Mob*.

In any case, Hooker's anti-Semitism did not go over well with his bosses, Lew Wasserman and Jules Stein, and ultimately Hooker had a parting of the ways with MCA (only to have his MCA years memorialized in Denker's book). However, Hooker, through his own ingenuity, managed to walk away from MCA a very rich man and actually was able to outwit Wasserman of MCA to the point that Hooker was later described in print by show business columnist Walter Winchell as the only one of MCA's employees who ever outfoxed Wasserman.

In personal conversations Winchell was known to say, more candidly, that Hooker was the "only goy" (i.e. non-Jew) to have accomplished that feat, although Winchell's additional language was far more gutteral in describing what Hooker had done to his former employer.

Hooker later moved toward setting up a "fourth" television network in the mid-1950's, much to the distress of the media elite. Hooker candidly admitted that his project was designed to be the first "non-Jewish-controlled" television network.

Although he actively solicited the financial backing of Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy (father of then-Senator John F. Kennedy) for the project, the founder of the Kennedy dynasty refused to participate (although he wholeheartedly supported the concept). Kennedy said that his participation would enrage the Jewish community and would endanger his son's chances of winning the presidency. Hooker's first-hand reminiscences of his then-secret meeting with Kennedy were told in detail for the first time in this author's work, *Final Judgment*.

In any case, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith learned of Hooker's effort to organize a "fourth" network and in 1954 the ADL devoted a two-page spread in its bulletin to "exposing" Hooker under the title "The Case of the Charming Bigot." The title itself was quite revealing about Hooker's dynamism: Even the ADL, so disposed to smearing people and casting aspersions on their character, was forced to acknowledge that Hooker was possessed of an engaging personality that just wouldn't quit.

Ultimately, New York State Attorney General (and later U.S. Senator) Jacob Javits, a corrupt and vicious Jewish ally of the ADL, issued an injunction preventing Hooker from raising funds for the network, thereby killing the project on behalf of the other Zionist-run networks.

Although Hooker then left the United States and went into self-imposed exile in Italy where he made a fortune in the soda bottling busi-

ness, he returned to this country in the mid-1980s to resume his political endeavors.

For many years, Hooker was working quietly behind the scenes in an energetic effort to set in place an international petroleum distribution network—in concert with sympathetic interests in the Arab world—that would provide funding for the American nationalist movement. Unfortunately, however, Hooker's efforts were frustrated by figures in a certain Arab regime that had been co-opted by Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad. In fact, one of Hooker's working partners in the project was murdered.

Hooker himself had the benefit of living on the proceeds of a trust fund provided to him by his mother and had no desire whatsoever to reap any profit for himself from the oil venture which, if successfully launched, would have, by his estimate, provided a minimum of \$10,000,000 per year for the nationalist cause.

Sadly, although Hooker was quite physically fit, almost until his death, Hooker's sharp mind fell victim to the onset of age and his memory began to fail. This was a great tragedy for it prevented him from ever putting down the complete record of his remarkable career in writing or on video, although, fortunately, some of his writings have survived.

Amazingly, although he suffered for five years from the prostate cancer which had spread throughout his body and which ultimately killed him, Hooker was quite active and just several months before his death appeared at a public meeting in Arlington, Virginia (where this author, Michael Collins Piper, spoke) earning Hooker a final attack upon him by his enemies in a published report about the meeting by the Southern Poverty Law Center of Morris Dees. Hooker, frankly, was delighted to know that his endeavors were still being recorded by his sworn enemies. "Jesus was no sissy," Hooker would often say. "He marched right in and threw the money changers out of the temple."

In any case, Hooker was a remarkable man indeed. And what he discovered during the 1950s about the Zionist effort to control the "anti-communist" movement—information we are now about to detail—will be an amazing and eye-opening and very much sobering revelation for modern-day Americans who have never known the real story.

What follows is the text (slightly annotated for purposes of clarity) of a sworn statement that Hooker executed on September 30, 1954 outlining his findings about the role of the self-styled "American Jewish League Against Communism" and how it was manipulating then Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy's efforts to investigate communism in high places in the American system. The affidavit reads:

I had an astounding interview for two hours some time ago with Norman L. Marks of the American Jewish League Against Communism, Inc.

As a matter of fact, I was brought along by another party, and Mr. Marks did not know anything about me (hence he really opened up because the person who took me was "trusted" by him).

The AJLAC has offices at 220 West 42nd Street, New York City. Its national chairman is Alfred Kohlberg. Its executive director is Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, and its treasurer is Harry Pasternak. Listed on its national board are the following: Bern Dibner, Lawrence Fertig, Theodore Fine, Benjamin Gitlow, Hon. Walter R. Hart, Herman Kashins, Eugene Lyons, Norman L. Marks, Morris Ryskind, Rabbi David S. Savitz, Nathan D. Shapiro, George E. Sokolsky, Maurice Tishman, Rabbi Ascher M. Yager.

I swear under oath to you that the following is as accurate as it is possible to put down from memory an hour or so later. Also, the information can be verified by the other unnamed party.

Mr. Marks, listed above and on the letterhead of the AJLAC as a member of the national board, said: "Far and away the principal financial contributor to the AJLAC is Mr. Bernard Baruch." When questioned on this point as to what percentage he would say Mr. Baruch contributed, he answered: "About 85% or 90% of the funds."

I said that I had thought Mr. Kohlberg was the main contributor to the AJLAC and Mr. Marks answered: "Well, he contributes some but nothing like what Baruch contributes." I asked Mr. Marks why Baruch's name did not appear on the letterhead. He stated that Baruch was very emphatic about NOT having his name appear on the letterhead, and that it was to be unknown that he contributed funds to it.

Mr. Marks said that the organization was entirely Jewish but that a funny thing was that many of the founders of it seemed to have "Christian" wives. He said that they used to meet every Thursday at the Ambassador Hotel for lunch and talk about the world situation. Marks said that the organization would not accept either a "Christian in it" or a "Christian dime of support" and that no Christian money had ever been accepted in the past—that it was completely a Jewish

organization and financed by them.

He said there were only two purposes for its founding: That the Number One purpose was to take the heat off the Jewishness of Communism, and a secondary aim was to get the Jews out of Communism and to support Zionism. He said that: "for a while there, almost all the spies of the Communists that were turned up were Jews and that they had become concerned, and thought that something should be done to take the sting off the Jews. They wanted to show the Christian world that ALL Jews were not Communists."

When asked just how they went about this whole project, Mr. Marks said: "It's impossible for a Christian to get away with criticizing the Jews. Only a Jew can do that."

He went on: "And so we got together a strong group of Jews that "were known to be anti-Communists" and started our campaign of pressure from our point of view."

[According to Hooker's original affidavit, Marks' reference to those who were said to be "anti-Communists" actually meant that the Jewish leaders in question were, as Hooker put it, "meaning anti-Stalinist."—Ed.]

Marks stated: "We were the ones that wrote the speeches for McCarthy back in West Virginia that started his build-up into the famous anti-Communist that he is today. Our pressure on the press resulted in his getting as much attention as he has. In return for this build-up he agreed not to call up or expose Jews in the Communist movement by the investigations through his sub-committee."

Mr. Marks stated that a lot of Jews called McCarthy an anti-Semite but little did they know that "he is the best friend the Jews ever had."

[Hooker noted of McCarthy that "Eventually they destroyed him anyway when he started calling up Jewish Communists later on."—Ed.]

Marks went on to say that "other investigations might have turned up Jews and McCarthy had been given credit for them, but that if we traced the record back, we would find that McCarthy actually did not call up a single Jew in that period when the heat was on the Jews." He later qualified these remarks by saying that "while McCarthy was operating as a temporary subcommittee under the Truman administration, he did not call up any Jews; that when he once got himself elected as the chairman of the permanent

investigating committee, in the new administration, he then began to call witnesses "as they came."

[That is, whether the witnesses were "Jewish or not," according to Hooker—Ed.]

Mr. Marks continued: "But that doesn't make much difference now because he accepted our own men to work right with him. For example, he accepted as his top man next to him our man Roy Cohn, which was arranged through another of our men, George Sokolsky."

If memory serves me correctly, Marks stated that Julius Kahn was also their man on the McCarthy committee, but who was now on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He definitely stated that David Schine was NOT with the AJLAC but that he was put there by "another group which I don't know about."

Mr. Marks went on to say that "not only is McCarthy under our control but so are Jenner and Velde, who also took our men to work right with them. Benny Mandel and Robert Morris represent us on the Jenner Committee." He mentioned Robert Kunzig as "their man" for Velde.

Marks also stated definitely that Professor Louis Budenz was under "their control" and one of "their men," and that he was working to take the "heat" off the Jews.

[Budenz was a well-known "ex-communist" who became a leading figure in the so-called anti-communist movement, key elements of which had come under the control of the Zionist and Trotskyite elements. Hooker's revelations explain why—Ed.]

He stated that [Alfred] Kohlberg, their national chairman, was the one who "found" Budenz when he was testifying in Washington and Kohlberg "picked him up and practically supported him for a while in order to get him started and built up to the man he is today in the anti-Communist movement."

Marks also stated that they got "their man Robert Morris" elected recently as a judge in New York City, and that Victor Lasky was another one of their men who did a lot of "press work" for them, and "made speeches favoring their people, for example, Robert Morris." He said, "All these people agreed to take the 'heat' off the Jews."

I recall now another statement by Mr. Marks that "there is a vast pooling of information in the New York City area

and throughout the country which is connected with our organization.”

I asked if J. B. Matthews and his files were in on “the deal” and he said: “Yes, we have access to all of his files.”

[J. B. Matthews was a prominent “anti-communist crusader” in the period, but, clearly, under the control of the Zionist-Trotskyites.—Ed.]

He said that they have at least “thirty Communists on our payroll who report information to us,” and that “we know everything that goes on in this field.”

Mr. Marks told all the above information as if there was nothing “wrong” with what he was saying. He even invited me and this other unnamed fellow to go to a meeting the following Tuesday night at the University Club, sponsored by Norman Lombard.

When they finally found out who I was, however, I was told by Norman Lombard and Norman Marks not to come to the meeting. I sure hope that the true patriotic American nationalists will be able to straighten out a few of these “pseudo-patriots” who are trying to lead the so-called “anti-communist” movement.

Don’t misunderstand me: I’m just as anti-Communist as any of you, but I don’t want our country to be led head-long into traps which enable these pseudo-patriots to “use” the fine instincts of the American people and the anti-Communist movement for their own diabolical ends.

In other words, some of these pseudo-patriots are “anti-Communist,” meaning “anti-Stalin communism,” but are pro-as hell another form of Communism (American brand) leading to dictatorship by them in our own country and the rest of the world under Bernard Baruch and the crowd he represents.

[The “American brand” of communism to which Hooker referred, although he didn’t say it directly, was precisely the Trotskyite brand, then in its evolution, that has come today to be known as “neo-conservatism.”—Ed.]

(Signed) DeWest Hooker

END OF HOOKER AFFIDAVIT

So we have DeWest Hooker to thank for having spotted, early on, that there was much more to the rise of "anti-communism" in America, at least in the form approved by the Zionist and Trotskyite elements. *It is vital that Hooker's revelations be fully understood today.*

What adds amazing further credibility to Hooker's shocking revelations about the manipulation of Sen. McCarthy is the point made by famed organized crime writer Hank Messick in his book, *John Edgar Hoover*, a less than flattering portrait of the longtime FBI director which delved into Hoover's ties to the organized crime syndicate. Messick wrote about the founding of the aforementioned American Jewish League Against Communism:

Varied were the motives of the League's founding, but one of them was self-protection. . . . Many of the intellectuals in America were Jewish. During the New Deal some had achieved high position. Moreover, Karl Marx himself was the son of a Jew who later became a Christian. To adopt the sane position, to resist unfair smears and the attempts of bigots to portray the Jew as pro-red, might only make people mad. Better to go on the offensive against the Communist menace itself. Such was the attitude of some Jews—or at least the excuse they offered their friends—as national hysteria built up in 1948.

The possibility of the anti-Communism attack turning into a persecution of the Jews was very much on the minds of the government officials charged with prosecuting the alleged atom bomb spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. For that reason a Jewish judge was chosen, and the prosecuting staff selected to try the case was composed of Jews. One of their members was Roy Cohn.

More than concern for the Jews was involved in the formation of the League, however. Anti-Communism offered both political and business opportunities.

The League was formed at the home of Eugene Lyons, a right-wing author of note. Taking part in the first meeting were other right-wingers, including Louis Waldman, Lawrence Fertiz, Isaac Don Levine, and George Sokolsky. The prime mover was Alfred Kohlberg who, along with Lewis Rosenstiel, supplied most of the funds.

According to Messick, Kohlberg had long had business interests in China and now, as leader of what came to be known, in part, as "The

China Lobby," hoped to stoke up a war against China—in the name of "fighting communism"—in order to win back his lost source of lucre.

Rosenstiel, a liquor baron with long-standing ties to the organized crime syndicate of Jewish mob boss Meyer Lansky, had his own interests in mind. Rosenstiel had procured big supplies of liquor prior to World War II and then profited immensely (when, during the war, government-imposed limits on the production of liquor, effectively gave him a quite profitable monopoly on liquor supplies). So, with the possibility of a new war against China (or even Russia or both), Rosenstiel evidently dreamed of repeating his previous success.

As such, Rosenstiel and Kohlberg and their Zionist allies initially lined up behind 1948 Republican presidential candidate Thomas E. Dewey (who had long been quietly allied with the Lansky Crime Syndicate, Dewey's reputation as a "gang-buster" notwithstanding). Although, of course, President Harry Truman is largely remembered as the American president who recognized Israel upon its founding in 1948, the truth is that there were many "insiders" in the Truman administration, including Truman himself, who were not quite so enthusiastic about giving the nod to Israel, recognizing—quite presciently—the dangers of setting up a Zionist state on land stolen from the native Christian and Muslim Palestinian people. As a result of this, the Zionist movement was less than enthusiastic about Truman and was quietly working on behalf of Thomas E. Dewey.

However, to the surprise of virtually everyone—with the possible exception of Truman himself—Dewey did not defeat Truman. And this set the stage for the virtual "creation" of no less than Senator Joseph R. McCarthy as the unwitting voice for the Zionist and Trotskyite elements. Messick fills in the details:

The unexpected defeat of Dewey in 1948 upset a good many people, and made it necessary for the American Jewish League Against Communism to revise its program. It needed a new political figure behind whom it could rally. Coincidentally, the league had come into possession of a one-hundred page FBI report on Communist influence on government. The report was originally leaked to an intelligence officer in the Pentagon with instructions to pass it on to leaders of the league . . . We have the word of none other than Roy Cohn that the secret FBI document was read, and conferences held, in New York and Washington. As Cohn put it, "a small group" took "upon itself the responsibility of getting the story across to America."

The League decided it should approach a senator rather than a representative. At a meeting in Washington in November 1949, a special committee of the league "sifted carefully through the roster of United States senators for one who might successfully undertake the task of educating his fellow Americans." They narrowed the list down to four possibilities, all Republicans. In turn, each senator was given a look at the FBI report. Each was urged to go on the warpath. Each was promised financial support. The first three men on the list refused. The fourth took the document home and read it carefully. Next morning he called a member of the League and told him he was "buying the package." That fourth senator was Joseph McCarthy.

Not long afterward, on February 9, 1950 McCarthy spoke before the Ohio County Women's Republican Club in Wheeling, West Virginia and announced that there were 205 "security risks" in the State Department. And so it was that the "McCarthy Era"—which the Zionists today so hypocritically denounce—was launched. In fact, as we have seen, the McCarthy period was hardly more than the effective work of The Enemy Within.

And although McCarthy was very much correct, it seems, in pointing out that there were indeed "communists in the government," it is probably safe to say that the war that was being fought out on Capitol Hill during the McCarthy hearings and in the media was actually hardly more than an overflow, into the United States, of the long-standing war between the surviving Russian Nationalist Communist elements in the Soviet Union (formerly led by Josef Stalin) and their bitter enemies in the Jewish-Zionist-Trotskyite movement which was now ensconced on American soil.

All of this, of course, is not to say that McCarthy was not sincere in his motives, but he was very clearly being manipulated by forces that were far beyond his comprehension.

And the fact that his chief "advisor" was the ubiquitous Roy Cohn, who continued to play a major role as a Zionist "fixer" (at the same time doubling as an organized crime lawyer) points precisely toward those forces that were guiding McCarthy toward ultimate destruction.

We also learn more from Jewish writer Stuart Svonkin's book *Jews Against Prejudice: American Jews and the Fight for Civil Liberties* which demonstrates that—despite what the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Committee would like to us to believe today—the truth is that both organizations were very much involved in the very

type of “McCarthyism” that they today decry. Svonkin noted:

As committed Cold War liberals, staff members of the ADL and AJC cooperated with the FBI, HUAC [the House Un-American Activities Committee], and other agents of the federal loyalty and security program during the late 1940s and 1950s, sharing their files on politically suspect organizations inside and outside the Jewish community.

This policy of cooperation, which built upon the partnership established during the antifascist campaign of the 1930s and early 1940s, was designed to minimize the association of Jews with communism, to protect liberals from persecution, and to ensure that the federal government remained attentive to the activities of right-wing extremists.

While the AJC and ADL hoped to moderate HUAC’s methods, these attempts to reform the anticommunist crusade from within reflected a basic acquiescence to the assumptions and strategies of the domestic cold war and inevitably contributed to the infringement of civil libertarian principles.

In addition, it’s probably worth noting what the well-known “conservative” critic of McCarthyism—Peter Viereck—pointed out in 1954 in regard to McCarthy. His words are rather interesting, when recalled in the modern-day context of how McCarthy and “McCarthyism” are best remembered. Viereck said:

McCarthy basically is not the fascist type but the type of the left-wing anarchist agitator, by an infallible instinct and not “by accident” subverting precisely those institutions that are the most conservative and organic, everything venerable and patrician, from the Constitution, and precisely the most decorated or paternal generals (Marshall, Eisenhower, Taylor, Zwicker), to the leaders of our most deeply established religion and precisely the most ancient of our universities . . . He satisfies the resentments of his followers, because his sincerest hatred is always against the oldest, most rooted, and most deeply educated patrician families—the Cabot Lodges, Achesons, Conants, Adlai Stevenson.

Rather than targeting the big American Zionist families (such as the

Rothschild-allied Schiffs, for example) who were known to have financed the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, McCarthy was targeting some of America’s old-line families and their associates in the foreign policy establishment.

And it is probably no coincidence that one of McCarthy’s most prominent targets—former Gen. George C. Marshall—was actually one of the most outspoken American critics (during the Truman administration) of the establishment of the Zionist state of Israel.

What is particularly interesting is that Ann Coulter—one of the current “neo-conservatives” whose ideological sponsors and patrons are modern-day standard bearers of the old-line Trotskyite banner (now posing as “neo-conservatism”)—basically concurs with Viereck’s assessment, saying in her recent book, *Treason*:

McCarthy’s real “victims” were not sympathetic witnesses, frivolous Hollywood screenwriters, or irrelevant blow-hard college professors. They were elite WASP establishment policy-makers . . . They were well-born and looked good in dinner jackets

In other words, although Viereck was a McCarthy critic and Coulter one of McCarthy’s defenders, both assert (quite correctly) that—contrary to the popular image of McCarthy being a “vicious anti-Semitic hatemonger who was harassing innocent Jewish Hollywood screenwriters”—McCarthy was instead—in the broader sense—effectively taking aim in another direction altogether, thereby muddying the picture of the real sources of subversion in America.

These revelations regarding the McCarthy era are not intended to suggest that there were no disloyal communist traitors within the American system. In truth, in many respects, the late Senator McCarthy did indeed correctly target a large number of communists within the government, the media, and academia. *But there was clearly much more to the story of McCarthy than we had ever known before.*

Taken together, we see full well that the “Cold War”—as it is generally remembered—was not quite what we generally recall today. The Cold War was the reflection of long-festering behind-the-scenes conflict between Zionist elements in Russia and their Stalinist opponents, a war that ultimately transferred, in many respects, over onto American soil.

The Zionists and the Trotskyites had effectively merged, having found common cause, and began their drive to take over and manipulate—as an Enemy Within—the genuine “anti-communist” movement in America, acting as Judas Goats, leading real patriots to destruction.

Chapter Fifteen:

The FBI and the Communist Party USA: The Truth About “The Communist Threat”

For nearly 30 years J. Edgar Hoover and his FBI were effectively running the Communist Party USA. That little known detail raises new questions about how “real” the so-called Cold War really was.

Hoover became a legend in his own time and a hero to American anti-communists for his perceived role in “fighting communist subversion” in America. However, Hoover held a very big secret about the communist movement that he kept under wraps for the 20 years that preceded his death in 1974.

The fact is that beginning in 1954—and for the 27 years that followed—the FBI was essentially directing the activities of the Communist Party USA. This eye-opening tidbit appeared in the book, *The Secret History of the FBI*, by veteran mainstream journalist Ronald Kessler. Despite its sensational title Kessler’s book was hardly a genuine “secret history.” But the revelation regarding Hoover’s secret “reign” over the Communist Party was certainly an item that has not really been given the public airing that it deserves. According to Kessler:

In 1954, the FBI began running a top-secret operation code-named SOLO, which entailed operating as an informant Morris Childs, the principal deputy to Gus Hall, the head of the American Communist Party. In effect, Childs—referred to by the FBI as Agent 58—was the second-ranking official of the party.

Carl N. Feyman, an FBI agent in Chicago, recruited Childs, a Ukrainian-born Jew and a former editor of the party newspaper, *The Daily Worker*, after visiting him in his Chicago apartment. Since Childs was in ill health, the agent arranged for him to be treated at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota. Freyman managed to convince Childs that Josef Stalin had betrayed Marxist ideals.

Actually, Kessler’s report was not original research and he admitted it, pointing out that in an earlier book, *Operation SOLO*—released in 1996—author John Barron had described the FBI’s communist intrigue. Kessler noted:

Childs reported for twenty-seven years on party activities and strategy. In addition, he made fifty-two clandestine trips to the Soviet Union, China, Eastern Europe, and Cuba. The Soviets so trusted him that on his seventy-fifth birthday,

the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev, gave Childs a birthday party at the Kremlin. Meanwhile, on behalf of the Soviets, Childs and his brother Jack Childs distributed \$28 million in cash for Communist activities in the United States.

The FBI held the secret of SOLO so tightly that officials of the CIA, National Security Agency, Defense Department, State Department, and National Security Council could only read reports of the operation while agents waited to return them to bureau headquarters. Not until 1975 did the FBI inform the president and secretary of state of the true source of the information.

The disingenuous and deceitful nature of the FBI's covert relationship with the ruling elite of the Communist Party is exemplified by the fact that FBI Director Hoover once told President Richard Nixon that the bureau suspected but "can't yet prove" that the anti-war group, the Students for a Democratic Society, was getting "millions of dollars from the Soviet Union via the Communist Party of the United States."

Obviously, if SDS was indeed being funded by the Soviets, if anyone would have known, it was Hoover. The fact it was an FBI informant who dispensed Kremlin money to various causes should raise eyebrows, for the reason that while the FBI was supposedly fighting "communist subversion," Kremlin money (under the FBI's watchful eye and probable direction) was being disbursed.

Who actually received the money is a question that deserves further exploration, for it would undoubtedly point toward certain favored "causes" of a particular persuasion.

In fact, the FBI's secret control over the disbursement of Kremlin money by the Communist Party - USA explains why the Federal Election Commission refused to prosecute longtime party boss Gus Hall for illegally accepting foreign aid.

On March 1, 1992, *The Washington Post* reported that the Communist Party - U.S.A. (CPUSA) and its veteran commissar, Gus Hall, had received at least \$21 million from the Soviet dictators in the Kremlin over an extended period of years. In 1987 alone, Hall took \$2 million in Soviet money. The proof came when once top-secret Kremlin documents were released by the new government in Russia.

Hall usually picked up cash bundles from a KGB courier. In one instance Hall signed a receipt for \$2 million in cash. The evidence proves that, in his heyday, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev personally arranged for the payments.

Although the Kremlin cut Hall off in 1990, Hall had milked the deal

for all it was worth. One columnist reported the lifestyle of the would-be leader of the proletarian revolution in the United States:

[Hall] owns and lives in a big mansion, with sauna, expensive and original art and an underground garage, in an affluent section of a New York suburb. He has an amiable fault: He likes to stuff his wallet with bills of large denominations. He flies first class and stays at first-class hotels. He has a chauffeur-driven limousine (cellular phone, of course) which he replaces every two years. He has an estate and power boat out on Long Island in chic Hamptons Bays.

When Liberty Lobby, the populist institution that published *The Spotlight*, learned of Hall's deal with the Kremlin, Liberty Lobby took action and on March 11, 1992 filed a complaint with the Federal Election Commission (FEC) demanding the agency prosecute the CPUSA and also Hall and Gorbachev, for their blatant violation of American election laws.

The Spotlight told its readers the whole amazing story. Unlike the rest of the media, which treated the story as a quaint relic in the Cold War attic, *The Spotlight* pointed out the glaring inconsistency in the way that the FEC and the U.S. Justice Department turned their heads at this violation of not only election law, but also laws targeting the activities of foreign agents operating on American soil.

The FEC allowed the matter to hang for well over a year and then on Dec. 10, 1993 announced it had "determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action" against Hall, the CPUSA, or Gorbachev. The FEC buried the case amidst a backlog of numerous cases dismissed in one fell swoop, thereby directing attention away from the more "sensitive" cases on file.

In truth, the FEC regulates elections only to ensure the dominance of the major parties and the special interests and never prosecutes those whose aim is to wreck "third" party movements from within.

The FEC also permits Israeli lobby fundraisers to illegally pool resources and back candidates in American elections. The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) is one of the primary players in this criminal activity, yet the FEC takes no action.

In contrast, the FEC harassed Liberty Lobby for organizing the fledgling "third" party, the Populist Party, in 1984 when, in that year, the party's entire national budget was about one-tenth the amount of the average Israeli lobby-backed congressional candidate. That little party was eventually destroyed from within.

It should be noted, too, that “former” CIA officer Mira Lansky Boland, head of the ADL’s Washington office, was found to be funnelling “information” about Liberty Lobby to the FEC, including covertly-obtained photographs of Liberty Lobby staff members.

According to the late Bella Dodd, an ex-leader of the CPUSA, the ADL was a primary (though covert) control agent behind the CPUSA. So the FEC’s collaboration with the ADL (and refusal to prosecute the CPUSA) is really no surprise.

And in light of the ADL’s longtime behind-the-scenes alliance with J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI, dating back prior to World War II—it appears as though the ADL and the FBI were acting as partners in directing high-ranking CPUSA official Morris Childs in influencing CPUSA affairs and disbursing Kremlin largesse.

Defenders of the FBI may suggest that the fact of the FBI’s effective control of the Communist Party is actually a tribute to the agency’s skill in penetrating enemy forces. However, the consequences of the FBI’s strange secret “alliance” with the Communist Party played a major part in influencing U.S. foreign and domestic policy for the next half century.

While J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI were hyping the dangers of the Communist Party and the Cold War, the American munitions industry made vast profits building a massive American defense against Soviet aggression.

At the same time, American supporters of Israel—including many American “anti-communists” in the “responsible conservative” movement—began promoting Israel as a “bulwark against Soviet power in the Middle East.”

Chapter Sixteen:

The Cold War and the Early Origins of the Trotskyite “Neo-Conservatives” As the Zionist Vanguard of The Enemy Within

It is no coincidence that what in effect was the FBI’s takeover of the Communist Party USA came at precisely the time when a group of “ex-communists” were taking control of the “conservative” movement in the United States.

The method by which Hoover and the FBI “turned” high-ranking Communist Party USA official Morris Childs into a secret agent for the FBI points toward the little-understood “family fight” between the anti-Zionist Stalinist elements in Soviet Russia and their Trotskyite foes, many of whom are now in control of the so-called “neo-conservative” movement in America.

In his book *The Secret History of the FBI*, Ronald Kessler reported that the FBI convinced Childs to turn informant by claiming that Soviet boss Josef Stalin (who had recently died) had abandoned Marxist ideals.

In fact, the FBI’s argument is one of the arguments used against Stalin by the political heirs and disciples of Stalin’s hated rival, Leon Trotsky, who was killed in exile in Mexico at Stalin’s direction in 1928.

That the FBI adopted Trotskyite rhetoric to influence Childs adds substance to long-held and growing suspicion that certain “anti-communist” elements in the American “conservative” movement were, in fact, effectively deep-cover Trotskyites working to “turn” the anti-communist conservative movement from within.

Although, in the period in question (the mid-1950s), the rising “anti-communist” leader was “former” CIA operative William F. Buckley, Jr., future elements rising within the Buckley sphere of influence came to prominence in U.S. policy-making circles. And, as we shall see later in this chapter, and in subsequent chapters, those in Buckley’s sphere of influence played a major part in ushering today’s so-called “neo-conservatives” into power.

Ultimately, the so-called neo-conservative elites solidified under the leadership of a ubiquitous father-and-son team, Irving and William Kristol, who have established a far-reaching and influential network in official Washington. The senior Kristol, an “ex-Trotskyite” and a veteran of the CIA-financed International Committee for Cultural Freedom, began to infiltrate and remake the “conservative” movement, first in the mid-1950s under the patronage of Buckley, Jr. and then more openly during the Ronald Reagan era of flourishing Republican conservatism.

In fact, many of the problems that America is facing today are a direct consequence of what happened during the era of Ronald Reagan’s presidency when the neo-conservatives became increasingly

prominent and were placed in positions of influence in official Washington through the efforts of the Kristol-sponsored Zionist “neo-conservative” syndicate.

A noteworthy example: The infamous Iran-Contra affair, in which the United States, allied with Israel, engaged in global arms trafficking and in the trade of illicit drugs in order to prop up its foreign policies in both Central America and the Middle East.

This Iran-contra matter—which critics said should have been more forthrightly described as the “Israel-Iran-contra” affair—established a network of corrupt businesses and bought-and-paid-for politicians (including Bill and Hillary Clinton in Arkansas), along with high-level intriguers in Washington (notably the much-heralded Lt. Col. Oliver North) in league with Israeli arms dealers and Latin American drug lords, all of whom conspired to enrich themselves at the same time they effectively advanced the foreign policy aims of the Zionist elite. One simply cannot examine Ronald Reagan’s “Iran-contra” legacy without acknowledging this central fact.

However, somehow, in most accounts, the role of Israel and its American enablers always seems to be ignored. And it was this Iran-contra network which, in many respects, laid the groundwork for the clique of “neo-conservative” conspirators who—during the years that followed—made their way into positions of influence with the Reagan Republican policy-making establishment in Washington and later solidified their influence in the administration of the figure who was hailed as “the new Ronald Reagan”: George W. Bush.

The same can be said about the other Reagan-era Republican scandal—less well known, but equally significant—often referred to as “Iraq-gate,” the arming of Saddam Hussein’s Iraq. The same Reagan-era cabal that helped arm Saddam, having likewise helped arm his enemy, Iran, added massive fuel to the fire of the Middle East, creating a framework upon which Israel was able to expand its influence at the cost of millions of lives and horrible destruction that laid the groundwork for future geopolitical tensions in that region. And an examination of “Iraq-gate” also finds the same forces—and personalities (including the Clintons and, again, Oliver North)—very much in play.

Finally, of course, Ronald Reagan is remembered fondly by Americans, not so much because of his policies, but because of his cheerful personality and his patriotic image. But the operative word here is “image”—not reality. The ugly fact is that during the Reagan era, a clique of very real Judas Goats spread their influence felt and the consequences remain with us today, more damaging than ever, particularly during the era of George W. Bush.

It is William Kristol, the son of the aforementioned neo-conservative “godfather,” Irving Kristol who perhaps best personifies the evil face of the neo-conservatives today. A media darling who is a member of the powerful Bilderberg group, Kristol is publisher and editor of billionaire Rupert Murdoch’s *Weekly Standard* magazine, using that forum to call for imperialistic U.S. intervention abroad, particularly as a means to advance the interests of the state of Israel.

Kristol’s chief financial angel, Murdoch, is a long-time front man for the combined forces of the Rothschild, Bronfman and Oppenheimer families who, with Murdoch, are often described as “The Billionaire Gang of Four.” This clique of billionaires are tied together not only by a mutual association in international financial wheeling and dealing but also by ethnic ties and a devotion to promoting the interests of the state of Israel. They are also widening their control and influence over the American media with Murdoch’s operations being perhaps the most visible. (Later in these pages we will examine Murdoch in further detail.)

Kristol-sponsored neo-conservative fellow-travelers have been represented in policy-making circles in the current George W. Bush administration by such figures as longtime Israeli loyalist Richard Perle, once chairman of the Defense Policy Board, Perle’s longtime ally, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz (now head of the World Bank), and Vice President Dick Cheney’s chief of staff, I. Lewis Libby. All were among the key figures beating the drum for war against Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya and any other nation deemed dangerous to the survival of Israel.

Although Libby was criminally indicted for some of his misdeeds and the rest of the neo-conservatives have been exposed Hellish serial liars of the worst sort, these Zionist Trotskyites still hold great sway in Washington. In some respects, it might be said, the Trotskyites triumphed in America where, quite in contrast, they failed in Russia.

For the whole sordid history of the neo-conservatives—in far greater detail—see *The High Priests of War*, by the present author. It is not a pretty story, but one that needs to be told, for it helps explain the insidious nature of The Enemy Within.

However, long before the neo-conservatives came to the prominence and power that they hold today, during the 21st century, there arose an influential group of self-styled “responsible conservatives” who laid the groundwork for the rise of the neo-cons. These “responsible” conservatives moved within the sphere of a character named William F. Buckley, Jr., who—along with his closest cronies—we will dissect in the pages that follow.

An Interlude . . .

An introduction to Part III

The Rise of the “Responsible Conservatives”

The Cold War Era Subversion of the American Nationalist Movement

At the height of the Cold War—during the mid-1950s—there occurred in America the birth of a “new” so-called “conservative” movement whose leaders, especially one William F. Buckley, Jr., declared their movement to be boldly internationalist. They were intent on “winning” the Cold War—even at the expense of a hot war—and they had no desire to bring American troops home to protect American soil.

In reality, they were venturing out on a global imperium, to crush Communism and to crush those old-line elements in America—the traditional conservatives, nationalists, those “discredited” forces who made up the America First movement that fought U.S. intervention in the European war that became World War II—and they were loudly and proudly declaring their intention to smash any “nativist” elements that would dare raise questions about the need for American boys to be dispatched into global brush-fire wars or into conflicts in the Middle East arising from the establishment of the state of Israel.

A host of “ex-Communists”—yes, the ubiquitous Trotskyites—surrounded William F. Buckley Jr. in those halcyon days when the young Yale graduate—scion of an oilman whose father was ultimately discovered to have oil interests, in, of all places, Israel—launched his crusade. Buckley’s *National Review* magazine became “the” voice for what Buckley and his colleagues came to describe as the voice of “responsible conservatism” and his “ex-Communist” writers became the intellectual vanguard of the “new” American conservatism, thanks to friendly publicity from the major (controlled) media in America.

Foremost among those promoted by Buckley was no less than James Burnham who, at one point earlier in his career, was said to have been considered Leon Trotsky’s “chief spokesman” within American “intellectual” circles.

Then, of course, when Josef Stalin began moving against the Trotskyites, Burnham evolved into a so-called “anti-communist liberal” which, effectively, in some respects, was a euphemism for the more dan-

gerous-sounding (and perhaps more accurate) term “Trotskyite.”

In the years that followed, during World War II, Burnham worked for the Zionist- and Trotskyite-infested Office of Strategic Services, forerunner of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Burnham, the much-touted “intellectual,” was not just a critic of Stalinist Russia and of those American nationalists and other policy-makers who wanted to “contain” the Soviet giant.

Instead, Burnham was calling for all-out war against Russia. But notably among Burnham’s critics was eminent American nationalist historian Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, who once described one of Burnham’s shrill calls for war as being “most dangerous and un-American.”

Despite this record—or actually because of it—Burnham the Trotskyite became “Burnham the Conservative Leader” under the patronage of William F. Buckley, Jr.’s *National Review* magazine, for which Burnham was perhaps the key theoretical writer for slightly more than two decades. Burnham himself died in 1987 but his influence remains critical in the Zionist-Trotskyite-Neo-Conservative circles today.

So it was that those whom we here call “The Buckley Gang” soon proved to be the guiding force within the “conservative” movement, even as old-line American nationalists were being pushed to the sidelines. Today there are more than a few who say that Buckley’s *National Review* was a CIA propriety—a CIA “front”—from the start. At the very least it was a font for “ex” Trotskyite thinking, which was now evolving into what we call “neo-conservatism” today. And all throughout that evolution, a devotion to the Zionist Internationale remained consistent.

The bottom line was that there was indeed a new twist in the American conservative philosophy—at least as it was being dictated by Buckley—and many good Americans enticed by Buckley’s claim to “conservatism” fell into line, led to the slaughterhouse as the innocent lambs they were, guided by The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within.

In the chapters which follow, we will examine the so-called “responsible conservative” phenomenon—better described as a “subversion”—that came in the wake of Buckley’s sudden media-promoted prominence (and power). It was the rise of Buckley and those in his sphere of influence that laid the groundwork for the modern-day emergence of the Trotskyite-Zionist “neo-conservatives” who reign supreme in the American “conservative” movement today.

In addition, we’ll see that even one “independent” conservative group that was not even in Buckley’s sphere of influence was also, for all intents and purposes, being promoted and prodded and manipulated into functioning as one of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within.

Chapter Seventeen

Early Zionist Corruption of the American Nationalist and Anti-Communist Cause

For years, many in the “conservative” movement in the United States viewed *Soldier of Fortune* magazine, published by hard-fisted Robert K. Brown, as a voice of anti-communism and patriotism. As such it came to the surprise of many when *Soldier of Fortune* published malicious smears of Liberty Lobby, the nationalist institution in Washington.

However, the smears of Liberty Lobby by *Soldier of Fortune* were no real surprise to those who knew the background of the shadowy figure who has been called “Bob Brown’s mentor”—Marvin Liebman, a long-time political fund-raiser with what can most be charitably described as a remarkably checkered background. Liebman’s career is a classic case of one of the mid-20th century’s most influential Enemies Within—and a particularly egregious one at that.

As we shall see, Liebman’s influence on the so-called “conservative” movement was quite immense. He played a major role in working to undermine both the traditional American nationalism during the Cold War and the rise of the anti-communist movement during the 1950s and well into the 1960s.

Born in New York City in 1923 and active in the Communist Party and the young Communist League in the 1930’s and 1940’s, Liebman found his political niche just after the close of World War II. At that juncture, Liebman signed up as a volunteer for the American League for a Free Palestine (ALFP) and soon became one of its most energetic fundraisers—its “boy hero” in Liebman’s own words.

ALFP was the U.S.-based fundraising arm of the Irgun Zvai Leumi, the underground Jewish terrorist group then fighting to drive both the British and the native Christian and Muslim Arabs out of Palestine.

(Just a few years previously, during World War II, Irgun members actively collaborated with Nazi Germany, supplying trucks, oil and other war materiel to the Nazis in return for the release of “selected” Jews from the Nazi-run concentration camps in Europe—a dirty little secret that modern-day supporters of Israel would prefer remain under wraps.)

The leader of the Irgun was Menachem Begin who later became Prime Minister of Israel. The violent youth group of the Irgun-ALFP was known as Betar and it is still active today, carrying out terrorist attacks against presumed critics of Israel. Irgun elements, upon the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948, became the backbone of the new nation’s intelligence service, the Mossad.

(While working for the Irgun-ALFP, Liebman reported directly to one Hillel Kook, better known by his alias “Peter Bergson.” Among

Bergson's Irgun colleagues, incidentally, was the ubiquitous Hungarian-based gold-arms-and-refugee smuggler, Ernst Mantello.

It was Mantello, who in the late 1950's, along with Louis M. Bloomfield, a leader of the pro-Israel lobby and henchman of the Bronfman family in Canada, formed a shadowy international "trading company" known as Permindex. The Permindex operation came to play a central role in the joint CIA-Israeli Mossad plot that resulted in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. For more details, see *Final Judgment*, by this author.)

From 1946 through the founding of Israel in 1948, Liebman and his cohorts engaged in arms smuggling for the Irgun as well as financing and arranging for the transport of Jewish refugees from Europe into Palestine. These networks became the foundation for Israel's Mossad.

Key players on the New York end of these activities included Teddy Kollek, later mayor of Jerusalem, and Meyer Lansky, boss of the American—and soon-to-be-international—crime syndicate.

Key players in the European end of the arms-and-refugee-smuggling networks were OSS man and later CIA operative, James Jesus Angleton, the Israeli loyalist who headed the CIA's liaison desk with the Mossad, and Rabbi Tibor Rosenbaum who emerged as the first director for finance and supply for the Mossad and who—like, the aforementioned Mantello and Bloomfield—played a central part in the mysterious Permindex operation.

In 1948—after the state of Israel was established—Liebman signed on with the United Jewish Appeal in New York and, according to Liebman, "it was there that my professional fund-raising career began." In short order Liebman went west to Hollywood where he set up the local chapter of the American Fund for Israel Institutions.

By 1951 Liebman was working for the International Rescue Committee (IRC) which Liebman described in his memoirs as "a liberal, social democratic, anti-Stalinist organization." The IRC was not only headed by Leo Cherne, long a high-ranking figure in B'nai B'rith, but it was also actively collaborating with the CIA.

During the next two decades, Liebman emerged as one of the most successful self-described "conservative" fundraisers, organizing a bevy of letterhead organizations and individuals that dominated what Liebman and his associates frequently described, in political shorthand, as a movement of "responsible conservatives" who were, actually responsible first and foremost to the whims of the pro-Israel lobby and its allies in the international elite.

Best personifying the "responsible conservatives" in Liebman's fund-raising sphere of influence was Liebman's friend, William F.

Buckley, Jr., founder of *National Review* magazine.

(Buckley, who served as a CIA operative in Mexico under the tutelage of his CIA “godfather” E. Howard Hunt, raised eyebrows among even some of the “responsible conservatives” when he not only accepted membership in the Rockefeller-financed Council on Foreign Relations, but also popped up at the secretive international Bilderberg confab in Cesme, Turkey in 1975.)

In 1961 Liebman played mentor to another now well-known operator in conservative fund-raising, Richard A. Viguerie (more about whom later). In 1962 Liebman evidently first made contact with *Soldier of Fortune* publisher-to-be Robert K. Brown, according to a letter written by Brown to Liebman that was discovered only a decade ago.

Young Brown, who had left the U.S. Army’s Counterintelligence Corps, wrote Liebman and bragged of having been an undercover operative in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee (FPCC) and asked the New York-based fundraising whiz if Liebman had any advice on how he (Brown) might circumvent the U.S. Neutrality Act and become a mercenary abroad. (At that juncture Liebman was running the so-called American Committee for Aid to Katanga Freedom Fighters which has been described as yet another “CIA front group.”)

That Brown was an undercover operative—apparently for the Chicago Police Subversive Squad—in the FPCC is interesting, to say the least, inasmuch as it was none other than John F. Kennedy’s accused assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, who was the “founder” of the New Orleans branch of the FPCC just one year later.

Although there continues to be much speculation as to what precisely Oswald was doing as an FPCC organizer, there are many who believe that Oswald, too, was an undercover informant in the FPCC working for some intelligence agency of the federal government.

In any case, by this point, Liebman had already established himself as “the man to see” when it came to conservative fundraising and he was already venting his hostility toward nationalist endeavors not within his sphere of influence—Liberty Lobby, in particular.

With the establishment of Liberty Lobby in 1955, Liebman became immensely hostile to the populist institution, particularly after former New Jersey Governor Charles Edison (son of the famed American inventor, Thomas Edison) and other members of the Edison family became enthusiastic supporters and generous financial backers of Liberty Lobby. (Prior to that time Liebman’s various fund-raising gimmicks had relied extensively on Edison’s largesse.)

Liebman claimed in his memoirs that in 1962 he was the victim of a “virulent anti-Semitic campaign” waged by rivals for power in the con-

servative movement. “The first story,” he says, “appeared in *Spotlight*, the publication of the anti-Semitic and racist Liberty Lobby” which he says portrayed him as being part of a “Jew-Zionist cabal.”

But there’s a major problem with this accusation: *The Spotlight* did not even come into existence until 1975—thirteen years after the alleged offense.

Liebman also complained that “even my good friend [Charles] Edison’s response was disappointing. Although he really loved me,” said Liebman, “it was hard for him to disengage himself from his own beliefs about Jews.”

In his memoirs, Liebman frankly admitted that upon later learning that Governor Edison was seriously ill he kept thinking, “If he dies, I wonder what he’ll leave me.” In fact, Liebman was on hand for the reading of the will upon Edison’s death. “When my name came up,” wrote Liebman, “I listened attentively. Instead of the million, or the hundred thousand or even ten thousand, the will read that the deceased ‘forgives Marvin Leibman any debts he might have to the estate.’”

Actually, Liebman was not then currently in debt to Edison. During Edison’s funeral service, according to Liebman, William F. Buckley Jr. whispered to Liebman that, in his judgment, “you sure got shafted.”

Although Liebman faded out of the limelight of the “responsible conservative” orbit after Edison’s demise, he popped back into public controversy when he went public and declared his long-time homosexuality, later penning his autobiography entitled *Coming Out Conservative: A Founder of the Modern Conservative Movement Speaks Out on Personal Freedom, Homophobia and Hate Politics*.

Liebman himself died several years ago, but his legacy survives in the ongoing antics of his associates and proteges such as William F. Buckley, Jr., Robert K. Brown and Richard Viguerie, all of whom continue to operate, in one way or another, to this day. But Buckley himself far eclipsed his mentor, Liebman, and became, in his own way, a pivotal figure in the evisceration of traditional American nationalism.

Chapter Eighteen

William F. Buckley, Jr. Self-Appointed “Responsible Conservative” And Longtime Spokesman for The Enemy Within

At almost precisely the time that the FBI was enlisting high-ranking Communist Party USA official Morris Childs, as described earlier, a host of “ex-Communists” banded together under the leadership of William F. Buckley, Jr. to form the editorial bulwark of Buckley’s fortnightly magazine *National Review*.

In the succeeding years Buckley—in alliance with his close friend and collaborator, Zionist operative Marvin Liebman—began a heavy-handed war against hard-line American nationalists, attempting to isolate them and deny them respectability. In so doing, Buckley was actively aided and abetted by the mainstream media monopoly in America.

In *The New Jerusalem*, this author’s earlier work, a point about Buckley was raised that probably had never before been committed to print, and in the context of what we are about to examine, is probably worth repeating here: Although Buckley is widely recognized as an Irish Catholic and is known as a devout Catholic, his Roman Catholic antecedents are not from his Scotch-Irish father’s side, as widely believed, but, are instead from his mother’s side.

Although Buckley’s mother was born to a German Catholic family based in New Orleans named Steiner, the late *Chicago Tribune* columnist Walter Trohan privately told intimates that it was his understanding that the Steiner family was originally Jewish and converted to Roman Catholicism, as did many Jewish families in New Orleans during the 18th and 19th centuries.

In any case, whatever his real ethnic heritage, young Buckley—enthusiastically encouraged by his cohorts and friendly promoters in the major media—authoritatively began to “draw the lines” and determine what was “proper” and permissible for American conservatives to discuss and what was not. Buckley announced that anyone who dared raise questions about such issues as Zionism or the power of elite groups such as Bilderberg and the Council of Foreign Relations was “beyond the pale” and delving into “fever swamps.”

Buckley and his “ex-Communist” allies and their minions declared themselves to be “responsible conservatives” and actively waged war against anyone they deemed not to be.

A favorite Buckley target was the growing populist movement surrounding Liberty Lobby, founded by Willis Carto (at roughly the same time Buckley was establishing *National Review*) in 1955. Not only did Buckley later file a legal action against Liberty Lobby, but Buckley’s close friend and former CIA colleague, E. Howard Hunt, did likewise.

Over the years, the four major lawsuits that were filed against Liberty Lobby all had one thing in common: those responsible all had definite connections to the CIA and the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, the U.S.-based intelligence and propaganda arm of the CIA's close collaborator, Israel's spy agency, the Mossad.

- The first of these lawsuits was filed by “ex” CIA operative E. Howard Hunt, best known for his role in the Watergate burglary that led to the forced resignation of President Richard M. Nixon. (Today it is generally suspected that the Watergate affair was largely a CIA orchestration designed to lay the groundwork for a *coup d'état* aimed at Nixon.)

Hunt filed his suit against Liberty Lobby shortly after *The Spotlight* published an explosive story in its August 14, 1978 issue in which the author, former high-ranking CIA official Victor Marchetti, charged that the CIA intended to frame Hunt for involvement in the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

Although Hunt admitted under oath that the story could be true—that his colleagues at the CIA could indeed be targeting him as a scapegoat in the crime of the century—he still persisted in pursuing his lawsuit. When the case went to trial, Hunt won a potentially devastating \$650,000 libel judgment against Liberty Lobby. However, due to errors in jury instructions by the trial judge, Liberty Lobby was able to wage a successful appeal and the case was ordered for re-trial.

During that second trial in January of 1985, famed JFK assassination investigator Mark Lane came on board as Liberty Lobby's defense counsel. Much to Hunt's dismay, Lane brought forth evidence that revealed, contrary to Hunt's denials, that Hunt had been in Dallas just prior to the JFK assassination in the company of CIA-backed Cuban exiles. The jury rejected Hunt's arguments and ruled against him—a major victory for Liberty Lobby. Then, after the trial, jury forewoman Leslie Armstrong announced publicly that she and her colleagues had concluded that Lane's defense was on target and that the CIA had indeed been involved in the assassination of President Kennedy.

- During the period leading up to the final victory in the Hunt case, Liberty Lobby's sources advised the populist institution that Hunt's case was being actively assisted by the CIA, to the point that the CIA actually provided attorneys and others to assist Hunt. What's more, it was discovered that Hunt's CIA protege, millionaire dilettante, William F. Buckley, Jr., was also providing Hunt tactical and financial assistance.

Buckley, who was Hunt's deputy in the CIA station in Mexico City in the early 1950's, had long harbored a grudge against Liberty Lobby's newspaper, *The Spotlight*, which had quickly outpaced Buckley's own publication, *National Review*, in terms of circulation and outreach.

When Buckley published a 1971 smear of Liberty Lobby, it came out in sworn testimony that a primary source for Buckley’s smear was syndicated columnist Jack Anderson. Along with his mentor, the late Drew Pearson, Anderson had bragged for years that much of the garbage that they peddled about Liberty Lobby came directly from the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith, a known conduit for Israel’s spy agency, the Mossad. Pearson’s own ex-mother-in-law, newspaper publisher Cissy Patterson, once called Pearson “both undercover agent and mouthpiece for the ADL.”

After Liberty Lobby launched an extended investigation of Buckley and his affairs, some details (but not all) of which were published in *The Spotlight*, Buckley then filed his own libel suit against Liberty Lobby in 1980, almost directly on the heels of his friend Hunt’s libel suit. Again, after much expense to Liberty Lobby, the case came to trial in 1985—just months after Hunt’s case had been laid to rest.

During the trial Buckley declared that he had a “mission” to expose Liberty Lobby but despite the high expectations of Buckley and his sycophants who were on hand expecting victory, a District of Columbia jury had a big surprise for the former CIA officer.

Although Buckley had sued for millions of dollars in damages, the jury awarded Buckley only one dollar (plus \$1,000 in punitive damages). When the verdict was announced, a Buckley supporter in the courtroom burst into tears. Buckley—like his CIA mentor, Hunt—had failed to destroy Liberty Lobby.

In any case, the sordid career of the aging *enfant terrible*, William F. Buckley, Jr., is drawing to a close. However, his manipulations—from the 1950s and well into the early years of the 21st century—did much to lay the groundwork for the evisceration of traditional American nationalism. Buckley indeed can be ranked as one of the most destructive of the Judas Goats.

The strange circle of hangers-on, crooks and cronies, who have populated the world of “WFB” and his “responsible conservative” sphere of influence continue to carry out his treachery, as the chapters which follow will demonstrate in sad detail.

Chapter Nineteen

The Vatican's Own Enemy Within: Buckley Associate Malachi Martin's Secret Role as a Subversive Acting on Behalf of Zionist Interests

The identity of an operative for the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith inside the Catholic Church during the Second Vatican Council in the early 1960s has been revealed: the late ex-priest-turned-best-selling author, Malachi Martin, a longtime close associate of none other than William F. Buckley, Jr., himself an outspoken Roman Catholic. As a result of the revelations concerning Buckley's friend Martin, some prominent Catholic traditionalist critics now call Martin a "*de facto* Zionist double agent" and a "priest-spy for Zionism"—labels that will come as a surprise to many good traditionalist Catholics who viewed Martin, at least in his later years, as their ally.

It now turns out that this same "double agent"—Martin—was a financial backer of a conspiratorial group that was working to destroy Liberty Lobby, the Washington-based populist institution.

It was Cincinnati-based Lawrence W. Patterson who was apparently the first-ever national publisher to unveil Martin as the so-called "priest-spy" inside the Vatican who, in Patterson's words, was the key figure in "saving the Vatican II documents which have since been used to begin the attempted melding of Zionism and Catholicism."

In the April 1991 issue of his magazine *Criminal Politics*, Patterson called Martin the magazine's "fake conservative of the month, fronting for the Trilateral/Zionist cause," and outlined the explosive evidence indicting Martin.

But Patterson is not the only major figure to expose Martin. Widely-regarded revisionist historian Michael A. Hoffman II called Martin a "double-minded occultist" and a "20th century Judas." (See Hoffman's website at hoffman-info.com)

In addition, Hutton Gibson, the outspoken lay traditionalist Catholic, said of Martin on a broadcast of *Radio Free America* (with host Tom Valentine) that "I think Martin was kind of a Judas Goat. He was at the Second Vatican Council and one of the things he did was call in bishops who were a little obstreperous and threaten them to get in line. Malachi Martin is not my idea of a Catholic."

The late Revilo P. Oliver, one of the great nationalist intellectuals, wrote that "if Martin did indeed play an important role in betraying the [Catholic] Church into the hands of its inveterate enemies, he certainly knew what he was doing. (See Oliver's essay, "How They Stole the Church," at revilo-oliver.com)

Hoffman said that Martin "saved the day for the Jewish/Masonic infiltrators of the church." In *Criminal Politics*, Patterson explained how

Martin did just that, outlining the amazing story of Martin's intrigue.

Relying largely on an indubitably "mainstream" article, "How the Jews Changed Catholic Thinking" by Joseph Roddy—published in the January 25, 1966 issue of the now-defunct *Look* magazine—Patterson pointed out that the *Look* article revealed quite candidly that a priest working inside the Vatican was shuttling back and forth between Rome and New York during the Vatican II proceedings.

The priest was providing inside information about proposed Catholic Church "reforms" to not only *The New York Times*, but also to the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee and its magazine, *Commentary*.

Then, as the article noted, this confidential information leaked from inside the Vatican was then used to pressure the Vatican into making major changes in church policy.

The *Look* author would not identify the priest by his real name, referring only to him as "Timothy Fitzharris-O'Boyle," but also explained that this priest also wrote for *Commentary* under the name "F.E. Cartus" and had written a book, entitled *The Pilgrim*, under the name "Michael Serafian."

(*The Pilgrim* was a 1964 book, rushed into print, according to Michael A. Hoffman II, for the very purpose of divulging efforts by traditionalists inside the Vatican to counter the proposed revolution in church teachings.)

As Lawrence Patterson's investigation determined, when Malachi Martin (by then an internationally-known writer) released his 1974 book, *The New Castle*, a filler page listing "books by Malachi Martin" indicated that Martin had written the aforementioned book, *The Pilgrim*, "under the pseudonym, Michael Serafian."

And as if Patterson's revelations (based on Martin's own published acknowledgment) are not enough evidence that he was indeed the "priest-spy" inside the Vatican, a July 31, 1999 *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel* obituary for Martin said that he had published *The Pilgrim* under the "Michael Serafian" pseudonym.

Almost immediately after completing his subversive ventures inside the Vatican, Martin left the priesthood and went to New York where he began writing for the American Jewish Committee's *Commentary* (under his real name) and acting as "religious editor" for William F. Buckley, Jr.'s *National Review*.

In the years that followed, Martin's novels and other works received widespread international promotion in the organs of the major media, making Martin almost certainly a multi-millionaire.

According to Michael A. Hoffman II, Martin "was the descendant of

*“Satan’s smoke has made its way into
the Temple of God through some crack.*

—GIOVANNI BATTISTA MONTINI*



***BETTER KNOWN UNDER HIS TITLE** of Pope Paul VI—under which name he implemented the controversial Vatican II “reforms” that re-directed and distorted traditional Roman Catholic doctrine—at a time when Judas Goat Malachi Martin (see accompanying chapter) was acting as an agent inside the Vatican II conference on behalf of Zionist interests. On more than one occasion Montini (above) publicly wore the Freemasonic emblem known as the “ephod,” the symbol worn by Caiaphus, the Jewish High Priest who ordered the death of Jesus Christ. Montini’s ephod can be seen (circled) at the bottom of his portrait. At right is an ephod in which Hebrew letters can clearly be seen at the top. Said to be of Jewish extraction, Montini was buried Jewish-style, in a plain wooden box, in a ceremony at the Vatican which featured *not a single crucifix*. Many traditionalist Catholics consider Montini a Judas Goat. Zionist interests have also forcefully infiltrated Protestant fundamentalist churches, promoting the “dispensationalist” doctrine, first cooked up by John Darby in the 1840’s and then widely promoted in the 20th century by Cyrus Scofield, whose famous “Scofield Reference Bible” was financed by the Zionist Rothschild family-funded Oxford University Press in London. Today, Rothschild-sponsored “dispensationalism” dictates the pro-Zionist stance of the so-called “Christian Right,” a major influence in the Republican Party. Thus, an alliance between Radical Judaism and Radical Christianity is responsible for the misconduct of U.S. foreign policy for the benefit of the Zionist imperium under President George W. Bush, a fervent disciple of dispensationalism surrounded by Zionist fanatics.

a Jewish banker who sought refuge in Ireland,” where Martin was born in 1921. Hoffman scored Martin for, as recently as 1997, comparing himself with Maimonides, whom Hoffman identifies as “the foremost interpreter of the Jewish Talmud and one of the most implacable enemies of Christ in the annals of Judaism” who once “commanded the extermination of Christians.”

This is interesting since Martin, in fact, did study at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem where he concentrated on the knowledge of Jesus Christ as transmitted in Jewish sources. Soon afterward, according to London’s *Independent* of August 6, 1999, Martin was “marked out as a high flyer” and promoted to a post at the Vatican as a theological advisor to Cardinal Augustin Bea, who was himself, along with several other of his advisors, of Jewish descent.

It was Bea who emerged inside the Vatican as the prime mover behind the changes in church policy during Vatican II, and Martin acted as his agent in dealings with the Jewish community in New York City during that time frame. Revilo Oliver went so far as to suggest that Martin may have actually been a “courier” for vast amounts of cash bribes transferred out of New York to Rome and elsewhere during the Vatican II period.

The fact that Martin forged a close relationship with William F. Buckley, Jr.—one that lasted for decades—is noteworthy since both Buckley and his former supervisor in the CIA, E. Howard Hunt, waged extensive (albeit failed) lawsuits against *The Spotlight* for the purpose of demolishing the populist weekly. Thus the question remains as to whether Martin was later acting as an agent for the vengeful team of Buckley and Hunt in assisting other operatives who were working to silence *The Spotlight*.

The bottom line: Malachi Martin’s role in financing a conspiracy to destroy *The Spotlight* does point toward the origin of that conspiracy, and it is safe to say that Martin was clearly a prime example of The Enemy Within—in this case involved in the subversion of the Roman Catholic Church.

The damage done to the church by the revolutionary conclave known as Vatican II may never be undone and the future will remember Malachi Martin as a treacherous Judas Goat of the worst order.

Chapter Twenty

The "Conservative" Fund-Raising Racket: Looting American Patriots on Behalf of The Enemy Within

On August 26, 1985 *The Spotlight* warned its readers about the controversial activities of direct mail fund-raiser Richard Viguerie, a protégé of the ubiquitous Zionist intriguer, Marvin Liebman, discussed in a previous chapter. Accurately headlined, "Scandal hallmark of direct mail king Viguerie's rise to power," *The Spotlight's* report described Viguerie's peculiar craft—and his heavy-handed fund-raising gimmickry—in detail.

For years, Viguerie essentially looted millions of American patriots of perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars contributed to various "conservative" causes that Viguerie hyped—and in some instances, actually created—even though, in some cases, Viguerie and his associated companies were pocketing, it was said, as much as 75 percent of the money raised, quite a profitable racket.

However, some seven years later, in its November 12, 1992 issue—with the conservative movement moribund and drained of its resources and energy—the Establishment's *New York Times* finally let the cat out of the bag and confirmed *The Spotlight's* reports about Viguerie's mode of operation.

In a story beginning on page one and then filling an entire page in the national section of the Establishment daily, the *Times* told its readers of Viguerie's latest fund-raising enterprise.

Operating from a non-profit, tax exempt outfit called the United Seniors Association (USA), Viguerie was raking in millions by sending out letters to senior citizens and milking them for contributions, in one instance, to keep on "fighting hard in the nation's capital to ensure the rights and benefits of America's seniors are protected."

(Actually, Viguerie has operated several different "senior citizens" outfits—USA being just one of them.)

Viguerie's "fright mail"—announcing the end of Social Security for example—scared up contributions from unwitting senior citizens who were led to believe that Viguerie's outfit was really out there fighting hard for their security. In fact, most of the money Viguerie raised was immediately re-channeled into new direct mail pitches sent to other potential contributors.

What happened, then, the *Times* noted, is that in the process Viguerie and his various front groups "spread large sums among list-renters, letter-writers, printers, mailers and other subcontractors, always including Mr. Viguerie himself."

What was particularly intriguing was that one of Viguerie's collaborators is one Dan C. Alexander, Jr, who served 51 months of a 12-year prison sentence for extorting kickbacks in school construction projects in Mobile, Alabama.

Interestingly, Alexander's most recent fund-raising gimmick, at that time, cooked up with Viguerie, was an outfit called the Taxpayers Education Lobby.

This, however, was not the first time that Viguerie had linked up with some strange birds.

While his companies were raking in millions from patriots and conservatives, Viguerie once admitted, frankly, "I am not an America firster" which he proved by his long-standing and close collaboration with Korean cult leader, Sun Myung Moon. It was with Viguerie's assistance that Moon and his cult became a key influence within the conservative movement. Moon himself, of course, long ago announced that he wanted to take over the world.

Viguerie's first entry into the mailing list business came in 1960 when the young Texan popped up in New York toting the list of contributors who had kicked in money to the Republican Senate candidate in the Lone Star State.

Viguerie found a gracious patron in the form of Marvin Liebman. At the same time Viguerie was learning his trade under Liebman's tutelage, his mentor was operating an outfit known as Young Americans for Freedom (YAF), a conservative youth group founded by Buckley. Sensing Viguerie's sharp business acumen, Liebman put the young Texan in charge of YAF.

Viguerie bailed out of YAF in 1965 and moved on to Washington where he set up his own firm, from which the later Viguerie operations ultimately evolved.

In subsequent years Viguerie began building a massive mailing list of contributors to patriotic and conservative causes. Viguerie also assembled a gang of associates whose chief talent seemed to have been the ability to put on fright wings and scare patriots into contributing millions of dollars into all kinds of dubious causes cooked up in the Viguerie kitchen.

In the mid-1980's, however, Viguerie's mailing list empire began to unravel as American conservatives, reveling in the Ronald Reagan era, became convinced that Reagan had "saved the country" and ceased contributing to Viguerie's money-raising schemes.

Viguerie, as a consequence, was forced to dismantle his home-grown fundraising empire. He sold his long-time headquarters building and dismissed a large portion of his staff.

Viguerie also sold his in-house magazine, *Conservative Digest*, to corrupt silver promoter William Kennedy, Jr. who had been victimizing conservative investors for years with the active support of a prominent ring of self-appointed conservative leaders.

By buying Viguerie's failing magazine with his ill-gotten gains, Kennedy was, essentially, enriching Viguerie with stolen money.

Not surprisingly, considering its record of honest reporting about the activities of *The Enemy Within*, it was *The Spotlight* which—in yet another exclusive—warned its readers against Kennedy's criminal practices. Kennedy, of course, was ultimately indicted and convicted on multiple charges stemming from his activities and sent to federal prison.

It was after his own conservative rackets began to collapse that Viguerie decided to go into scaring senior citizens out of their money. He evidently is still succeeding to a certain degree to this day, although he has largely been sidelined by the rise to power of the hard-line pro-Israel “neo-conservatives” who—in the spirit of Viguerie's mentor, Lieberman—have achieved absolute iron-clad control of the so-called “conservative” movement and used that control to capture the Republican Party itself.

Chapter Twenty-One

How The Enemy Within Manipulates the “Anti-Communist” Cause To Advance the Zionist Agenda

Perhaps Richard Viguerie’s primary contribution to the destruction of the American “conservative” movement has been his central role in playing mentor (much as Zionist operative Marvin Liebman served as Viguerie’s mentor) to a motley crew of quite skilled direct mail fundraisers whose chief talent seems to have been the ability to raise vast amounts of money from good American patriots and then squander them in failed causes, but making the fundraisers rich in the process.

However, in at least one instance that we are about to explore, it seems as if a Viguerie protégé has figured out a way to soak patriots in order to finance a pet project designed to advance the agenda of The Enemy Within.

Lee Edwards, a veteran of direct mail wizard Richard Viguerie’s direct mail kitchen, has really cooked up a good one. And this time, not surprisingly, he’s got the imprimatur of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) to boot.

Don’t let the high-sounding aims of Lee Edwards’s latest fund-raising venture lead you into opening up your wallet just yet. There’s an unusual twist (and an interesting agenda) behind Edward’s gimmick that has a lot of veteran anti-communists upset. Panhandling patriots for some forty years now, Edwards is the brains—he initially gave himself the impressive title “president”—behind the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation.

Sounds noble. Edwards even got the support of Congress which granted his foundation a site on the Mall. Now, the direct mail impresario is trying to come up with \$100 million to establish a memorial museum that will commemorate the worldwide victims of communism.

Veteran anti-communists across America like the idea of a memorial to the victims of communism. “After all,” they argue, “since the U.S. already has a taxpayer-financed memorial to Jewish victims of the ‘holocaust’ of World War II, shouldn’t we also have a memorial to honor the very real victims of communism around the globe?”

However, according to the *Forward*, an influential New York-based Jewish weekly, which has given a favorable boost to Edwards’ gimmick, the focus of the museum will be just a little bit different than American anti-communists might expect. In fact, *Forward* reported that the museum would be especially interested in demonstrating how the Jewish people were largely the victims of communism and not its perpetrators. The museum, in short, is going to be a variation on a theme—another version of the Holocaust museum (showing the sufferings of the Jewish

people), but this time with an anti-communist twist.

Edwards' museum, according to *Forward*, will actively work to combat the belief among many Eastern Europeans that a preponderance of leaders in the communist movements throughout the nations of Eastern Europe were Jewish. In fact, as the old red regimes of Eastern Europe toppled and nationalist elements began to reassert themselves, many people in the region pointed to a substantial Jewish role in communism and its advancement beginning as early as the days of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

Now, however, Edwards was stepping forward to show all of these people that their ideas were dead wrong. Assisting him in its efforts was an interesting array of people who—in the past—would have never trafficked with a professional “conservative” fundraiser such as Edwards.

Foremost among them was Carl Gershman, a longtime “social democrat” who was best known for his service as a national staff official of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith. (Gershman later served as president of the so-called National Endowment for Democracy, an internationalist “think tank” promoting the globalist agenda.) That Gershman had lent his “prestige” to Edwards' effort demonstrated, beyond question, that the highest levels of the elite had given their nod to Edwards' fund-raising venture.

In addition to the pivotal presence of the ADL's Gershman, a bevy of other old-line pro-Israel elements were boosting Edwards' endeavor, ranging from Albert Shanker, the so-called “anti-communist liberal” who has long headed the American Federation of Teachers, to Harvard historian Richard Pipes who has been affiliated with the Jonathan Institute which has been described “as a virtual arm of the Israeli state.”

Representing the “conservatives” among Edwards' board of directors were Rabbi Daniel Lapin and Grover Norquist, a close associate of former House Speaker Newt Gingrich.

(Note: at the beginning of 2005, Rabbi Lapin became embroiled in an ugly scandal involving a prominent Washington lobbyist, one Jack Abramoff, a loud and contentious Orthodox Jew who channeled money, apparently illicitly obtained from American Indian tribes, toward a Washington area Jewish school headed by Lapin's brother, David, another rabbi. Abramoff also funded a school for Jewish snipers on the West Bank in Occupied Palestine. As this is written, the whole Abramoff-Lapin affair has yet to unfold but Abramoff is believed to have corrupted perhaps as many as half a dozen members of Congress.)

However, to return to Lapin's associate, Lee Edwards: Those familiar with Edwards' history were not surprised that he would pop up again in Zionist circles. Back in 1974 a group of Mexican anti-commu-

nists who inadvertently got caught up in one of Edwards' earlier fund-raising ventures described him as a "fanatical Zionist" whose activities were a disservice to the American anti-communist cause.

Edwards himself, who had been making a living in conservative (and Zionist-linked) fund-raising schemes for years, as we've noted, launched his career as a satellite of famous—some would say "infamous"—direct mail wizard Richard Viguerie, protégé of Israeli Stern gang luminary Marvin Liebman.

Running in Viguerie's circle, Edwards hooked up with Korean cult leader (and CIA front man) Sun Myung Moon and ran an operation known as the Korean Cultural Freedom Foundation, a highly profitable "anti-communist" group that gave Moon's network further legitimacy in conservative circles in the early days when Moon was just beginning to spread his ill-gotten wealth among conservative "leaders."

Edwards, in fact, was an early Moon sycophant, writing for Moon publications long before Moon's anti-family cult became prominent as a key source of funds for American conservatives. Edwards has been a senior editor of Moon's magazine, *The World & I*, when he's not out raising money, that is.

(In subsequent pages, we will learn much more about Moon himself and the strange history of this CIA- and Mossad-connected operation, a story that truly needs to be told.)

Edwards himself has largely kept in the background, but he did have a brush with (ill) fame in 1972 as a result of one of his more memorable fund-raising ventures—an outfit known as "Friends of the FBI." Teaming up with a chap named Pat Gorman, another Viguerie satellite, and a Chicago attorney, Luis Kutner, Edwards sent out fundraising letters promising to put the proceeds raised toward building a better public image for J. Edgar Hoover's FBI. Edwards even managed to get the endorsement of popular actor Efrem Zimbalist, Jr., star of television's series, "The FBI."

Edwards and his cohorts raised some \$400,000. However, according to published reports at the time, fully \$155,000 went to a fellow named Pat Gorman for the use of Gorman's mailing lists; another \$77,000 went to Gorman for "fees"; \$27,500 went to Edwards himself; and \$47,000 went to Kutner.

Things were so outrageous that Zimbalist demanded his name be removed from the group's letterhead. In a telegram Zimbalist's attorneys accused Edwards, Gorman and Kutner of "fraud and misrepresentation."

Edwards's business partner Kutner is an interesting character. A longtime friend of Jack Ruby, the organized crime-linked nightclub operator who killed Lee Harvey Oswald, the alleged assassin of President

John F. Kennedy, Kutner had known Ruby since at least 1936 when Ruby assisted Kutner in his unsuccessful congressional campaign. In 1950 Kutner represented Ruby when his client was called before the staff of the Kefauver Senate Rackets Committee in 1950 to discuss underworld activities in Chicago.

Later, as the historical record shows, Kutner was involved in wide-ranging international intelligence operations—from Latin American coups to the defense of ousted Congolese leader Moise Tshombe. Kutner was also active in efforts to advance the interests of Israel, serving as “honorary counsel” of the Center for Global Security, Inc., a pro-Israel lobby group.

So it is that wherever one looks it seems that Lee Edwards has intimate ties to some very unusual people who are always ready to lend him a hand in “passing the hat.” His current venture honoring the “Jewish Victims of Communism” is but one more example of the corrupt nature of The Enemy Within.

Chapter Twenty-Two

The John Birch Society: A Premier Case Study of The Judas Goat

Although William F. Buckley, Jr. and his fellow “responsible conservatives” made many noises critical of the John Birch Society, founded by Massachusetts candy maker Robert Welch in 1958—therefore leading many to believe that the Birch Society and Buckley were, in some ways, at odds in their approach to dealing with the problems of the day (despite the fact that both the Buckleyites and the Birchers claimed the mantle of “anti-communism” and “conservatism”)—there are many intriguing elements surrounding the history of the John Birch Society that have largely remained ignored by many Americans who believe the Birch movement, in the balance, made a valuable contribution to the anti-communist cause.

The truth is that Buckley’s attacks on the John Birch Society—echoing much of the same rhetoric about the Society appearing in the major media in America—effectively brought massive publicity to the Birch movement that it would not have otherwise received. And the very fact that the major media gave so much attention to the society is an interesting point indeed. For the direct result of all of the attention was that the Birch Society grew exponentially and effectively “corralled” a very substantial group of American anti-communists into the ranks of an organization which—as we shall see—was very suspect indeed.

The following essay is an account by the author of *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within* of his own brief journey into the strange world of the John Birch Society. While highly personal in nature, the essay reflects much of the thinking of many others who had their own individual experiences as members—and ultimately former members—of the JBS. The essay—originally published in the July-August 2005 issue of *The Barnes Review*, the bimonthly historical magazine based in Washington—speaks for itself. The essay was originally entitled “My One-Minute Membership in the John Birch Society.”

Many questions about the John Birch Society (JBS) have passed through my own mind since I first became aware of the existence of the JBS when I was a sixteen-year-old high school student. Honestly, I’m fully aware that there will be many good people who will be utterly inflamed by my remarks, but let’s let the chips fall where they may.

My first awareness of the JBS came at a time when I was becoming embroiled (for better or worse) in political affairs. Having pretty much determined (on my own, with no input from friends or family) that I was some sort of “conservative,” I quickly began the process of trying to

learn as much as I could about various “right wing” political organizations. That led me to my local libraries where I savored all the standard conservative writings that were available. However, I did not restrict my reading to literature that reflected my own point of view. Always open-minded, I was curious to see what “the other side” had to say.

As a consequence of that, I zipped through a wide variety of volumes coming from what might be described as the “liberal-left” and I continually came across references to a mysterious and controversial “John Birch Society” and its founder, Robert Welch. In my own mind, I said, “If the liberals consider the JBS and its founder to be so bad, then they must be pretty good.”

No sooner had I made up my mind to try to find the address of, and contact, the John Birch Society, than there—lo and behold—in my own local public library—I spotted a copy of the JBS publication, *American Opinion*, sitting right there on the shelf, alongside so-called “mainstream” publications.

With great excitement, I began leafing through the professionally-produced JBS journal, thrilled to have access to the forbidden facts and hidden information that I just knew I couldn’t get from *Time* or *Newsweek* or even in the pages of the so-called “conservative” weekly, *U.S. News & World Report*.

That particular issue of *American Opinion* had a chart that captured my attention. It was an overview—country by country—of “communist influence” (by percent, on a scale of 0 to 100) in the various countries of the world.

I knew, of course, that communists were in control of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and that they also had widespread influence throughout the West. I was acutely aware that communist influence, in one form or another, had gained a stranglehold in my own United States of America.

However, I was surprised to see that, according to the JBS, communist strength in America was far more powerful than I would have estimated. I don’t recall the exact percentage, but I recall that it was extraordinarily high.

“Thank God,” I thought, as I studied the chart, “that there are a few countries, such as Argentina and Chile, that are in the hands of anti-communist military leaders.” But when I turned to those two republics, I found that the JBS listed communist influence there to be in the range of 70 to 90 percent. I was startled, needless to say. “Maybe they know something I don’t know,” I thought. But I continued to read on.

Next I turned to the state of Israel. Based on my own earlier research I knew that Israel’s economy was based on a strictly socialist

model, funded by billions in U.S. tax dollars. In addition, I was also aware of the predominant influence of Russian and Eastern European Jews in the worldwide communist movement and knew that many Jews of a Marxist bent had been involved in establishing the Jewish state. What's more, I also knew that not only had Israel been strategically assisted, in its founding years, with arms and support from the communist bloc, but also that tiny Israel was the only nation in the Middle East with a freely-flourishing communist party.

With all of this in mind, imagine how surprised I was to learn that—at least according to the JBS in its *American Opinion* chart—communist influence in Israel was hardly more than 10 to 20 percent!

At that moment—having only had a JBS publication in my hand for the first time ever, for less than several minutes, in fact—I realized that something was very much amiss.

Skimming the rest of the chart, I soon saw that, in the Birch worldview, Israel was probably the only serious bastion of anti-communism on the entire face of the planet. Not even the anti-communist regimes in Argentina and Chile seemed to qualify.

It was then I knew, pure and simple, that those at the highest levels of the JBS had fallen under the influence—perhaps the outright control—of the insidious force of political Zionism. That was enough for me. I knew then that the JBS was not for me. My “membership” in the JBS, if truth be told, lasted little more than a minute.

Little did I know at that time, however, that I had learned, rapidly and quite easily, what thousands of good, honest members of the JBS had to learn with much more pain over a considerably longer period of time. I had no idea that there were disillusioned former members of the JBS all over the United States who had, in one way or another, figured out what I had discovered on my own, without ever even having been a member of the JBS.

The most notable among the former Birchers, perhaps, was the late Dr. Revilo P. Oliver, an eminent classicist and former U.S. intelligence officer who, for several years, was quite active in the JBS and very much publicly identified with the group. However, Oliver quit the Birchers precisely because he knew that Birch Boss Welch was determined to carry water for the Zionist cause and Oliver wanted nothing to do with it. (Some remarkable commentary on the Birchers by Oliver, excerpted from his writings, can be found on the lively and fascinating website of John “Birdman” Bryant at the thebirdman.org).

In any case, some four years later, when I went to work in Washington for *The Spotlight*, I learned the full history of the Zionist infiltration and manipulation of the JBS. At *The Spotlight* I gained access

to fascinating archives accumulated over the years, pointing to the strange origins—and directions—of the JBS. There I discovered the facts about the little-known “Rockefeller connection” to the JBS. In the August 1965 edition of *Capsule News*, Morris Bealle laid it bare. He wrote:

Robert Welch (and his brother Jimmy) received a tremendous pay-off from the House of Rockefeller two years ago, for organizing the John Birch Society and sitting on the Communist lid for the past seven years. The total pay-off was \$10,800,000, less the value of the family candy company which is reputed to be maybe \$100,000 or \$200,000.

On October 1, 1963, Rockefeller’s National Biscuit Company announced the “purchase” of the James O. Welch Candy Company of Cambridge, Massachusetts. In *Moody’s Manual of Industrials*, and in *Standard-and-Poor’s Business Index*, NBC gave the alleged purchase price as “200,000 shares of National Biscuit common stock.” According to *The Wall Street Journal* for Oct. 1, 1963, NBC common stock was selling for \$54 a share on the New York Stock Exchange. Today it is selling for \$58. Thus the Welch brothers were given \$10,800,000 “just like that.”

Candy people say the whole family business, with plants and five sales offices, was hardly worth \$200,000. Welch will tell those dopes who will believe him that National Biscuit is not a Rockefeller concern.

Again, *Moody’s Manual* will trip him up. It lists as two of the directors the names of Roy E. Tomlinson and Don. G. Mitchell. [Both are] members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Further, they are a pair of Rockefeller’s ‘professional directors.’ Tomlinson is also a director of their Prudential Life and American Sugar Refining.

It was American Sugar that was directly concerned with the financing and embargoing into the hands of Communist Russia of Cuba in 1959. They made the deal with Castro which ended freedom on the island of Cuba and made possible those Havana missile bases designed to wipe out American eastern seaboard cities.

It also appears that the Rock Mob financed and promoted the organization of the John Birch Society. How else could it have gotten millions of dollars worth of newspaper publicity by the phony “attacks” on Welch that came with dramatic suddenness.

And, for the record, in more recent years, famed populist historian Eustace Mullins, author of *The Federal Reserve Conspiracy*, *The World Order* and other classics, has said publicly—more than once—that his research led him to the conclusion that the Birch Society was indeed a creation of the Rockefeller empire, based on precisely the same data that led Bealle to reach his assessment. So Bealle was not standing alone, by any means, in making these allegations.

In the matter of the privately-owned Federal Reserve banking monopoly, the JBS took some mighty peculiar positions. In the September 1964 issue of *American Opinion*, one of Birch's favorite economists, Hans Sennholz, wrote an article about the Federal Reserve System. The article stated of the Fed as follows:

The control rests absolutely and undividedly in the hands of the U.S. president . . . They [the people who run the Federal Reserve System] are agents of the government, not corporate officials with the proprietorship rights and powers customarily of stockholders of corporations. The Federal Reserve System is not, nor has it ever been, a 'private banking institution' that is busily filling the pockets of the bankers, nor is it the evil product of an international conspiracy of foreign bankers

The late Norbert Murray, an outspoken Montana patriot who was a career journalist in the mainstream media and a former New York publicist for major business interests, succinctly described the article as a "pack of lies" that "protected the fraud of the system."

Publication of such an article could only mislead good members of the JBS who were trying to sort out the myths—from the facts—about the nature of the privately-owned and banker-dominated Federal Reserve and of the powerful international banking houses that play such a major role in the manipulation of U.S. foreign policy.

In any case, while working for *The Spotlight*, I did indeed learn much more about the JBS than I would have ever imagined possible.

It was at that point—in the late 1970s and early 1980s—that the JBS began actively promoting the interests of the state of Israel and hyping spokesmen for its powerful lobby in Washington, discarding any ambiguity about where the Birch Society's controllers stood on the issue of U.S. policy toward the Middle East.

Much to the dismay of longtime JBS loyalists, *The Spotlight's* hard-hitting senior journalist, the legendary Andrew St. George, reported at length and in devastating detail on the mysterious maneuverings of one

John Rees, a Britisher by birth and one with quite a murky past, who had squirreled his way into the inner circles of the JBS, establishing himself as the real “power behind the throne” during Robert Welch’s declining days. *The Spotlight* pinpointed Rees’ disturbing role in operating his own intelligence and spying operation which was, in many respects, quite akin to that of the Anti-Defamation League, the all-powerful American adjunct of Israel’s intelligence agency, the Mossad.

For my own part, as a student of the JFK assassination, I discovered the fact that like Robert Welch in his heyday, the John Birch Society—to this day—endorses the discredited Warren Commission fraud that “one lone nut” assassinated President Kennedy.

Morris Bealle pointed out early on (June 19, 1965) in his newsletter, *Capsule News*, that Robert Welch had declared Bealle’s book, *The Guns of the Regressive Right*—which pointed a finger in the direction of the CIA—to be “all wrong” and told his followers that it was not the CIA but Lyndon Johnson behind the JFK assassination.

According to Bealle, “We examined thoroughly all of his 1964 bulletins . . . [which] were filled with attacks on Earl Warren and curious expressions of hearty agreement with him on the myth that ‘a Communist [meaning the Decoy Man Oswald] killed Kennedy.’”

In fact, as I pointed out in *Final Judgment*, my own book on the JFK assassination, Welch played a major part in directing conservative attention away from a possible role by the CIA in the JFK assassination and in the direction of the Soviet KGB. *This was the same propaganda line of top CIA figure James J. Angleton, the CIA’s pro-Israel liaison to Israel’s Mossad.*

So while the Birchers think Lee Harvey Oswald was a lone-nut communist under the direction of the Soviet KGB—the theory put forth by the Mossad loyalist Angleton—they are very careful to avoid pointing toward the culpability of the CIA and certainly never ever dare mention that—as documented in my own book—the Mossad also played a critical role in the assassination conspiracy.

On Nov. 21, 1988 the Birch Society’s *New American* magazine touted the Warren Commission Report, saying that “evidence demonstrates beyond a reasonable doubt” that Lee Harvey Oswald—one lone communist nut—killed JFK.

In any case, however, the JBS acceptance of the obviously dubious claim that one lone communist nut killed JFK remains in force. In 1995, I sent a copy of the second edition of my book to a vast array of individuals inviting them to debate the thesis of the book with me—on radio or in any public forum or in writing. I gave them the opportunity to refute the book in the manner they wished. One of those to whom

I sent a copy of the book was Bill Jasper, senior editor of the Birch Society's *New American*. To this day—more than ten years later, and following the sales of almost 50,000 copies of *Final Judgment* to enthusiastic readers around the world—I have yet to hear from Mr. Jasper.

My experiences with the JBS—as far as the issue of the JFK assassination is concerned—were certainly instructive. But (years before) I had already figured out that the Birch Society was somewhat dubious, based on my research and that of others and on the study of Birch publications. Certainly, there are many fine Americans who are supporters of the JBS but my “one minute membership” was enough for me.

In closing this essay on the role of the Birchers in “shifting” the philosophy of many good Americans, it seems appropriate to recall what Richard Gid Powers, in his book *Not Without Honor: A History of American Anti-Communism*, had to say about Robert Welch and the John Birch Society:

The John Birch Society was, if truth be told, more in the nature of a study club devoted to the reading and discussion of Welch's literary production than a threat to the country. . . . Welch's notoriety was largely bogus, concocted by enemies on the left and within the respectable elite.

They knew from past experience that a weird figure like Welch, with his oddball turns of phrase, could be used to discredit the anticommunist right and the entire anti-communist movement. In 1961 the liberal Democrats . . . needed someone like Robert Welch.

If Robert Welch had deliberately decided to reduce everything valid anticommunists had ever said about communism to an absurdity, to turn himself into a demonstration of every ludicrous delusion that had discredited anti-communism in the past, to make all anticommunists look like dangerous fools, he could not have done a better job.

So while, on the one hand, self-styled “responsible conservative” William F. Buckley, Jr. was denouncing the Birch Society, the American “mainstream” media was providing massive publicity to the JBS and corraling many Americans into this dubious movement.

There could be much more written. However, considering even just what we have examined, can there be any real doubt that America would have been much better off if Robert Welch had stayed in the candy business and stayed out of politics?

Chapter Twenty-Three

The Rise and Fall of *Human Events*: Self-Styled “Responsible Conservatives” Who Helped Destroy America’s Traditional Conservatism

A select group of long-time self-appointed spokesmen for America’s “responsible conservatives”—satellites and willing allies of William F. Buckley, Jr., Grand Poohbah of the “Responsible Conservative Movement”—started pounding their heads against the wall when they realized that some of those “fellow conservatives” that they allowed into the conservative camp (and helped promote to real grass-roots conservatives) were really not so conservative after all.

For years the Washington-based *Spotlight*, a nationalist newspaper, warned that the Trotskyite “neo-conservatives” were working to take over the conservative movement for their own insidious (and notably hard-line Zionist) agenda. Yet, all during that period, a self-styled “responsible conservative” publication in the sphere of William F. Buckley, Jr.—*Human Events*—was busy telling its readers to ignore *The Spotlight* and/or to support these very “neo-conservatives” who were widely heralded as “ex-liberals who’ve seen the light,” etc.

However, having ignored warnings from *The Spotlight* that the conservative movement was being taken over from within by an internationalist Trojan Horse, the “responsible conservatives” suddenly realized that their power and influence was slipping out of their hands with incredible speed. The neo-conservative invaders were taking over the conservative movement, lock-stock-and-barrel.

Finally, in 1996, the editors of *Human Events* publicly complained—sounding just like *The Spotlight*—that William Kristol, publisher of the new *Weekly Standard*, funded by pro-Zionist billionaire Rupert Murdoch, was trying to take over and warp the views of the conservative movement. According to *Human Events*:

The sad truth is that the *Standard* is increasingly being viewed by many longtime conservatives, both here in Washington and around the country, as sort of a neoconservative Trojan Horse. Wrapped in conservative bunting, of course, it nonetheless is perceived as a vehicle for moving the [GOP] leftward, especially in the family values area.

True, each issue of the *Standard* normally contains several interesting articles written from a staunch conservative point of view. But the ones that pack that extra punch, those that always seem to be highlighted to get the major liberal media attention that Kristol obviously enjoys, are those that cut sharply against the conservative grain.

Despite these brave words, there were a few interesting things about Kristol and his publication that *Human Events* failed to mention:

- Kristol, who emerged out of nowhere to become what the media always calls “a leading conservative Republican strategist,” was inducted into the secretive Bilderberg group at its 1995 gathering in Burgenstock, Switzerland, a fact first reported by populist journalist Jim Tucker who—over the years—has provided in-depth reports on Bilderberg’s activities, first in *The Spotlight* and now in *American Free Press*. Tucker’s lively *Bilderberg Diary* is the first-ever English-language book on Bilderberg’s affairs. (In contrast, *Human Events* has always studiously avoided mentioning the Bilderberg or its affiliated groups such as the Council on Foreign Relations or the Trilateral Commission.)

- Kristol’s sole claim to power and influence (prior to being inducted into Bilderberg) is being the son of Irving Kristol, a prominent Trotskyite-turned-“liberal”-turned-self-styled “neoconservative” and a major figure in the pro-Israel lobby. The editors of *Human Events* are loath to mention Kristol’s Bilderberg and Israel lobby connection for fear of being tarred as “anti-Semites” or “conspiracy theorists.”

- Rupert Murdoch, the billionaire publisher who put up the money for Kristol’s magazine, has been a long-time front man for the combined forces of the Rothschild, Bronfman and Oppenheimer families.

As only *The Spotlight* reported at that time, Murdoch’s motivation in making a major move on the American media was to gain political power in this country on behalf of his behind-the-scenes sponsors. In addition, through his media clout, Murdoch was working to dominate the “conservative” movement.

As of 2006, it is accurate to say that Murdoch (and his behind-the-scenes sponsors in the international Zionist elite) have succeeded in doing both, having gained influence over the “conservative” movement and then having used it to achieve power.

Actually, *Human Events*’s cowardice vis-a-vis the internationalist take-over was no real surprise, inasmuch as *Human Events* has played no small role in that ultimate take-over. The record speaks for itself:

ITEM: It was largely an article published in *Human Events*, criticizing populist Pat Buchanan’s chances as a candidate in the Republican presidential primaries in 1988, that forced Buchanan to abandon his then-unannounced candidacy, thereby clearing the way for George H.W. Bush to capture the GOP presidential nomination without any serious challenge from the populist “right.”

Ironically, the same arguments that *Human Events* used against Buchanan were the same arguments used by the Establishment media against *Human Events*’s long-time hero, Ronald Reagan, when Reagan

was seeking the GOP nomination in 1968, 1976 and even in 1980. The Establishment media then said that Reagan was “too conservative” and too tough-talking and outspoken.

Yet, when *Human Events* was undermining Buchanan and boosting its favored 1988 candidate, Reagan administration HUD Secretary Jack Kemp, *Human Events* unleashed those same arguments against Buchanan. *The Spotlight* warned at that time that Kemp, in fact, was, in its words, a “Trojan Horse.” *The Spotlight* pointed out that among Kemp’s most influential backers was Irving Kristol, father of William Kristol who ultimately emerged as a villain in *Human Events*’s eyes.

ITEM: In its March 11, 1991 issue *The Spotlight* reported that *Human Events* had published a story attacking *The Spotlight* for publishing what *Human Events* claimed were “anti-Israeli” and “pro-Iraqi stories” leading up to and during the Persian Gulf War. In fact, *The Spotlight* had only pointed out the role of the pro-Israel lobby in pushing for the war and of the secret participation by Israel in the war itself. The allegations in *Human Events* were based upon claims made by a so-called “disinformation specialist” at the U.S. Information Agency whom *The Spotlight* later determined was associated with the Mossad-affiliated Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith.

Human Events failed to note that long before Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait *The Spotlight* was not only taking Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein to task for his brutality, but also exposing the American government (in league with Israel) for helping prop up Saddam’s regime when the U.S.-Israel axis was quietly supporting Saddam in his war against Iran. That *Human Events* would take such a stance is no surprise. After all, in its July 23, 1977 issue *Human Events* described then-Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin as “Israel’s Ronald Reagan.” (Begin was a former terrorist with a record so reprehensible that even many pro-Israel zealots had furiously rejected him in the 1950’s when he came to the United States as a representative of Israel.)

ITEM: With history virtually repeating itself, on December 30, 1991 *The Spotlight* reported that *Human Events* had determined that Pat Buchanan’s nationalist views might be a reason for “disqualifying” Buchanan for conservative support in his 1992 primary challenge against then-President George Bush. According to *Human Events*’s December 21, 1991 issue, there were three “problems” with Buchanan that unidentified “conservatives” found “disquieting, if not disqualifying: his views on isolationism, protection and the state of Israel.”

Interestingly, this same kind of snide broadsides about Buchanan appeared in issues of both *Time* and *Newsweek* that appeared during the same period, not to mention a similar attack published in another

conservative journal, *The American Spectator*. The author of this particularly vicious anti-Buchanan broadside was one David Frum. Interestingly, it was Frum who had recently authored another attack on Buchanan, this time published in Kristol's *Weekly Standard*.

Frum's article correctly contended that Buchanan was abandoning the internationalism imposed upon the GOP during the preceding forty years. Much to the dismay of the Bilderberg weekly, Buchanan's populist and nationalist views were then proving popular among GOP voters, but, in the end, of course, Buchanan's candidacy (in 1996 and, later, as the Reform Party presidential candidate in 2000) went nowhere.

(In later years, Frum ended up on the White House staff of George W. Bush, closely collaborating with the Kristol family's neo-conservative network in hyping the impending war on Iraq. Ultimately Frum quit the Bush White House after his wife bragged that her husband had coined the president's term "Axis of Evil"—used to defame perceived enemies of Israel that were now being targeted by the United States. Frum then co-wrote, with neo-conservative intriguer and former Israeli arms peddler Richard Perle, a virulent anti-Muslim hate screed entitled *The End of Evil*, which was a call for an all-out war against the Muslim world.)

National Review, published by William F. Buckley, Jr., the "former" CIA operative who has been a long-time close friend of *Human Events*'s prime movers, Tom Winter and Alan Ryskind, also levelled a blast at Buchanan during the 1992 primary campaign, hinting that Buchanan was an "anti-Semite." Buckley had bragged publicly and repeatedly that it was his "job" to expel populists and nationalists from Republican ranks. Buchanan, at that time, was the number one target.

So although *Human Events* had played a primary role in assisting the very forces that have been attempting to stamp out the growth of populism and nationalism within Republican Party ranks, *Human Events*'s editors were now decrying those same forces as they saw their own influence on the wane.

It was *The Spotlight* that rightly cried "wolf" when the wolf was at the door, but now that the wolf was inside the door and devouring the food at the GOP dinner table, *Human Events* and its editors were screaming in terror. By playing along for decades with subversive, anti-American forces that were passing themselves off as the "new" American conservatives, *Human Events* established itself as a willing tool of The Enemy Within, a Judas Goat of the worst sort.



This January 1953 cartoon from a Soviet magazine shows one of the doctors charged in the famous “Doctors Trial” of having been part of a Zionist plot to kill Josef Stalin. As he is yanked into custody by a big strong Russian hand, the conspirator’s mask and costume (of a smiling, benevolent doctor) falls away to reveal a bloated, snarling, black-suited intriguer (hiding behind dark glasses). Coins—pay-off money—are falling from the conspirator’s clutches. In the background, the Zionist elements charged with sponsoring the conspiracy to kill Stalin peer out from an upturned top hat—signifying the wealthy New York Jewish aristocracy—upon which is affixed the U.S. dollar sign. No image better represents the split between Stalin and the Zionists, a struggle which overflowed into the American arena, thereby setting the stage for the rise of the Trotskyite neo-conservatives who are the vanguard of Zionism today. Three months after this cartoon was published, Stalin died, said to have been murdered by others who wanted to stop Stalin’s burgeoning drive to dismantle Zionist power.

By way of a digression . . .

An Introduction to Part IV

The CIA's Role As a Destructive Mechanism Working for The Enemy Within

In preceding chapters we reviewed the insidious role of a number of self-styled “anti-communists” in bending and warping traditional American nationalism and leading America into a global crusade that had no real American interests at heart. A key player among those intrigues was an ex-CIA man, William F. Buckley, Jr.

In fact, as we shall see in more detail in the chapters that follow, the CIA has played a particularly pernicious role as one of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within in more ways than one.

All of this is not to say that the CIA—any more than the FBI or any other American intelligence agency—is totally controlled or populated by those with an alien agenda.

To the contrary!

Some of the most outspoken American nationalists and critics of the globalist and Zionist agenda can be found in the ranks of the CIA and the FBI and they have done yeoman's work in trying to combat the intrigues of The Enemy Within.

But the historical record shows that the CIA, as an institution, has been at the center of many of the dangerous intrigues that have brought America to its sad state today.

Accordingly, we will now explore some of what we know about the role of the CIA in thwarting traditional American nationalism, infiltrating and corrupting and otherwise working to destroy those individuals and institutions that stood fast, daring to say “no” to alien forces as they achieved such power and influence in the American system.

Chapter Twenty-Four

Intelligence Agency Manipulation of the Science of Mind Control And Exploitation of the Cult Phenomenon: A Very Real Tactic of The Enemy Within

In light of speculation that Oklahoma City bomber Timothy McVeigh was subjected at one time or another to some form of “mind control,” it is worth reviewing some of the solid evidence which demonstrates that extensive experimentation in the field of mind control has been conducted by not only the CIA and its allies in Israel’s intelligence agency, the Mossad, but also by the Soviet KGB and other agencies.

The subject of mind control un-nerves many people who dismiss the topic as some form of “science fiction” or “conspiracy theory.” However, the truth is that mind control—in perhaps its simplest form—is nothing more than old-fashioned hypnosis—and there are few who deny that hypnotic states can be induced.

There are several well-written and thoroughly-researched books that have examined the history of mind control experimentation and technology.

One of the earliest known “experts” in the bizarre science of mind control was George Estabrooks, chairman of the Department of Psychology at Colgate University who came to Washington to work for the War Department in World War II. In his book *Hypnosis*, Estabrooks described how important mind-control could be for use in intelligence operations. “First,” he wrote:

There is no danger of the agent selling out. More important would be the conviction of innocence which the man himself had, and this is a great aid in many situations. He would never “act guilty” and if ever accused of seeking information would be quite honestly indignant. This conviction of innocence on the part of a criminal is perhaps his greatest safeguard under questioning by authorities. Finally, it would be impossible to ‘third degree’ him and so pick up the links of a chain.

Estabrooks said that people under mind-control can be encouraged to engage in so-called “fifth column” activities. “Through them,” he wrote, “we would hope to be kept informed of the activities of their ‘friends;’ this information, of course, being obtained in the trance state.”

Following Estabrooks’ pioneering work, it was during the 1950s that the newly-formed CIA (and its allies in Israel’s Mossad)—as well as the Soviet KGB—began heavy-duty research in this field.

Perhaps the most authoritative work examining the CIA's activity is *The Search for the Manchurian Candidate*, subtitled "The CIA and Mind Control: The Story of the Agency's Secret Efforts to Control Human Behavior." First published in 1979, the book was very rare and only recently went back into print. Certainly no "extremist tract," the book was first published by a subdivision of no less than the prestigious *New York Times*. The author was John Marks, best known as the co-author, with flamboyant former high-ranking CIA official Victor Marchetti, of *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*, the first book ever censored prior to publication by the CIA.

(Marks' book title was a play on the title of a famous 1958 Richard Condon novel—later a popular motion picture—*The Manchurian Candidate*. In Condon's horrifying scenario, an American soldier is brainwashed by the communists during the Korean War, falsely set up as a "war hero," and later manipulated in an assassination plot upon his return to the United States.

(It turns out that the hero's own mother is actually a secret communist agent—despite the fact that she is one of the best known "anti-communists" in America—and is using her son as part of a communist plot to seize control of the United States in the guise of fighting communism—truly *The Enemy Within*. The mind-control victim never knows he is being manipulated—until it is too late.)

Marks's book was not a novel. Instead, Marks' study was based largely on some 16,000 pages of documents that Marks pried out of the CIA through the Freedom of Information Act.

Several years before Marks' book came out, the first details about the CIA's adventures in this bizarre field reached the pages of daily newspapers in the wake of a controversial series of Senate hearings conducted by Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho) into the activities of the CIA. Until then, Americans believed that only the "Communists" and the "Nazis" had engaged in unpleasant experiments to study the process of manipulating human behavior.

In truth, the CIA had delved into mind control beginning just shortly after its creation in 1947. The CIA's mind control project was initially known as "Bluebird" and then later expanded into "Artichoke" by 1953. The overall code name for the operation became known as MK-ULTRA.

The impetus for the CIA's mind-control operations came from Richard Helms who went on to head the CIA's entire clandestine operations program, and then become CIA director. Helms' idea was approved by then-CIA chief Allen Dulles who gave the go-ahead for the project. Chief of operations for the experiments was the chief of the agency's technical services section (TSS), one Dr. Sidney Gottlieb,

although he was under the supervision of James Jesus Angleton, the CIA's chief of counterintelligence and the Israeli Mossad's devoted liaison at the CIA.

According to Marks, in June 1960 [Gottlieb's] TSS officials launched an expanded program of operational experiments in hypnosis in cooperation with the CIA's Counterintelligence [CI] staff:

Counterintelligence officials wrote that the hypnosis program could provide a 'potential breakthrough in clandestine technology.' Their arrangement with TSS was that the MK-ULTRA men would develop the technique in the laboratory, while they took care of 'field experimentation.' The Counterintelligence program had three goals: (1) to induce hypnosis very rapidly in unwitting subjects; (2) to create durable amnesia; and (3) to implant durable and operationally useful posthypnotic suggestions.

Marks noted that the CIA's prime locale for its mind-control experiments was Mexico City. The Mexican capital was, during the Cold War period, according to all accounts, the Western Hemisphere's primary nest of international intelligence intrigue. It was in Mexico City where—as we've noted—E. Howard Hunt served as the CIA's station chief and one of his CIA lieutenants was none other than future pundit, William F. Buckley, Jr., who emerged as a leading figure in the effort to bend traditional American conservatism toward internationalism. Mexico City was also a major base of operations for Israel's Mossad.

According to formerly secret CIA documents released under the Freedom of Information Act, among the "additional avenues to the control of human behavior" that Gottlieb's operatives found appropriate to investigate were "radiation, electro-shock, various fields of psychology, psychiatry, sociology and anthropology, graphology, harassment substances and paramilitary devices and materials."

The New York Times reported on September 20, 1977 that "The documents show that the tests were carried out in New York City and San Francisco between 1953 and 1966, in CIA 'safe houses,' mainly apartments and motel rooms, that were secretly rented for the agency by an official of the old Federal Bureau of Narcotics, since supplanted by the Drug Enforcement Administration.

"Prostitutes, perhaps men as well as women, may have been employed to lure the subjects to the safe houses, where they were offered cocktails laced with various chemicals while unseen CIA officials observed, photographed and recorded their reactions."

The CIA is also known to have conducted drug experiments with drug addicts held at a federal facility. In 1975 the CIA formally admitted that experiments were conducted at the Federal Addiction Research Center in Lexington, Kentucky, involving the administration of drugs, including hallucinogens, to prisoner volunteers.

One prisoner, James H. Childs, testified to a Senate committee of inquiry that the prisoners who participated in the CIA program were paid by the CIA in the form of addictive drugs.

Another former prisoner who testified, Edward M. Flowers, said that LSD was given to prisoners in cookies during experiments. From 1952 to 1955, he said, prisoners were allowed to take their pay for being in the programs in either drugs or time off their sentences.

One of the key figures at the CIA's Lexington, Kentucky operation was the on-base chaplain, Rabbi Maurice Davis who, in later years, emerged as a widely-known operative of the Anti-Defamation League, the politically influential American-based intelligence and propaganda arm of Israel's secret service, the Mossad.

Other experiments in drug-induced mind-control were conducted at the Vacaville prison facility in California. It was there, according to one witness, that Donald DeFreeze, later head of the violent terrorist group, the Symbionese Liberation Army, told another inmate that he, too, was part of the CIA's mind-control experiments.

DeFreeze and his gang later kidnapped Patty Hearst of the Hearst publishing empire and brought her into their criminal activities. Later Miss Hearst's attorneys said they believed she showed signs of being under the influence of drugs.

Considering all of this, it is no surprise that the CIA and the Mossad have long had a particular interest in the phenomenon of cults, which have long been in existence in virtually every culture, in one form or another. Cult members are typically very pliable and willing to do whatever their masters tell them.

And this is one reason why the CIA and the Mossad have been especially determined to gain control of cult groups at the highest levels and thereby use those cults—and their members—to advance their own agendas.

In addition, there is widespread speculation that some of the best known cults today—such as the infamous Unification Church of Sun Myung Moon, to name just one—are actually outright creations of state intelligence services. In another case, a group of Zionist lawyers, largely based in California, are known to have grabbed control, at the highest levels, behind the scenes, of another well-known “religious” organization—called a “church” by its members but often described as a “cult” by

its critics—and utilized the vast financial (and membership) resources of that cult for their own purposes.

Here's how the mind control operations of the CIA and the Mossad (utilizing cult groups) work: While these intelligence agencies actually control the cults, the lower-level cult members do not know, of course, that they are now part of a highly-sophisticated intelligence-based mind-control operation.

While the cult members are completely subservient to their higher-ups, subject to their discipline, the cult members, naturally, are from all walks of life and some reach high positions of influence within the companies and organizations in which they work in their day-to-day life outside the cult. However they always remain loyal because of the “brainwashing” process to which they have been subjected.

Sometimes the cult members are open about their cult membership. Other times—for strategic reasons—they do not reveal their cult affiliation, if the cult association could hinder the “black op” underway.

Whether the cult members are employed by political groups, historical revisionist research institutes, banks, insurance companies, government agencies, or even fast-food restaurants, they will always be available for deployment when their higher-ups in the cult (operating at the behest of the CIA or the Mossad) make the decision to carry out some particular intelligence operation.

For example: suppose a member of a Mossad-controlled cult is employed by a maverick, dissident political group which is considered dangerous to the Establishment. If the Mossad wishes to undermine that organization, it will utilize its control of the cult to manipulate that individual to work to wreck the organization from within.

Liberty Lobby, the populist institution that published *The Spotlight* until Liberty Lobby was driven into bankruptcy and destroyed by a corrupt federal judge in 2001, had its own unpleasant experiences with the operatives of one cult.

Over a period of many years, admitted, overt operatives of the cult made friendly contact with Liberty Lobby.

The cult members supplied Liberty Lobby with hard-hitting and factual information about corrupt activities within the federal government. Behind-the-scenes, however, the cultists were working to disrupt the work of Liberty Lobby on other fronts.

A cult member (“Mr. M”)—who did not reveal his membership in the cult—frequently attended Liberty Lobby meetings, visited Liberty Lobby headquarters, and socialized with Liberty Lobby employees, gaining their confidence.

(This was the same *modus operandi* of the infamous Roy Edward

Bullock, now exposed as a long-time operative of the CIA-allied, Israeli Mossad-controlled Anti-Defamation League.)

After some time, however, it became apparent that "Mr. M," ostensibly a friend of Liberty Lobby, was, in fact, trying to undermine the populist institution and its weekly newspaper in a wide variety of ways. It was not until later that Liberty Lobby's suspicions were confirmed and "Mr. M's" affiliation with the cult was exposed.

Liberty Lobby learned that "Mr. M" was a former alcoholic who joined the cult and then reformed. In the process, however, "Mr. M" became subject to the cult's discipline (and its controllers) and emerged as one of the cult's key national intelligence operatives, in this case deployed against Liberty Lobby.

It was precisely at the time that Liberty Lobby learned that "Mr. M" was a cult operative that the previously-friendly other members of the cult (who had openly acknowledged their affiliation) abruptly broke off all contact with Liberty Lobby.

Later, the cult played a special role in a broad-ranging conspiracy that resulted in the destruction of Liberty Lobby.

But the role of cults in the world of intelligence intrigue is something that few understand or know about.

In another case, it was revealed that a Justice Department special task force was investigating charges that a notorious cult known as "the Finders" was used by the CIA as a front group during the 1980's.

What makes the intelligence agency's reported link to this particular cult especially troubling is that the Finders have been accused of engaging in Satanic rituals, child abuse and pornography. Federal authorities were also trying to determine whether the CIA impeded state and local investigations of child abuse within the cult in order to protect its own intelligence operations.

The CIA, never known to own up to its own misdeeds, responded to the charges by saying, "Most days we expect our share of unusual questions, but his one is clear off the wall. Any claim that we obstructed justice in this case is nuts."

A CIA spokesman, David Christian, admitted, however, that it had sent some of its agents to a company called Future Enterprises, Inc. for computer training. However, according to Christian, the nation's crack intelligence agency did not know about connections between the computer company and the Finders cult.

Christian claimed that the company "was in no sense a CIA front or ever owned or operated by anyone for the CIA."

However, the president of Future Enterprises, Joseph Marinich, admitted that his company was under contract to the CIA for computer

training. Marinich admitted, further, that his tax accountant, R. Gardner Terrell, was a Finders member.

Finders cult members claimed that Terrell's work for Future Enterprises had nothing to do with his membership in the cult.

Finally, an April 13, 1987 report by a Customs Service Agent who was investigating the Finders cult said that the CIA "admitted to owning the Finders organization as a front for a domestic computer training operation but that it had 'gone bad.'"

(In other words, the CIA had been using the Finders as a front, but that the cult members had become engaged in activities beyond the control of the CIA and, as such, had "gone bad.")

Clearly, the use of "mind control" in general, as well as the secret control and manipulation of cults, by the CIA and the Mossad and myriad other evil-doers has a very real (and ugly) history that many people are too eager to discredit as "science fiction" or "conspiracy theories." Mind control is a fact.

It is another mechanism used by The Enemy Within to wage war against political dissidents in America. The next time you hear someone claim that he has an "implant," put in his head by the CIA, don't dismiss what he's saying out of hand. For it may very well be true.

How many "lone assassins," "lone bombers," "right-wing racist gunmen," and other such poster boys for the media monopoly in America to exploit have been subjected to some form of mind control is a question that may never be answered, but the bottom line is this:

Mind control is for real.

Chapter Twenty-Five

Korean Cult Leader Sun Myung Moon: Rockefeller Empire Front Man and Moneybags for the Zionist Network Inside the American “Conservative” Movement

After years of fighting American conservatives and traditional nationalists for control of the Republican Party, the far-flung international corporate empire of the family of New York’s liberal Republican Governor Nelson Rockefeller decided that if they couldn’t *bury* the conservatives politically, they would *buy* them and influence them that way. That’s exactly what the Rockefeller empire did.

The way the global forces of Rockefeller internationalism coopted the American conservative movement is one of the most amazing “untold” stories of our time—one that was reported exclusively by *The Spotlight*, over a period of years beginning in the mid-1980s.

Essentially, the Rockefeller empire couldn’t beat down the conservatives who had successfully frustrated New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller’s presidential ambitions, so instead the Rockefellers hatched a bizarre scheme to take over the conservative movement.

They used the peculiar and unlikely vehicle of Korean cult leader Moon and his globe-encircling international network to do it. Moon’s network has been utilized as a funnel through which the Rockefeller interests literally bought control of the conservative movement lock, stock and barrel.

This scenario does indeed seem bizarre and unlikely—until one knows and understands some critical details.

The fact is that Sun Myung Moon was an operative of the Korean central intelligence agency, the KCIA, which was itself set up under the direction of the American CIA.

The first director of the KCIA was Col. Kim John Pil, a shadowy figure who was the real power behind the dictatorship of the better-known long-time Korean dictator Park Chung Hee. Sun Myung Moon was a lieutenant of Korea’s KCIA boss and was responsible for using religious persuasion and anti-communist rhetoric to bring a variety of groups under the KCIA’s wing.

In 1962, Kim brought his protege Moon to the United States where they were wined and dined at a formal dinner hosted by the Rockefeller brothers, Nelson (then New York governor) and David (head of the Rockefeller flagship Chase Manhattan Bank.)

According to Dr. Lee Han Won, a Korean political scientist, interviewed by the late Andrew St. George for *The Spotlight*: “It might have been an odd encounter. Moon thought of himself as a god, a divine being fated to ‘finish the task begun by Christ’ and unify world Christianity

under his own banner. Privately, Nelson Rockefeller held a similarly exalted view of his own destiny: it was to bring the nations of the world under the rule of a globalist government. The two men hit it off right away." Quite a momentous meeting indeed!

Chase Manhattan became lead banker for the Korean government and also the repository for the Moon movement's banking business. During this time Moon—with the support of the KCIA as well as the American CIA—began using the credit and the facilities provided by the Rockefeller interests to assemble his own international mini-empire.

The multicultural Moon cult, populated by virtual "zombies"—perhaps a million people worldwide who had fallen under Moon's spell—worked at slave labor wages in health food stores, for a New England fishing fleet, an import company and a variety of other lucrative enterprises including an arms manufacturing company as well as a candle and religious ornament producing concern that were self-sustaining and providing profits for the ultimate purpose of Moon and his handlers: the invasion and takeover of the American anti-communist movement.

From the 1960s through the early 1980's, Moon remained a marginal figure politically, although, quietly, for nearly two decades, he had been spreading his largess, establishing a variety of inter-connected front groups that distributed Moon money into the hands of literally thousands of willing recipients—political conservatives all—in the United States and abroad.

In addition, at least three former American presidents, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower and Richard Nixon, at one point or another were funnelled large fees to front for committees and organizations bankrolled by the Moon network.

At one count there were well over a hundred different groups under Moon's direct control or within his sphere of influence, with hundreds of scientists, journalists, politicians and former military leaders effectively at Moon's beck and call.

All the while, Moon's financial empire expanded, developing ties to dictatorial regimes in Latin America as well as with the government of Israel and its intelligence service, the Mossad.

In fact, longtime Israeli agent Joseph Churba, an American, was a key figure in the Moon orbit and promoted by the Moon network as "a leading anti-communist theoretician" and became influential in the upper echelons of the John Birch Society.

The establishment of the daily *Washington Times* newspaper by the Moon empire in 1982, during the early days of glory for the newly-installed "conservative" administration of Ronald Reagan, set the stage for the Moon empire to expand its tentacles throughout the anti-com-

munist movement by leaps and bounds. Installed as editor-in-chief of the “Moonie” paper was veteran journalist, Count Arnaud deBorchgrave, a relative by marriage of the Rockefeller-allied Rothschild family of Europe, suggesting that there were additional powers at work behind the Moon empire.

One former *Washington Times* editor provided a prime example to *The Spotlight* of how the Moon empire played a major role in impacting favorably upon the work of one conservative leader, Richard Viguerie, a veteran “right wing” fundraising wizard: “Moon staved off bankruptcy for Richard Viguerie by giving him a check for \$10,000,000.” What happened was that a Moon front, going by the innocuous title of “U.S. Property Management,” bought part of an office building owned by “7777 Leesburg Pike Associates Inc.” (a Viguerie company), thereby keeping Viguerie in business—and effectively beholden to Moon and his behind-the-scenes backers.

At the same time, other conservative leaders and groups were watching these events carefully, recognizing that they, too, could turn to Moon for funding as long as they touted the Moon line on the issues that really counted.

Such deals “transformed large sections of the conservative movement into wholly owned subsidiaries of the Moon cult,” according to Paul Weyrich, a respected conservative figure in Washington who watched as Moon money was spread far and wide within the conservative movement, ultimately—as we know—corrupting it.

According to Dr. Gunnar Bofglid, a Swedish economist who was a United Nations consultant, the Moon newspaper and its affiliates “spear-headed the drive for so-called free trade, unlimited imports and debt-financing— notions that should have been anathema to conservatives but which became the official economic doctrine of the Reagan era. The outcome was that U.S. markets were flooded with cheap imports from Korea and Japan.”

Bofglid explained why the Rockefellers found the Moon empire and its media holdings and affiliations with American conservatives so important to their own aims:

After World War II, the Rockefellers had secretly acquired substantial holdings in Japan and wanted to see them develop. To achieve that, they wanted the United States to preserve and broaden its dominant free trade policies. These were goals shared wholeheartedly by the Koreans, who knew that unhindered access to the vast U.S. market would mean growth and wealth for their industries.

Until the advent of the “Moon era,” traditional conservative leaders had essentially stood in opposition to virtually every internationalist measure being promoted by the Rockefellers and their allies in the Bilderberg group and in the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission, among numerous other Rockefeller-financed pressure groups.

Traditional conservatives—nationalists, not internationalists, at least until the rise of the Moon empire—opposed foreign aid giveaways, global military and economic meddling, free trade policies that export American jobs and industry, and other sovereignty-busting measures that are part and parcel of the globalist agenda.

Thus, the Rockefellers had opted for a new strategy: “If you can’t lick ‘em, buy ‘em.” Which is what they did. The Rockefellers adopted the Korean cult leader and KCIA operative Moon and set him up as a “Mr. Moneybags” for the often cash-starved conservative movement.

That they chose the leader of a movement that is so bizarre is not so strange since Moon’s very weirdness served as a distraction. Who, after all, would think such an alliance possible? But it was real, public perceptions notwithstanding. In any event, conservatives began turning to Moon for money, and, in the process, began to abandon their traditional stands on many key issues, in particular, trade.

In addition, as we have seen, the Moon empire quickly proved to be a valuable ally for the Zionist cause, with its *Washington Times* newspaper emerging as a propaganda sheet for what is now known as the “neo-conservative” (i.e. Zionist) agenda. The opinion pages of the newspaper, as well as its “news” section, are top-heavy with unabashed advocacy of the Zionist cause, making even the rival liberal pro-Israel *Washington Post* appear almost moderate and sensible in its tone. Not only does the *Times* “set” the “conservative” agenda, but it also plays a major part in shaping Republican Party policy through its influence over the GOP leadership in official Washington.

As a direct consequence, the “conservative” agenda has been distorted and varies little, on the major global issues, from the stands taken by the liberal internationalists. The conservative movement was thus further subverted, by yet another mechanism of infiltration, from another arm of The Enemy Within.

Chapter Twenty-Six

A Major American Media Outlet: A Willing Propaganda Tool for The Enemy Within

Although *The Enemy Within* has found many ways to manipulate the American media—as demonstrated by the immense clout of the Anti-Defamation League whose press releases are often published verbatim by mainstream media sources—there is firm evidence that certain media outlets are demonstrably hardly more than shameless pipelines of propaganda and disinformation (and willingly so) for federal intelligence agencies such as the CIA and the FBI, sometimes both simultaneously. A good case example is the Copley Press, a longtime media giant in Southern California.

When *The San Diego Union-Tribune* published a vicious attack on Liberty Lobby, the Washington-based populist institution, on October 25, 2000, the *Union-Tribune* didn't mention to its readers that as long ago as 1977, the paper and its publisher, the Copley Press, were exposed as hardly more than a front for the CIA. What's more, it turns out that the Copley Press and the *Union-Tribune* also functioned as a conduit for (and intelligence arm of) the FBI.

That a CIA front should level an attack on Liberty Lobby at that juncture was no coincidence: the carefully-timed smear was clearly designed to interfere with and scuttle Liberty Lobby's appeal of an unjust judicial ruling that resulted from a lawsuit orchestrated against Liberty Lobby by a known CIA operative. (Ultimately, that lawsuit resulted in Liberty Lobby's demise and in the pages that follow, we will examine that tragedy in detail.)

In any case, at the very moment the *Union-Tribune* published the smear, Liberty Lobby's appeal of the judgment was being considered by the California state court of appeals. Although the ruling was not expected for perhaps another six weeks, just five days after the article appeared, the court suddenly issued a ruling and rejected Liberty Lobby's appeal.

Ironically, the journalist who first publicly revealed the long-secret Copley Press/*Union-Tribune* link to the CIA was Joe Trento, a "liberal" who was by no means a supporter of Liberty Lobby and who, in fact, had several times, in the past, lent his literary skills to published attacks on the populist institution.

However, in the August 1977 issue of the men's magazine *Penthouse*, Trento co-authored an expose of the Copley-CIA connection, entitled "The Spies Who Came in From the Newsroom." Among other things, Trento reported that the Copley Press and the *Union-Tribune* newspaper (which was previously two separate newspapers, both published by Copley):

- Provided credentials, information, and placement of stories for the CIA and the FBI.
- Exchanged intelligence information with the CIA for “scoops” and planted CIA and FBI stories and editorials.
- Harbored CIA operatives on the payroll of the Copley News Service and fed stories to news-service clients at the request of the CIA and the FBI.

Trento’s investigation also determined that the Copley News Service (which actually had been a financial failure) was set up by James S. Copley at the suggestion of then-President Dwight Eisenhower for the purpose of supplementing CIA activity.

A series of meetings and phone calls between Eisenhower and Copley, outlined in documents examined by Trento, revealed that Copley volunteered his newly formed news service as “the eyes and ears” for “our intelligence services” and that Eisenhower told the publisher that his favors were appreciated and would be “reciprocated when possible.”

Although CNS lost money every year, Gene Gregston, the former editor of the *San Diego Union* (later merged into the *Union-Tribune*) admitted to Trento that CNS “was never run to make money; it was an ego thing for Jim Copley, and the CIA wanted it.”

According to Trento, no less than 23 Copley News Service employees had worked for the CIA simultaneously. Although there were some 194 American newsmen who had CIA connections during that same period, according to Trento, CNS was the only news service that engaged in “full cooperation with” the CIA for some thirty years. The CIA connections of the Copley empire were such that, according to Trento:

CNS reporters often acted as if they were doing CIA public relations. When the CIA decided to overthrow a Latin American government, CNS would begin writing unfavorable articles about it. Editorials would appear on the pages of the *Tribune* and *Union* in San Diego, warning of the dire consequences of Communists in Latin America. Then articles on “freedom fight[er]s” and “anti-communist opposition” would appear on the CNS wires. When the coup came, Copley editorials rejoiced.

Trento also revealed that “Copley Press’s relations with the FBI are as intriguing as its CIA connections.” Trento’s investigation revealed that many times Copley reporters were turned into virtual informants for the

FBI, so much so that the Copley Press effectively “ran a system of intelligence gathering for the FBI.”

According to Trento, Copley reporters were sent to cover anti-war demonstrations and other public meetings of political dissidents. Afterward, when the reporters turned in stories and photographs, the materials were often turned directly over to the FBI and never even published in the Copley newspapers.

Trento quoted *Union-Tribune* photographer Thane McIntosh who said that forwarding of the photographs to the FBI was something “that all the photographers suspected. Some were disturbed about it and some were not, but you couldn’t help participating. You had the assignment, so you had to do it.”

One photographer was asked to supply pictures to the Los Angeles Police Department, according to Trento, but that photographer refused to cooperate and resigned. In addition, Copley employees were ordered to draft memos on events that they covered, which memos were then turned over by Copley management to the FBI.

Trento also revealed that: “The FBI also used Copley to release ‘raw’ and often unverified data about individuals of whom it didn’t approve.” In other words, the Copley press would effectively publish unproven smears of individuals who were targeted for special treatment by the intelligence community. Also, Trento learned, the FBI placed editorials in the Copley Press against dissident groups of which the FBI did not approve.

When one Copley writer, Vi Murphy, attempted to force full disclosure by Copley regarding the names of journalists at Copley who were collaborating with the CIA, she was told that she could “never utter another public statement or another three-letter word spelled CIA as long as she was an employee of the *Union*.”

The fact is, as we have demonstrated, The Enemy Within can even constitute an established media combine—working for secret controllers behind the scenes.

Chapter Twenty-Seven

Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson— Media Skills for the Anti-Defamation League: Propagandists for The Enemy Within

Although, sadly, the list of newspaper columnists and so-called “reporters” who have lent their “talents” to the services of The Enemy Within would continue for many pages, the record of treachery by two columnists in particular, the late Drew Pearson and his protégé, Jack Anderson, warrant particular scrutiny.

For a generation, Americans were told by the major media that the phrase “fearless investigative reporter” was synonymous with the name of syndicated columnist Jack Anderson. However readers of Liberty Lobby’s newspaper, *The Spotlight*, knew otherwise. They knew—as *The Spotlight* once observed: “Jack Anderson is a liar—a shameless, scurrilous, professional liar.” In making the charge *The Spotlight* added that “if he wishes to prove he is not a liar” Anderson could bring a libel suit against the populist institution.

In fact, five years before—in 1981—Liberty Lobby had filed a libel suit against Anderson after he published defamatory articles about the lobby in the premiere edition of his (thankfully short-lived) magazine, *The Investigator*. After losing in the lower courts, the columnist appealed all the way to the Supreme Court which, in 1986, slapped Anderson down. That ruling—a triumph for Liberty Lobby—is a cornerstone legal precedent familiar to every first-year law student in America.

Anderson had been trained well in attacking Liberty Lobby by his late mentor, columnist Drew Pearson—a longtime critic of Liberty Lobby. Yet, despite his embarrassing Supreme Court defeat, Anderson actually fared better, in the end, than Pearson. Anderson’s mentor expired in a Washington hospital after a process server for Liberty Lobby served papers on “Smearson” in his hospital bed in the opening stages of a libel suit against Pearson by the populist institution.

In light of the fact that Pearson’s own ex-mother-in-law, *Washington Times-Herald* publisher Cissy Patterson, once described Anderson’s mentor as “both undercover agent and mouthpiece for the Anti-Defamation League,” Pearson’s hostility to Liberty Lobby was no surprise. For years, the ADL worked with Pearson to destroy Liberty Lobby because of the populist institution’s opposition to U.S. foreign aid giveaways to Israel and its steadfast concern that American favoritism toward Israel could create unnecessary cleavages between the United States and the billions of good folks in the Arab and Muslim worlds.

According to Oliver Pilat, Pearson’s admiring biographer: “Over the years the ADL had helped Pearson enormously. It had provided information he could not obtain elsewhere, backed his lecture tours, even

assisted in the circulation of his weekly newsletter.”

In addition, in a long-standing secret deal with Pearson, the ADL paid the travel expenses of his chief investigator, John Henshaw. In return Pearson featured ADL propaganda in his column. Henshaw broke with Pearson in the mid-1960s and exposed misdeeds of Pearson, Anderson and the ADL in Liberty Lobby publications.

It was inevitable that Anderson would use his own new magazine to attack Liberty Lobby. Anderson clearly had little regard for the truth when he published his attack. One of Anderson's editors admitted not only that he had told Anderson the article was "ridiculous" but that Anderson said the ulterior motive in publishing the article was to please "Jewish distributors" to get better distribution for the new magazine. Anderson himself bragged publicly that much of the bilge he used to attack Liberty Lobby was supplied by the ADL.

Involved in preparing the libelous article was one Joe Spear who, in 1969 (while on Anderson's payroll) had smeared Liberty Lobby in a free-lance article in *True* magazine. Confronted by Liberty Lobby, *True* settled out of court, paying damages and printing an interview with Liberty Lobby's chairman, Col. Curtis B. Dall. Still, many of Anderson's lies about Liberty Lobby were lifted from Spear's 12-year-old garbage.

Liberty Lobby also discovered that in 1971, Anderson and another of his henchmen had conspired with a writer for "former" CIA operative William F. Buckley Jr., in crafting a muddled smear of Liberty Lobby published in Buckley's *National Review*. Ten years later, some of the same trash popped up in Anderson's *Investigator*.

The judge acknowledged there were numerous discrepancies in Anderson's articles, but still dismissed the case. However, Liberty Lobby's attorney, Mark Lane, appealed the dismissal and in 1984 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ruled for Liberty Lobby.

The court refused to buy Anderson's excuse that the things he said about Liberty Lobby had been printed before. In the court's opinion, Judge Antonin Scalia (soon to be elevated to the Supreme Court) wrote: "We are not yet ready to adopt for the law of libel the principle that 10,000 repetitions are as good as the truth. We see nothing to be said for the rule that conscious, malicious libel is not actionable so long as it has been preceded by earlier assertions of the same untruth."

Anderson then appealed to the Supreme Court. Not surprisingly, the major voices in the media rushed to file a "friend of the court" brief on his behalf, including CBS and NBC and *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *Newsweek*, *Time*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Chicago Tribune*, *The Los Angeles Times* and *The Miami Herald*.

On Dec. 3, 1985 the Supreme Court heard the case. Liberty Lobby's

counsel Mark Lane told the court that all Liberty Lobby asked was to be able to present its case to a jury to defend itself against Anderson's lies. On June 25, 1986—to the shock of the major media—the high court ruled in Liberty Lobby's favor directing the case against Anderson to go to trial in the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C. In the wake of this defeat, Anderson and his supporters practiced "damage control," falsely proclaiming Anderson had "won," the truth notwithstanding.

Despite the ruling, the case lay dormant for four years. Then, on May 2, 1990 the chief judge of the district court stepped in and ordered Anderson to stand trial. Facing a public spectacle with his hit-and-run tactics subject to scrutiny, Anderson offered to settle—a clear-cut victory for Liberty Lobby. Anderson publicly apologized for any negative misconceptions he had promoted about Liberty Lobby and announced that since both Liberty Lobby and Anderson supported "the frank assertion of differing views and robust freedom of speech" he and Liberty Lobby were making a joint contribution of \$1,000 to the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press. What Anderson did not tell the public was that his portion of the contribution was \$999.99. Liberty Lobby's share was only one penny.

Anderson and his mentor were not just shells for the ADL. They also did dirty work for the ADL's ally, CIA counterintelligence chief James Angleton, the Israeli loyalist who was CIA liaison to Israel's Mossad.

In 1967—just two weeks after the public learned New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison had launched an investigation of CIA involvement in the assassination of John F. Kennedy—Pearson and Anderson floated Angleton disinformation alleging that former Attorney General Robert Kennedy had "approved an assassination plot [against Castro] which then backfired against his late brother [resulting in JFK's assassination]." In this fanciful account, Castro had captured U.S.-sponsored hitmen who were gunning for him and then "turned" them to go after JFK. Pointing the finger at Castro, the duo shifted attention from Garrison's investigation which—if pursued—would have uncovered CIA-Mossad collaboration in the JFK assassination.

On December 17, 2005 Jack Anderson died in retirement at age 83 and no doubt joined his mentor "In That Place Which the Lord Hath Prepared for Them," to recall the colorful words of the late Rev. Kenneth Goff, a former communist who became an outspoken anti-communist and critic of the odious Pearson-Anderson duo.

However, despite their descent into the netherworld, the incendiary torch of that evil team has been picked up by other media prostitutes who have no qualms about using their sometimes rather dubious literary "skills" to promote the agenda of The Enemy Within.

Chapter Twenty-Eight

A Frightening First-Hand Account: How The Enemy Within Recruits “Right Wing” Patsies For Political Assassinations

In the summer of 1963, Ralph P. Forbes—a U.S. Marine veteran well known for his so-called “right wing” political views—had an unsettling experience that he relates in the following personal account, which he has entitled, “The Day the CIA Recruited Me to Be a Sniper Assassin.”

Forbes’s personal experiences as related here dovetail with the accounts of others—both on the political “right” and “left”—who (like Forbes) believe with good reason that they were being considered as potential assassins (or as “patsies”) in the events that took place in Dallas on November 22, 1963—an event that remains of continuing interest to millions of Americans who believe that the murder of President Kennedy was a turning point in modern history.

Forbes—now a correspondent for *American Free Press*—has been politically active all of his adult life, more recently in his adopted state of Arkansas where he has waged a number of highly effective political campaigns only to be the victim of high-level “votescam” and other dirty tricks of the lowest sort.

In any case, Forbes’ reminiscences of his experiences with the FBI’s infamous COINTELPRO operations aimed against American political dissidents, waged in concert with the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, could fill an entire volume. Forbes’ remarkable first-hand account of his 1963 experience follows.

They never told me the name of the operation, that summer of 1963, but from what I have since learned I believe it was the CIA’s ZR/Rifle Team.

If it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it must be a duck. To understand the situation let me share some background. The Bay of Pigs and the Cuban missile crisis were still hot issues. The cold war was getting hot. There were hot spots all over South America, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Europe, etc. I was a patriot when patriotism wasn’t cool. Because I wanted to fight Communism I turned down appointments to both West Point and the Air Force Academy to join the Marines.

When my hitch was up and they asked me to re-up, or reenlist, I gave as my condition that I be sent over on a combat mission to Vietnam. They said, “Sorry, ‘Nam will be long over before we can get your ship-over papers processed.”

Although many Americans were not yet wholly conscious of Vietnam, our boys were already coming home in body bags. The radio news was nightmarishly Orwellian. "This week two American advisers were killed, bringing total American casualties up to eleven." Next week the script might read, "This week three American advisers were killed, bringing total American casualties up to seven."

The reported numbers were picked at random, and bore no relation to reality or the previous reports. My buddies were being stabbed in the back and sent to slaughter in another no win war. So I and other like-minded vets did everything we could to fight treason wherever we found it.

In the summer of 1963 several of us were approached by spook types with offers of "doing something" for our country. American interests needed "wild geese" or mercenaries as surrogates in exotic places all around the globe.

Not only would we help save America and the world, but we would be rewarded with large bounties in numbered Swiss accounts and enjoy a life of excitement and adventure. It came to pass that I, an ex-Marine who shot sharpshooter and expert, was invited to a recruitment meeting in a hotel in Hollywood.

The vibes were all wrong. The agent, who thought I would take the bait, gave me the creeps. He apparently thought I had been briefed a lot more than I had. He hinted my assignment would be to "terminate" Castro "with extreme prejudice." He was very proud of the "pieces of steel" in his small briefcase.

Within a short time, it seemed less than a minute; he assembled a precision target rifle with scope. He wanted me to handle it. Before I would touch it I took a towel to make sure not to leave any latent fingerprints. He said that it was very sharp of me, but he seemed extremely disappointed or upset. He explained the rifling, the cartridge weight and load, the action, bragged about the scope, the weight, the quick assembly and disassembly.

He was extremely mysterious and vague. Sometimes he hinted it was a "company" (CIA) operation. Other times he suggested it was financed by Texas oil baron H. L. Hunt or some other rich anti-Communists. Or maybe a joint covert action sponsored by people in high places, both in and out of the U.S. government, perhaps intelligence agencies from

“friendly” countries. They couldn’t tell me more, until after they were sure I was in.

The meeting lasted less than an hour. At the time I didn’t have a clue of what the real agenda was, but it did not pass the smell test. Wiping the piece off, just in case, I handed it back and said I would let them know. I never saw this recruiter again, but that was far from the last time they would try to set me and other patriots up to be the fall guys to take the rap for that infamous crime in Dallas.

Had I not seen through the attempt to recruit me, people today might have heard that “right-wing extremist Ralph Forbes” had been one of the assassins of John Kennedy—but like Lee Harvey Oswald I was simply one of the potential fall-guys.

END OF FORBES’ FIRST HAND ACCOUNT.

This is just one story by one man, but based on the well-documented record of *The Enemy Within*, it is safe to say that there are many such stories that could fill the record.

What appears in the pages of this volume is only the tip of the iceberg—a deep, murky hidden world of intrigue that would shock the average American if he knew the truth.

Chapter Twenty-Nine

The CIA's Infiltration of the Anti-War Movement During the Vietnam War: Bill and Hillary Clinton and John Kerry as Judas Goats for The Enemy Within

Although most of our study of *The Enemy Within* focuses on the infiltration, monitoring and disruption of what are generally perceived to be “right wing” and “nationalist” groups by a variety of agencies and institutions under the control of the power elite, it is important to point out that three of the most prominent Democratic politicians today—Bill and Hillary Clinton and John Kerry, the 2000 Democratic Party presidential nominee—clearly seem to have been prime examples of CIA infiltration of the anti-war movement during the tragic period of U.S. involvement in Vietnam and, in later years, key players in CIA intrigues here at home and abroad.

However, before we take a look back at the little-known intrigues by these well-known Democratic political figures, we should briefly review the CIA's domestic spying operations that reached a fever pitch in the period of the 1960s and 1970s when the Clintons and Kerry were moving toward political power.

Writing in the July-September 1995 issue of *NameBase NewsLine*, Daniel Brandt provided some important details surrounding the CIA's domestic spying:

The CIA's domestic operations were first exposed by Seymour Hersh in *The New York Times* on December 22, 1974. Within two weeks President Ford created the Rockefeller Commission to look into the matter, and their report was issued the following June. It detailed the CIA's mail intercept program for mail to and from the Soviet Union, described Operation CHAOS (the CIA's domestic spying program that was headed by Richard Ober), also described a separate domestic spying program run by the CIA's Office of Security called Project Resistance, and mentioned an Office of Security program that gave seminars and training on lock-picking and surveillance to a number of local police departments.

[The aforementioned Ober, it should be noted, was a deputy of James Jesus Angelton, the CIA's chief of counter-intelligence and the intensely pro-Israel CIA liaison to Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad.—Ed.]

The Rockefeller report stated that "during six years [1967-1972], the Operation [CHAOS] compiled some

13,000 different files, including files on 7,200 American citizens. The documents in these files and related materials included the names of more than 300,000 persons and organizations, which were entered into a computerized index." This compares to the CIA's index of some 7 million names of all nationalities maintained by the Directorate of Operations, an estimated 115,000 of which are believed to be American citizens.

But the numbers may be on the low side; CHAOS was tightly compartmented within the CIA and free from periodic internal review. For example, later reports of the number of state, local, and county police departments assisted by the CIA were put at 44, far more than the handful mentioned in the Rockefeller report.

The Center for National Security Studies, a late-1970s liberal watchdog group headed by Morton Halperin, obtained 450 documents that describe the CIA's Project Resistance. These documents show that the purpose of this Security Office program was much more than an effort to protect CIA recruiters on campus by collecting newspaper clippings, as described in the Rockefeller report.

The Security Office was authorized for the first time to assist the recruiting division "in any way possible," and restrictions on contacting the FBI at local levels were dropped. Contacts were also developed with campus security officials, informants within the campus community, military intelligence, and state and local police. Special attention was paid to the underground press.

Clearly, the CIA had immense active domestic operations, far beyond what was either legal or even suspected. And as we shall see in the pages which follow, the evidence strongly suggests that both Bill and Hillary Clinton—along with John F. Kerry—were heavily enmeshed in the CIA's spying operations. In fact, at the time Bill Clinton first emerged as a presidential front-runner, details surrounding Clinton's covert connections were coming to the fore, although they were largely ignored in the so-called "mainstream" media.

In the summer of 1992, while the major media was focused on Bill Clinton's affair with Gennifer Flowers, the Washington-DC based populist newspaper, *The Spotlight* focused instead, on the big story: Clinton's longtime deep-cover connections to the CIA and its intrigue in arms-and-drugs smuggling ventures tied to the now-infamous scandal

involving the Bank of Credit and Commerce Internationale (BCCI).

In its March 2, 1992 issue *The Spotlight* was the first national media voice to report that when Clinton's 1992 presidential campaign was in financial crisis, the Worthen Bank of Little Rock had extended a \$2 million line of credit to the campaign. Worthen was owned jointly by Little Rock billionaire Jackson Stephens and Arab entrepreneur Abdullah Taha Bakhsh, both tightly knit into BCCI.

Stephens was intermediary in the deal for BCCI to gain control of two American banks. Bakhsh was not only a close associate of BCCI founder Agha Hasan Abedi, but also a partner of a young Texas businessman, George W. Bush, in Harken Energy, the company that made the son of Vice President (and later President) George Bush a millionaire.

On Aug. 31, 1992 *The Spotlight* was the first national media voice to expose Clinton's ties to the CIA's Iran-contra arms-and-drugs smuggling operations through the tiny Mena, Arkansas airport, funded by massive money laundering through financial institutions controlled by Clinton cronies. Although Iran-contra is remembered as a "Republican" scandal (involving George Bush), Arkansas's Democratic governor was very much involved.

In addition, evidence suggested that Clinton's wife, high-powered Little Rock attorney Hillary Rodham, was also involved in Republican era CIA scandals—known as "Iraq-gate"—that involved the arming of Iraq funded through both BCCI and the Atlanta branch of the Italian, Banca Nazionale de Lavoro (BNL).

As early as March 25, June 3, and Aug. 19, 1991 *The Spotlight* reported that scandals involving the two banks were connected but this was never acknowledged anywhere else until Nov. 16, 1992 when *The Washington Post* finally acknowledged what *The Spotlight* had been saying: "It's now clear the two [scandals] are connected. What's not clear is the motive for the conspiracy that tied them together."

The Spotlight was the only voice to reveal that "the motive for the conspiracy that tied them together" was that both banks were involved in secret, private, non-government oil deals between George Bush and his associates in partnership with Saddam Hussein, the leader of Iraq and which played a part in the CIA's secret arming of Iraq.

These CIA deals to arm Iraq involved Hillary Clinton. Her Rose Law Firm brokered the deal with the Atlanta branch of BNL to disguise U.S. agricultural funds to help secretly arm Iraq. The BNL funds were channeled through BCCI.

In any event, *The Spotlight* (on Aug. 16, 1993) was the first publication ever to outline evidence Bill Clinton had been a CIA asset since his days in the anti-war movement at Oxford.

Conservatives later accused Clinton of being a “traitor” because of a trip he made to Moscow at this time. However, the CIA had agents in the anti-war movement and *The Spotlight* cited former high-ranking CIA Soviet analyst Victor Marchetti, who commented:

The time that Clinton was supposed to have gone to Moscow was the time when the CIA was very active recruiting American students and other students to go to Moscow [and] Helsinki and get involved in peace activities in order to counter Soviet actions.

Without revealing any secrets [as to] how I come to this conclusion, I would not be surprised to find out that Clinton was actually kind of working for the CIA.

On September 27, 1993 *The Spotlight* provided new information suggesting that during his Moscow trip, Clinton was involved in a much bigger operation than spying on his college buddies: the appropriation of former Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev’s papers for the CIA.

In fact, Clinton’s Oxford friend, Strobe Talbott—later appointed to a State Department post by Clinton—is known to have played a role in the CIA’s acquisition of the Khrushchev papers. Cord Meyer, the CIA’s London station chief, was “handler” for the two young men, although Meyer denies this.

Later, Clinton attended Yale—a major CIA recruiting ground—where he met Hillary Rodham. The young lady soon served on the staff of the House Watergate committee, a controversy in which the CIA played a major part. Some have suggested Hillary may have kept watch on the committee for the CIA, especially considering Hillary’s activities in later years through the Rose Law Firm.

In 1996, author Roger Morris released his book, *Partners in Power*, and—based on information provided by well-connected sources—concluded that Clinton was—as *The Spotlight* suggested—secretly affiliated with the CIA beginning in his college years.

Providing additional information pointing to Clinton as a longtime CIA asset, the Oct-Dec. 1996 issue of *NameBase Newslines* newsletter credited *The Spotlight* with being the first publication to make the Clinton-CIA connection.

After Clinton’s election to the presidency, the death of his lifelong friend and White House counsel, Vince Foster, was linked to the Clinton involvement with the CIA and the “Iraq-gate” scandals involving George Bush. *The Spotlight* revealed on Dec. 6, 1993 that sources for investigator Sherman Skolnick found that Foster had played a part in convincing

President Clinton to stop a CIA plot on July 17, 1993 to assassinate Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein. That plot was later publicly exposed in the Nov. 1, 1993 issue of *The Chicago Tribune*. According to Skolnick:

Why did the White House abort that plot? Well, Saddam has a half-brother in Geneva who said that if Saddam is assassinated by the CIA he will release bank records showing Saddam had private business deals with George Bush.

It appears that there is an overlap between Saddam's deals with Bush and with the affairs of the Clintons. The Clintons, Bush and Saddam—to put it in simple terms—are all effectively business partners.

Then, on July 3, 1994 *The Spotlight* reported another story that appeared in the *Sunday Telegraph* of London on May 21, 1994 but was never reported in the “mainstream” media in America: Investigators discovered that during the five year period prior to his death, Vince Foster had made secret international travels, including at least two virtual overnight trips to Geneva.

Foster's trips were purchased at a discount available only to senior government officials or to contract operatives doing work for the federal government. He used these fares when he was ostensibly only an attorney in private practice. Probably sponsored by Bill (and/or Hillary) Clinton, Foster was clearly engaged in work for the CIA.

In July of 1993, twelve days after canceling an impending trip to Geneva Foster was found dead. Clearly not a “suicide,” Foster was not murdered by the Clintons—as Clinton haters suggest—but as payback by Saddam's foes, angry at Foster's successful intervention in the plot to kill the Iraqi leader.

So, in the end, the world of Bill and Hillary Clinton is clearly much bigger and more tangled and involves much more than than we were ever led to believe. But only *The Spotlight* dared to tell the story.

What about Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.)—who, unlike Clinton, started out as a Vietnam war “hero” and then apparently did a 180-degree turn-about and became a very prominent critic of the war from his position as a decorated combat veteran? The truth is that there's probably much more to Senator John Kerry's wartime service in Vietnam—and his subsequent anti-war activities—than is at first apparent. John Kerry's “Swiftboat Scandal” was the buzz among Republican Party campaign workers, on the Internet, and the subject of a book that raised questions about whether Kerry

really was a “hero” and whether he deserves the medals (and accolades) he received for his service in Vietnam.

While a handful of veterans who served with Kerry—for at least a brief period—were touring the country in the 2000 campaign on Kerry’s behalf, there were considerable numbers of other former Swift boat officers and sailors campaigning against Kerry and challenging his claims regarding his war record.

What it came down to was this: which group of veterans were voters to believe? If one group was lying, why were they are lying? Was Kerry a hero or a fraud? And what about Kerry’s anti-war activities after he came back from Vietnam?

At this juncture, it is necessary to draw the parallel between Kerry’s woes and the similar “scandal” that surrounded Bill Clinton during the 1992 presidential campaign when it was revealed that Clinton had actively worked to avoid the draft.

The Bush campaign in 2004 actually had very little to say about Kerry’s possible distortions of historical truth regarding what Kerry did—or did not do—in Vietnam, which may be due to the fact that the president’s military record was rather spotty, in and of itself, and not something that Bush wanted to remind voters about. This did not stop “independent” political activists from raising quite a ruckus about Kerry’s war-time ventures.

However, recall that in 1992, Bush’s father and his re-election campaign actually had very little to say about Bill Clinton’s effort to dodge the draft. In fact, in 1992—and in the years that followed—some suggested that the very reason that former CIA Director George Bush (then running for reelection against his Democratic challenger Bill Clinton) did not actively take on Clinton and call him a “draft dodger” was precisely because the former CIA director knew that Clinton—as a college student—was almost certainly working as a CIA asset, infiltrating anti-war groups in Britain and elsewhere.

So although many veterans and grass-roots Republicans were calling Clinton a “draft dodger” and implying he was somehow “disloyal to his country,” the truth is that Clinton evidently had found a way to avoid military service, but still get an “in” with the power elite in this country: acting as a student sleuth for the CIA.

Although, as noted, *The Spotlight* was certainly the first publication to pinpoint Clinton’s early service for the CIA (which neither Clinton nor the CIA, of course, have ever acknowledged), a wide variety of writers—including former National Security Council staffer Roger Morris, British correspondent Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, and journalist Daniel Brandt, among others—have since filled in some of the missing pieces

of the puzzle and essentially confirmed that Clinton—during his draft-dodging days—was very much working on behalf of the United States government as a CIA informant.

Which brings us to John Kerry. Many took Kerry to task for his anti-war activities following his return from duty in Vietnam, suggesting he was involved with “radical” anti-war elements. However, what the less discerning Kerry critics did not note is that a careful reading of accounts of Kerry’s anti-war days, presented in skillfully worded accounts in such elite dailies as *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, lead to the very clear conclusion (at least by a discerning reader) that Kerry was actually one of the more “moderate” forces in the anti-war movement and, in some respects, was acting almost as if to restrain the movement.

This seemed to be the point that the two major papers focusing on Kerry’s antiwar protest record—*The New York Times* and especially the CIA-friendly *Washington Post*—wanted to convey in their lengthy and very similar stories on that topic.

In short, one might begin to suspect that Kerry’s brief service and “heroics” in Vietnam were part of a classic intelligence community “legend” created for Kerry, a recent graduate of Yale—a longtime CIA recruiting post—and a member (like George W. Bush) of Skull & Bones, the exclusive Yale secret society (another elite training ground).

Is it really beyond the pale—considering Clinton’s CIA background (and Clinton’s Yale connection likewise)—to suggest that Kerry was also a CIA asset all along?

This is not a stretch: the record shows many prominent (and not-so-prominent) military men—for example, the famous Air Force General Ed Lansdale—were also secret CIA assets during their military service.

Is it possible that Kerry’s short period in Vietnam was to establish his bona fides as a “war hero” and then bring him back for a stint as a “critic” of the war?

As we noted in the early pages of this volume, we do know that at least one leading critic of the Vietnam War, Allard Lowenstein (later a member of Congress) was secretly on the CIA payroll during his days as a war protester and that a leading anti-war organization, the National Student Association, was also being financed by the CIA.

It’s probably no coincidence that when Kerry announced he was jumping into the anti-war frenzy, he said—perhaps hinting broadly for those “in tune” enough to get the gist of what he was saying—that he wanted to follow in Allard Lowenstein’s footsteps. And again, it’s probably no coincidence that Lowenstein’s son ended up as one of Kerry’s top foreign policy advisors.

How does the old saying go? “Birds of a feather flock together.”

Perhaps Kerry's service in Vietnam was less-than-heroic as his critics were suggesting, but, on the other hand, it is also quite possible—perhaps likely—that his trip to Vietnam was part of a pre-planned venture organized by some mentors back at Yale (or should we say, the CIA)?

Judas Goats come in many different political stripes as the case of the Clintons and Kerry and his mentor, Lowenstein, clearly demonstrate.

In the chapter which follows we will examine how John Kerry's failed bid for the presidency in 2004 appears very much to have been orchestrated from behind the scenes as a candidacy, if not doomed to fail, certainly one designed to prop up the overall agenda of the Zionist elite—to assure that The Enemy Within remained firmly in control of the U.S. foreign policy-making apparatus, whatever the election result.

Chapter Thirty

The Fix Was In: How Zionist Judas Goats Led the GOP to Defeat in 1940 And the Democrats to Defeat in 2004

Although the parallels are not precisely on point, the 2004 American presidential election campaign was remarkably similar—in some notably important respects—to the 1940 battle between the incumbent, third-term seeking Democrat, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and his Republican challenger, Wendell L. Willkie.

As in 1940, the elite, plutocratic powers-that-be were determined in 2004 to control (and did control) “both horses in the race,” primarily because they recognized that whoever won the election would be positioned to direct the future course of American involvement on the global stage—and that is always vital to the international banking and industrial elements that stand ready to profit through manipulation of both U.S. foreign and domestic policy.

In the 1940 election, Franklin D. Roosevelt was loudly and repeatedly telling Americans that their boys were not going to fight in any foreign wars. Meanwhile, of course, behind the scenes, both in terms of U.S. policy toward Europe and the Far East, Roosevelt was angling, in every way possible, to involve the United States in a war that upwards of 90% of the American people believed was a war that need not and should not be fought.

But despite polls indicating overwhelming American opposition to American involvement in the war in Europe, the GOP—in rejecting nationalist Sen. Robert Taft (Ohio)—opted not to challenge FDR’s international war-mongering which was apparent, Roosevelt’s official public rhetoric notwithstanding. Instead, the GOP nominated Willkie, a Wall Street lawyer who was not only a recent convert to the Republican Party, but who was also, like FDR, a fervent internationalist and an avid partisan of the theory that America should intervene, on the British Empire’s behalf, in the war in Europe.

In fact, this was essentially the situation in the United States election campaign in the 2004 election. Although there was a Republican president, George W. Bush, in the White House seeking reelection (and, of course, a war was already underway), his presumptive Democratic successor was essentially saying “me too” as far as the ongoing debacle in Iraq was concerned.

Not only did Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.) vote in favor of the war, but he was now actually calling for more American troops to be deployed in Iraq, his version of “managing the war better.” In essence, Kerry was taking the “loyal opposition” theme to its farthest reach.

And considering (as we have already seen) Kerry’s likely role as a

covert CIA operative going back many years, it may well be that Kerry was, in the end, hardly more than a willing “fall guy,” ready to sacrifice himself on behalf of the globalist agenda, even if it meant actually losing the election.

This was reminiscent of the same situation in the 1940 Republican presidential primary campaign when GOP voters were selecting a candidate to oppose FDR. In 1940 the overwhelming grass-roots favorite of GOP voters was Ohio’s Bob Taft, a fervent critic of FDR’s foreign policy. Taft, in 1940, essentially played the same role in the Republican primaries that maverick Vermont Governor Howard Dean played in the Democratic presidential primaries 64 years later: Although Dean—like Taft before him—shot to the early lead for his outspoken opposition to American involvement in a senseless foreign war, the elite media in the United States began hammering away at Dean—just as it had done to Taft—undermining his campaign.

Thus, it is no coincidence—although the media never focused on his remarks—that, during the primary campaign, Dean himself repeatedly pointed out that an increasingly smaller number of elite financial interests were grabbing control of the mass media in America. So it was that Dean’s campaign was sabotaged and, as some newspapers, notably *Forward*, a leading Jewish newspaper, pointed out, the *tide was turned against Dean and in Kerry’s favor when many leaders of Iowa’s small, but influential, Jewish community rallied behind Kerry and saved his faltering campaign in that critical caucus state.*

Although Dean’s wife was Jewish, Dean’s opposition to the Iraq war—which was supported by pivotal leaders and leadership groups in the American Jewish community—was what sparked the most significant opposition (and media hostility) to his candidacy. As such, with Dean out of the way, a “loyal opposition” Democrat—who had actually voted for the Bush war in Iraq—was on his way to the nomination.

This was similar to the fate of GOP favorite Taft. But we now know that Wendell Willkie’s famous “dark horse stampede” of the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia in 1940 was anything but that. Instead, as Dr. Thomas E. Mahl has carefully demonstrated, beyond question, in his book *Desperate Deception: British Covert Operations in the United States, 1939-1941*, the Willkie campaign at the GOP convention was essentially bought-and-paid-for by wealthy American interests who were sympathetic to FDR’s foreign policy and who wanted to ensure that the GOP nominated a candidate who would not take serious issue with FDR’s views. As such, it was vital that Taft’s candidacy be destroyed.

In addition, according to Mahl’s thoroughly documented research, it’s very clear that British intelligence—and persons working with

British intelligence—were working both to sabotage Taft and to promote Willkie, and succeeded in both.

So Taft—like Dean who came later—was sacrificed within his own party (despite the fact his anti-war position was considerably more popular) and substituted with a candidate (Willkie—echoed in 2004 by John Kerry) who essentially stood with the incumbent president on the matter of U.S. intervention abroad.

Significantly, almost a year after the 1940 election—when the debate over U.S. intervention in Europe still raged—famed American aviator Charles Lindbergh, in a much-criticized speech before the anti-war America First Committee, charged publicly that there were three groups that were pushing America toward war: “the British, the Jewish and the Roosevelt administration.”

In fact, with the substitution of the name “Bush” for the name “Roosevelt” this could essentially be a capsule description of the same groups that pushed for the war in Iraq. So, as they say, the more things change, the more they remain the same. Or, more simply: history repeats itself. The Enemy Within will simply not go away without a fight.

And in the context of all of this, it is worth noting, by way of corollary, how—during the lead up to the American invasion of Iraq and the subsequent debate over that debacle during the 2004 presidential election—the Zionist movement worked overtime to prevent the anti-war movement from venturing so far as to point out the fact that Israel and its American lobby were prime movers behind the proposed war.

In the spring of 2003, with grass-roots opposition to the Iraq war growing in the United States and worldwide, increasing knowledge about Israel’s support for the war and of the preeminent role of a powerful pro-Israel “neoconservative” clique inside the George W. Bush administration promoting the war, a handful of pro-Israel “liberals” (who said they were against the war) actually worked to undermine critics of Israel in the anti-war movement.

That many people were starting to accuse Israel of being a cause of the war in Iraq was a point that was of increasing concern to supporters of Israel. On Feb. 16, 2003 *The Washington Post* weighed in with its opinion as to what constituted proper grounds for opposition to the war. According to the *Post*, “opponents arguments are sometimes,” in its words, “incoherent or groundless,” among such being “the suggestions that the U.S. campaign is motivated by an undisclosed agenda to defend Israel or seize Iraq’s oil.” The only worthy reason to oppose the war—at this point—according to the *Post*, was that any unilateral action by the United States without prior United Nations approval would be wrong.

Concurrent with the *Post*’s comments, the effort to sabotage the


anti-war movement from within came into view after prominent liberal Rabbi Michael Lerner alleged that he was barred from speaking at an anti-war rally in San Francisco because the rally's primary organizer, International ANSWER (Act Now to Stop War and End Racism) was totally anti-Zionist whereas he (Lerner) favored the establishment of a Palestinian state alongside Israel. ANSWER denied this, saying that Lerner was not allowed to speak because, previously, Lerner had been attacking ANSWER and the diverse group of organizers for the rally had already agreed that they would not have speakers who had criticized any of those groups. In fact, Lerner had attacked ANSWER saying that, in organizing anti-war rallies across the country, ANSWER had included too many speakers who charge that the U.S. war on Iraq is stimulated primarily by Israel's desire to see Iraq destroyed.

Whatever the case, because of the Lerner furor, a group of some 150 other self-styled "progressive intellectuals" (most of whom were overwhelmingly Jewish supporters of Israel and who said they were against the war) raised a ruckus and sent out an open letter condemning ANSWER's refusal to allow Lerner to speak, going so far as to say that ANSWER is unfit "to lead mass mobilizations against the war in Iraq."

Considering the tremendous success that ANSWER had already achieved—whatever its political orientation—in organizing mass demonstrations against the war, critics questioned the motivation of the pro-Israeli forces in attempting to undermine the anti-war movement leadership at this critical time.

Meanwhile, as Zionist elements schemed to split the anti-war movement, a prominent longtime Zionist money speculator George Soros, emerged as an outspoken "critic" of President George W. Bush and the war in Iraq. Casting himself as the "money bags" for many progressive groups and anti-war activist units, Soros effectively grabbed control of the opposition, thereby blunting many possible sources of opposition to Zionist influence in America. With Soros—a Jew—providing funding for such a variety of organizations, he has set himself up as the virtual "dictator" of the American progressive movement for years to come.

What all of this means quite simply is that—once again—the American people have been manipulated and misdirected. The 2004 presidential election was the ultimate "sham," and the truth about the war in Iraq—one of the primary issues of debate during that corrupt presidential campaign—was never fully aired to the American people. Another victory for The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within.



American nationalist Whitelaw Reid (upper right) lashes out at “British Free Traders” and “Pharisees” in this 1884 cartoon. British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli (upper left)—a tool of the Rothschild banking dynasty—abandoned his initial opposition to free trade and under Disraeli (who died in 1881) British imperialism reached its pinnacle, the “British” empire emerging as a Rothschild fiefdom. U.S. President Woodrow Wilson (inset), a disciple of Disraeli *and* British free trade, worked to dismantle traditional American nationalism, such that he (like Disraeli) is much admired by modern-day neo-conservative Zionist elements promoting the New World Order. Under the Rothschild imperial agenda, British colonials (such as those shown above, posing triumphantly with a trophy) established a record that led many in “The Third World” to be sympathetic to Adolf Hitler (at right, with a friend). Although Hitler hoped to forge an alliance with Britain against Soviet Russia, Jewish opposition stymied his plans, an irony in light of the fact that *some* Zionist elements actually sought to curry favor with Hitler because his domestic policies had the effect of stimulating Jewish immigration to Palestine.

Were they lambs—or Judas Goats?

An Introduction to Part V

Two Big Names—Two Bad Records: Let the Chips Fall Where They May

The two chapters that follow are veritable case studies of prominent figures who, while being lionized by American conservatives, were actually acting as agents for The Enemy Within.

The two personalities in question are considered by many as “titans” of the American “conservative” movement. But a close examination of their records unfortunately tells a far different story.

We refer to longtime North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms and former Republican House Speaker Newt Gingrich.

In the case of Senator Helms, it appears that the senator was co-opted, effectively forced to repudiate his own apparent past dedication to traditional American nationalism.

In the case of Newt Gingrich, it appears Gingrich was never what he appeared to be.

In both instances, however, the careers of the two Republican congressional “giants” are sadly parallel.

Chapter Thirty-One

The Sad Story of Jesse Helms: How an American Patriot Became A Judas Goat for The Enemy Within

Was America's best known "critic" of the United Nations really a critic of the global body? Perhaps the most amazing turn-about for any American politician is the case of that former North Carolina senator, Jesse Helms, long a favorite of many American conservatives. It's an eye-opening story that evolved over the years, and one that caused great distress for many of Helms' admirers. The amazing "adjustment" by Helms, not only vis-à-vis the United Nations but also regarding his stand on U.S. Middle East policy, demonstrates how even a seemingly "hardcore" American nationalist could tilt in the opposite direction—clearly influenced by The Enemy Within.

While—throughout Helms' career—the media publicized name-calling back and forth between Helms and "social issue" groups such as feminists, abortionists, homosexuals, opponents of school prayer and other minorities—with both Helms and his critics raising tons of money to fight one another—Helms' unexpected alliance with the plutocratic elite remains largely known.

Early in his Senate career, Helms was a fierce critic of foreign aid—most of which went then, as now, to Israel. Consequently, Helms was considered "suspect" by the powerful pro-Israel lobby in Washington. Then, on March 27, 1979, Helms actually stood up on the Senate floor and declare that the newly-signed peace accords between Israel and Egypt did not protect America's interests.

Helms was the only member of Congress who dared to say (publicly) that the primary stumbling block in the way of Middle East peace was Israel's refusal to relinquish control of the occupied West Bank that Israel had seized from Jordan in the 1967 war.

Helms was indubitably the leading congressional voice for an America First foreign policy. In 1982, Helms even called for cutting off diplomatic relations with Israel after its bloody invasion of Lebanon.

But just two years later in 1984—in the midst of his bid for a third term and with Israeli lobby money pouring into the coffers of his Democratic opponent—Helms did an amazing about-face: He shocked "both the left and right" by calling for moving the U.S. embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. And he declared that the U.S. should continue to support Israel's occupation of the West Bank.

Obviously, Helms had been co-opted by the Israeli lobby. Raising funds for his campaign were big names in the pro-Israel elite, reportedly under the lead of Zionist media billionaire S. I. Newhouse, whose family were longtime major patrons of the Israeli lobby and such groups as

the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith.

One particularly disturbing fact is that Helms had accepted campaign money from a New York-based businessman, Bob Jacobs, who had publicly admitted supporting a violent militia-style terrorist group—the Jewish Defense League (JDL)—that has been connected to numerous murders, bombings and other crimes.

Writing in *The Village Voice* on May 6, 1986, Jewish-American journalist Robert I. Friedman described Jacobs as one of the “most fanatical supporters” of the since-assassinated Rabbi Meir Kahane, founder of the JDL, and revealed:

Jacobs reportedly gave Kahane \$20,000 for his 1984 Knesset campaign and has raised money on behalf of convicted Jewish terrorists in Israel. Jacobs also has raised money for his close friend, North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms, who made his first journey to the Holy Land with Jacobs [in the summer of 1985].

One of Kahane’s proteges, New York JDL boss Victor Vancier, told journalist Friedman in an interview that Helms’ close friend Jacobs “said the JDL should be beating up American Arabs and left-wing Jews, especially journalists, who support the PLO. This is what [JDL founder Kahane] told him should be the JDL’s priority.”

Precisely because of the critical support from people like Jacobs and Zionist billionaire and media kingpin Newhouse—who reportedly intervened on Helms’s behalf and urged other supporters of Israel to either fund Helms or else withdraw their financing of his Democratic opponent—Helms won re-election in 1984.

Since the Israeli lobby had managed to defeat Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.), who was—unlike Helms—an unbending critic of Israel, Helms succeeded Percy as GOP chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and quickly demonstrated his fealty to his new allies.

In 1985 Helms publicly supported continued Israeli military occupation of Arab lands, making the remarkable assertion that Israeli occupation was “not an issue at the core of the Israeli-Arab dispute.”

Helms also played an unusual role in a series of circumstances that led to the takeover of media giant CBS by a consortium of “new rich” hard-line pro-Israel financial manipulators.

The Spotlight was the lone newspaper in America to tell the full story behind the story of Helms’ purported bid to buy CBS and make it into a conservative television network. Helms had sent out a call for conservatives to rally together to buy control of CBS, saying this would tem-

per the network's liberal bias. That sounded good, but the truth was that a successful takeover by Helms would have required a war chest of some \$5 billion.

Yet, in the wake of Helms' campaign, CBS stock shot up in value more than 30 percent. One who made vast profits was Zionist billionaire stock speculator Ivan Boesky who procured a substantial interest in CBS stock. In fact, Boesky was part of a consortium of pro-Israel billionaires led by Lawrence Tisch, who did finally gain control of the network.

According to *Spotlight* sources on Wall Street, the Helms campaign had effectively "diverted the attention" of CBS management and set the stage for the Tisch consortium to grab the network. And today, of course, CBS remains as liberal as ever.

In 1996 Helms stunned many of his longtime supporters once again when he wrote an article for the Sept/Oct 1996 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, the journal of the Council on Foreign Relations, the internationalist pressure group, talking about UN "reform," effectively accepting the role of the UN in American affairs—quite another turnabout indeed.

Helms' political evolution—some might call it a "revolution"—continued. In the year 2000, two years before his retirement, Helms gave a fiery speech to the United Nations Security Council, criticizing the UN. "Conservative" newspapers cheered Helms on.

But again, there was more to the story that the conservative journals preferred not to mention. In fact, Helms's speech was part of a carefully orchestrated plan—concocted by then-President Bill Clinton's UN Ambassador, Richard Holbrooke—to deflect criticism from the UN during the election year. And since Holbrooke was a member of not only the internationalist power group known as Bilderberg but also the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and the Trilateral Commission, his plan was clearly being directed from and approved at the highest levels.

Writing on Feb. 3, 2000 in *The Washington Post*, Holbrooke's fellow Bilderberger—columnist, Jim Hoagland—revealed the inside story. Helms fans who read the column were left feeling squeamish. Commenting that "[populist commentator and presidential hopeful] Pat Buchanan's cynical fear-mongering" was "gaining little attention," Hoagland said Helms' UN appearance was "an important barometer of change" and revealed that it was Holbrooke who invited Helms to speak in the first place.

Scoffing that while "the ultraconservative Republican senator barked predictably about UN shortcomings," Hoagland dropped the real bombshell: that Helms had "quietly proposed a continuing dialogue to seek improvement in U.S.-UN relations." Hoagland added that "the high profile" appearance by Helms was "engineered by Holbrooke to under-

line the need for bipartisanship in U.S. policy toward the United Nations and insulate the relationship from election-year drive-by shootings."

The whole exercise was a charade to assure conservatives there are still "UN critics" in the GOP; that there was no need to turn to Pat Buchanan who was waging a presidential campaign in which he said he wanted to "Get the US out of the UN and the UN out of the US."

Perhaps Helms' most astounding venture, which effectively hinted at the surrender of American sovereignty and the seeming merger of the governments of the United States and Mexico, took place in 2001.

On April 17-19, 2001, Helms took the entire Senate Foreign Relations Committee (of which he was chairman) with him on a trip to Mexico. The visit was reported in the elite media as being "warm" and "unprecedented," with Helms now "reassessing" his previous critical attitude toward the notoriously corrupt, drug-money-infested regime.

While there was friendly coverage in major papers such as *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* in the days preceding the Helms trip, the actual press coverage strangely halted during the trip itself. Neither the *Post* nor the *Times* (which calls itself the "newspaper of record") provided any on-the-spot coverage of Helms' actual time in Mexico or what went on there. It was as if the media imposed a black-out on what Helms and the American lawmakers had said and done in the company of their colleagues from south of the border.

In truth, what actually happened was this: Helms took the unprecedented step of convening a joint meeting in Mexico between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and its counterpart in the Mexican Senate. *The Washington Times* reported on April 4 that Helms himself had bragged of the impending session, declaring: "This will be, to the best of my knowledge, the first time in history that a committee of the United States Congress has held a joint meeting on foreign soil with a committee of another nation's congress or parliament."

Liberal Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.), a member of the elite Bilderberg group who served with Helms on the Foreign Relations Committee, praised Helms' venture: "I commend you," said Dodd, "It is an exciting way to begin the 21st century—to try to reach out and establish closer ties with these emerging stronger democracies."

While the average, perhaps naive, observer might view Helms' action as nothing more than a symbolic act of friendship, there was much more at work behind the scenes. A careful review of the facts (and history) surrounding Helms' Mexican venture paints a more disturbing picture. The elite press reported that Marc Thiessen, a spokesman for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had said Helms' visit to Mexico was modeled on Helms' previous trip to the United Nations.

In any event, Helms' unexpected role as an effective cheerleader for the drive toward globalization began receiving praise in the elite media. A spokesman for the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) publicly acknowledged in a commentary in the April 22, 2001 issue of *The New York Times* that Helms had now emerged as a key player in the process. Walter Russell Mead, described as "a senior fellow" at the CFR, wrote a remarkable piece explaining to the readers of the *Times* "Why the World is Better for Jesse Helms."

Calling Helms "the man American internationalists love to hate," and noting wryly that "hating Jesse Helms remains a parlor sport in Georgetown, Cambridge and Manhattan," the CFR man made the revealing comment that "a longer view of American history would demonstrate that Jesse Helms is a necessary part of the process: if he didn't exist, America would have to invent him."

Mead quoted Professor Douglas Brinkley at the Eisenhower Center at the University of New Orleans as saying that while Helms "respects his hard-line constituency" (that is, his populist fans across the country) he "is willing to explore centrist possibilities. That is what makes him so important to the foreign-policy process."

It is no coincidence that Helms' new fan, Brinkley, was with the Eisenhower Center, named after the GOP president who severed the Republican Party from its traditional nationalist moorings after serving as the global elite's "blocking candidate" to keep Sen. Robert Taft (R-Ohio) from winning the GOP presidential nomination in 1952.

While the CFR analyst acknowledged that Helms "speaks for the tens of millions of Americans who don't trust the foreign policy establishment," the CFR analyst goes on to declare that Helms "also opens the door to a true national consensus behind important foreign policy goals." By the use of the term "consensus" the CFR man was saying that Helms' new position helped blur the differences between a nationalist foreign policy and an internationalist foreign policy, with the nationalist position being moved further toward internationalism.

Thus, well-known nationalists such as Helms become tools of the internationalists in breaking down populist opposition toward globalization. In other words, patriots were supposed to think: "If it's okay with Jesse, it must be all right for America." CFR man Mead described the part that Helms was playing in this process:

This role of broker between a skeptical public opinion and an insistent internationalist elite is one of the most important in American foreign policy. This is the role Senator [Arthur] Vandenberg [R-Mich.] played in the 1940s.

Mead did not mention that Vandenberg, once a leading nationalist critic of Franklin Roosevelt's globalist interventionism, was actually the victim of intrigue by three female British intelligence operatives who played upon Vandenberg's Bill Clinton-style womanizing to influence his change of heart, bringing the Michigan senator around to full-fledged support for internationalism.

Why Helms had now modeled himself after Vandenberg may be one of the great mysteries of our time. Helms' earlier drastic turn-about from being the foremost Senate critic of Israeli imperialism to becoming a top Senate water carrier for the Israeli lobby is a scenario that also remains subject to speculation.

The hard truth is that no matter how wonderful Helms' rhetoric on a wide variety of issues, on the larger scale, the once-dependable Tarheel senator had become a valued asset in the drive for a New World Order. Helms' political flip-floppery reflected in many ways the very demise of traditional Republicanism itself and, by the end of his career, it might well be said that the former titan of American nationalism had not just been influenced by *The Enemy Within* but, in fact, had become one of *The Enemy Within*.

Chapter Thirty-Two

A Judas Goat From the Beginning: Newt Gingrich: Voice for Corrupted Conservatism— The Republican Favorite of The Enemy Within

A front-page exclusive published in the January 28, 1985 issue of *The Spotlight* revealed—much to the dismay of many self-styled “conservatives”—that Georgia Congressman Newt Gingrich, then a little-known “backbencher” in the House of Representatives, was the brains behind a clique of internationalist Republicans who were working to scrap the GOP’s historic nationalist stance in foreign policy making.

Unfortunately, this honest effort to expose Gingrich’s internationalist bent was greeted with a mixture of outrage and scorn by many conservatives who were hoodwinked by the mainstream media into following the Georgia congressman’s peculiar brand of “leadership.”

The Spotlight revealed that Gingrich, along with several other House Republicans (Reps. Vin Weber [Minn.], Connie Mack [Fla.], and Robert Walker [Pa.]) had attended a secret meeting with Donald Graham, publisher of the *Washington Post*, and Meg Greenfield, the *Post*’s editorial page editor.

Gingrich and his fellow GOP lawmakers had dubbed themselves the Conservative Opportunity Society (COS), although their critics called them the Conservative “Opportunists” Society.

At that meeting, *The Spotlight* reported, Gingrich and his colleagues effectively agreed to work to revamp the so-called “conservative wing” of the Republican Party and use their influence to push the GOP into the internationalist camp.

In return, the *Post*’s power-wielders agreed to give Gingrich and his colleagues widespread favorable publicity in the pages of their influential daily in the nation’s capital. Until that time Gingrich and company had been relegated to “backbench” status by the media, sometimes even painted as “extremists” and “troublemakers.”

Gingrich and his colleagues told the *Post* that they would come out swinging in favor of economic sanctions against the anti-communist, pro-American regime in South Africa. This, of course, was a 180-degree reversal of the traditional “conservative” stand in support of South Africa and in opposition to sanctions.

In short time they did, in fact, call for sanctions, causing syndicated columnist Pat Buchanan to comment that Gingrich and company were “turncoat[s]” who were guilty of “stabbing South Africa in the back.” By adopting the new position, Gingrich and his COS clique had effectively signed on with the liberal internationalists in Congress who had been waging war against South Africa for decades.

Shortly, the *Washington Post* published a laudatory profile of

Gingrich. This set the stage for many future such puff-pieces promoting Gingrich and placing him in line for his ultimate election as House Minority Whip (second-ranking position in the GOP hierarchy).

Then, to the outrage of nationalist-minded Republicans, Gingrich's COS colleague, Vin Weber, authored a prominently-placed op-ed column in the *Post* (never permitted as a forum for GOP conservatives) which called upon the GOP to become "America's new internationalist party."

Ultimately *The Spotlight's* world exclusive on the secret meeting between Gingrich and the *Post* was confirmed by the *Post* itself—but only after Gingrich had reached a position of influence. In short, *The Spotlight's* "conspiracy theory"—as some called it—proved not to be a "conspiracy theory," but a fact.

As *The Spotlight* warned, Gingrich himself is an unabashed internationalist and has been recognized as such by the self-styled "new age" movement. One internationalist journal, *New Options*, even hailed Gingrich as a key "globally responsible" legislator.

In keeping with his orientation, Gingrich, in 1983, joined then-Rep. Albert Gore Jr. (D-Tenn.), later vice president, in introducing a bill to "advise the president on 'critical trends and alternative futures'"—an effort heralded by a well-known "one world" advocacy journal known as *Leading Edge*.

All of this should have been no surprise to long-time Gingrich watchers, however. In 1968 when then-California Governor Ronald Reagan and Richard Nixon were vying for "conservative" support in their respective bids for the GOP presidential nomination, Gingrich opted to sign on as the Southeast regional coordinator for one of their opponents, New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller. Later, prior to his election to Congress, Gingrich taught at the Rockefeller-funded Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, an outpost of the Rockefeller empire.

The reality of what Gingrich truly represents is reflected in his critical role in railroading NAFTA through Congress. Gingrich was almost single-handedly responsible for ensuring passage of the sovereignty-robbing, job-exporting North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). He rallied the GOP votes necessary to enable NAFTA's enactment, delivering a victory to his fellow member of the Rockefeller-financed Council on Foreign Relations, President Bill Clinton.

On September 3, 1995 *The Washington Post* assured its readers that Gingrich was "okay" despite many public criticisms of Gingrich by some liberal critics. The *Post* rushed to the defense of the new House Speaker and pointed out in a headline that "For the ultra-right, Gingrich is just a tool of the world government plot." The *Post* said that "anyone who glances at *The Spotlight*, the weekly newspaper of the far-right

Liberty Lobby . . . knows that . . . Gingrich is hardly the leader of their movement; in their eyes, he is actively working to subvert it.” (However, the *Post* was careful not to mention that it was *The Spotlight* that first blew the whistle on the secret deal between Gingrich and the *Post*.)

According to the sarcastic and less than factual commentary by the *Post*, “Those with a paranoid bent are convinced that the Georgian is in cahoots with President Clinton, the Rockefellers, the Freemasons, the Council on Foreign Relations and the entire Eastern Establishment to abrogate the Constitution and forge a New World Order under the thumb of Jewish central bankers and the United Nations.”

The *Post* concluded: “It is important for national opinion-makers to understand the chasm between most House Republicans and the loony right. Gingrich and his GOP revolution may be controversial and provocative, but they are not the source of violent extremism.”

As far as Gingrich’s close friend and fellow House Republican Vin Weber is concerned, Weber was forced, ultimately, to abandon a promising career in the House after he was caught red-handed in the House check-kiting scandal.

Despite having devoted much time and energy to promoting the demands of the pro-Israel lobby, including working to disrupt an effort to force a congressional inquiry into Israel’s June 7, 1967 unprovoked naval and air attack on the *U.S.S. Liberty*, sailing peacefully in the Mediterranean, resulting in the deaths of 34 Americans and the wounding of 171 others, Weber’s financial misdeeds caught up with him.

Needless to say, Weber received heavy campaign financing from pro-Israel elements in return for his efforts. However, after Weber’s departure from Congress, his friends in the Zionist elite ensured his future financial security. Weber was named to the prestigious globalist group, the Council on Foreign Relations, and was later named by President George W. Bush as head of the National Endowment for Democracy, an institution promoting “global democracy,” part of the neo-conservative agenda.

Gingrich himself abandoned his congressional seat in the midst of the furor over President Bill Clinton’s affair with White House intern Monica Lewinsky. Because it was subsequently revealed that Gingrich had been carrying on an extramarital affair behind the back of his second wife, Marianne, many speculated that Gingrich’s affair (and the possibility that it might become a political issue in the heated fight over the attempt to drive Clinton from office) was the reason that he left office, perhaps convinced by his fellow Republicans that it was best for the party. He later married his mistress, who was a singer in a church choir during her affair with the GOP leader.

As an added note, it should be pointed out that while Gingrich was busy on Capitol Hill carrying water for Israeli interests, his then-wife Marianne was on the payroll of a group known as the Israel Export Development Company (IEDCO) which was promoting the financial interests of Israel vis-à-vis lucrative trade agreements with the United States. In fact, it seems that Mrs. Gingrich's lucrative deal with IEDCO was cut in August of 1994 after she and her husband traveled to Israel at the expense of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, a foreign lobby for Israel.

Although she was taking home a monthly salary of \$2500, plus "commissions," Mrs. Gingrich refused to disclose the size of those "commissions." And while Mrs. Gingrich responded to criticisms of her sweet deal that "If I were going to get a political payoff, it would not be for the amount of money I am making," the fact is that the yearly figure of \$30,000 is precisely the kind of figures often seen linked to political payoffs. And what is interesting is that IEDCO's president, Larry Silverstein, admitted to the *Wall Street Journal* that Gingrich was one of a number of members of Congress who were lobbied to support his company's proposal.

Although his wife's Israeli connection was obviously an egregious conflict of interest for Newt Gingrich, the congressman's friends in high places saw no problem whatsoever—since "our ally Israel" was involved. Imagine the ruckus if Mrs. Gingrich had been working for Arab interests!

These days Gingrich continues to make noise on behalf of Israel and is said to be positioning himself for a future presidential run, his past scandals notwithstanding. He is even promoting himself—and the media is helping him do it—as an advocate of "reform," his record of corruption notwithstanding.

The bottom line, however, is that Gingrich is not just a spokesman for The Enemy Within. He constitutes an Enemy Within in and of himself. He is a classic case study of the manner in which the major media has created and promoted a shameless and power-hungry politician whose loyalties clearly do not lie with the interests of the American people—his rhetoric notwithstanding—but instead with the plutocratic forces within the Zionist and globalist elite. Americans would do well to reject Gingrich now and in the future.



This 1849 caricature—entitled “The Loan-Monger Grinding Swords”—is a derisive swipe at war profiteering by the Rothschild dynasty (and, to be fair to the Rothschilds, other Jewish banking houses) who loaned the money (often to both sides) that provided the crowned heads of Europe the funds needed to conduct seemingly never-ending wars against rival kingdoms (often ruled by members of their own family). In the background, a rat-like figure (no doubt a Rothschild agent) whispers in the ear of a smiling crown-wearing king, probably “advising” the king of the necessity of waging some future war. Profiting from bloodshed, the Rothschilds assembled the world’s most gigantic fortune which, in turn, has seeded other great Zionist family fortunes. These allied plutocratic elites—who still profit from war—use all means at their disposal to destroy those who oppose them and to promote those who do their bidding.

More recent history unfolds . . .

An Introduction to Part VI

EXPLOSIVE EVENTS . . .

In the preceding pages we've explored a broad history of ugly intrigue reaching into many places. We've covered a lot of ground, to say the very least.

In several chapters that follow, however, we'll be going into much further detail, describing the activities of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within as they have been intimately connected to some of the most devastating events—true Holocausts, by anyone's definition—ever to have taken place on American soil.

Ranging from the first attack on the World Trade Center to the bizarre tragedy at Waco to the horrendous Oklahoma City bombing and more, we'll see precisely how far-reaching (and yet still how hidden) the role of The Judas Goats has been, even in some of the most widely-publicized events of our time.

Chapter Thirty-Three

The FBI-ADL-Mossad Nexus In the First Attack on the World Trade Center: The Little-Known (and Chilling) Story

It is probably no coincidence that an ex-FBI official who helped cover up the Mossad connection to the first bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993—as well as FBI foreknowledge of the planning of the crime—was later appointed for a brief period to serve as chief of the infamous “fact finding” (spy) division of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith.

Neil Herman, a 27-year FBI veteran, succeeded Gail Gans who was appointed to the post upon the death of longtime ADL spymaster Irwin Suall. The former head of the FBI's Joint Terrorist Task Force, Herman was not only a key player in the World Trade Center “investigation” but he also oversaw the equally suspicious FBI inquiry into the downing of TWA Flight 800 off Long Island on July 16, 1997.

That a veteran FBI official would take a key post with the ADL is an ominous signal that the long-standing covert relationship between the FBI and the ADL—forged in the years prior to World War II—was now “going public” with a vengeance.

As the ADL's chief spymaster, Herman was able to provide the ADL far more wide-ranging contacts within the FBI and the intelligence community than ever before, but, strangely, he evidently did not remain in the post for long.

In fact, shortly after his appointment was announced in the New York press, Herman seemed to have dropped off the radar screen and—even today—very little can be found on the Internet about him. He was succeeded as chief of spying operations by one Mark Pitcavage.

It is, of course, possible to speculate as to why he departed so quickly from the ADL realm—if indeed he did—but the fact is that Herman, positioned as he was in the investigation of the first attack on the World Trade Center, was clearly part of a cover-up of the little-known, seldom-commented-upon Israeli connection to the first attempt to bring down the twin towers that finally fell on September 11, 2001.

Here are the facts about the Mossad connection to the tragedy first revealed by investigative reporter Robert I. Friedman in the August 3, 1993 article in *The Village Voice*, an independent left-wing New York weekly that has occasionally dared to criticize Israel.

Friedman reported that Ahmad Ajaj, a 27-year-old West Bank Palestinian held in federal custody for conspiring to bomb the World Trade Center, may have been a Mossad mole, according to Friedman's own Israeli intelligence sources.

Ajaj was arrested at Kennedy Airport on September 1, 1992, after

he arrived on a Pakistani International flight from Peshawar carrying a forged Swedish passport and bomb-making manuals. He was taken into custody, and subsequently pleaded guilty to entering the country illegally. Ajaj's traveling companion was Ramzi Ahmed Yousef, an Iraqi who law enforcement sources say is a "key player" in the World Trade Center bombing.'

Although the FBI identified Ajaj as a senior intifada terrorist, with links to Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic fundamentalist organization, *Kol Ha'ir*, a respected Hebrew-language weekly published in Jerusalem, said Ajaj was never involved in intifada activities or with Hamas or even the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Instead, according to *Kol Ha'ir*, Ajaj was actually a petty crook arrested in 1988 for counterfeiting U.S. dollars out of a base in East Jerusalem. Ajaj was convicted of the counterfeiting charges and then sentenced to two-and-a-half years in prison.

According to Friedman, writing in *The Village Voice*: "It was during his prison stay that Mossad, Israel's CIA, apparently recruited him, say Israeli intelligence sources. By the time he was released after having served just one year, he had seemingly undergone a radical transformation." Friedman reported that Ajaj had suddenly become a devout Muslim and an outspoken hard-line nationalist. Then, Ajaj was arrested for smuggling weapons into the West Bank, supposedly for El Fatah, a faction of the PLO.

But Friedman says this was actually a sham. Friedman's sources in Israeli intelligence say that the arrest and Ajaj's subsequent deportation were "staged by Mossad to establish his credentials as an intifada activist. Mossad allegedly 'tasked' Ajaj to infiltrate radical Palestinian groups operating outside Israel and to report back to Tel Aviv. Israeli intelligence sources say that it is not unusual for Mossad to recruit from the ranks of common criminals."

After Ajaj's "deportation" from Israel, he showed up in Pakistan, where he turned up in the company of the anti-Soviet Mujahideen rebels in Afghanistan.

This, in itself, could point further evidence that Ajaj was working for the Mossad, for—according to *Covert Action Information Bulletin* (September 1987)—the funding and supply lines for the Mujahideen were not only the "the second largest covert operation" in the CIA's history, but they were also, according to former Mossad operative Victor Ostrovsky (writing in *The Other Side of Deception*) under the direct supervision of the Mossad.

According to Ostrovsky: "It was a complex pipeline, since a large portion of the Mujahideen's weapons were American-made and were

supplied to the Muslim Brotherhood directly from Israel, using as carriers the Bedouin nomads who roamed the demilitarized zones in the Sinai.”

After Ajaj’s ventures with the Mujahideen, he popped up in New York and purported to befriend members of a small so-called “radical” clique surrounding Sheikh Abdel-Rahman who was accused of being the mastermind of the World Trade Center bombing.

On February 26, 1993, the actual day of the World Trade Center bombing, Ajaj was “safe” in federal prison serving a six-month sentence for entering the country on a forged passport. Later, he was indicted for conspiracy in the WTC bombing.

According to Robert Friedman, “If Ajaj *was* recruited by Mossad [Friedman’s emphasis], it is not known whether he continued to work for the Israeli spy agency after he was deported. One possibility, of course, is that upon leaving Israel and meeting radical Muslims close to the blind Egyptian sheikh, his loyalties shifted.”

However, Friedman also reported another frightening possibility: “Another scenario is that he had advance knowledge of the World Trade Center bombing, which he shared with Mossad, and that Mossad, for whatever reason, kept the secret to itself. If true, U.S. intelligence sources speculate that Mossad might have decided to keep the information closely guarded so as not to compromise its undercover agent.”

Friedman broke amazing ground with these revelations that were ignored by the mainstream press.

What Friedman did not mention—and which only came out later—was that the copy of the infamous “Al Qaeda Terrorist Training Manual” that received widespread publicity following the second attack on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001 had been uncovered . . . in the possession of Ahmad Ajaj, the Mossad undercover informant in the first WTC attack. And that point speaks volumes, far more than we can address in these pages.

However, there’s much more to the story of the first WTC attack: It also turns out that the FBI itself had its own undercover informant inside the “Arab bomb plot” and did nothing—repeat nothing—to prevent the tragedy from happening.

The facts indicate that the FBI had an informant inside the so-called “Arab terrorist cell” that may have fronted for Israel’s Mossad in the World Trade Center bombing. Although Americans have been told that a blind Arab sheik, Omar Abdel-Rahman, was the mastermind of the bombing, what they don’t know is that one of the sheik’s security guards, Emad A. Salem, was an FBI informant who had filled in the FBI, in advance, of the specifics of the bomb plot.

The FBI officially severed its contacts with Salem seven months before the bombing. However, in the aftermath of the tragedy, the FBI opened up relations with Salem once again. At that time, however, Salem—unbeknown to the FBI—began recording his exchanges with his FBI handler.

Salem's recorded conversations confirmed that the FBI, in fact, had extensive prior knowledge of the plot to bomb the World Trade Center. The recordings indicate that Salem had told the FBI that he would sabotage the plot by replacing the explosive components of the bomb with an inert powder, after which time the FBI could come in and capture those involved in the conspiracy.

In his book, *The Medusa File*, investigator Craig Roberts, a well-regarded 26-year veteran police officer and U.S. Marine Vietnam veteran, outlined the parameters of this outrageous scandal that has been effectively buried by the mainstream media. According to Roberts:

It seems that the FBI actually had more than a simple "informant" inside Rahman's terrorist cell. What they actually had was an Egyptian intelligence officer named Emad Salem, who reported directly to his FBI control agent, Special Agent John Anticev. Salem, it turns out, was hired to infiltrate the Rahman group long before the bombing took place, and consistently reported on the activities of the radicals—including their plans to conduct bombings in the New York City area.

What the FBI did not know was that Salem recorded his conversations with his control agents. The tapes tell a far different story than the official versions of the "investigation." According to *The New York Times*, which managed to obtain secret transcripts of some of the conversations, the FBI knew in advance when the bomb was going to be planted, who was going to do it, the names of everyone in the terrorist cell, and where the truck was rented. But worse, one tape went even further. It seems that the FBI not only knew about the planning, they actually assisted the bombers in obtaining and constructing the bomb!

The original FBI plan was for the informant to provide a non-explosive substance that would be labeled "ammonium nitrate," then use it to construct a "bomb" that would not go off. All the FBI needed to show in court was the elements of conspiracy and intent. It would be a classic "sting" operation and the FBI would come out in the media as heroes—

a much-needed polishing of their tarnished image since the earlier debacle at Ruby Ridge, Idaho.

Instead of arresting the conspirators when they received inside information that the bombing was being planned, the FBI instead kept their source in place and continued to monitor the progress of the terrorists in planning and preparing for their goal. According to the transcripts, the plan was changed and the informant was directed to provide the terrorists with real explosive materials. The reasoning behind this may have been simply that showing “intent” might not be enough to make a terrorism case in court, and that if real explosives were discovered then the case would make itself. But whatever the reason, the plan moved into stage two: building the bomb.

According to reports and transcripts, Salem was instructed to not only provide the materials, but to give instruction and help in building the bomb itself . . . In [one] transcript [Salem] admitted [to his FBI handlers] that he used government funds to procure the materials and build the bomb for the Rahman group, as he was instructed to do.

These interesting details about the first World Trade Center tragedy paint a starkly different picture of what happened than what we have been told by both the FBI and their allies in the ADL. It is another ugly profile of the manner in which The Enemy Within has been operating on American soil, and one which—quite obviously—raises the question: “If the Israelis were responsible for the first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993—using Arabs as “false flags”—did they come back in 2001 to finish the job?”

Don't bet against it.

Chapter Thirty-Four

The FBI-ADL Nexus That Provoked the Holocaust at Waco

On April 16, 1993—just three days before the fiery holocaust at the Branch Davidian Church in Waco, Texas—a leading supporter of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith publicly revealed the ADL's role in prodding the FBI/BATF actions at Waco, presumably not knowing, of course, of the awful ADL-provoked tragedy which lay ahead.

In a signed headline story which appeared in the April 16, 1993 edition of *Heritage*, Herb Brin, the publisher of the Southern California-based (and highly influential) Jewish weekly praised the ADL's intelligence network and stated flatly:

U.S. and Texas authorities have precise documentation (from ADL, of course) on the Branch Davidian cult in Waco and how it operated in the past.

In other words, it was the ADL which was “advising” the FBI and the BATF on how to respond to the Davidians and what course of action would be necessary to bring the church members out of the compound. And in light of the relationship between the FBI and the BATF and the ADL, it is apparent that it was the ADL's “documentation”—in Brin's words—that led to the fiery holocaust.

Brin's amazing revelation (ostensibly designed to praise the ADL's activities) shed light on the truth about the propagandea and disinformation directed at the hapless and beleaguered Branch Davidian religious sect. Then, of course, it was just three days later that the Davidians were massacred.

Despite all the words that have been written about Waco, the only publication to reveal the ADL role (other than Brin's *Heritage* newspaper) was *The Spotlight*, in a special report published on May 17, 1993, shortly after the Waco holocaust.

Although the FBI and the BATF played the front-line role in the botched raid on the Branch Davidian church at Waco, Texas, with the loss of several BATF agents in the process, the fact is that the ADL was active behind the scenes.

Even material published later in the so-called “mainstream” press provides additional evidence that there were indeed “outside” agencies such as the ADL that were prodding the government leading up to the Waco holocaust.

Two notable examples come to mind that are definitely worth noting for the official record,

First of all, on May 1, 1995, *The Washington Times* published an

article by Dan Freedman of the Hearst newspapers which revealed:

Peter Smerick, the FBI's lead criminal analyst and profiler of [Branch Davidian leader David] Koresh, has broken his silence to charge the bureau officials pressured him into changing his advice on how to resolve the situation without bloodshed . . . [He] had counseled a cautious, non-confrontational approach to Koresh in four memos written from Waco for senior FBI officials between March 3 and March 8, 1993. But he was pressured from above, Mr. Smerick says, as he was writing a fifth memo March 9. As a result, that memo contained subtle changes in tone and emphasis that amounted to an endorsement of a more aggressive approach against the Branch Davidians.

Although Smerick was initially hesitant to point an accusing finger at his former FBI superiors, he changed his mind, according to the report, "after becoming convinced that the traditionally independent process of FBI criminal analysis had been compromised at Waco."

As the evidence suggests, it was the ADL, using its influence at the highest levels of the FBI, that caused the issuance of a faulty and biased analysis that resulted in the Waco tragedy.

However, it was not until July 2, 1995 that an article buried in the opinion section of *The Washington Post* laid out—at least indirectly in part—the details of the involvement of outside groups, including one in particular with long and intimate ties to the ADL.

The author of the article in question was J. Gordon Melton, director of the Institute for the Study of American Religion in Santa Barbara, California and author of the authoritative *Encyclopedia of American Religions*. His co-author on the article was Lawrence Criner, a journalist.

Under the headline "What the hearings may tell us" appeared the provocative subtitle asking the question, "Did the federal authorities heed the wrong 'experts'?"—a question that Melton and Criner believe the much-ballyhooed then-upcoming congressional hearings on Waco should address if the inquiry were to be complete. (In fact, this aspect was hardly considered at all in the very cursory examinations of the Waco affair that were conducted.)

They pointed out that some members of Congress wanted to divert attention from the truth about Waco to the "militia" bogeyman, whereas others—primarily Republicans—hoped to use the hearings to embarrass the Democratic Clinton administration.

Melton and Criner said: "It will be disappointing if the purpose of

the hearings is lost in the netherworld of American politics, especially as new information surfaces on what occurred behind the scenes before the Davidian compound went up in flames." Here was the big question, according to the authors: "What exactly was the rationale for the siege, and who helped to script it?"

The authors explored, in some detail, the conflict within the FBI over the precise approach to be utilized in dealing with the Branch Davidians, noting, in particular, the problems that faced the FBI's Peter Smerick (referenced above) and the failure by the authorities to attempt to understand Koresh's religious theology and how it would impact the standoff—a matter that the authors viewed as a major factor that was explicitly ignored. The authors then went on to suggest that:

Another area for the hearings to explore is law enforcement's connection to outside "experts" with axes to grind. In this case, the FBI had been prepared for this moment by the anti-cult movement, whose ideals are embodied in the Cult Awareness Network (CAN) and the American Family Foundation.

For years, these organizations have presented their views on mind control and manipulation to anyone who would listen, including some within the FBI. Integral to this perspective is the charge of cult preparedness for mass suicide. During Waco, the FBI relied heavily on an anonymously written "white paper" that summarized this view. Agent Jamar, in the first congressional hearings on Waco, emphasized its "usefulness" in the weeks before the fire.

Another person who played a role in the Davidian drama was Rick Ross, who is listed as a "cult expert" and self-described "deprogrammer" in the government's official report on Waco. Ross told the FBI he "would willingly aid law enforcement in an attempt to destroy a cult."

Nancy Ammerman, professor of sociology at Emory University, in her addendum to the government's report, says that Ross was "closely involved with both the BATF and FBI," supplying the ATF with the "name of an ex-member he believed would have important strategic information." Ross recently said in a deposition that he "acted as a liaison between BATF and David Block," a Davidian who turned against the group when he was "deprogrammed" by Ross in 1992. According to the Treasury report, the information Block provided was decisive in the BATF's decision to

storm the Davidian complex instead of serving a warrant in the usual way. No one seems to have questioned whether Block was an objective or reliable witness.

Dean Kelley, counselor on religious liberty to the National Council of Churches, has written that it “[is a mistake] to insist that CAN did not contribute to the animus against Koresh and his followers when Ross and other cult opponents were doing their best to advance their views on the subject to the federal authorities, the media, and anyone who would listen.”

In light of the course the FBI followed, why did the federal authorities tend to put more faith in “cult experts” than in credentialed authorities in religious studies? These questions have not been fully investigated. The congressional hearings, if they are to be worthwhile and revealing, must focus on answering them.

That the authors acknowledged the role of the so-called Cult Awareness Network (CAN) and the American Family Foundation (AFF) is political dynamite that should have thrust the ADL's less widely known role in Waco right into the limelight.

Although the authors did not mention the ADL by name—but undoubtedly they were aware of its existence—the fact is that both CAN and AFF had long-standing intimate ties to the ADL and even shared their offices with the ADL.

In 1974, a long-time ADL functionary, Rabbi Maurice Davis, founded Citizens Engaged in Reuniting Families (CERF), a deprogrammers' front which later merged into the American Family Foundation and the Cult Awareness Network.

The ADL then established a full-time anti-cult center, housed at the Washington, D.C. headquarters of the B'nai B'rith. The Cult Center of B'nai B'rith maintained joint offices with the Cult Awareness Network. In this way, the ADL established formal, ongoing links to the AFF/CAN, which continue through to the present.

And what is all the more intriguing about Rabbi Davis—as we noted earlier in these pages—is the rabbi's own long-time ties to the CIA's infamous MK-ULTRA mind-control experiments, beginning in the 1950's, that included the use of LSD and other mind-altering drugs.

Clearly, the murders of innocent men, women and children at Waco were directly the responsibility of the federal law enforcement officers who carried out the attack. *But the evidence shows that the dirty hand of the ADL was at work behind the scenes.*

Chapter Thirty-Five

Judas Goats on Parade: Andreas Strassmeir, Kirk Lyons and a Sordid Cast of Other Enemies Within Linked to the Oklahoma City Bombing

If there is one thing about the Oklahoma City bombing of April 19, 1995 that is absolutely certain, it is this: undercover informants—Judas Goats—were surrounding accused bomber Timothy McVeigh and were clearly tuned in to his most clandestine ventures.

The Enemy Within—represented by such groups as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)—along with intelligence agencies such as the CIA, the FBI and the BATE, were closely involved in monitoring (and directing) the activities of the handful of individuals who were implicated (but not necessarily charged) in the Oklahoma bombing.

And, of course, in view of the ADL's role in the affair, it is also accurate to say the ADL's foreign principal, Israel's Mossad, was definitely keyed in to (and probably directed) the events leading up to the tragedy.

Although there is a wealth of information that has continued to emerge surrounding the official Justice Department and FBI cover-up of the facts about the bombing, one particularly sad fact is this: even many of those who have been quite forward in publicly discussing aspects of this cover-up have been afraid to venture so far as to suggest the likelihood of involvement by Israel's Mossad. Nevertheless, there is solid evidence pointing toward the role of undercover informants in the circumstances surrounding the tragedy.

On May 12, 1997, highly-regarded syndicated columnist Sam Francis (since deceased) raised questions about an individual named Andreas Strassmeir whom Francis described as “perhaps the single biggest anomaly in the whole case” surrounding the bombing.

Until that time only *The Spotlight* and a handful of independent publications had questioned whether Strassmeir may have had some connection to the tragic events.

However, on Oct. 20, 1997, *The Washington Post* rocked the otherwise complacent world of those who decry “conspiracy theories” by publishing a column by syndicated commentator Robert Novak that suggested that undercover government informants—specifically Strassmeir—may have been moving in Timothy McVeigh's circle prior to the Oklahoma City bombing.

Novak focused on what he calls “grave and disturbing questions” raised in a book by Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, the longtime Washington correspondent for *The Daily Telegraph* of London. The book, entitled *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton: The Unreported Stories*, opened with 108

pages of facts about the Oklahoma bombing unearthed by Evans-Pritchard. Novak advised his readers that the English writer was “no conspiracy-theory lunatic” but instead “was known in Washington for accuracy, industry and courage.” Evans-Pritchard had “offered leads to discovering a pattern of lies and deception after Oklahoma City that, if verified, would approach Vietnam and Watergate in undermining American citizens’ confidence in their government.”

In particular, Novak described Evans-Pritchard’s inquiries into the strange activities of Strassmeir, a former German army intelligence officer who was illegally in the United States. Evans-Pritchard says he is “certain” Strassmeir was “under federal protection.” The English investigator also examined the activities of another individual, Dennis Mahon, who was closely associated with Strassmeir prior to the bombing.

According to Evans-Pritchard, Mahon was convinced that Strassmeir was actually a federal undercover informant reporting back to either the FBI or the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (BATF)—or both—on the activities of so-called right-wing extremists.

Novak’s report (based on Evans-Pritchard) echoed what *The Spotlight* reported (as follows) on June 16, 1997:

Americans relying on the major networks and on wire service reports about the McVeigh trial were told little—if anything—about proposed testimony by former paid BATF informant Carol Howe whose information could have shed light on not only:

- Foreknowledge by federal authorities of a plot to bomb the federal building in Oklahoma City; but also
- The possibility that a federal undercover agent was actively encouraging such activity . . .

On May 28, 1997, *The Denver Post* also gave its readers an account of Howe’s allegations saying that her testimony could have been “one of the biggest wild cards in Timothy McVeigh’s trial.”

Miss Howe charged that German immigrant Andreas Strassmeir had talked about bombing federal buildings.

The Denver Post also reported that “although the FBI and federal prosecutors repeatedly denied that either Strassmeir or Mahon were suspects in the bombing, documents turned over to the defense prove that they were and that Howe was extensively interviewed by federal agents two days after the bombing.” The *Post* also reported that “the government has refused to talk about Howe.”

Then, the judge in the McVeigh trial, Richard Matsch, ruled in what *The Rocky Mountain News* described on May 28, as a “closed door session” that Howe’s testimony was “irrelevant” and would not be permitted.

Despite the successful effort to block Miss Howe’s testimony, investigators who have been examining all of the evidence have repeatedly focused—in particular—on the role of the enigmatic Strassmeir.

The role of Strassmeir’s close friend and attorney, Kirk Lyons, who popped up some years ago in the “right wing,” is also drawing attention, inasmuch as it was Lyons who played a key role in spiriting Strassmeir out of the country and out of the hands of the McVeigh defense. (In fact, McVeigh is known to have actually called Lyons’ office just prior to the bombing.)

This has led to speculation that Lyons was actually functioning as Strassmeir’s “handler” for the federal government, which, of course, wanted to keep any evidence of its foreknowledge of any bombing conspiracies out of the reach of the McVeigh jury—particularly since its own reputed informant was perhaps acting as an instigator.

Evans-Pritchard’s new book also contained intriguing information about the likely identity of the now-infamous “John Doe No. 2.” The English writer suggested that Doe No. 2 is actually a Pennsylvania man, Michael Brescia, who was seen with McVeigh and Strassmeir on at least one occasion. However, in the end, it is likely that there were many other “Does” involved as well.

According to Kirk Lyons, Strassmeir came to the United States because of his (Strassmeir’s) interest in Civil War reenactments. Sounds innocent enough. However, in light of Strassmeir’s involvement in “Civil War reenactments,” it is worth noting, according to John Hurley—the longtime head of the Confederate Memorial Hall (CMA) in Washington, D.C.—that the CIA has frequently used Civil War reenactment activities as a front for their own covert operations. Hurley is knowledgeable on these subjects, having tangled with the CIA when it used front men in an attempt to seize control of the CMA and use it for its “black ops.” In any event, British writer Evans-Pritchard commented:

It is assumed that Strassmeir could not have been a CIA asset because he was operating on U.S. soil. But this is not necessarily the case. He could have been reporting to the

domestic services section of the CIA, which has offices all over the country. Under usual procedures, his reports would be passed through them to the CIA's Directorate of Operations. Or alternatively, he could have been an FBI operative working under CIA auspices. My own conjecture, for what it is worth, is that Strassmeir was a shared asset, on loan to the U.S. government, but ultimately answering to German intelligence.

Evans-Pritchard also pointed out that the federal prosecutors portrayed McVeigh as "an anti-government radical set on avenging Waco" but have "downplayed" McVeigh's links to the circles in which Strassmeir was operating. And, he added, "the U.S. press has followed suit. The question is why. Why deflect attention from the white supremacist movement?"

But it gets murkier. The June 8, 2001 issue of the *Times* of London featured a revealing story about Strassmeir, in which the authors concluded that Strassmeir probably was an undercover operative. The *Times* reported: "The syringe that executes McVeigh will also drain Strassmeir of significance; giving him the status of a footnote." In other words, it would eliminate the one person who could finger Strassmeir.

The newspaper noted Strassmeir can read Hebrew—Israel's state language—as a consequence, it is said, of having had a girlfriend who served in the Israeli army, "not exactly the typical choice of a neo-Nazi," the *Times* added.

In addition, the *Times* pointed out that when Strassmeir first arrived in the United States, he "found friends easily—retired Army officers, CIA veterans, history buffs—and became part of a network" which the *Times* said "is powerful in the U.S., a web of influence that stretches into the Pentagon and the federal agencies, in churches and boardrooms, on the oil rigs and building sites."

This is hardly the profile of your average "neo-Nazi extremist" but certainly that of an intelligence operative.

Additional evidence brought forth by independent investigator J. D. Cash strongly suggests Strassmeir was the undercover informant who tipped off his federal handlers (who in turn then tipped off the German authorities) that Gary Lauck, a Nebraska-based publisher of so-called "holocaust denial" literature was making a trip to Denmark.

During that trip, Lauck was taken into custody and then deported to Germany to be tried, convicted and jailed under Germany's "thought control" laws for his role in distributing literature (printed in the United States) that is illegal in Germany.

Although Timothy McVeigh's first attorney, Stephen Jones, and later, his final attorneys prior to his execution—Rob Nigh, Richard Burr, Nathan Chambers and Christopher Tritico—all charged that Strassmeir was a key player in the Oklahoma bombing scenario, the U.S. media kept that information under wraps.

When McVeigh's attorneys appealed to block McVeigh's execution, they cited newly-released FBI documents which suggested that "there was . . . evidence, withheld by the government, that another person could well have been the mastermind behind the bombing."

The attorneys named Strassmeir and his friend, Dennis Mahon, as possible co-conspirators, charging the FBI engaged in a "scheme to suppress evidence" of their roles, alleging that information in the FBI documents "suggested that one of the other participants in the bombing was an informant for federal law enforcement officers."

In fact, in time, solid evidence began to emerge which most definitely pointed toward Strassmeir as an undercover informant.

The aforementioned independent investigator, J.D. Cash, and his colleague, ex-Marine Lt. Col. Roger Charles, pinpointed evidence, taken from a declassified FBI document, proving that *Andreas Strassmeir was an informant working under cover (posing as a "neo-Nazi") on behalf of Morris Dees and his Birmingham, Ala.-based Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), a private intelligence operation.*

The document, an electronic four-page Teletype message, dated Jan. 4, 1996, was sent by then-FBI Director Louis Freeh to FBI offices involved in the Oklahoma bombing investigation. The existence of this document was first exposed by Cash and Charles in the Dec. 14, 2003, issue of Oklahoma's *The McCurtain Daily Gazette*.

Although heavily redacted, the document confirmed what *The Spotlight* reported about Strassmeir and his close friend and attorney Kirk Lyons. Within the declassified document, the FBI director makes a reference to an SPLC informant being in place at the Elohim City "extremist" compound, on the Arkansas-Oklahoma border and confirms that a telephone call was made to that informant on April 17, 1995, two days before the bombing.

Although the names of the caller and the person being called were blacked out by FBI censors, it had been documented that, around that time, Timothy McVeigh made a telephone call to Elohim City seeking to contact Strassmeir, who was reportedly unavailable to take the call.

The FBI memo further indicated that a person at Elohim City had "a lengthy relationship with one of the two indicted [bombing] conspirators" (McVeigh and Nichols). Multiple independent investigators have documented that Strassmeir was with McVeigh on several occa-

sions over an extended period, prior to the bombing.

The FBI, Lyons and others—including the SPLC—have insisted that this did not prove Strassmeir was involved in the bombing. However, it is now clear—based on separate information, coupled with revelations in Freeh’s memorandum—that the SPLC informant was indeed Strassmeir.

Cash and Charles concluded that “references to an informant working for the SPLC at Elohim City on the eve of the Oklahoma City bombing raise serious questions as to what the SPLC might know about McVeigh’s activities during the final hours before the fuse was lit in Oklahoma City—but which the SPLC has failed to disclose publicly.”

Both investigators reported that when Dees of the SPLC was pressed to explain what his informant was doing at Elohim City, he offered the following explanation: “If I told you what we were doing there, I would have to kill you.”

Dees claimed that the SPLC didn’t have McVeigh on its “radar screen” until after he was arrested. However, that conflicts with evidence McVeigh was being closely monitored by the SPLC-allied Anti-Defamation League (ADL) as much as a year before the bombing. The ADL and the SPLC regularly trade spy data gleaned from informants.

Although the FBI said Strassmeir was expected to flee into Mexico “in the near future,” Cash and Charles point out that “none of the offices that received this FBI director’s memo [was in] Texas, where Strassmeir had just arrived and [from which he] was expected to make an escape across the Mexican border.” In addition, the FBI made no effort to visit Lyon’s office in North Carolina, where Strassmeir apparently hid out before fleeing to Mexico.

According to the *Gazette*, “Although Strassmeir was wanted for questioning in the Oklahoma bombing at the time of his escape and was illegally in the United States, those facts were known to attorney, Kirk Lyons . . . who has never been charged with harboring a fugitive, obstructing justice or disciplined by the [bar association] for his admitted role in assisting a client to elude federal authorities.”

The totality of the evidence, including the FBI memo, suggests Strassmeir was protected by the FBI, even before the bombing. Initially, the office of the BATF in Tulsa, Okla., had sought an arrest warrant for Strassmeir after one of its informants, Carol Howe, announced Strassmeir’s reported plans to bomb a U.S. federal building. That was in February 1995—two months prior to the Oklahoma bombing.

The *Gazette* alleged that Bob Ricks, special agent in charge of the Oklahoma City FBI office, enlisted the U.S. attorney in Tulsa, Steve Lawrence, to prevent Strassmeir’s arrest and a planned raid on Elohim

City where Strassmeir was living.

In preparation for McVeigh's trial, his attorney, Stephen Jones, requested FBI documents relating to its surveillance of Elohim City. However, the FBI claimed it had no information linking McVeigh to anyone there, and that is now clearly shown to have been a lie.

So although Strassmeir spent seven years in the United States, including time after his visa had expired, thereby making him an illegal alien, he was never interviewed by the FBI, despite the fact that he was associating with neo-Nazis who were under investigation, including several linked to a nationwide bank-robbing spree.

The FBI never needed to speak directly to Strassmeir because his handlers acted as his conduit and passed his information to the agency. That has been a long-standing strategy employed by the SPLC and the ADL in the handling of intelligence from informants and the conveyance of that data to the FBI and similar law enforcement bodies.

Thus, it is no surprise that Dees and the SPLC and the ADL have worked to suppress the role of Strassmeir in the bombing and quick to dismiss the charges about Strassmeir made by BATF informant Howe.

The attacks on Howe echo the same language used by Strassmeir's friend Kirk Lyons who, from the beginning, joined Dees and the ADL, along with all of the elite media trying to suppress the Strassmeir link.

That the ADL and Dees are adamant in discounting the involvement of a purported "neo-Nazi" in the Oklahoma scenario raises the question: "Why?" The only logical explanation is that Strassmeir was a "snitch" all along.

In fact, as we now know, it was the now-defunct *Spotlight*—whose reporters went on to found *American Free Press*—which was the one newspaper that wrote articles about the Oklahoma City bombing that Timothy McVeigh privately said "hit very close to home."

Spotlight coverage was unique (and obviously of interest to McVeigh) in that it focused on the "big picture," conveying evidence McVeigh was a small cog in a wide-ranging conspiracy involving multiple intelligence agencies and informants working with McVeigh and his inner circle and manipulating their actions.

Now much of what *The Spotlight* first wrote has finally been confirmed for the first time. Although McVeigh publicly claimed he was a "lone bomber," privately he said *The Spotlight* was aiming in the right direction, even thwarting his effort to claim a singular role in history.

Two of McVeigh's friends from death row at the federal prison in Indiana have written a book telling the "inside" story of the bombing, based largely on what McVeigh told them really happened. *Secrets Worth Dying For*, by David Paul Hammer and Jeffrey William Paul, probably

comes much closer to the truth than any other book on the subject.

And, as already noted, although McVeigh publicly proclaimed himself as a “lone bomber”—even dismissing the role of his friend, Terry Nichols—McVeigh told a far different version to his friends in prison. As such, what *Secrets* reports is far more credible than what is found in “mainstream” media books.

The book contends that McVeigh was recruited (while still in the military) by a superior to immerse himself in the rhetoric and lifestyle of the American “militia” and “patriot” movements, traveling from gun show to gun show, reporting back his findings. In short, McVeigh was a federal “snitch.”

However, although unusual from a psychological standpoint, McVeigh evidently shared the views of those he was informing on.

Eventually, McVeigh was ordered to organize a team of “extremists” to carry out a terrorist bombing in the United States in order to give the federal authorities the opportunity to crack down on political dissidents in this country. McVeigh did orchestrate a bombing conspiracy (the details of which he reported back to his superiors) and that conspiracy included at least one other undercover informant, the now-notorious Andreas Strassmeir.

McVeigh himself sent a letter to this author, Michael Collins Piper, from his cell on death row at the federal prison in Terre Haute, Indiana. Inside the envelope was a print-out of an article about an individual named Cary Gagan who claimed to have inside knowledge about the Oklahoma bombing. In his own handwriting on the print-out, McVeigh wrote, “One lie too many smokes out a con artist,” evidently suggesting that Gagan was a liar.

But what made this note from McVeigh interesting was the fact that, never once, had I written anything about Gagan. Instead, my writing for *The Spotlight*, had focused almost exclusively on the Strassmeir connection.

My immediate reaction to receiving this note from McVeigh was to make the deduction that McVeigh was indirectly communicating to me (through a round-about, indirect means) was that *what I actually had written was on the mark*. And now, of course, I have the satisfaction of knowing that I was very much on target all along, much to the dismay of Andreas Strassmeir, Kirk Lyons and all of their allies and handlers in the murky world of covert action.

However, despite all of this, there is much, much more to the ugly “story behind the story” of the Oklahoma City bombing and in the pages that follow we will explore all of this further.

Chapter Thirty-Six

Timothy McVeigh and the ADL: The Untold Story

Immediately after the tragic Oklahoma City bombing, the Washington, D.C.-based *Spotlight* newspaper inadvertently—and by a surprising means—came upon solid evidence that the accused bomber, Timothy McVeigh, was in close and probably sustained contact with an agent of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, and that the ADL had McVeigh under regular surveillance for some time.

Whether that informant was the ubiquitous Andreas Strassmeir, whose own sordid record we've already examined, or someone else, we'll probably never know. But here are the facts which prove that McVeigh and his activities were under the close scrutiny of the ADL.

On April 21, 1995, in an early-morning edition, *The Washington Post* reported—to the surprise of *The Spotlight*—that, in the fall of 1993, McVeigh—using the name “T. Tuttle”—had taken out a classified advertisement which had run for four weekly issues in *The Spotlight*, beginning on Aug. 9, 1993.

According to the *Post*, the source of this information was an ADL press release. Needless to say *The Spotlight* was surprised to learn of this story. So when alerted to this allegation *The Spotlight* staff underwent a time-consuming effort to locate the advertisement and the related in-house paperwork relating to the advertisement.

The Spotlight soon learned from a friendly source with high-level U.S. intelligence contacts that the reason why the ADL knew McVeigh had advertised in *The Spotlight* was because the ADL had an "inside source" in McVeigh's circle.

In the meantime, later that afternoon, *The Spotlight* staff was astounded when the *Post* published a late-morning edition of its April 21, 1995, issue and in reprinting the quite lengthy article about McVeigh, deleted *only* the reference to the ADL's data on McVeigh.

(Now, years later, according to investigators, the first version of that *Post* article seems to have conveniently disappeared from *Post* archives altogether—highly unusual, so they say!)

The Spotlight soon understood why the *Post* had come to the ADL's rescue, covering up the ADL's intimate knowledge about McVeigh when republishing the story.

Although McVeigh had indeed contracted to run the same advertisement in four consecutive issues of *The Spotlight*, the ad did not run the first week (Aug. 9, 1993) it was scheduled. The ad did not actually run until one week later, in the Aug. 16, 1993 issue. Yet, when the ADL had scurried to tip off *The Washington Post*, the ADL reported that the ad had first run in the August 9 issue.

In short, although the ADL knew (through McVeigh or a source close to McVeigh) that McVeigh had contracted to run ads in *The Spotlight* and put that data in its record, the ADL did not know that an in-house scheduling conflict at *The Spotlight* prevented the ad from appearing when it was first scheduled.

Ironically, *The Spotlight's* editor ultimately pulled the ad (which was for a flare gun) because, as he put it, something seemed "suspicious." Consequently the ad never ran as many times as the ADL expected and first noted in its surveillance file on McVeigh!

As a consequence, after the bombing, over a year later, when the ADL rushed to *The Washington Post* with "news" about McVeigh's "link" to *The Spotlight*, they mistakenly cited the first scheduled date for the advertisement. However, the ADL obviously quickly discovered (as did *The Spotlight*) that the ADL's data was incorrect and hastily arranged to have the *Post* re-write its initial story. Obviously, the ADL's mistake did point toward its intimate knowledge of McVeigh's advertising deals.

Since the ADL is known to report its findings to agencies such as the FBI, the BATE, the CIA, and Israel's intelligence service, Mossad, is it unreasonable to ask whether any of these agencies also had knowledge of McVeigh's activities—and his intentions?

There is a final point that needs to be mentioned in relation to the interest of the ADL in the affairs of Timothy McVeigh.

Keeping in mind that there had been conflicting reports about the exact time of Timothy McVeigh's arrival in Oklahoma City prior to the bombing—a point the government was eager to suppress—this lends some credence to the theory that there may have actually been a "Tim McVeigh No. 2" (that is, someone masquerading as McVeigh) as part of a wide-ranging conspiracy of which McVeigh was possibly unaware.

Here's one possible answer as to who may have been masquerading as McVeigh: Ten days after the bombing, a "right wing" Israeli terrorist—28-year-old Sharon Svi Toval (also known as Zvi Sharon) —was arrested in New York by U.S. authorities. Then, under escort and airtight security, Toval was deported to Israel.

The one published photograph of Toval that appeared in *The New York Daily News*, on May 3, 1995, shows a young man who—without beard, mustache and yarmulke—could be mistaken by a stranger for either accused Oklahoma bomber Tim McVeigh or for the person shown in the famous "John Doe No. 1" sketch that authorities released immediately after the bombing and which was used to identify McVeigh.

In light of reports in 1995 that McVeigh's attorneys were looking into the possibility that "right wing terrorists" from Israel—or even Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad itself—had a hand in the bomb-

ing, Toval's specter is intriguing. Couple that with the obvious "inside" knowledge about McVeigh's activities by the Mossad-connected ADL and a whole new light is shed on the affair.

And there's one other point worth noting: Although, before his execution, Timothy McVeigh said that he acted alone in delivering a bomb to the Murrah Building on April 19, 1995, McVeigh never revealed the name of the person in Oklahoma City who—on April 17, two days before the bombing—mailed *The Spotlight* what can only be described as a "warning" of the impending bombing.

The existence of this warning laid myth to McVeigh's claim that no one else—other than Terry Nichols and their friends, Michael and Lori Fortier—knew of the bomb plot. It also raises two pertinent questions: 1) Did the the ADL—which was clearly monitoring McVeigh—have a hand in putting forth this "warning" or have knowledge of who was responsible for sending it? and 2) Why has the FBI refused to comment publicly about what—if anything—the bureau did to identify the person (or persons) who mailed this warning to *The Spotlight*?

Here's the story that only *The Spotlight* and New York's left-wing *Village Voice* (in its October 1, 1997 issue) and later *American Free Press* dared to report.

On April 20, 1995—the day after the OKC bombing—*The Spotlight's* mail room opened an envelope postmarked "Oklahoma City." The envelope had been mailed to *The Spotlight* on April 17—two days before the bombing. It was hand-addressed in script, but we now know that the writing is very clearly not McVeigh's.

Inside the envelope was a postcard featuring a Depression-era photograph depicting a dust storm over Oklahoma. This famous picture is ominously entitled "Black Sunday" (which, incidentally, was also the name of a Hollywood film about terrorism). The postcard also bears the printed legend, "Dust Storm Approaching at 60 mi. per hr. April 14, '35."

Also enclosed alongside the postcard was a photocopy of a twelve-year-old article from *The Spotlight* about the government murder of IRS and Federal Reserve critic Gordon Kahl. There was no name or return address anywhere on the envelope or on any of the contents.

When the staff of *The Spotlight* saw this postcard (just one day after the bombing) they knew something was up and called in *The Spotlight's* attorney, Mark Lane, who immediately turned the original card and envelope over to Attorney General Janet Reno and the FBI.

Although this strange postcard strongly points to foreknowledge (by somebody) about the impending bombing, the FBI subsequently told Lane that they had "lost" the postcard! Fortunately, however, *The Spotlight* had made a copy.

When James Ridgeway, a well-known columnist for *The Village Voice*, learned about the postcard from this author, Ridgeway contacted the FBI in April of 1997, but all an FBI spokesman would say was this: “We have not stated anything in regards [sic] to that.” (The bad grammar was that of the FBI spokesman.)

Several questions arise: Why has the FBI “not stated anything in regards to that”? Whose handwriting is on the envelope? Are we to conclude that it was simply a bizarre coincidence that such an ominous postcard was mailed from Oklahoma City just two days before the bombing?

Or, in the alternative, is it possible that McVeigh himself had no knowledge that this postcard was being mailed to *The Spotlight* and had no part in so doing—that a third party orchestrated the mailing as part of some covert plot to implicate *The Spotlight* in the bombing? (And this, of course, seems likely.)

If *The Spotlight* had simply thrown the postcard away or if their attorney had not turned the material over to the FBI, there’s hardly any doubt about what would have happened then: The FBI would have been told about the postcard from a “source” and FBI agents would have stormed *The Spotlight’s* offices, accusing the staff of “obstructing justice” by destroying evidence, etc.

There’s no question that somebody other than Timothy McVeigh addressed this suspicious envelope and mailed the material within to *The Spotlight*—two days before the bombing. That person had advance knowledge of the impending bombing and, by enclosing *The Spotlight* article, was implicitly linking the death of Gordon Kahl (and *The Spotlight’s* account of his tragic story) to the bombing.

The mystery surrounding this postcard demonstrates, beyond any question, that there’s much more to the Oklahoma City bombing than either McVeigh or the FBI is willing to admit. What motivated McVeigh in not telling the entire story is open to speculation. By the same token, that the FBI is refusing to talk about this postcard only adds fuel to the continuing doubts about what really happened in Oklahoma City.

The bottom line, though, is that the FBI and its allies at the ADL know much more about the Oklahoma City bombing than they are willing to admit, and no doubt for very good reason: exposure of the truth would demonstrate, beyond any question, that Judas Goats—The Enemy Within were ultimately responsible for what happened in Oklahoma City on the tragic day in 1995.

Chapter Thirty-Seven

Disinformation Central: Neo-Conservative Zionist Propaganda Regarding the Oklahoma City Bombing

In the spring of 2004—supported by major pro-Zionist elements in the media monopoly—high-level figures from the pro-Israel neo-conservative network began promoting a book claiming Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein had been behind the Oklahoma City bombing and that reputed Islamic terrorist ringleader Ramzi Yousef—a purported operative of Al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden—was a key player in the affair.

The theory that the two Arab leaders, Saddam and bin Laden, were involved in a highly unlikely alliance to blow up the Murrah Building and blame it on American “lily white” patsies came at precisely the time when the neo-conservatives were struggling to explain the utter failure of the U.S. war in Iraq. The “Saddam Bombed Oklahoma City” crowd touted this theory as another justification for a war that, as most Americans now know, was based on a patchwork of horrendous lies.

The neo-conservative promotion of *The Third Terrorist*, by former Oklahoma City television journalist Jayna Davis, is an after-the-fact means to justify the misdeeds and misinformation by the neo-conservatives and their allies in Israel who helped bring the war about.

Former CIA Director James Woolsey and Frank Gaffney (a longtime colleague of neo-conservative intriguer Richard Perle, once investigated by the FBI for espionage on behalf of Israel) were just two of the neo-conservatives who lent their names to the promotional efforts behind the new book.

In the meantime, *U.S. News & World Report*, published by hard-line pro-Israel ideologue Mort Zuckerman, former chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, along with Fox News (owned by pro-Israel billionaire Rupert Murdoch) also joined the chorus promoting the book.

For its part, *The Wall Street Journal* not only hyped Davis's claim of Saddam's involvement in the Oklahoma affair but even conjoined it with the conspiracy theory concocted by neo-conservative writer Laurie Mylroie who asserts Saddam was also behind the first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993.

In addition, *Vanity Fair*—published by pro-Israel media titan S. I. Newhouse—offered a friendly profile of Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz noting that a “longtime friend” of Wolfowitz (probably the aforementioned Perle) says Wolfowitz has long believed Saddam was behind the Oklahoma tragedy.

Of particular interest is the background of the chief sponsor of *The Third Terrorist*: WND Books, an enterprise of Joseph Farah, editor of

Internet-based World Net Daily. Not only has Farah long operated in the sphere of billionaire Richard Scaife, whose CIA-connected intrigues go back decades, but in 2003 Farah was honored as “journalist of the year” by the Zionist Organization of America, one of the most vociferous advocates of the war against Saddam. Although an Arab-American, Farah is a fervent supporter of Israel and hardly an unbiased source.

Now about the book: Jayna Davis presented a convincing case that Timothy McVeigh was traveling with at least one—and likely more—Iraqi nationals (based in Oklahoma City) in the minutes, days, weeks and months leading up to the disaster. And—although she never mentions it—it was the now-defunct *Spotlight* that most consistently gave attention to Davis’ investigation, even while “mainstream” news sources studiously ignored her work.

However, obviously, that’s changed. But to those who carefully reviewed *The Spotlight’s* reportage on Davis’s work, none of this comes as any surprise, for—as *The Spotlight* said early on—so-called evidence of “Iraqi” involvement actually pointed elsewhere: that is, toward the likelihood that elements operating inside the U.S. (and manipulating McVeigh) were setting the stage for a terrorist attack that could be falsely blamed on Saddam, for the very purpose of stoking up a war against the Iraqi strongman—a war that finally came in the spring of 2003.

Although Davis no doubt believes that there was a Middle East connection—of Arab or Muslim origin—ultimately behind the bombing, there are many serious problems with her book. First of all, Davis completely disregarded the following critical evidence:

- Eyewitness testimony by bombing survivor Jane Graham, who—a day or so prior to the bombing—spotted a group of mysterious figures engaged in activity which suggests they were placing explosives inside the Murrah Building; these men were not Arabs, they were white Americans and definitely neither McVeigh nor his alleged co-conspirator Terry Nichols;

- Testimony by multiple bombing survivors—including, notably, V. Z. Lawton—who insist there was a major internal blast inside the Murrah Building following the explosion of the “McVeigh truck bomb” outside on the street;

- Seismographic data indicating more than one blast at the time of the disaster;

- And while multiple news reports at the time—from a wide array of sources—indicated other unexploded bombs had been found inside the Murrah Building after the explosion, Davis stated flatly that these bomb scares “proved innocuous.”

- Although Davis referenced the heroics of Oklahoma City police-

man Terrence Yeakey—almost gratuitously—she never mentioned that Yeakey’s purported suicide is deemed “murder” by his friends and family who believe, based on Yeakey’s remarks at the time, that he witnessed something either before or after the bombing that led him to believe the authorities were covering up the truth about what really happened.

- Most notably, Davis never once referenced the intrigues of Hebrew-speaking former German military intelligence officer Andreas Strassmeir, almost certainly an undercover informant, most likely working for the CIA or the FBI or some “private” agency such as the Southern Poverty Law Center or the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith, an acknowledged asset of Israel’s clandestine services unit, the Mossad.

Although, of course, it was not Davis’ intent to explore all of the mysteries surrounding the bombing, it was disconcerting that she ignored some of the more notable questions that have arisen in its wake. Her focus was the purported “Iraqi connection” but even in that regard she actually leaves more questions unanswered than answered.

There are those who say Davis’s book was simply looking at a small part of a much larger picture and ignoring relevant details that—taken together in their entirety—point in another direction entirely.

Davis never adequately explained why the FBI—under either Bill Clinton or George W. Bush—would be so eager to suppress evidence that Saddam Hussein and/or “Islamic” or “Arabic” militants working with Saddam or in his sphere of influence had been involved in the Oklahoma tragedy.

Her best—albeit quite lame—explanation was the excuse that the Democratic Clinton administration (in power at the time of the bombing) did not want to admit that it ignored “warnings” of a possible attack put forth by a Republican Party-associated operative on Capitol Hill, Israeli-born “terrorism expert” Yosef Bodansky, who just happened to be one of Davis’s key sources. Davis made the highly unlikely assertion that Democrats in the Clinton administration would have been inclined to dismiss Bodansky’s warnings as “Zionist propaganda.”

In fact, in one respect, there may be some grain of truth to this, but in a quite different way than Davis suggested.

There is no question that—as Davis herself demonstrated—Israeli operatives landed in Oklahoma City immediately after the bombing and began promoting the theory that, as one of Davis’s Israeli sources put it, “the bomb which destroyed the Murrah Building was constructed by Arab terrorists or people trained by Arab terrorists.”

But what Davis never explored (or never mentioned, for it would not fit with her theory) is the possibility that the Clinton administration had no desire to crank up a war against Saddam, recognizing the Israeli

claim that Saddam was behind the bombing was part of the long-standing neo-conservative drive to topple the Iraqi leader.

In one instance Davis pointed out that a Senate staffer told her she was known as “the baby with the loaded gun.” The fear was, he said, that “they don’t know where you are going to point it next.” Although Davis evidently never considered it, one could read into this remark that perhaps Davis’s dogged inquiries were going a bit too far.

In short, if Davis started digging too deeply into the “Iraqi connection” she could discover something quite the opposite: that the Iraqi connection was another Israeli “false flag” designed to shift the blame for a covert operation carried out by Israeli intelligence.

So although Davis painted a fairly convincing picture that an Iraqi immigrant, Hussain Al-Hussaini, was in league with McVeigh in the Oklahoma bombing, her book is unclear in explaining whether she believes it was Saddam’s sworn enemy, Islamic fundamentalist Osama bin Laden or Iraq’s secular Arab ruler Saddam (who actively suppressed Islamic fundamentalists) who was the ultimate sponsor of Al-Hussaini.

Instead, Davis weaved a tangled story that links Osama and Saddam in an unlikely scenario that never precisely pinpoints the finger of blame—a rather important detail that seems to be missed by those so eager to accept her thesis. A discerning reader will note this immediately, but then, again, most readers are not that discerning, a point arguing in favor of the likelihood that many will—regrettably—take Davis’s book seriously. (“Arab plots” *are* popular in the media these days.)

At one point, she does state that “it really is a foreign conspiracy masterminded and funded by Osama bin Laden, according to my intelligence sources,” but this flat-out charge is refuted by other claims she made elsewhere regarding Al-Hussaini having “possibly” (her word) been “a devoted member of Saddam Hussein’s prized military unit, the Republican Guard,” (and therefore an agent of Saddam—not Bin Laden).

When Davis begins to explore the purported link of the mysterious Ramzi Yousef to the Oklahoma affair is when her theory really begins to unravel. For here, she is treading on shaky ground, attempting to tie an alleged Islamic fundamentalist (ostensibly under the discipline of bin Laden’s Al-Qaeda network) to an agent of Saddam Hussein—the Iraqi leader whom bin Laden himself had vowed to destroy.

And there are real questions about just whom Yousef and his uncle, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed (said to be Al Qaeda’s chief of operations) were *really* working for.

As we saw earlier in these pages, evidence first published by Jewish-American journalist Robert I. Friedman in New York’s *Village Voice* indicates Yousef was working closely with an Israeli mole inside

the conspiracy behind the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center (WTC), forerunner of the September 11, 2001 tragedy.

So when Davis asserted that “the terrorist who engineered the delivery of a Ryder truck packed with a powerful fertilizer-fuel oil bomb to America’s financial district likely orchestrated a similarly executed bombing in Oklahoma City,” she was—unwittingly—suggesting that perhaps Israeli intelligence may have also had a hand in Oklahoma as it did in the 1993 WTC attack.

But don’t expect Davis or her media promoters to say that.

All of this is not to suggest Davis is deliberately promoting false information. However, it is conceivable that Davis—driven by a desire to bring her painstakingly assembled story to the fore—has been manipulated and that she has not recognized or understood the more subtle intricacies of the world of intrigue.

To sum it all up: there was much, much more to the Oklahoma bombing than most Americans realize—and those hidden facts point unmistakably to the role of Judas Goats—The Enemy Within.

Chapter Thirty-Eight

What Really Happened in Oklahoma City? A Scenario That Does Make Sense

Let us note, at the outset, that what follows in this brief chapter is purely speculative in nature. However, it is based upon this author's own long-term review of a wide variety of published information put together by many different independent Oklahoma City bombing investigators, not to mention an assortment of facts and statements put forth by official investigators.

And it should be added that even within the ranks of those who have been investigating the OKC bombing, there is a great range of differing opinion as to precisely what happened on that tragic day.

Most of the varying theories intersect at some points, but the truth is that most of those who put forth what *appear to be competing* theories seem to be quite prepared to dismiss the basics of the other theories, quibbling with details or deliberately ignoring uncomfortable facts that would suggest that the conspiracy led in directions that they would prefer to ignore.

It must be noted here that many of those supposedly "independent" investigators who choose to ignore uncomfortable facts appear to be afraid to suggest that, perhaps, there might be an Israeli connection to the Oklahoma City tragedy. Some of them, for example, reason to acknowledge that the Arab players who have been linked to the conspiracy may, in fact, have been acting as "false flags" for Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad. (That aspect, of course, has already been discussed at some length in a previous chapter.)

So what of the various theories? Let's review them and attempt to delineate, as simply as possible, the main points of each..

Some hold that it was a "U.S. government operation" deliberately designed to destroy the Murrah Building and place blame upon "right wing militias" for the purpose of setting in place police-state measures ultimately designed to impose martial law on the United States and thereby dissolve our Constitutional republic.

Many promoters of this scenario suggest that the orders "came from the top"—that is, that President Bill Clinton and his top advisors were "in on it," acting perhaps as proxies for favorite villains such as "the Illuminati" or the Council on Foreign Relations or some other shadowy international power bloc. This is the simplistic version that disregards some of the more down to earth details that we'll explore shortly.

While some contend that McVeigh was simply a "patsy"—perhaps brainwashed and under mind control—others suggest that McVeigh was a knowing agent of higher-ranking behind-the-scenes conspirators, that he was part of a secret government team staging acts of terrorism.

Others contend McVeigh was “for real”—that he was actively conspiring to blow up the federal building on his own (along with a handful of other extremists, known and unknown) and that government authorities allowed the conspiracy to go forward, again for the purpose of clamping down on the militias and setting in place a police state as part of a grand design for a New World Order.

In contrast, there are those who say that while the government was aware of McVeigh’s plans, a federal sting operation (perhaps by the BATF) designed to stop—and expose—McVeigh and his collaborators went awry; that the bomb went off and destroyed the Murrah Building and that the government agents who failed to prevent the tragedy from happening were thus forced into a cover-up mode.

This thesis is based on the theme that the BATF was smarting under public scrutiny as a result of the debacle at Waco with the Branch Davidian church and that the BATF was trying to show how valuable its efforts were in fighting “extremism” of the type of which McVeigh was found guilty. However, of course, according to this theory, the BATF bungled and the bombing took place.

Generally, this thesis contends that McVeigh was “for real,” so to speak, but that government bungling allowed the tragedy to happen and that the cover-up by the government was necessary to keep the truth about government incompetence from reaching the public.

Another variation on one or more of the above versions of “what happened” is that McVeigh and his co-conspirators were planning to set off a bomb in front of the Murrah Building, but that others—generally said to be “government agents”—also put bombs inside the building and made sure there was a massive loss of life and major destruction. This thesis is founded on the reasonable contention that only government agents would have the kind of access to the Murrah Building (a federal facility) in order to make such a scenario possible.

And then, of course, as we have seen, there are those who say that either Osama bin Laden or Saddam Hussein (or both working together) were ultimately responsible for what happened in Oklahoma City. This thesis, obviously, is the least likely scenario, but, as we’ve already noted, it is this thesis that has received the most widespread publicity other than that accorded the official government scenario that McVeigh was effectively, a “lone nut” (with the exception of peripheral involvement by his friend Terry Nichols, and possible foreknowledge by his friends Michael and Lori Fortier).

In the end, however, there is one scenario which, in its entirety, ties many of these threads together in a way that does seem to make sense. And that is the scenario we now put forth.

Our Oklahoma City bombing scenario follows: Timothy McVeigh was a young man—an ex-Army combat veteran—with leanings toward the philosophy of the “right wing” and the militia movement. He may have been recruited by a secret intelligence unit to infiltrate the militias and report back on their activities.

This assignment to infiltrate the militias was part of a calculated effort to place McVeigh in the position of being—in the public perception—precisely the type of “right wing militia” activist that he (McVeigh) believed he was monitoring for his superiors (who had a covert agenda kept well hidden from McVeigh).

McVeigh himself—if sympathetic to the militias, as many believe, based on what are purported to be McVeigh’s own writings and statements—was probably told that he was acting on behalf of higher-ups in the government or in the military who were sympathetic to the militias, seeing them as a possible ally in some ultimate fight against the dreaded “New World Order.”

In this part of the scenario, McVeigh may have believed, as a consequence, that he was not acting as a “rat” or as an informant but was, instead, working to help the militia movement by acting as a liaison between the movement and its purported sympathizers inside the federal military or law enforcement apparatus.

There is also the possibility that as an aspect of his recruitment and training, as part of some clandestine operation, McVeigh was subjected—even at this early stage—to some form of programming or mind-control of which he may not have been aware.

McVeigh’s former federal prison associate, David Paul Hammer, has put forth the idea that McVeigh had been recruited into some secret unit and that McVeigh was indeed sympathetic to the philosophy of the militia groups he was monitoring.

However—and here’s the point—it is entirely possible that the unit (or entity) that recruited McVeigh was *not* an officially-sanctioned U.S. government operation *per se*, and was, instead, a “rogue” operation under the thumb of a genuine militia sympathizer within U.S. military and intelligence circles.

There is another alternative: this operation (which had enough earmarks to convince McVeigh that it was U.S.-government sponsored) may not have even been a U.S. government operation at all. Instead, it could have been a totally spurious operation, set up on American shores by Israel’s Mossad.

This Mossad operation could have been utilizing home-grown American assets who were—either knowingly or unknowingly—working on behalf of Israeli intelligence. In other words, even McVeigh’s

immediate supervisors may have been hoodwinked by the Israelis and may have never even suspected it; that is, genuine militia sympathizers in U.S. military circles may have been co-opted by the Mossad and thus, in turn, were used to recruit McVeigh and other individuals.

In short, we're talking about layer upon layer of intrigue, but actually rather simple in its set-up. And that is a hallmark of the Mossad's classic use of "false flags" and false identities in pursuit of its historically insidious games of intrigue.

With all of this in place, Timothy McVeigh began moving in militia circles, making contact with seemingly like-minded individuals. And in short order, as we have seen, McVeigh's activities were clearly being monitored, at least in part, by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, a most efficient arm of the Mossad.

It was during this same time frame that McVeigh had found among his new associates an enigmatic individual by the name of Andreas Strassmeir, who, as we have seen in earlier chapters, had quite stellar military and intelligence connections both here and abroad, not to mention the fact that he spoke Hebrew, the state language of Israel. Hardly, as we've noted, the profile of your run-of-the-mill "neo-Nazi" or "white racialist" agitator.

There was obviously much more to Strassmeir and his close friend and attorney, Kirk Lyons, as well Lyons' associate, Dave Holloway, a former CIA pilot, than they would have us believe.

In any case, as we now know, undercover informant Strassmeir and the denizens of Elohim City, the now-infamous "Christian Identity" compound, were under surveillance by at least one division of the BATE, that office which utilized young Carol Howe as an informant. Miss Howe was reporting to her handlers at the BATE, describing talk by Strassmeir of attacking U.S. federal buildings.

However, in the end, of course, the U.S. government did all in its power to dismiss Miss Howe's claims regarding Strassmeir despite the fact that the record is clear that she had made her claims about Strassmeir well before the Oklahoma City bombing took place.

Thus, it seems, one hand of the U.S. government intelligence apparatus (that directing Miss Howe) was perhaps unaware of the other hand directing the activities of Strassmeir (and McVeigh).

This would not be the first time that such a thing happened. As noted earlier, at the very time one division of the CIA was utilizing and funding informants inside the anti-Vietnam War movement, other divisions of the CIA and even the FBI were spending millions of dollars working to combat the anti-war movement.

And all of this does not preclude the possibility—dare we say the

likelihood—that domestic government elements involved in manipulating Strassmeir and McVeigh were also working hand-in-glove (knowingly or unknowingly) with a foreign intelligence network, namely that of Israel. And needless to say, Israel was the only foreign government that any interest whatsoever in discrediting the domestic American “right wing” circles (often anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist) in which Strassmeir and Lyons and McVeigh were operating.*

* SOME YEARS AGO, this author, Michael Collins Piper, had the opportunity to directly confront Kirk Lyons and charge him with being a Judas Goat. Although I had long held suspicions about Lyons, due to several things I had observed about him over the years, colleagues had counseled me to keep my suspicions under wraps since Lyons was ostensibly a “friend” of my employer, Liberty Lobby, the populist institution that published *The Spotlight*.

Finally, however, at the time the details surrounding Lyons’ links to Strassmeir were coming to the fore, Lyons popped up as an open player in the destruction of the Populist Party which Liberty Lobby had played an instrumental part in creating. Lyons revealed his open hostility to Liberty Lobby when he represented a party official, Donald Wassall, in a legal matter that required me to serve as a witness in federal court and be questioned under oath by Lyons. It was then that I confronted Lyons—much to Lyons’ apparent distress.

At one point during the trial, when Lyons asked me a question regarding some material that had appeared in *The Spotlight*, I responded, “My source on that, Mr. Lyons, was *your* FBI.” The emphasis was on the word “your.” My intent was to publicly, if rather subtly, suggest to Lyons—as I had already charged openly in *The Spotlight*—that Lyons was an FBI collaborator based on his association with Strassmeir who was (as we now know) indeed an undercover informant.

Although my remark certainly went over the heads of the jury and probably most others in the courtroom, including Judge Lancaster himself, Lyons literally jumped back a foot or two, shrieking, “Objection.” His eyes were blazing. It occurred to me at that moment that I was *absolutely on target* and Lyons was thoroughly astounded, horrified, angry that I had dared to make that accusation to his face, probably the first time it had ever been done.

The opposing attorney jumped in, addressing the judge, saying, more or less, “Your honor, there’s nothing wrong with what Mr. Piper said. It’s Mr. Lyons’ FBI. It’s *your* FBI. It’s *everybody’s* FBI. We see no reason for Mr. Lyons to object.” Lyons sputtered again, fuming, and Judge Lancaster slapped him down, saying, “Mr. Lyons, step back.” Lyons obediently did so. Then Lancaster ordered Lyons to “have a drink of water.” Dutifully, almost sheepishly, Lyons did have a drink of water. Then the judge instructed Lyons he could continue.

Having seen Lyons’ response—up close and personal—I now had no doubt whatsoever that Lyons was indeed a Judas Goat. Although he postured as a “nationalist attorney,” he and his associate, Dave Holloway, a former CIA pilot, (and their friend Andreas Strassmeir) were deep in the world of intrigue and betraying the trust of so many good nationalists who believed in them.

In the meantime, of course, we must add to this already complex mix the evidence indicating that there were also foreign-born Arabs—at least one, and maybe more—involved with McVeigh in the weeks prior to the bombing. And, as we've seen in some detail in an earlier chapter, this "Arab connection" does point toward the likelihood of Israeli Mossad involvement.

Of course, there are many independent Oklahoma bombing investigators who will be—for obvious reasons—loathe to mention the possible (even likely) Israeli connection, despite all the evidence that stares them in the face. These people rightly fear being accused of "anti-Semitism," but the truth is that by even putting forth "alternative" theories of "what really happened in Oklahoma City" they have already put themselves in the position of being "monitored" by the Anti-Defamation League, the Southern Poverty Law Center, the FBI, the BATF, the CIA and every other entity that keep an eye on those folks who dare to question the official U.S. government scenario about the events that took place in Oklahoma City.

It is not by coincidence that the scenario outlined in this chapter echoes the model of a scenario that this author, Michael Collins Piper, has already put forth in the book *Final Judgment*, regarding the assassination of John F. Kennedy, a scenario that also places Israel's Mossad at the center of the machinations and circumstances surrounding the murder of our 35th president.

That scenario contends, essentially, that elements inside the American CIA—eager to bring down Fidel Castro of Cuba—were setting up a "dummy" assassination attempt on President Kennedy, one designed to fail but, at the same time, sensational enough to cause a public clamor for President Kennedy to invade Cuba.

Shots were to be fired on President Kennedy as he triumphantly paraded through Dallas, with evidence then to be found implicating Castro's Cuba. There are some who have suggested that JFK's brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, may have been involved in the operation, perhaps even with the knowledge of the president.

This scenario suggests that the president's behind-the-scenes friendly gestures toward Castro were part of a scheme to mislead the Cuban communist leader and then set him up for a fall, although even this aspect of this particular scenario is subject to scholarly debate.

In any case, what role Lee Harvey Oswald, ultimately accused of being the president's assassin, played in the scenario has yet to be determined, but, more than likely, his role was simply to deliver to the crime scene the weapon slated to be discovered by the Dallas police after the

“failed assassination attempt.” Increasingly, it is becoming all too clear that Oswald never fired a single shot that tragic day in Dallas.

But, as the basic scenario unfolded, outside intervention turned the “dummy” assassination attempt into the real thing. In other words, while Oswald carried out his assignment—at the behest of his handlers, who were almost certainly CIA officials or contract agents who thought they were carrying out the “dummy” attempt on JFK—some very real assassins set up shop in Dealey Plaza and carried out a very real assassination.

The effect of the murder was to compromise otherwise innocent CIA officials in a crime that they never intended to happen. And, then again, there were almost certainly a handful of domestic intelligence officials, in the CIA specifically, who were very much aware that a real assassination was scheduled to take place.

In *Final Judgment*, we assert that the CIA’s chief of counterintelligence, James J. Angleton—a dedicated Israeli loyalist—was foremost among them. And as for Oswald himself, he was silenced before he could ever publicly tell what he knew or thought he knew.

Essentially, outside elements aware of the intended “dummy” assassination intervened and turned everything upside down, thus setting the stage for a massive cover-up.

We contend here that what we’ve outlined regarding the Oklahoma City tragedy is the most likely scenario of how the bombing unfolded, a conspiracy that employed almost precisely the same model used in the public execution of John F. Kennedy.

Thus, it seems likely that Timothy McVeigh was quite cognizant of a plan to explode a bomb outside the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City. McVeigh and his co-conspirators were being monitored and manipulated by those whom we describe as “higher forces” who were fully intent on allowing McVeigh’s truck bomb to explode.

At the same time, there appear to have been some inside the U.S. intelligence agencies (specifically the BATF) who may have attempted to thwart McVeigh’s plans, but then failed, either because of classic government incompetence or—in a more sinister scenario—perhaps precisely because they themselves were thwarted by their colleagues who were witting or unwitting accomplices of the “higher forces.”

In the end, as a consequence of the fact that myriad U.S. government agencies—including the BATF, the FBI, the CIA and probably others—had been tuned in to McVeigh’s activities long before the bombing (and also those of Strassmeir), this put the government in a critically necessary cover-up mode that led to the ultimate “lone bomber” scenario that became the official U.S. government line.

As we've seen, however, there is enough evidence to suggest that the so-called "international connections" to the Oklahoma City bombing do not point toward Osama bin Laden or Saddam Hussein, either working together or independently of one another.

Instead, they point to Israel.

The bottom line is this: it is our contention that the Oklahoma bombing can ultimately be attributed to Israel: That Israeli intelligence used its considerable influence at wide-reaching levels inside American law enforcement—and through such domestic spying operations as the ADL and the Southern Poverty Law Center—to manipulate Timothy McVeigh (and his various associates, including Andreas Strassmeir and others) to carry out the chain of events that led to the disaster in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995.

And although there were repeated efforts—from the beginning—to lay a trail of evidence linking the tragedy to Osama bin Laden and/or Saddam Hussein (all the work of Israeli intelligence and those in its sphere of influence) there was enough resistance inside the U.S. government that this Israeli scheme to spark a U.S. military reaction was stopped in its tracks.

However, on September 11, 2001—we believe—Israel accomplished (on a far grander scale) what it tried, and failed, in Oklahoma City: that is, orchestrating a shocking terrorist event on American soil, blaming it on "the Arabs" and setting the stage for U.S. military intervention in the Middle East.

And let us close by noting this: *there is nothing to refute this scenario of likely Israeli involvement in the Oklahoma City bombing.*

The fact remains that most honest independent investigators now concede that Andreas Strassmeir was an undercover informant for the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) and that American law enforcement officials were aware of this. Furthermore, there is absolutely no question that the SPLC and the allied Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith have long acted jointly (and independently) as agents of the Israeli lobby in America. And all of this does not even address the obvious point that Strassmeir, though his own connections abroad, had a history of involvement with Israel, even having an Israeli girlfriend.

To continue further would only belabor the point that Israel most certainly had a role in the Oklahoma City bombing. The truth is that The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within have been effectively utilized by Zionist elements time and time again in American history, and Oklahoma City, as well as the JFK assassination and 9-11, are just some of the more notable examples.

Chapter Thirty-Nine

Talmudic Justice . . .

The Criminal Misdeeds of Michael Chertoff: Chief Tactician in the Zionist Campaign to Crucify Jim Traficant and David Duke

The former Justice Department official (a fervent supporter of Israel) who trumped up phony “corruption” charges against two prominent and outspoken critics of the Israeli lobby now holds one of the most powerful posts in America today: chief of homeland security.

How Michael Chertoff railroaded then-U.S. Congressman Jim Traficant (D-Ohio) and former State Rep. David Duke (R-La.) into federal prison is instructive. It says much about “who rules” in the United States today and is a perfect case study of how the “justice” system is used to punish those who question Zionist power in America.

When President George W. Bush named Chertoff to serve as secretary of homeland security, that nomination was widely hailed by the pro-Israel mass media. Chertoff was being made the central figure determining and dictating “who’s a patriot and who isn’t” to thousands of law enforcement officers across the nation. Republicans said Chertoff was a “wonderful Jewish conservative,” that Chertoff—touted by the media as “the son of a rabbi”—was a “Mafia-busting” assistant U.S. attorney who later “served with distinction” as chief of the criminal division of the Justice Department under then-Attorney General John Ashcroft.

Those were bare-bones details, but the unreported aspects of Chertoff’s path to power raised real questions as to whether he should serve in such a sensitive post. What went unreported—except by Christopher Bollyn in *American Free Press*—was that Chertoff’s mother, a citizen of Israel, had once worked for Israeli intelligence. And, of course, for many years, Chertoff himself was a part of the pro-Israel “ex-Trotskyite” neo-conservative network which is the prime mover behind the Zionist web of influence in official Washington today.

Chertoff is a protégé of the father-and-son team of Zionist propagandists, Irving and William Kristol. As far back as Jan. 29, 1996, *The Weekly Standard*—the “neo-conservative” journal funded by Rupert Murdoch and edited by William Kristol—was hyping Chertoff as an up-and-coming figure in Washington, a sure sign Chertoff was approved by the Rothschild dynasty which stands behind Murdoch’s media empire.

Chertoff was among the founding members of a legal group known as the Federalist Society that has been funded by foundations in the Kristol sphere of influence, namely the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation and the John M. Olin Foundation. These foundations are known for their ties to hawkish elements in Israel and to arms manufacturers that profit through the U.S. “special relationship” with Israel.

This is all significant considering that, as chief of the Justice Department’s criminal division, Chertoff released dozens of Israelis whom the FBI had arrested after the 9-11 attacks, suspecting those Israelis of having foreknowledge of—or involvement in—that tragedy.

Although John Ashcroft—a fanatic Christian devotee of Israel—headed the department, Chertoff was the real power behind the scenes. And based on his career at Justice, it is appropriate to dub Chertoff “Bush’s Beria,” recalling Lavrenti Beria, the notorious chief executioner for Soviet leader Josef Stalin, although the analogy might upset Chertoff’s “ex-Trotskyite” friends. In any case, the record shows Chertoff was a political executioner on behalf of the Zionist cause.

His first major high-profile victim was then-Rep. Jim Traficant (D-Ohio), the outspoken populist maverick. Chertoff was finishing a job the Justice Department failed to finish some 20 years before.

Back in 1983—when Chertoff was entering Justice Department service (as an assistant U.S. attorney) and Traficant was a popular county sheriff in Ohio—Traficant conducted his own successful defense against dubious Justice Department criminal charges claiming he took bribes from “the Mafia.” Acquitting Traficant, the jury sent embarrassed Justice lawyers back to Washington. Soon afterward Ohio voters also sent Traficant to Washington: in 1984 the sheriff (a local folk hero) was elected to Congress, soon emerging as the only serious congressional critic of the powers-that-be during the last decade of the 20th century.

When Chertoff had the opportunity to “get” Traficant, he did. Although dozens of members of Congress could be convicted of major offenses involving influence peddling that is often quite open but *never* prosecuted, Chertoff spent several years conjuring up dubious (and quite penny-ante) charges against Traficant.

In fact, here are some of Traficant's real "crimes" in the eyes of the elite who worked overtime to railroad Traficant into prison:

- Criticizing the Internal Revenue Service and calling for expanded protection for the rights of taxpayers under fire from the IRS;
- Taking a hard-line stand against NAFTA, the World Trade Organization, and so-called “free” trade, and urging protectionist measures to protect American jobs and defend domestic industry;
- Tackling corruption inside the FBI and the Justice Department;
- Attacking Wall Street predators and raising questions about the enrichment of high-level financial interests through the lending practices of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund;
- Calling for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from around the globe and questioning U.S. meddling in the affairs of other nations;
- Charging American policy-makers with treason for having given top-secret U.S. defense and nuclear technology to Red China;
- Demanding that U.S. troops be sent to guard the Mexican border and prevent continuing hordes of illegal aliens—and potential terrorists—from entering the United States; and—last but very far from least:
- Challenging one-sided U.S. support for Israel to the detriment of America’s security and interests. In fact, Traficant was the only member of Congress, the day after the 9-11 attacks, to point out that U.S. support for Israel was a root problem of the tragedy.

Despite *all* of this, in the end, it was Traficant's brash public challenge to the Israeli lobby that was—in Traficant's own judgment—the reason why the Zionist-dominated Justice Department was so determined to knock Traficant out of Congress and into prison.

In fact, in 1983, at the time of the first Justice Department attack on Traficant—and all during the years of GOP rule under Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush—Justice (along with other federal agencies) was penetrated in key posts by members of a clique acting as an "inside" pressure group for Zionist interests. The existence of the group—known as "Nesher" (Hebrew for "eagle")—was revealed by the late Andrew St. George in *The Spotlight*. While Nesher acknowledged that its members' Zionist views influenced their policy decisions, the story was controversial and one Nesher figure threatened to bring a libel suit. However, St. George deftly leaked the evidence he had to back up his story, and Nesher backed off. But Nesher—often called "The Talmudist Lobby" by its critics—remains in place, *even today* . . .

Not coincidentally, *The Spotlight* was shut down in 2001 by corrupt federal Judge S. Martin Teel who had been a Justice Department attorney under the thumb of key Nesher operative, then-Deputy Attorney General Arnold Burns, who was then mired in an ugly scandal involving the theft—by Justice officials—of high-tech surveillance software belonging to the INSLAW company. In fact, INSLAW discovered the stolen data had been turned over to Israeli intelligence, for whom Burns was known to have done many "favors" over the years.

When INSLAW brought suit against the thieves, Teel was the Justice lawyer fighting that lawsuit and was rewarded with his judgeship after the judge in the case (who ruled against the Justice Department) was forced off the bench by Nesher operative Arnold Burns.

One detail about Nesher and INSLAW brings the matter of Jim Traficant's prosecution full circle: It turns out that the Justice unit that stole INSLAW's software was the Office of Special Investigations (OSI)—the Mossad-collaborating "Nazi hunting unit" in Justice. Traficant exposed the OSI as a fraud when he came to the defense of Ukraine-born naturalized American, John Demjanjuk, a retired Cleveland, Ohio autoworker, who had been falsely accused by Jewish groups and the OSI of being "Ivan the Terrible," a so-called "Nazi death camp guard." During the entire time the Zionists in the OSI were persecuting Demjanjuk, Traficant was the only member of Congress who came to his defense, drawing the ire of Jewish groups and the Nesher network for doing so.

Although stripped of his citizenship and sent to Israel where he was charged and convicted of war crimes, Demjanjuk escaped the hangman's noose when, in 1993, the Israeli supreme court overturned his conviction, admitting Traficant and others had proven Demjanjuk had been misidentified as being "Ivan." Traficant then traveled to Israel to bring Demjanjuk home. Despite all this, the Chertoff gang and the OSI came up with new charges against Demjanjuk, saying that if he wasn't

“Ivan,” he was still a Nazi war criminal and must be deported.

In any case, Traficant was clearly a Zionist target, and the chief Nesherite at the Justice Department, Chertoff, began moving against him. Utilizing nearly 100 attorneys and FBI agents, Chertoff spent some \$10 million over several years dragging Traficant’s friends and associates—even people with only a tertiary link to Traficant—before a long-running grand jury in hopes of getting some charge against Traficant.

Chertoff’s scheme was to indict a number of Traficant associates in Ohio and offer them “deals” in return for providing “evidence” of Traficant’s corruption, or otherwise threaten people with indictment unless they provided testimony against Traficant. Through this tactic, Chertoff cobbled together, for public consumption, an image of vast corruption surrounding Traficant. The Zionist-controlled media actively aided Chertoff in promulgating this image. The media repeatedly churned up stories about “the Mafia” and “organized crime” in Traficant’s home town as if to suggest Traficant—an Italian-American—was part of it. Often, the stories had nothing to do with Traficant at all. And despite the media’s “Mafia” drama, *not one of the charges Chertoff filed against Traficant had anything to do with organized crime in any way.*

Chertoff and the media talked of “racketeering” by Traficant, using that specific legal term to conjure up the “gangster” scenario in the public mind. The so-called racketeering was alleged to be part of a so-called “pattern of corruption” by Traficant. This “racketeering” included such nefarious misdeeds as having a congressional staffer help with chores on Traficant’s farm in Ohio and help do repairs to the rickety houseboat which Traficant lived on in the Washington harbor because he could not afford an elegant apartment due to an IRS garnishment of his wages.

While the charges against Traficant sounded sinister—such as “conspiracy to violate bribery statutes, seeking and accepting illegal gratuities, obstruction of justice, conspiracy to defraud the government, tax evasion and racketeering”—close analysis demonstrates that neither Traficant’s actions nor his intent were illegal or even vaguely sinister.

Traficant was charged with such heinous crimes as allowing a constituent (who was a personal friend) to pour concrete on his farm. Chertoff said this was “bribery” because Traficant wrote a letter urging that a federal contract be awarded to his friend’s construction company (which employed many people in Traficant’s district). This was no crime. This was old-fashioned (and honorable) constituent service.

When Traficant went to trial, the judge, Lesley Wells, repeatedly showed her hostility to the populist maverick. At one point, she denied Traficant the right to call an expert witness, a financial crimes investigator, who could refute the lie that Traficant had forced a staffer, Allen Sinclair, to pay him a regular \$2,500 kickback from Sinclair’s salary.

The investigator had discovered that every time Sinclair withdrew \$2,500 from his personal account, the same amount showed up going into Sinclair’s lawyer’s trust account. Prosecutors claimed that money

had been given in cash to Traficant. However, the judge would not let the investigator testify. This testimony (if heard by the jury) would have certainly dealt a mortal wound to the conspiracy to crucify Traficant.

Earlier, during jury selection, the judge wouldn't allow Traficant to ask potential jurors about their political associations, a relevant matter since AIPAC and other Jewish groups had publicly targeted Traficant as an "enemy." Traficant hoped to determine whether potential jurors were associated with such hostile organizations.

In the end—it turned out—a Jewish juror caused such a commotion during jury deliberations that she relentlessly badgered other jurors—who were holding out to acquit Traficant—until they finally voted to convict him, just to shut the hellish woman up and bring the matter to a close. In addition, solid evidence since emerged proving Chertoff and his henchman clearly suborned perjury, forcing witnesses to lie in order to convict Traficant. (Thus, Chertoff should be in jail.)

Traficant was convicted and—unlike other public figures convicted of crimes and allowed to remain free until their appeals are exhausted—the vicious judge ordered that Traficant immediately be taken into custody at the time she handed down his nine-year prison sentence. As this is written, Traficant has been behind bars since July 30, 2002.

Since that time, Traficant has given only one interview to any journalist anywhere, this author, Michael Collins Piper, representing *American Free Press* (AFP), speaking by telephone with Traficant on August 2, 2002 as he sat in his holding cell in an Ohio jail, prior to his transfer to federal prison. "Yours is the only paper I've agreed to talk to," said Traficant who noted that AFP was the only media voice in the United States to expose the nature of the conspiracy to destroy him.

Despite his imprisonment, Traficant still ran for re-election in 2002 (as an independent) and won 15% of the vote in a three-way race. He remains highly regarded at home and across the country, but still sits in federal prison, a victim of Zionist power. Although it was said Traficant might be offered early release if he admits to his "crimes" and apologizes for them, Traficant has said he will not admit to crimes he did not commit in order to get his sentence cut short.

Just as in the Traficant case, the "mainstream" media had a field day with the news that another critic of the Israeli lobby—former State Rep. David Duke of Louisiana—had been "bagged" by Michael Chertoff's Justice Department. Headlines screamed: "David Duke pleads guilty to defrauding his supporters." Loaded terms like "tax evasion," "mail fraud" and "money laundering" echoed across the airwaves, recalling the media misdirection and lies in the Traficant case.

Despite the hoopla in the press, it was never noted that Duke—like Traficant—was a victim of a Zionist vendetta. A careful look at the Duke case demonstrates there is no question Duke's prosecution was unwarranted. Like Traficant, Duke was confronted with a nightmarish "Twilight

Zone” scenario concocted by Zionist-backed prosecutors who wanted to silence—and imprison—an outspoken figure with a national following, a warning to other dissidents: “This could happen to you.”

And despite what some Duke supporters might have believed, Duke’s opposition to affirmative action was not an issue with the Zionists, evidenced by the fact that two leading Zionist forces—the ADL and the American Jewish Congress—both oppose affirmative action. The sole reason for the drive to crucify Duke was because Duke—like Traficant—was challenging the power of the Israeli lobby in America.

Although the Justice Department campaign against Duke began in the Clinton era, the inquiry was dragging since, after all, Duke had not committed any crimes and no evidence could be found that he had.

One stimulus for that initial inquiry seems to have been rumors being circulated about Duke by a certain former Duke supporter who was nursing a long-standing and quite bizarre (perhaps even pathological) personal grudge against Duke. Jealous of Duke’s good looks and popular appeal, not to mention the fact that he craved the opportunity to convert Duke’s financial supporters into his own, the agitator told anyone who would bother to listen that “Duke is corrupt.” It was inevitable that these rumors would reach the federal authorities.

However, in light of the fact that this rumor-monger was close to the now-infamous phony “nationalist attorney” Kirk Lyons—clearly some sort of government operative—it may be the rumors were part of a COINTELPRO-style operation, designed to lay the pretext for a criminal inquiry into Duke’s personal finances and his political endeavors.

Once the Bush administration’s pro-Israel stalwart, Chertoff, took command at Justice in 2001 the campaign to nail Duke picked up steam. Following the 9-11 tragedy, when Duke publicly outlined evidence of Israeli involvement in the attacks and described how Chertoff allowed Israelis taken into custody by the FBI (on suspicion of 9-11 involvement) to go home to Israel, Chertoff escalated the campaign to “Get Duke.”

Thus, there was never any doubt Duke would be indicted on *some* charge, no matter how trumped-up or trivial. Duke knew well the old saying that: “A U.S. attorney can indict a ham sandwich if he wants to.”

In the Traficant case, Chertoff went to elaborate lengths to “frame” Traficant, using false testimony. The technique in the Duke case was more subtle: Chertoff took the fact that Duke gambled and “made a federal case out of it.” *It was no secret Duke gambled*—a popular legal diversion. Years before, during Duke’s widely-publicized statewide campaigns for governor and U.S. senator, the press reported Duke gambled.

However, the Nesherites in Justice under Chertoff got the idea to build a *criminal* scenario around Duke’s gambling by saying that—by gambling—Duke was “defrauding” people who had sent him contributions to support his political endeavors. The FBI seized Duke’s financial records and then contacted Duke’s contributors to advise them—so sadly—that it was their grim duty to reveal that it had been “discovered”

that “Duke is gambling with the money you send him.”

Now, there were probably Duke contributors who didn’t like Duke (or anybody) gambling. But Duke never tried to pretend he was working 9-5 on a assembly line. Duke’s supporters knew that in order to continue his writing and speaking and travel on behalf of his work, Duke needed their financial assistance—and they gladly gave it.

Under the same theory, if Duke had been a drinker (which he is not)—the corrupt prosecutors could have gone to Duke’s supporters and said, “Duke is going out drinking with the money you send him.”

The bottom line was that Chertof and the Nesher gang in the Justice Department contrived a thoroughly fraudulent criminal case against Duke, one stemming from the fact Duke’s personal life and income is indistinguishable from his involvement in public affairs—a full-time avocation for Duke.

Such a prosecution scenario could certainly be concocted against virtually any outspoken dissident in America today, any part of whose income stems from his political activity—even the so-called “nationalist” who started the first rumors about Duke’s alleged “corruption.”

So this, then, was the “substance” of Chertoff’s lie that Duke “defrauded” people.

To make the allegations sound all the more disturbing to Duke’s supporters and to the public, Chertoff cooked up an indictment that featured a wide-ranging raft of multiple (and repetitious) charges stemming from the same set of (false, trumped-up) allegations. If convicted on all the charges, Duke could have faced 30 years in prison.

Since Duke would be prosecuted before what would almost certainly be a largely Black jury—which would be regularly reminded by the media that Duke had formerly been a member of the Ku Klux Klan—Duke’s attorneys advised him to accept a plea bargain. Thus, Duke admitted guilt to two specified counts—tax evasion and mail fraud—rather than going to trial and risk being convicted on all counts.

As a result of the plea bargain, Duke ended up spending thirteen months in prison, but finally came home to an enthusiastic gathering of his supporters who knew full well that Duke had been the victim of an evil, ugly and crooked Zionist thug named Michael Chertoff.

The shocking demonstration of raw power by Zionist intriguer Chertoff, corrupting and abusing the American justice system to crucify two prominent critics of Israel, is instructive indeed, clear evidence how far America has gone astray.

Jim Traficant and David Duke are not the only victims of Zionist misdeeds in America and unfortunately they will probably not be the last. When one considers the fact that the man responsible for their troubles has now been designed chief of “homeland security,” the future for American political dissidents is frightening indeed . . .

And so it continues . . .

An introduction to Part VII

What Could Lie Ahead . . .

Having reviewed the machinations and intrigues of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within during the latter half of the 20th century, it seems almost fitting, by way of wrapping up our study, to take a look at what’s been happening in the opening days of the 21st Century.

The Judas Goats are hard at work—as always—doing all in their power (and that of their behind-the-scenes handlers and controllers) to subvert traditional American nationalism.

In the chapters which follow we’ll take a closer look at some of the modern-day Judas Goats and examine precisely what it is they seem to have in store for Americans who dare to question the authority of those who have determined they are the ones best suited to rule America and the world.

These Enemies Within have an international agenda—a “perpetual war for perpetual peace,” a war not only against global terrorists but also “domestic terrorists” as well. And those “domestic terrorists” are those who stand in the way of the New World Order—which is nothing more than the longtime Zionist dream of world conquest.

And make no mistake about it, Russia and China and even Venezuela—under populist strongman Hugo Chavez—along with the Arab and Muslim worlds, as well as any other nations who stand in opposition to the Zionist agenda, are also in the Zionist gun-sights. There are more wars being planned.

The question is whether Americans are going to agree to fight those wars. More importantly, will Americans band together—once and for all—to stop the international war-mongers dead in their tracks?

Undoubtedly, Americans do need to fight another war, but this time it should be a war against The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within . . .

Chapter Forty

The Fox News Phenomenon: How Zionist Plutocrats Created a “Media Alternative” To the Garbage of the Established Liberal Media

In the opening pages of this volume, we met a handful of quite notorious Judas Goats whose names and faces are familiar to millions of Americans: Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, Laura Ingraham, Anne Coulter and—last but far from least—Bill O’Reilly.

All are tried-and-true (and high-salaried) water-carriers for the Zionist cause—and apparently enthusiastic ones at that. Neo-conservatives of the first (and worst) order, this crew (for want of a better term to describe them) owe much of their fame and fortune to the constant promotion that they, and their views, or rather the views of their masters and handlers receive through the medium of Fox News.

While Fox is the actual sponsor of the televised rantings of Hannity and O’Reilly, the other Judas Goats are also regularly hyped by Fox which, for all intents and purposes, has become the foremost popular mass media voice for the Zionist “neo-conservative” propaganda line.

For this reason, it’s quite worthwhile examining Fox News and the manner in which this network has become a Judas Goat in and of itself. Beyond question, Fox has emerged—perhaps even more so than the three “liberal” networks—ABC, CBS, and NBC—as one of the most dangerous and divisive forces operating in our world today.

Fox, of course, is the broadcast network owned by the far-flung News Corporation, the media empire of Australian-born Rupert Murdoch. Let’s take a quick look at just what this formidable media empire constitutes:

- *The Weekly Standard* magazine, run for Murdoch by “neo-conservative” William Kristol, son of the “ex-Trotskyite” neo-conservative godfather, Irving Kristol. (This magazine is one of the most loudly—not quietly—influential publications in America today, the virtual foreign policy bible of the “Dubya” Bush administration, and the one publication that can truly claim credit for laying the propaganda groundwork for the American debacle in Iraq.);

- 175 different newspapers including *News of the World*, *The Sun*, *The Sunday Times*, and *The Times*, published in Britain, and, perhaps most notably, *The New York Post*, the latter being one of the foremost voices for the Zionist cause in America;

- Twentieth Century Fox motion picture studios;

- Fox Television stations, in major metropolitan markets including: Washington, D.C., Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Minneapolis, Detroit, Atlanta, Baltimore, Orlando, Cleveland, Phoenix, Denver, St. Louis,

Milwaukee, Kansas City, Salt Lake City, Birmingham, Memphis, Greensboro (North Carolina), Austin, and Ocala (Florida);

- Direct broadcast satellite television, spanning five continents—notably Foxtel;
- Fox News (cable) Channel and other cable outlets, reaching 300 million subscribers;
- Major publishing houses, such as HarperCollins Publishers (which now controls such renowned publishing companies as William Morrow & Company, Avon Books, Amistad Press and Fourth Estate) as well as ReganBooks, and Zondervan.

Clearly, this is a major media empire. How it emerged to have such power and influence, even dictating American affairs, is an instructive story, and quite illustrative of the machinations of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within. In order to review the Fox phenomenon, we must go back to the mid-to-late 1960s.

During that time frame, many Americans began to perceive a determined and deliberate “liberal” slant in news coverage by the three major television networks (ABC, CBS and NBC) with CBS and its anchorman-of-long-standing, Walter Cronkite, often considered to be the most “liberal” of the three.

Americans detected much liberal propagandizing in the content of daily television programming, with blatant political messages being broadcast in the content of television dramas, situation comedies and made-for-television movies.

What’s more, the content of the programming began to focus on what can best be described as “sleaze”—and that’s putting it lightly. Traditional American values became the target of vulgar bathroom humor and the Christian faith was constantly upheld as somehow being a virtual form of evil, responsible for the tragedies of the past. America’s Founding Fathers were painted as evil and counter-culture figures were held up as role models for American youth. The list of very valid complaints about the three major networks, their “news” coverage and their programming could go on and on.

As Americans became more and more aware of the filth and the “liberal” propagandizing, many people—but not enough, sad to say—began to take a closer look at the “who”—rather than the “what”—of the three major networks. That is, Americans began to recognize that the three major networks were tightly-controlled mega-corporations held in the hands of a tiny clique of interlocking families and financial groups who were largely of Jewish origin.

What’s more, the Jewish influence in the editorial and management

levels in the “news” divisions of the three major networks was also becoming increasingly more obvious. In short, people began to recognize that the “liberal” networks were effectively the media voices of a Jewish elite whose values—and interests—did not, in any way, shape or form, represent those of the vast majority of the American people.

As a consequence of this, there began to emerge a distinct dissatisfaction not only with the three major networks, but a growing talk in the heartlands about “Jewish control of the media.” To be sure, many folks were not so vocal about discussing the Jewish aspect of the problem with the networks, but this remained a constant (if only quietly spoken) phenomenon.

And on occasion, some big names in American life—ranging from former Vice President Spiro Agnew to General George Brown, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and even Hollywood giants such as Robert Mitchum and Marlon Brando and famed author Truman Capote—actually dared to say publicly that there was an inordinate Jewish influence upon (or control of) the major media outlets in America.

In the end, this disillusionment with the broadcast industry and its machinations actually set the stage, in many respects, for the rise of Ronald Reagan and his election to the presidency in 1980. Americans were looking for a change and while Reagan promised a “new conservatism,” in the end it proved to be something entirely different. But Americans were eager for an alternative to the “liberal” media—and along came Rupert Murdoch to the “rescue”—or so it seemed.

Americans who were fed up with the “liberal” media now had a self-appointed savior, a colorful foreign-born media tycoon who seemed to share their dissatisfaction and who seemed to be willing to provide a real “alternative.” But that “alternative” is not what most Americans were really looking for, and many folks don’t seem understand that they’ve been conned—in fact, conned big-time.

Although already well-established in Australia as a growing media power on his own, Murdoch quietly received the international sponsorship and financial backing of some of the world’s most wealthy and powerful Jewish families: the Rothschilds of Europe, the Bronfmans of Canada and the Oppenheimers of South Africa. With their firm support, he began expanding his empire into Britain and around the planet.

In short order, Rupert Murdoch became the “hottest” item in the global media, and soon was on his way to achieving vast wealth beyond his wildest dreams and immense political power through the rise of his News Corporation empire and the lucrative advertising industry. It is thus no wonder that Murdoch himself came to be counted, along with the Rothschilds, Bronfmans and Oppenheimers, as part of a group quite

correctly described as “The Billionaire Gang of Four.”

Today, now well established, Murdoch’s media voices, particularly Fox News, press the “hot button” issues—such as abortion, gay rights, prayer in schools—that stir up animosities between so-called “Christian Right” organizations and the groups and institutions to which they stand in opposition.

Meanwhile, ironically, other Murdoch media outlets, such as Fox Television, are responsible for promoting some of the worst garbage ever to appear on American television screens. Yet, for some reason, the Christian Right folks who revel in Fox News’ “conservative” slant seem to miss the point that Rupert Murdoch’s media conglomerate is raking in advertising billions by selling sleaze.

All the while, of course, the Murdoch media is busy promoting the interests of the Zionist movement. And that, above all, is the most important point that needs to be recognized.

Although Murdoch and his media play the game of providing an “alternative,” they are, in fact, providing a “controlled opposition,” keeping the “conservative” and “traditional” American ranks in line, touting the Zionist cause as an “American” one, a cause that is fully in line with not just “making America great again” (in the imagery of Ronald Reaganesque rhetoric) but, in reality making America an empire—and one that is ruled by the Zionist elite.

In other words, Fox News is loudly—and proudly—promoting the theme that America is the world’s voice for sanity and democracy and that it is, quite simply, America’s job to rule the world.

And that is precisely—as we documented in our earlier work, *The New Jerusalem*—the Zionist agenda today: America’s capital and resources, its military men and women, its massive arsenal, are to be used for the establishment of a global imperium to advance the agenda of the well-heeled Zionist plutocrats and their international network of allied corporate interests and ideological soulmates.

While there are many good Americans who believe the Fox News (that is, Zionist) propaganda line that America must use its power “for good,”—even at the sacrifice of the thousands of lives of Americans and others—there are many more Americans (and others worldwide) who don’t share that philosophy.

However, Fox News—and other elements in the Zionist propaganda network—have begun to advance the theme that anyone who stands in the way of this global agenda is somehow “anti-American” and certainly “anti-Semitic” (and also, even, “anti-Christian”).

Legislation such as the so-called Patriot Act and other mechanisms of control are being put into place in order to suppress dissent against

the Zionist agenda. And Fox News is on the frontlines promoting these Orwellian schemes.

We need say nothing more in this regard, other than to warn sincere American patriots that Fox News is not their friend. Sincere Americans need to be wary of Fox News and its talking heads.

Americans must surrender to the winds the idea that “well, Fox says many good things,” and to abandon the rationale that such voices from the Fox stable (or should we say “gutter”?) as Bill O’Reilly, Sean Hannity and others are “often right.” Fox and its adherents are dangers to America and they are dangers to the world.

Fox News certainly ranks as among the most dangerous of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within.

Chapter Forty-One

The Past, Present and Future Agenda of The Enemy Within: Declaring American Patriots to be the “Real” Enemy Within

On May 29, 2005 *The Washington Post* revealed that the Bush administration was redirecting its vaunted “war on terrorism” toward a new “strategy against violent extremism.” Then, precisely one week later, on June 5, the *Post* featured a prominently placed commentary by a former FBI agent, Mike German—who specialized in infiltrating “right wing” dissident groups in the United States—proposing that federal authorities begin efforts to wage all-out warfare against perceived domestic “extremist” groups.

The former FBI agent contended that what he called the American “extremist” groups are a breeding ground for violence and therefore need to be dealt with essentially as a criminal conspiracy. “Behind the Lone Terrorist, a Pack Mentality” read the headline on German’s commentary. German made it clear that the “domestic terrorist” groups that he says need special treatment are a diverse group. The former FBI undercover operative pulled no punches in declaring that those whom he perceives to be America’s potential terrorists are not just those who might “look” like terrorists. German wrote:

They don't always call themselves the KKK or the militia; they sometimes use benign names that mask their true nature. They might wear Nazi symbols right on their sleeves, but they might not. They could be just a couple of grumpy old geezers who meet for coffee at a local cafe, or a few young punks looking for trouble, or even one guy sitting in his basement chatting on neo-Nazi Web sites. But they are all part of an underground extremist community.

However, said German, “every once in a while, a follower of these movements bursts violently into our world, with deadly consequences. He cited a number of individuals who committed violent crimes who had, in media jargon, been “linked” to a variety of so-called “extremist” groups. And while there are undoubtedly many organizations that might well be considered “extremist,” German does not lay down the lines of demarcation as to what constitutes “extremism” versus presumably respectable expressions of freedom of speech. Here’s where it gets quite interesting and even more disturbing. German asserted that:

The fact that these individuals, after being exposed to extremist ideology, each committed violent acts might lead

a reasonable person to suspect the existence of a wider conspiracy. Imagine a very smart leader of an extremist movement, one who understands the First Amendment and criminal conspiracy laws, telling his followers not to depend on specific instructions.

He might tell them to divorce themselves from the group before they commit a violent act; to act individually or in small groups so that others in the movement could avoid criminal liability. This methodology creates a win-win situation for the extremist leader – the violent goals of the group are met without the legal consequences.

In other words, German was suggesting, any time an individual who has been “linked” to an “extremist” group may commit a crime, it is not beyond logic to suspect that the group or its leaders actually instigated the crime; effectively, that Constitutionally-protected expressions of free expression by an individual or group which might have somehow influenced another party to carry out a violent act, must therefore be addressed. In short: that it’s time to start cracking down on those who are found guilty not of a crime, but only of “extremism,” however defined. It’s a conspiracy by the extremists, according to German, and he added that, “to close our eyes to this conspiracy is to deny reality. It’s a matter of connecting the dots.”

Claiming that “Neo-Nazi ideology is also a leading influence in rising school violence”—quite a stretch of the truth, and one which ignores the increasing use of psychiatric drugs in treating school kids, which often leads to depression and violence— German cited only two cases, the only two cases (out of many) that are even vaguely linked to “neo-Nazi” ideology.

The first instance German cited was the tragic school shooting in Minnesota where a young American Indian, who evidently was an admirer of Adolf Hitler, killed several people and then himself.

German also hypes the claim that the Columbine High School shooting was inspired by a devotion to Hitler. However, what German fails to note is that one of the Columbine killers, Dylan Klebold, was the scion of a family prominent in the Jewish community in Columbus, Ohio and the other, Eric Harris, was also reportedly of at least partial Jewish descent. The two Jewish Columbine killers apparently were not interested in Hitler and Nazism from the standpoint of being admirers of the German leader and his ideology, but were rather, instead, fiercely anti-Nazi and had a chip on their shoulders about “the Holocaust” and viewed their attack on their non-Jewish schoolmates (including African-

Americans) as a way of “getting back” at non-Jews.

All of this, of course, has been kept carefully under wraps by the media, which prefers to suggest that the two psychotic Jewish murderers were, instead, anti-Jewish extremists and admirers of Hitler!

In addition, it should be noted that a prominent psychiatrist, Dr. Robert John, strongly believes, based on his own study, a theme that another educator, Dr. Philip Glidden, echoed in his own book, *Trading on Guilt: Holocaust Education in the Public Schools*; namely, that “Holocaust studies” in the public schools are contributing to violence among young people by desensitizing them to violence through the constant display of images of violence. This alone should be reason to outlaw the teaching of Holocaust studies in the public schools.

In any case, German flatly asserted that “by providing both the motive and method for violence,” these leaders [of “extremist” groups] who have supposedly “devised a method of masking their influence” are therefore “part of the conspiracy” to commit acts of violence. He said that “Their cynical reliance on First Amendment rights, which they would not grant others, does not negate their role.”

German concluded: “Lone extremists pose a challenge for law enforcement because they are difficult to predict. It’s like searching every haystack for a needle. Perhaps we’d have better luck if we paid more attention to the needle factories.”

What made German’s message so chilling was that it has an eerie echo of long-standing claims by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith—which touts itself as a “watchdog” keeping an eye on “extremist” groups—that commentary to which the ADL objects constitutes “obscenity” and that such “obscenity” can lead to violence.

For example, in 1988 at Hofstra University in New York, the ADL conducted a three-day legal symposium entitled “Group Defamation and Freedom of Speech: The Relationship Between Language and Violence.” The forum concluded with a rousing call for passage of a law to ban what was described as “hate literature” by so-called “extremists.”

The opinions expressed by the featured speakers advocating a ban on hate literature centered around two ideas:

- That words, written or spoken, in and of themselves, constitute violence. (For example, one need only call someone a “bad” name without threatening any physical action to perform an act of violence.)
- That words, written or spoken, take on a certain power that creates a reality for the target or victim of these words. (For example, by calling someone a “dirty rotten bum,” he will become one.)

In his opening remarks, Hofstra law professor Monroe Freedman said that trying to defend free speech while trying to protect minorities

against those who “defame” them is a “paradox of Constitutional democracy.” According to Freedman:

Group defamation can create a social climate that is receptive to and encourages hatred and oppression. If a minority group can be made to appear less than human, deserving of punishment, or a threat to the general community, oppression of that minority is a likely consequence.

We know also that language itself can hurt, that there are words that, by their very utterance, inflict injury . . . When the message is violent, language can itself be violence.

Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich.) spoke of the “psychic pain” inflicted by language. Another speaker, self-described “Holocaust survivor” Elie Wiesel, injected his opinion that those engaging in group defamation should be “fought” and “dealt with harshly.”

The conference featured a moot court argument of the winning submission of a competition among law students around the nation to write a model statute that could be used to prosecute those who engage in so-called “group defamation.” The first prize winner was a model statute defining group defamation as:

Any oral, written or symbolic speech, published with malice that debases, degrades or calls into question the loyalties, abilities or integrity of members of a group based on a characteristic that is allegedly common to the members of that group, or that by its very utterance inflicts injury upon members of a group, or that promotes animosity against a group.

A “group” was defined as “an aggregation of people identified by a common race, religion, national origin, ethnicity, or gender, or based upon heterosexuality or homosexuality.”

Under the proposed statute, an agency would be established to monitor acts of group defamation; assess the impact of any speech that defames a group; and counteract the actually and potentially adverse effects of that speech. That agency would also review all films and movies before they could be shown and, if deemed to be offensive, ban public viewing.

On November 2, 1995, then-Rep. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.)—now a powerful U.S. Senator—joined with the aforementioned Congressman

Conyers in promoting legislation of the character proposed at the ADL conference. The Schumer measure, H.R. 2580, was deceptively called "The Republican Form of Government Guarantee Act."

A long-time ADL spokesman in Congress, Schumer proposed to outlaw discussion of what he called "baseless conspiracy theories regarding the government" that he said endangered public order. Already he was known as the leading congressional enemy of the Second Amendment and the rights of gun-owners, Schumer's new target—the First Amendment—would have been scrapped had the bill been passed

Under the proposed legislation, Schumer wanted to set up a formal, official police state apparatus to silence and control government critics. The Washington-based *Spotlight* newspaper concluded that Schumer's proposal might have been the most dangerous police-state legislation ever introduced in an American Congress as of that time and promptly launched an effort to defeat the bill. Although the ADL pressed hard for the measure, public pressure stimulated by *The Spotlight* resulted in the ADL scheme being rejected, angering Schumer so much that he issued a mass mailing to supporters, crying angrily that *The Spotlight* had "targeted" him for destruction.

That first ADL-sponsored conspiracy against freedom of speech has, of course, been egregiously surpassed by the now-infamous Patriot Act, which, even as this is written, the Bush administration—with the support of the ADL—is trying to expand.

And this comes at precisely the time when the Bush administration is declaring its new war on "violent extremism" and a former FBI agent has come forth asserting the need to fight what he sees as a "conspiracy" among political dissidents to stir up violence.

Do not be surprised to find a growing media focus on "violence by extremists in America" calling for American law enforcement to be more vigilant in dealing with those deemed to be "out of the mainstream" and therefore potentially violent.

In light of all this, it's no coincidence, for example, that the ADL maintains what it calls a "Law Enforcement Agency Resource Network" and that through this network the ADL cited the May 20-22, 2005 conference in New Orleans conducted by former State Representative David Duke of Louisiana as the type of "extremist" activity that needs to be monitored, this despite the fact that Duke firmly renounces violence and angry rhetoric and, in fact, always has.

But in the view of ex-FBI man Mike German, Duke and other leaders are simply sending out evil messages designed to insulate themselves and, at the same time, encourage violence.

Obviously, as a former FBI agent detailed to infiltrating "extremist"

groups, Mike German was certainly working closely with the ADL during his many years in the field. so he echoes this alien propaganda line.

Now that the Bush administration has moved toward a fight against “violent extremism” at a time when the ADL and other pro-Israel lobby groups are making the claim that American critics of Israel are lending moral aid and support to Islamic extremists by making statements critical of Israel, it appears as though German’s commentary in *The Washington Post* was nothing less than a proverbial trial balloon.

The stage is being set for future endeavors to destroy political dissidents in America who dare to criticize the global war-mongering and pro-Israel extremism of the so-called “high priests of war” who dominate policy in the Bush administration and who fully intend to dominate policy in future administrations Republican and Democratic alike.

Chapter Forty-Two

Modern-Day “Thought Police” Conspired To Censor Campus Criticism of Israel and Zionism: Two “Conservative” Shills for the Zionist Cause

In the spring of 2003, the third-ranking Republican member of the U.S. Senate, conservative Rick Santorum (Pa.), announced that he had plans to introduce so-called “ideological diversity” legislation that would cut federal funding for thousands of American colleges and universities if those institutions were found to be permitting professors, students and student organizations to openly criticize Israel.

One of Israel’s leading cheerleaders in Congress and a reported presidential hopeful, Santorum considered criticism of Israel to be an act of “anti-Semitism.” In that mode, Santorum wanted to rewrite the federal funding formula under Title IX of the Higher Education Act to include “ideological diversity” as well as sexual equality in education as a prerequisite for federal funding. Joining Santorum was another conservative GOP stalwart and pro-Israel ideologue—Sen. Sam Brownback (Kan.)—who had his own scheme to call for a federal commission—critics called it a “tribunal”—to be established under Title IX to “investigate” anti-Semitic incidents on American campuses.

And although the average American student or college professor had not heard of the Santorum-Brownback scheme, Wayne Firestone, director of the Center for Israel Affairs for the Hillel Foundation, said at the time that “Everywhere I go, this is the lead topic. This is drawing a lot of interest.” In fact, it was Firestone’s organization, Hillel—which has units on campuses across America—that first leaked word of Santorum’s scheme. Further details appeared in a circumspect report on April 15, 2003 in the small-circulation *New York Sun*. A stridently pro-Israel “neo-conservative” daily published in Manhattan, the *Sun* paper is funded by a passel of billionaire pro-Israel financiers including Michael Steinhardt and Conrad Black (who also published *The Jerusalem Post*).

In addition, the *Sun*’s top editors are Seth Lipsky and Ira Stoll who previously served in top editorial posts at *Forward*, the most influential Jewish newspaper in America. So if the *New York Sun* reported favorably on the scheme by Santorum, it hardly seems likely the *Sun* was telling lies about Santorum since it shared his enthusiasm for Israel.

In any case, in its version of events, Hillel told its supporters that Santorum, along with several other members of the Senate, had invited representatives of a number of powerful Jewish organizations to attend a private meeting on Capitol Hill in order to discuss the senators’ concerns about growing criticism of Israel on American college campuses.

The senators in question—all Republicans—were: Santorum, Robert Bennett (Utah), Sam Brownback (Kansas), and newly-elected

Norm Coleman (Minnesota). In addition, Senate Republican Majority Leader Bill Frist (Tenn.), and his GOP colleagues, Sens. Lindsey Graham (S.C.) and George Voinovich (Ohio), sent staff representatives.

Jewish organizations at the private meeting were the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, the Zionist Organization of America, the American Jewish Committee and Hillel, represented by the aforementioned Firestone and his colleague Jay Rubin. Louis Goldstein, Deputy Assistant Secretary for the U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, represented the Bush administration.

During the private session—of which there are no transcripts available to the taxpayers who footed the bill for the enterprise—an ADL representative reportedly claimed the ADL's "annual audit" of anti-Semitic activity in America detected an increase by 24% of anti-Semitism on U.S. campuses in 2002. That 24% increase—even by the ADL's own admission—constituted only 21 actions. However, the ADL definition of "anti-Semitism" is so broad it includes even the mildest criticism of Israel that isn't framed in parameters the ADL determines to be acceptable.

In the meantime, word of the Santorum-Brownback initiative was spreading among leaders of the educational community, as a result of an expose by this author, Michael Collins Piper, of the scheme.

The expose initially appeared in the Washington-based *American Free Press* (AFP) newspaper and was then widely circulated on the Internet by Joe Fields, a California-based American nationalist, so much so that the report on the scheme finally came across the emails of independent educators all across the United States and around the globe.

As a consequence of growing concern about the scheme generated by the AFP expose, the pro-Israel lobby began trying to deny that Santorum had ever proposed introducing the legislation that he had said he planned to introduce: the "official" propaganda line being circulated was that the AFP story was not true and that Santorum never considered such legislation. But there was much more to the affair.

Although AFP first broke this story on a national level, it was then picked up by a variety of media here in the United States and abroad, including publications in the Arab world. Then, according to the May 9, 2003 edition of the New York-based *Jewish Week* newspaper, the State Department contacted Senate offices to advise them that Palestinian Authority newspapers were carrying the story about the "ideological diversity" legislation and asking if the story was true.

In its report on the controversy that erupted following AFP's expose, *Jewish Week's* story, titled "Diversity Disinformation," declared that a "rumor of pending legislation barring campus criticism of Israel [was] sweeping Arab and left-wing media." The article never mentioned

that AFP (which is hardly a “left-wing” publication) first gave legs to the story, asserting only that “the story originated with several leading conspiracy theorists and Holocaust revisionists.”

However, this, in itself, was disingenuous at best. In fact, as AFP’s original report clearly indicated, AFP’s report was based on a story appearing in the pro-Israel *New York Sun*. So the truth is the story originated in a distinctly pro-Israel publication. However, AFP picked up on the story, recognizing its import, and gave it the attention it deserved—much to the distress of those who set the whole story in motion in the first place—including Santorum and his colleagues on Capitol Hill.

Thus, despite this, *Jewish Week* said the story “has become an article of faith throughout the Arab world and in some U.S. left-wing circles,” and went on to assert that “to pro-Israel leaders and leading members of the Senate, it’s a dangerous urban legend at best, deliberate disinformation at worst.”

(Some will recall that the Justice Department of then-Attorney General John Ashcroft also lied by saying that factual stories—first nationally publicized by AFP—surrounding the FBI seizure of Israeli spies operating on American soil prior to the 9-11 attacks were also an “urban legend.” Evidently the term “urban legend,” like the term “conspiracy theory,” is now Zionist “doublespeak” applied to any solid information that runs contrary to the official propaganda line.)

In any case, for the record, the original article in the pro-Israel *Sun* stated flatly (in discussing the Capitol Hill meeting where the “ideological diversity” scheme originated):

By the end of the meeting yesterday, Mr. Santorum was talking about introducing legislation that could cut federal funding to colleges where anti-Semitism and anti-Israel sentiments are prevalent—or more generally, where “ideological diversity” is lacking.

The problem with the AFP story—at least according to *Jewish Week*—was that “No such legislation has been introduced or even contemplated.” And this, of course, contradicted what the *Sun* said in the first place (and which AFP then told its readers).

Jewish Week then purported to describe the Capitol Hill meeting where the legislation was—or was not—hatched, depending upon whom you believe. According to an un-named Senate source, cited by *Jewish Week*, the meeting featured “many presentations from different groups,” failing to mention that the “different” groups were, as AFP noted, all hard-line pro-Israel organizations. The un-named source said no new

laws were in the works and only that Santorum “[was] currently looking at the problem and gathering information.” The paper also said “several Jewish leaders who attended the meeting confirmed that claim.”

Jewish Week reported that “Several participants suggested creating a Capitol Hill working group to examine rising anti-Semitism. Others suggested a panel to look at ideological diversity on campus.” The newspaper never mentioned—as did the *Sun*, and then, AFP—that Santorum’s GOP colleague, Sen. Sam Brownback (Kansas) had urged the formation of a special federal commission to “investigate” so-called anti-Semitism on campus. If the story was false or an “urban legend” or some sort of “disinformation,” why did a pro-Israel publication such as *The New York Sun* publish the story in the first place? And if the *Sun* was mistaken, why has the *Sun* not yet run a correction?

So the story was indeed true and Santorum was considering such legislation. However, thanks to the fact that AFP blew the whistle and put the story in its proper context—revealing the totalitarian nature of the scheme—Santorum and his allies in the pro-Israel lobby backed off. And then they had the chutzpah to begin trying to deny they ever concocted the scheme in the first place.

However, despite efforts to keep the story under wraps, the truth wouldn’t go away. On April 29, 2003, Hillel, which, as noted, amounts to a national network of pro-Israel student-manned “campus police,” complained on its website that newspapers—namely AFP—and web pages such as Rense.com (which picked up an advance copy of AFP’s story) and the Palestine-based Palestine Media Center, among others, were trying to “distort” the intentions of those who participated in the Capitol Hill meeting on “ideological diversity” legislation.

The pro-Israel group was also incensed to learn that the Progressive Faculty Network—an alliance of independent-minded college and university instructors—had widely distributed an e-mail announcing the scheme. Hillel claimed that AFP and the other media that picked up the story “are promoting a bizarre version of the meeting” that was held between various U.S. Senators—led by Santorum and Brownback—and a variety of pro-Israel lobby groups including Hillel.

Rather than directly addressing the specifics of the AFP article, Hillel instead took a shot at AFP and charged that the paper was “anti-Semitic”—which, of course, is precisely the smear levelled against anyone on any campus anywhere who dares to criticize Israel.

However, the bottom line was that the Capitol Hill meeting did take place and GOP conservatives had been planning to introduce legislation to deny federal funding to American colleges found to be in some way permitting speech deemed to be “anti-Semitic.”

Hillel now claimed that “the meeting of the Republican leadership was arranged to discuss campus anti-Semitism, not to combat anti-Israel groups.” Hillel said that the intention was “not to suppress free speech but to address hatred against Jewish students.”

However, as anyone who has participated in campus protests against the war against Iraq and/or against Israeli mistreatment of the Palestinians can attest, those who have participated have been regularly tarred with the over-used tarbrush of “anti-Semitism.”

So Hillel’s attempts to refute the AFP article fell flat. In the end, all Hillel could do was to allege that some groups were exploiting the “noble objective” of fighting “hatred against Jewish students” in order “to fuel their theories of international conspiracy.”

In the end—as this is written (May 2006)—new versions of this “ideological diversity” legislation (originally proposed by Santorum and Brownback) are now before Congress. One version has been passed by the House of Representatives. Another version is now before the Senate. Ultimately, the differences between the two measures may well be hammered out and the final version of the legislation will be approved by Congress. Considering the fact that Zionist influence over Congress reigns supreme, it is highly unlikely that the legislation will vary significantly from the corrupt proposal originally put forth by Santorum and Brownback and their like-minded conspirators.

The bottom line is this: The Enemy Within is capable of lying and twisting and distorting the truth in every way possible. The circumstances surrounding the so-called “urban legend” of the “ideological diversity” legislation constitutes a valuable case study of how The Enemy Within operates on a regular basis.

And with pliable and willing skills in high places—such as Senators Rick Santorum and Sam Brownback, among many, many others—The Enemy Within is well-positioned to impose egregious police-state-style “Thought Control” measures designed to curtail, suppress, and sanction those who dare to speak out. Santorum and Brownback are often touted in the mass media as “up and coming young conservatives” and being of “presidential timber,” but they are nothing more than Judas Goats acting on behalf of The Enemy Within.

Chapter Forty-Three

The Zionist Take-Over and Manipulation of Local Law Enforcement in America: Using Police Power to Strike Down American Patriots

During the last 25 years, a key element in the Zionist effort to gain increasing power at the local level has been the effort to infiltrate and manipulate local law enforcement agencies.

While Zionist influence at the level of the FBI and the CIA has long been in place, the Zionist role at the local level of law enforcement is not as well known, despite the fact that it was Zionist-sponsored intrigue (that is, corruption) inside the San Francisco Police Department that sparked the ADL spy scandal described earlier in these pages.

And although that spy scandal did focus attention on the role of the ADL in abusing police powers by influencing local law enforcement, the truth is that, since then, groups such as the ADL and the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) of Morris Dees have been even more aggressive in providing “services” to local law enforcement in the name of fighting such enemies as “domestic terrorism” and “hate crimes,” launching any number of well-funded programs to “train”—that is, inculcate—local law enforcement in the propaganda mindset of the ADL.

It would belabor the point to go into the details of these ventures here, all of which are thoroughly accessible on the Internet websites of the ADL and the SPLC, but suffice it to say that these Zionist lobby operations (disguised as “civil rights” organizations) have come to have a great deal of influence on local law enforcement. Today, anyone deemed “dangerous” to the Zionist cause is subject to violence and abuse from local law enforcement officials acting on behalf of the Zionists.

A primary example comes in the story of the thoroughly-illegal March 22, 1995 SWAT-team raid on the West Coast office of Liberty Lobby, located in the Escondido, California home of that nationalist institution’s founder, Willis A. Carto. Included among the group were agents of not only the FBI, but also the IRS, the BATF and (of all things), the Drug Enforcement Administration.

At 7:00 am on the morning of March 22, 1995 some 25 gun-waving members of a SWAT team raided the Carto home. Although Carto was not there at the time, his wife Elisabeth and two young visiting family members were present. Mrs. Carto, alerted to the danger by the barking of the family’s pet dog, Charlie, encountered the marauders outside the front door. They were converging upon the house after having broken down the gate leading onto the property.

As a helicopter whirred about overhead and as at least one sniper was positioned nearby with his rifle trained on Mrs. Carto, gun-wielding officers (some carrying assault weapons and wearing ski masks) vio-

lently seized Mrs. Carto, placed her in handcuffs and then sprayed Charlie in the face with an immobilizing chemical, leaving the hapless puppy howling in pain and unable to protect his mistress.

They then forced their way into the house. Alerted to the events by the ensuing noise, Mrs. Carto's attractive young niece came to the front door in her nightgown, where she was accosted by the thugs who pointed weapons in her face, shouting "Put your hands in the air" and demanding, "Are you carrying a gun?"

In the meantime the girl's cousin was being roused from his sleep, dragged from his bed in handcuffs, and isolated from the rest of the family. He was held in handcuffs for twenty minutes before being released. The young man, a recent law school graduate, had come to California for a three-week rest before beginning his new job.

Although the marauders subsequently took the handcuffs off the prisoners, Mrs. Carto and the two young people were held incommunicado as "the law" ransacked the house from top to bottom for five hours. At one point Mrs. Carto overheard officers pondering the possibility of bringing in bulldozers for excavating on the property, for the purpose of uncovering "stolen goods" they said "might be buried."

The marauders took with them fourteen boxes of documents, Mr. Carto's personal gun collection, and Mrs. Carto's computer. Despite the energetic efforts of the SWAT team, no "evidence" turned up of any "stolen goods,"—the phony pretext of the raid.

It was only after the raid that attorneys for the Cartos uncovered evidence that *a longtime asset of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith had played a key role in orchestrating the raid.*

It turned out that a San Diego County Deputy Sheriff, Tim Carroll, was a prime mover behind the attack on the Carto home which was located in San Diego County, outside the jurisdiction of the Costa Mesa (Orange County) Police Department which officially directed the raid. Carroll was not only the San Diego Sheriff's Office liaison with the ADL, but also an admitted long-time collaborator with the ADL's San Francisco-based operative, Roy Bullock. In fact, when the SFPD launched its inquiry into the ADL's spying operations in 1992, the SFPD relied extensively upon admissions by Carroll as the basis for filing for a search warrant for the ADL's offices in San Francisco and in Los Angeles.

In asking for that search warrant, the SFPD's investigator, Ron Roth, detailed his interview with Carroll. A transcript of that interview was part of official records on the ADL spy case released by the SFPD to the public at the time the investigation was under way. In short, Carroll's admissions—under questioning by the SFPD—were a key element in the earliest stages of the inquiry into the ADL's illicit spying operations.

Carroll answered the SFPD's questions *not because he wanted to, but because he had to*. As the ADL's man inside the San Diego County Sheriff's Office, Carroll was as much a part of the ADL's law enforcement-linked spy apparatus as his associate Bullock and Bullock's SFPD contact, Tom Gerard, were in San Francisco

Here are highlights from the police interrogation of Carroll that illustrated the close relationship between Carroll (the central player in the ADL-orchestrated attack on Liberty Lobby) and the ADL and its "number one investigator," Roy Bullock:

- When Investigator Roth asked the San Diego ADL collaborator how long he had known Bullock, Carroll responded: "Probably goes back five or six years. I do a lot of work with the ADL in San Diego and that's how I met [Bullock] and, uh, I have met him at various conferences," including two, he noted, where Bullock was a "guest speaker."

- Carroll also admitted he traveled to Israel in May 1991 on "an ADL sponsored law enforcement trip," which included some eleven American law enforcement people—including the SFPD's Gerard.

(Carroll's so-called "law enforcement trip" was actually an all-expenses paid Mediterranean vacation, compliments of the ADL—a lucrative "gratuity" indeed. Many police officers, in other circumstances, have lost their jobs and/or gone to jail for accepting far less valuable gifts and favors from those suspected of criminal activities.)

- Accompanying the ADL's police informants on the trip, Carroll admitted, was Mira Lansky Boland of the ADL's Washington office who, in his words, "coordinated everything with the ADL people in Jerusalem." Since that time, Carroll said, he had "talked to her off and on . . . She may want to know stuff, I may want to know."

- Carroll also admitted that Bullock had told him that he (Bullock) had received classified intelligence information from the SFPD files. (This suggests Carroll himself may have been criminally liable for having failed to report a crime: i.e. Bullock's receipt of stolen SFPD files.)

- Of his relationship with Bullock, Carroll also confessed that "we've done joint ventures together," although he did not specify what those "joint ventures" were.

That a long-time ADL collaborator (Carroll) who played a key part in the attack on Liberty Lobby was a material witness in the ADL affair is significant. As we saw earlier, Liberty Lobby's expose of Bullock's ADL affiliation in the June 30, 1986 issue of *The Spotlight* set in motion the process which led to the investigation of the ADL's criminal activities. The ADL was thus ensnared in a crisis that should have sent top ADL officials—and its police collaborators, including Tim Carroll—to jail.

This, however, is not the end of Carroll's peculiar involvement in

the world of intrigue involving the ADL and the Mossad. In fact, shortly after the SWAT-team raid on Liberty Lobby, Carroll suddenly “retired,” only to mysteriously return to active duty a few weeks later as a “special investigator” into the murder of Ian Stuart Spiro, a San Diego County man whose strange death (along with his family) on Nov. 7, 1992 still remains officially “unsolved.”

If Carroll was serious about solving the Spiro case he could have referred to former Mossad officer Victor Ostrovsky’s *The Other Side of Deception*. According to Ostrovsky, Spiro had worked with the Mossad for years. The Mossad had given Spiro several million dollars to pay to a third party. However, Spiro kept the money. Then, when a Mossad team came to Spiro’s house to reclaim the money, the Mossad murdered his family and Spiro was forced to give up the money and then fed poison to make it appear he committed suicide after killing his family.

Ultimately—and to no one’s surprise—ADL asset Tim Carroll concluded the Spiro case was a simple “murder-suicide.” No Mossad involvement. No CIA intrigue. Just an everyday crime. That Carroll returned to duty as the “investigator” into Spiro’s death suggested Carroll’s real job was to whitewash the Mossad’s murder of the Spiro family.

The sheriff of San Diego County, who appointed Carroll to this new assignment, was William Kolender, a dedicated Zionist. In March 1995—at the time of the raid on Liberty Lobby—the San Diego ADL office donated a computer system to Kolender’s office to assist him and Carroll in keeping track of “hate crimes” in their jurisdiction.

In the end, by the way—despite the “big show” at the Carto home and the office of Liberty Lobby—no charges were ever brought against Mr. or Mrs. Carto. In fact, San Diego County settled out of court with the Cartos after the couple brought a civil rights suit against the county in response to the egregious attack staged by the ADL asset Carroll and his law enforcement colleagues.

The bottom line is that Zionist influence (over a local law enforcement agency) played the key part in a flagrantly illegal and dangerous scheme to harass and intimidate an American patriot and his family. On a pretext of phony allegations, Zionist-dominated law enforcement officers conducted a SWAT team raid that could have ended in tragedy.

The sad truth is that in years ahead it is likely that more and more Americans will suffer what Willis and Elisabeth Carto were subjected to. Only when Americans finally stand up and rebel and say “no more” and reclaim their freedoms will this type of totalitarian tyranny be put to rest. Let us pray that the Second American Revolution comes soon.

Chapter Forty-Four

“If it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck . . .” Jared Taylor and the New “Zionist-Friendly Nationalism”

As the Zionist Internationale—using the United States military as its imperial mechanism—faces increasing opposition from the American people, who are hesitant to commit more of their young people to foreign wars on behalf of Israel, it is critical to the Zionist cause to generate more anger among Americans toward the Muslim world. In the wake of this, the Zionist movement has energized its efforts to further infiltrate and manipulate the American nationalist movement.

As such, in recent years, one leader of what has been described as the “white nationalist movement” (that is, the element of the nationalist movement focusing on the issue of race) has come under increasing scrutiny because of his unusual stand toward Zionist influence in America. We refer to one Jared Taylor, a Yale-educated figure who heads his own American Renaissance organization. Taylor has emerged as a major critic of the Muslim world and of Muslim immigrants in America, sounding much like the Trotskyite neo-conservatives.

Taylor is best known for his book, *Paved With Good Intentions*, which says that blacks are inferior to whites. Remarkably, this book was published by a “mainstream” New York firm responsible for Harrison Livingstone’s series of peculiar books—*New York Times* best-sellers—that insist the CIA had no part in the JFK assassination.

So although Taylor’s work might be “controversial” due to its racial slant, *the book was promoted by a “mainstream” publishing house*. But even more intriguing is the fact that Taylor’s book was also favorably mentioned in the February 1993 issue of *Commentary*, the journal of the American Jewish Committee, edited for many years by CIA-connected Trotskyite “neo-conservative” Norman Podhoretz.

That a book with a so-called “racist” slant would get a boost from Podhoretz and *Commentary* is interesting in and of itself. But that Taylor should get a friendly nod from these Zionist Trotskyites is not really so extraordinary if Taylor’s record is considered in context.

Although the Anti-Defamation League has criticized Taylor for some of his views, and Taylor, in turn, has sent gentle barbs in the ADL’s direction for chiding him on the race question, the totality of the record that we will review here suggests that Taylor is effectively lending support to the Zionist movement. And that’s precisely what makes Taylor’s new “Zionist-Friendly Nationalism” so valuable to the Zionist lobby.

Widely promoted as one of the “intellectuals” of the American “racialist” movement, Taylor has insinuated himself into a leadership position in the Council of Conservative Citizens (CofCC) and from that

post he has emerged as a critic of those who take positions in opposition to Zionism. In some respects, this recalls the old days of COINTELPRO when—as Dr. Edward Fields has reported—the FBI told its infiltrators in the Ku Klux Klan that they were free to publicly make anti-black remarks in public speeches and in their publications, but, at all costs, to avoid criticizing Jews or Israel.

Many have noted that Taylor seems to revel in surrounding himself with a variety of Jewish “intellectual” who have been waggishly (if insensitively) dubbed “Jared’s Jews.” Taylor has particularly close ties to one Rabbi Meyer Schiller, a New York-based Zionist who has publicly bragged that his friendship with Taylor has helped diminish anti-Zionism within the ranks of Taylor’s followers. (An interesting point indeed.)

This same Rabbi Schiller—a leader of a Jewish community known as New Square—also endorsed Hillary Rodham Clinton in her 1992 campaign for the U.S. Senate from New York, hardly something that might be expected from an ally of Jared Taylor, of all people.

The truth is that Taylor plays a valuable role on behalf of Zionist interests by stoking up opposition to Arab and Muslim immigration into America, adding fuel to the ever-building fire in America against Arabs and Muslims. And all of this comes at a time that—the record shows—Taylor has worked to scrub anti-Zionist attitudes from the nationalist circles in which he operates. In fact, on March 3, 2006, the influential Jewish newspaper, *Forward*, reported that Taylor said, in *Forward*’s words, that he wanted to “de-Nazify [the] white nationalist movement.”

Forward wrote that Taylor said that “Ultimately, for all the things I care about to happen, Jews must be part of the movement,” because, he noted, Jews are widely seen as being “the conscience of our society.” But while Taylor has been quite friendly to the likes of Rabbi Schiller, he has adopted quite a different stance to those who have taken on Israel.

For example, when prominent Louisiana maverick David Duke and the aforementioned Dr. Edward Fields—both of whom have been known for their opposition to Zionism—spoke at a forum attended by CofCC supporters in the Washington, D.C. area, Taylor boycotted the meeting (doing so quite vocally) and told others not to attend.

Similarly, prior to that, on December 12, 1998, Taylor boycotted another meeting of the National Capital Region branch of the CofCC precisely because the featured speaker was yours truly, Michael Collins Piper, discussing the JFK assassination study, *Final Judgment*, which focuses on the role of Israel’s Mossad in the murder of President Kennedy. Taylor instructed his disciples not to attend this meeting.

Noting Taylor’s conduct, critics have pointed out that the woman who became Taylor’s wife, Evelyn Rich, actively worked to sabotage

David Duke's 1990 campaign for the U.S. Senate. Miss Rich released an audio tape to the national media that she had secretly recorded of Duke's private conversation with a supporter. The tape (taken entirely out of context) was used to "prove" that Duke was a "Nazi."

In fact, evidence demonstrates that Taylor does seem to have some sort of friendly behind-the-scenes *entente cordiale* with the ADL. According to one American revisionist, whose name is well known to revisionists worldwide, Taylor's wife-to-be, Miss Rich, received a phone call at the home she shared with Taylor from no less than Irwin Suall, the now-deceased longtime chief of the ADL's "fact finding division." According to the source (who was visiting Taylor's home at the time), Taylor answered the phone, then handed it to Miss Rich saying, "It's Irwin Suall," after which Miss Rich conversed with the ADL spymaster.

[Note: due to a court-issued gag order on the publisher of this book, the name of the individual who witnessed Taylor's call from the ADL cannot be mentioned. However, the name of that person was published some years ago in the now-defunct *Spotlight* newspaper.]

There is a great irony here. Although the ADL claims it opposes "racism," the fact is Taylor's views on affirmative action and race quotas are quite similar to those of the ADL and the American Jewish Committee whose magazine, as noted, favorably reviewed Taylor's book. So perhaps the ADL-Taylor link is not really so surprising.

The inimitable Dr. Robert L. Brock, a longtime Black nationalist who has been a no-holds-barred critic of the Israeli lobby, has summarized Taylor's stance: "Mr. Taylor talks about how Black folks commit crime and how we're not as smart as Whites but Mr. Taylor never mentions Zionist power in America."

In May 2006, writing in his *American Renaissance* magazine, Taylor lashed out at his critics whom he says advocate the theory of what he calls "a Jewish conspiracy," never addressing the role of Zionist power in America. With such a tone, he implicitly dismisses criticism of Zionist intrigue and makes it clear he is not about to be re-directed despite the growing criticism of his position on this issue.

Considering all of this, particularly Taylor's opposition to discussion of Zionism and its role in American affairs, it's probably worth pointing out that Taylor—a graduate of Yale, a longtime recruiting ground for the CIA—just happened to be wandering around in Ghana during the early 1970s when that West African country was a major focus of interest to the CIA and its allies in Israel's Mossad.

Israeli historian Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi has written that "if Burma was the great Israeli [geopolitical] success story in Asia, Ghana was the equivalent in Africa." Beit-Hallahmi writes that Israel's outpost in Ghana

"turned out to be a stepping stone to the rest of Black Africa" but that things went sour, much to Israel's dismay. Beit Hallahmi points out that the Mossad was riding high in Ghana for years:

The first Israeli ambassador in Africa was Ehud Avriel, stationed in Ghana in 1957, and widely believed to be a Mossad operative. Avriel was active in recruiting individuals for "special missions" all over Africa. Cooperation with Ghana took many forms, marked by mutual enthusiasm . . .

Hundreds of Ghanaian trainees went to Israel, and hundreds of Israeli experts came to Ghana. There was also military and intelligence cooperation: Ghana's air force was supplied with reconditioned military aircraft and training and intelligence training was given by the Mossad.

Israel was described as "Ghana's closest friend in the early years." Nevertheless, [Ghana's leader] Kwame Nkrumah always demonstrated some reservations about Israel . . . While Israel established close ties with . . . the Ghanaian leadership even before formal independence in 1956, the special relationship . . . was over by 1967. Formal relations ended on October 28, 1973.

Quite significantly, Taylor's Ghanaian venture took place during the very critical time frame when Israel's ties with Ghana were dissolving. Beit-Hallahmi (writing in 1987) added:

Elements in the Ghanaian secret service are said to have kept contacts with the Mossad even while their countries did not have diplomatic relations, but relations with Ghana [have] worsened since the coup led by Lt. Jerry Rawlings. The Ghanaian government accused Israel of being involved in a planned coup attempt [with the CIA and Liberia]. Relations with the U.S. have deteriorated since then, with mutual accusations of spying . . .

Although we can only speculate as to what young Yale man Taylor was doing in Ghana in the midst of intense CIA and Mossad intrigue in that small country, the bottom line is that Taylor's actions in America today—more than 30 years later—suggest that Taylor (for whatever reason) has become an asset (in a most unusual way) for advancing one aspect of the Zionist cause within the American nationalist movement. *And let us close our study of The Judas Goats with that . . .*

CONCLUSION:

The “Israelization” of America

Judas Goat Number One: George W. Bush— Shill for Zionist Theoretician Natan Sharansky: Planning for Global War in the Name of “Democracy” Russia, China, Venezuela, “Islamofascists” Who Will be Targeted Next by The High Priests of War?

President George W. Bush may well rank—by virtue of his high office—as perhaps America’s most insidious and most dangerous Judas Goat. His role in guiding America into the war in Iraq—not to mention his lead part in covering up the truth about the forces behind the 9-11 attack on America—has cast him as a veritable Enemy Within-in-Chief, so to speak. Now he urges America to fight another war against Iran.

However, the truth is that Bush’s messianic call for a worldwide “democratic revolution” (enunciated in his second inaugural address and sounding much like the rhetoric of the global Trotskyite Bolshevik movement) was not really of his own making. His words were written by others far more intelligent than Young Bush. And the origins of Bush’s newfound philosophy are very telling indeed. Perhaps what is most frightening is that the rhetoric of the American president—prodded by his behind-the-scenes “advisors”—points toward more and more military action around the globe in the years to come.

Although a documentary, *Bush’s Brain*, suggested that Karl Rove, purportedly the president’s chief political tactician, is the mastermind who tells the president what to think, it is now clear—based on solid evidence—that Soviet-born Israeli cabinet minister Anatoly “Natan” Sharansky is the one who actually has bragging rights to that title.

Despite the fact that he gained worldwide attention in the 1970s as a Soviet dissident, make no mistake in thinking that Sharansky was ever any kind of Western-style free-market conservative or anti-communist. Instead, Sharansky was a traditional old-line communist who—like many others in the Soviet Union—simply ran afoul of the ruling regime. But thanks to an adoring international media, Sharansky capitalized on his imprisonment by the Soviets—who accused him of being a CIA spy—and emerged as a much-touted “human rights activist.”

Later, after his release from prison, Sharansky emigrated to Israel and soon established himself as one of Israel’s most outspoken extremist leaders who damned even Israel’s heavy-handed Prime Minister Ariel Sharon—known as “the Israeli Caesar”—as being “too soft” on the Palestinian Christians and Muslims.

The role of Sharansky in guiding Bush’s thinking is no “conspiracy theory.” Instead, disclosures from the White House itself—published,

although not prominently, in the mainstream media—demonstrated that not only did Sharansky personally consult with the president in drafting the now-controversial inaugural address, but also that at least two of Sharansky’s key American publicists were among those brought in to compose Bush’s revolutionary proclamation.

Bush himself told *The Washington Times* in an interview published on January 12, 2005—even prior to his inauguration: “If you want a glimpse of how I think about foreign policy, read Natan Sharansky’s book, *The Case for Democracy*. It’s a great book.”

Buried in the very last paragraph of a very lengthy article published on January 22, 2005 *The New York Times* reported that “The president was given [Sharansky’s] book and asked Mr. Sharansky to meet with him in the Oval Office . . . Mr. Bush also gave the book to several aides, urging them to read it as well. Mr. Sharansky visited the White House last November.” The *Times* did not say who gave the book to the president in the first place, but to find out who actually pressed the book upon the president might be very telling indeed.

Affirming the *Times*’ disclosure, *The Washington Post* likewise revealed on January 22, 2005 (although, again, in the closing paragraphs of an extended analysis) that an administration official said that planning for Bush’s address began immediately after the November election and that Bush himself had invited Sharansky to the White House to consult with him and that, in the *Post*’s words, “Sharansky also helped shape the speech with his book.”

It was the *Post* which revealed that two well-known hard-line “neo-conservative” supporters of Israel—William Kristol, publisher of billionaire Rupert Murdoch’s *Weekly Standard* magazine, and psychiatrist-turned-pundit Charles Krauthammer, a strident advocate for harsh U.S. military and economic warfare against the Arab and Muslim worlds—were also among those brought in to help draft the president’s address.

Kristol—in particular—and Krauthammer are generally acknowledged even in the mainstream media in America as being among those we’ve dubbed as “the high priests of war” who were instrumental in orchestrating the U.S. war against Iraq, was a measure high-up on Israel’s “want list” for the Bush administration.

It is no coincidence that the individual on the White House staff whom the *Post* said helped set up the planning conferences to direct Bush’s thinking was one Peter Wehner, director of the White House Office of Strategic Initiatives. Wehner—it happens—is a Kristol protégé, having been his deputy when Kristol was serving as chief of staff for former Reagan administration Education Secretary William Bennett himself a protégé of Kristol’s very influential father, famed “ex-Trotskyite”

communist-turned-neo-conservative, Irving Kristol.

So, considering Kristol's wide-ranging input, shaping Bush's mindset, it is really no surprise that, as the *Post* put it, "Bush's grand ambitions excited his neoconservative supporters who see his call to put the United States in the forefront of the battle to spread democracy as noble and necessary."

Meanwhile, for his own part, William Kristol chimed in with an editorial in *The Weekly Standard* on January 24, 2005 declaring "it's good news that the president is so enthusiastic about Sharansky's work. It suggests that, despite all the criticism, and the difficulties, the president remains determined to continue to lead the nation along the basic foreign policy lines he laid down in his first term."

The BBC News noted on January 22, 2005 that Sharansky "has in fact been moving in American conservative circles for some time."

As far back as July 2002—just prior to the time Bush delivered a hotly-debated speech calling for "democratization" of the Arab world—neo-conservative Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz was in attendance at a conference addressed by Sharansky during which the Israeli leader put forth the same demand.

Shortly thereafter, when Bush gave his own speech, echoing Sharansky, the Israeli hard-liner "provided an important bit of last minute affirmation," according to American neo-conservative Richard Perle, who—between stints in government, during which time he was suspected of espionage on behalf of Israel—peddled weapons for an Israeli arms manufacturer.

Although the news of Sharansky's profound influence was not widely known among grassroots Americans, it was big news in Israel where *The Jerusalem Post* headlined a story declaring "White House takes a page out of Sharansky's democracy playbook." In fact, the Israeli newspaper actually went so far as to say that Bush is "doing [Sharansky's book] promotion free of charge," pointing out that the president hyped Sharansky's book in an interview on CNN.

But it's not only Bush who is relying on Sharansky. On January 20, 2005, Scotland's independent-minded newspaper, *The Scotsman*, noted that "Mr. Sharansky's influence on the way Washington now sees the world was clear this week when Condoleeza Rice quoted him during her Senate confirmation hearings," confirming that the Israeli hard-liner is very much the brains behind Bush policy.

The fact that Sharansky happened to be in charge of "diaspora affairs" in the Israeli cabinet was significant indeed. The term "diaspora" refers to all Jews living outside the borders of Israel and the "mission statement" of Sharansky's cabinet office says it places its "emphasis on

Israel, Zionism, Jerusalem and the interdependence of Jews worldwide. In essence, this translates into a single, general aim: securing the existence and the future of the Jewish people wherever they are." In short, Sharansky is no less than a powerful spokesman for the worldwide Zionist movement. And now, beyond any question, his views are directing George Bush's worldview.

Considering all of this, it is no wonder that on January 22, South Korea's English-language media voice, *Chosun Ilbo*, went so far as to describe Sharansky's philosophy as outlined in his book *The Case for Democracy*—now being touted by Bush—as "a blueprint for U.S. foreign policy."

The propaganda line of Israeli hard-liner Natan Sharansky upon which the president's inaugural address was based was virtually a complete turn-about from Bush's rhetoric in the 2000 presidential campaign. This contradiction is a point that—theoretically—should have given pause to many Republicans who voted for Bush the first time he ran for the presidency.

Enthusiastically proclaiming in a front-page analysis on January 21, 2005 that Bush's address laid the "groundwork for [a] global freedom mission," *The Washington Times*—a leading "neo-conservative" voice which advocates a hard-line globalist foreign policy in sync with Israel's security demands—stated flat out that:

President Bush's inaugural address sends the United States on a new, expansionist and far more aggressive global mission to free oppressed countries from dictators—a sharp departure from his 2000 campaign that warned against becoming the world's policeman . . . an ambitious, perhaps unprecedented internationalist doctrine that could deploy U.S. military power far beyond America's present commitments . . .

For its own part, the *Times's* daily "liberal" counterpart, *The Washington Post*, declared editorially on January 21, 2005 that Bush's address was "more Wilsonian than conservative"—that is, recalling the messianic internationalism of former U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, hardly a hero of American nationalists or traditional conservatives.

Effectively endorsing Bush's turnabout, the *Post* acknowledged that Bush's pronouncement "promised an aggressive internationalism, one that if seriously pursued would transform relations with many nations around the world," saying that if Bush is serious, U.S. policy "is on the verge of a historic change."

James Steinberg, the former deputy national security advisor in the Clinton administration, found Bush's emergence as the voice of globalism quite intriguing, inasmuch as it is a determined betrayal of what had been traditional Republican opposition to international meddling. Steinberg told *The New York Times* on January 21, 2005 that it is "quite remarkable that one of the notions that's been so resisted by Republicans is the idea of a deep interdependence in the world, and now [Bush has] essentially adopted the notion that tyranny anywhere threatens freedom anywhere."

In the same vein, hard-line American-based Zionist Robert Kagan, one of the most aggressive neo-conservative media voices, echoed *American Free Press* (AFP) when he wrote in the *Post* on January 23, 2005 that Bush's "goals are now the antithesis of conservatism." According to Kagan, "They are revolutionary."

In its January 31, 2005 editorial, AFP called Bush a "revolutionary," and this came very much to the dismay of many traditional conservatives who—inexplicably—still viewed the president as the voice of American patriotism.

These folks are evidently unaware that what is called "neo-conservatism" is anything but what Americans long viewed to be "conservative" in the traditional American nationalist sense of the word.

However, Zionist Robert Kagan understands this distinction and that's precisely why he said that "Bush may lose the support of most old-fashioned conservatives" once they realize what his new internationalist policy is all about. In short, conservatives have been "had." And that's why AFP reminded its readers not to forget what Jesus said: "Beware wolves in sheep's clothing" or, rather, "Beware the Judas Goats."

In the meantime, however, Sharansky's influence on American Republicanism—under George Bush and in the years ahead—remains substantial. In fact, there's a new brand of Republicanism, at least according to Ken Mehlman, whom President George W. Bush personally hand picked, following the 2004 election, to serve as chairman of the Republican National Committee.

In a March 14, 2005 speech in Washington to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the lobby for Israel, the GOP's national chairman candidly and enthusiastically described himself as a "Sharansky Republican."

What was so striking is that this appeared to be the first time in American history that the chairman of one of the national parties used the name and ideology of a political leader from a foreign nation—one known as an "extremist" at that—to describe his own ideology.

In the past, there were self-described "Taft Republicans," who supported the presidential ambitions of the nationalistic and traditionally conservative Sen. Robert Taft of Ohio—popularly known as "Mr. Republican"—who was the undisputed leader of the America First bloc in Congress from 1936 until his untimely (and some say "suspicious") death in 1953.

Later, there were the conservative "Goldwater Republicans" who—under the leadership of Sen. Barry Goldwater (Ariz.)—set the stage for the ascendancy of the "Reagan Republicans" who came to power in 1980 under the popular two-term president, Ronald Reagan.

At the same time, in opposition to the Taft and Goldwater Republicans, there were the more liberal and internationalist-minded Republicans who rallied behind New York Governor Thomas E. Dewey and Wall Street lawyer Wendell Willkie, dubbing themselves—naturally—"Dewey Republicans" and "Willkie Republicans."

And later, of course, many of those same party leaders evolved into "Rockefeller Republicans" following New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller. And there were even a few folks, for a time, who called themselves "Eisenhower Republicans," stressing their so-called "mainstream, moderate" point of view (however defined) in the spirit of America's 35th president, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Now, however, the new GOP national chairman is not calling himself a "Reagan Republican" or even a "Bush Republican" (after the reigning GOP president who is wildly popular among grass-roots members of his party), but, instead, is hailing a foreign leader—a known extremist—as the role model for what 21st century Republicanism is all about.

And this is a direct legacy of George W. Bush who so proudly installed Sharansky as one of the GOP's ideological dictators, betraying the historic legacy of the GOP. Sharansky's policy of promoting "global democracy" is hardly in the American tradition, but it's now part and parcel of what the "modern" Republican Party is all about.

All of this, taken together, raises questions about the course of the future conduct of American foreign policy. Already it appears that the hard-line Zionist elements surrounding George W. Bush have future wars and provocations in mind.

Although the so-called "global war on terrorism"—targeting those whom the pro-Israel neo-conservatives now call "Islamofascists" (conveniently recalling world Jewry's favorite 20th century villain: fascism), there's evidently much more in store, if the rhetoric of "the High Priests of War" is to be examined and taken seriously.

Aside from Iran and Syria—which have long been in the gunsights

of the Zionist warhawks—three additional countries (Russia, China and Venezuela) now seem to be special targets of Bush and his neo-conservative handlers. These countries don't seem to fall into the category of the "democracy" that Sharansky and Bush are so determined to promote on a global scheme, and even a cursory examination of the media coverage and rhetoric from the neo-conservatives concerning these nations clearly indicates that war—either "cold" or "hot"—may well be in the offing. And Americans will pay for these wars and fight them.

America's neo-conservative Judas Goats and their collaborators in the pro-Israel lobby in Washington have already fired the opening guns of a new Cold War against Russian leader Vladimir Putin who is increasingly the subject of harsh criticism and hostile questions about his "commitment to democracy."

Whether Putin is going to be cast as "the New Hitler" or the "New Stalin" remains to be seen, but recent indications suggest that the Zionist war against Russian nationalism has now been launched on American soil. The big question is whether Americans will be hoodwinked and again dragged into another war that need not and should not be fought.

The truth is that the neo-conservative hostility to Putin stems precisely from the fact that he has not been perceived as attentive to the needs of Zionist Israel.

And for that reason Putin and the nationalists of Russia are now the targets of the international Zionist elite.

Although the burgeoning hostility against Putin by the neo-conservatives had been widely hashed over in small-circulation pro-Israel publications and American Jewish community newspapers on a regular basis, it was only later that mainstream publications such as *The Weekly Standard* and *The New York Times*, to name the most prominent, began to echo those concerns about Putin, almost as if the big name dailies were taking the lead from the other journals. Increasingly, however, the notion that "Putin is a possible enemy" was now being put forth to the average American, through the outlets of the mass media.

Another major concern about Putin stems from the fact that he has been moving against the handful of billionaire plutocrats in Russia (many of whom also hold Israeli citizenship) who grabbed control of the Russian economy with the connivance of then-Russian leader Boris Yeltsin, following the collapse of the old Soviet Union.

One American hard-line pro-Israel publication, *The New Republic*, raised the question on September 24, 2004: "Is Russia going fascist?" asserting that whether Putin personally remains in power or not, there is a growing movement—"nationalist" in nature—that holds great sway among the Russian population. *The New Republic* expressed concern

that "a fascist revolution" could be in the offing, meaning a movement hostile to the Israeli oligarchs (with international criminal connections) who have looted the Russian economy. Likewise, earlier, in his 1995 book, *Russia: A Return to Imperialism*, Boston-University-based Israeli academic Uri Ra'an an sounded the concern that post-Soviet Russia may pose a threat to the West (i.e. to Israel and Zionist interests in the West).

These works echoed such writers as Jonathan Brent and Vladimir Naumov who, in their 2003 book, *Stalin's Last Crime*, concluded by saying that "Stalin is a perpetual possibility," leaving open the theoretical proposition that Putin, or other would-be Russian leaders, may ultimately emerge as heir to Stalin's anti-Zionist legacy.

Essentially, with the American neo-conservatives now moving against Putin, it is as if we are seeing a rejuvenation of the war against Russian nationalism by the Trotskyites, retooled for 21st century geopolitical considerations.

Now—unlike in the first half of the 20th century prior to the founding of the state of Israel—the central role of that Middle East state in the neo-conservative worldview cannot be understated, for the concern about Israel is a front-line consideration in the neo-conservative campaign against Putin.

And although for years, our so-called "ally" Israel was selling massive numbers of conventional weapons and providing (both directly and indirectly) American defense technology (including nuclear expertise) to Red China, this clearly and quite definitively had the imprimatur of Israel's lobby in Washington.

Now, however, thanks to the rhetoric of the very neo-conservatives, the drum-beat for war against China is in the air. Those very forces that helped China build its military machine over the past 25 years are now raising the specter of China as a danger to America. Over the last several years, China is more and more being made out to be a new potential "enemy," one that the advocates of war against China say may need to be dealt with through American military action.

However, those who dare to look more closely will find other forces at work in this anti-Chinese rhetoric.

Note this: on April 23, 2001 the aforementioned *New Republic*—published by "liberal" Martin Peretz, mentor to former Vice President Al Gore—took a no-holds-barred stand against China. No less than four major pieces appeared in that single issue under the theme: "An Enemy for Our Time." On the cover, a menacing photo of somber-faced, machine gun armed Chinese soldiers march toward the reader.

Then, on April 30, 2001 *The Weekly Standard*—owned by billionaire Rupert Murdoch and edited by neo-conservative propagandist

William Kristol—took a hard line against China in a series of articles hardly different in tone or rhetoric from those in the *Standard's* “liberal” counterpart, *The New Republic*.

What was remarkable is that not once did either *The New Republic* or *The Weekly Standard* cite the primary element that has cranked up the massive (and growing) Chinese war machine to where it is today: Israel’s little-known (but absolutely preeminent) role in massive arms transfers to China—including critical nuclear technology—over the past 50 years. This surprised no one who knew that both *The New Republic* and *The Weekly Standard*—despite their cosmetic “liberal” and “conservative” differences—have both been loud and enthusiastic media outlets for the propaganda of the pro-Israel lobby: Israel can do no wrong—and that includes arming China.

Make no mistake. Throughout its history—one that predates that of the United States by tens of centuries—China (long before it fell into the hands of the communists) always had its own geopolitical agenda and always will. However, the question must be raised as to whether China should be considered an “enemy” of America.

Why—suddenly—have influential “conservative” and “liberal” voices representing Zionist interests joined forces to beat the drum for war against China?

Don’t jump to the conclusion that “the liberals have finally wised up.” Instead, it’s time for American patriots to wise up.

China is now being designated, in the words of *The New Republic*, as “the enemy for our time.” In the past it was the Kaiser. Then Adolf Hitler. Then the Soviet Union. And now, along with the Muslim world, China is suddenly in the gunsights of “the High Priests of War.” There is a bigger agenda at work. There’s a “long struggle with China that lies ahead,” says *The New Republic*, and, not surprisingly, *The Weekly Standard* agrees.

In recent days, similar “concerns” about China have been raised in a wide variety of influential journals—especially in the Sharansky-Bush-Neoconservative realm—and there is much commentary in the mass media that repeatedly reverts to the theme that China is an “enemy” or “potential enemy.” The list of such anti-Chinese posturing is endless, but here’s a notable and preeminent example:

Writing in the neo-conservative *Washington Times* on November 15, 2005, Frank Gaffney, Jr, went so far as to say that George W. Bush should make it clear to the Chinese rulers that the power of the United States might well be used in “helping the Chinese people liberate themselves from a regime that oppresses them and increasingly threatens us.”

The aforementioned Gaffney is a longtime high-level player in the

pro-Israel neo-conservative network in Washington going back to his days as an aide (alongside the ubiquitous Zionist geopolitical mastermind, Richard Perle) to then-Senator Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), one of Israel's loudest cheerleaders on Capitol Hill.

So the truth is that Gaffney's warmongering is not simply the ranting of a little-noticed agitator. To borrow from a hackneyed advertising catch-phrase: "When Gaffney speaks, people listen."

The fact that these pro-Israel voices are so intent on raising up American arms against China—when, from the beginning, it was their favorite nation, Israel, that was arming China in the first place—is an intriguing phenomenon. It's not just "chutzpah." The Cold War against the USSR—conducted during the time when American banks such as Chase Manhattan and other Western interests were engaged in lucrative business deals with the Kremlin—enriched the plutocratic elite beyond their wildest dreams.

And as we noted in *The High Priests of War*, it was the hard-line "neo-conservative" supporters of Israel who played a major role in stoking up anti-Soviet feelings in the United States, raising the specter of what was actually a highly over-estimated "Soviet arms buildup" when, in fact, the USSR was on the verge of collapse.

In addition, the "no-win" wars conducted in Korea and Vietnam were part of the bigger scheme. Along the way, Saddam Hussein in Iraq, the ayatollahs of Iran, among others, were given prominent places in the media-orchestrated pantheon of villainy.

The American people—clearly and contrary to popular belief—love war. And the plutocrats and their puppet press are always ready to come up with a new one.

Today, the American people are being told by the "conservative" and "liberal" opinion-makers, who function as propaganda voices for the plutocratic elite who control the major media, to be prepared for war. And if we aren't about to take on China, we have a new "enemy" just a few hours south who is conveniently placed for old-fashioned American "gunboat diplomacy."

Hugo Chavez—the colorful Venezuelan nationalist strongman—is now officially a target of the imperialist neo-conservative pro-Israel network that directs policy inside the Bush administration.

Although the major media portrayed television evangelist Pat Robertson's call for the United States to assassinate Chavez as some sort of reckless outburst—which the Bush administration formally, if not convincingly, denounced and for which Robertson offered his own less-than-sincere "apology"—the record shows that the pro-Israel "neo-cons" have had Chavez's image on their dartboard for some time now.

The fact is that since Chavez first came to power in 1999, the neo-conservative “high priests of war”—along with their allies in pro-Israel journals and propaganda outlets in the United States and worldwide—had been muttering ominously that Chavez and his government are hostile to the interests of Israel and therefore “anti-Semitic.”

Chavez and his supporters (quite correctly) saw Robertson’s remarks as an effective “trial balloon” launched by Robertson in collaboration with the Bush administration—a scheme to focus attention on Chavez, perceived as an enemy of Israel and of imperialism

Probably not coincidentally, Robertson’s call for Chavez’s murder came on August 22, 2005—just shortly after the neo-conservative journal, *The Weekly Standard*, published a broadside aimed at Chavez in its August 8 issue, claiming that Chavez was “a threat to more than just his own people.” The article was devoted to the thesis that Chavez is a threat to the tiny but wealthy Jewish population in Venezuela—roughly 22,000 people in a nation of 22 million.

The Standard bemoaned the fact that Venezuelan state television broadcast a report speculating that Israel’s intelligence service, the Mossad, may have been linked to the assassination of a local official in Venezuela. Police officials conducted a raid on a Jewish school that was believed by the government to be housing weapons that may have been involved in the crime.

This act of national defense, against a perceived threat from the spy agency of a foreign power—Israel—was presented by the *Standard* as some sort of Adolf Hitler-style Gestapo action. Asserting that “hostility to Jews has become one of the hallmarks of the Venezuelan government,” the *Standard* cited a U.S. State Department “Report on Global Anti-Semitism” that purported to document, in the *Standard’s* words, “how openly anti-Semitic the Venezuelan government now is.”

Of particular concern to the pro-Israel journal is that one of Chavez’s closest advisors was the late Norberto Ceresole, described as “an Argentinian writer infamous for his books denying the Holocaust and his conspiracy theories about Jewish plans to control the planet” and whose book hailing Chavez, in its opening chapter, forcefully raised questions about Zionist influence worldwide.

Chavez has refused to back down in the face of Zionist criticism. In 2000, when he announced a trip to Iraq to visit Saddam Hussein, Chavez taunted neo-conservative media critics by saying, “Imagine what the Pharisees will say when they see me with Saddam Hussein.”

Actually, complaints by Israel’s supporters against Chavez go back to the beginning of his first years in office. In 2000, the Stephen Roth Institute on Anti-Semitism and Racism at the Tel Aviv University in Israel

issued a report on *Anti-Semitism Worldwide 1999/2000* which targeted Chavez declaring:

Venezuela has undergone a dramatic political transformation since the 1998 general elections, which has had a negative impact on the Jewish community. The new administration's cool stance toward the community and toward Israel has encouraged anti-Semitism, evidenced particularly in the mainstream press . . . Some observers [point] to the president's close relations with Libya, Iraq and Iran, which would serve to explain his hostility toward Israel as well.

The Israeli report also raised the specter of Chavez's friendship with the aforementioned Ceresole—"the well-known Argentine anti-Semite"—driving home the point that Chavez is thus considered an enemy of Israel.

Meanwhile, although Americans who heard of Robertson's violent provocation against Chavez were told by the media that Chavez was a "leftist" and a "friend of Fidel Castro"—charges certain to inflame many Americans—the fact that the pro-Israel network had an axe to grind with Chavez was carefully kept under wraps. The Israeli lobby's criticisms of Chavez were confined to small-circulation—but nonetheless influential—journals (such as *The Weekly Standard*) read almost exclusively by fanatical supporters of Israel, such as Robertson.

However, in order to manipulate the American public, the major media helped the Bush administration by stoking up fears of Chavez as some sort of new "communist threat" when nothing could be further from the truth.

Actually, Chavez has modeled himself (and his domestic revolution) on the tradition of Simon Bolivar, who liberated the Andean colonial provinces from the Spanish imperial crown and who (in traditional American history texts) has been called "The George Washington of South America."

Although Chavez is a critic of rampant global super-capitalism, which he calls "the demon," Alma Guillermoprieto pointed out in the October 6, 2005 edition of *The New York Review of Books* that "a great many businessmen have prospered under his rule, and he has made it clear he sees a significant role for the private sector and, most particularly, for foreign investment." So Chavez is hardly a "communist"—media disinformation notwithstanding.

As far as the aging Fidel Castro is concerned, he is clearly in his twilight and likely to be replaced, as most observers see it, by a military

regime. So the fact that Chavez has been friendly toward Castro—as virtually all South American leaders, not to mention leaders worldwide, have been—is hardly “proof” Chavez is a “communist.”

However, when Robertson went on his 700 Club—which is “must” viewing among many grass-roots Republicans—and called for Chavez’s murder, he was sending a message loud and clear: “We don’t like Chavez.” The “we” in this case were the neo-conservatives and their allies in Israel who have collaborated closely with Robertson and other “Christian Right” television evangelists who have provided the Israeli lobby with a fervent (and powerful) base of support.

In the end, all of this globalist saber-rattling in the name of some ill-defined form of “democracy” as divined by George W. Bush’s philosophical mentor, Natan Sharansky, is hardly winning America any new friends abroad. If anything, it is making America more enemies.

Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, often described as the “Father of Modern Malaysia” and long respected as a voice for the developing countries, is not backing down in the face of these war-like provocations. In a 2005 interview with Britain’s *Guardian* newspaper, the longtime Malaysian prime minister (who retired in 2003) declared the Bush administration a “rogue regime” and denounced Bush ally, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, as a “proven liar” for having propagated misinformation and disinformation put forth by Bush and his pro-Israel policy advisors.

The outspoken Malaysian, who is highly regarded throughout the developing world, created a major stir in 2003 when—in the course of an extended lecture before an international gathering of leaders from Muslim countries—he stated that “Jews rule the world by proxy,” only one brief comment in a lengthy discourse, but one that was enough to incite a global media frenzy.

However, Dr. Mahathir told the *Guardian* that he was not prepared to withdraw his remarks. He said:

[American] politicians are scared stiff of the Jews because anybody who votes against the Jews will lose elections. The Jews in America are supporting the Jews in Israel. Israel and other Jews control the most powerful nation in the world. And that is what I mean [about Jews controlling the world]. I stand by that view.

Dr. Mahathir’s pointed comments about the behavior of the United States, particularly vis-à-vis its engagement in the Middle East, reflect not only Muslim opinion, but growing opinion in Europe and elsewhere. Dr. Mahathir told the *Guardian*:

The U.S. is the most powerful nation. It can ignore the world if it wants to do anything. It breaks international law. It arrests people outside their countries; it charges them under American law. It kills them . . .

That is terror [and] the U.S. is as guilty of terrorism as the people who crashed their planes into the buildings ... Bush doesn't understand the rest of the world. He thinks everybody should be a neocon like him.

Coming from one of the world's foremost Muslim leaders—one who has urged his fellow Muslims to reject terrorism and extremism—Dr. Mahathir's assessment of the declared U.S. war on terrorism are particularly pointed and a very real caution to American policy-makers who are wedded to the interests of Israel:

Even if you get bin Laden, you can't be sure there won't be another bin Laden. You cannot get terrorists to sign a peace treaty. The only way to beat terror is to go for the basic causes. They don't blow themselves up for no reason, they're angry, they're frustrated.

And why are they angry? Look at the Palestinian situation. Fifty years after you created the state of Israel, things are going from bad to worse. If you don't settle that, there will be no end to the war on terror. For how long are you going to go on examining people's shoes?

Lest anyone dismiss Dr. Mahathir's comments as "a conspiracy theory from the Muslim world," note that on May 11, 2005 the New York-based *Forward*, a leading Jewish community newspaper, reported that Barry Jacobs of the Washington office of the American Jewish Committee said he believes that *there are high-ranking officials inside the U.S. intelligence community who are hostile to Israel and thus waging war against pro-Israel lobbyists and their pro-Israel neo-conservative allies in the inner circles of the Bush administration.*

Citing the ongoing FBI investigation of possible espionage by officials of AIPAC, the leading pro-Israel lobby group, *Forward* reported that Jacobs believes, in *Forward's* summary, that "the notion that American Jews and Pentagon neo-conservatives conspired to push the United States into war against Iraq, and possibly also against Iran, is pervasive in Washington's intelligence community."

The point is that the policies of George W. Bush are not just a cause of concern to those in the Arab and Muslim worlds, or in Russia, China

or even Venezuela. There are many good Americans (including those in high places) who see real danger in these policies. And there are many people around the world who recognize that those Americans

As one effort to throw a roadblock in the way of imperialism and wars to advance imperialism, Malaysia's Dr. Mahathir has assembled the Perdana Global Peace Organization—see perdana4peace.org on the Internet. On December 17, 2005 Dr. Mahathir and those attending a special forum of the organization, announced the Kuala Lumpur Initiative to Criminalize War. As its name implies, the initiative and the efforts to promote its message constitute a serious call for a global drive to make the conduct of war a criminal act. The initiative reads as follows:

THE KUALA LUMPUR INITIATIVE TO CRIMINALIZE WAR

The Kuala Lumpur Global Peace Forum of concerned peoples from all five continents

UNITED in the belief that peace is the essential condition for the survival and well-being of the human race,

DETERMINED to promote peace and save succeeding generations from the scourge of war,

OUTRAGED over the frequent resort to war in the settlement of disputes between nations,

DISTURBED that militarists are preparing for more wars,

TROUBLED that use of armed force increases insecurity for all,

TERRIFIED that the possession of nuclear weapons and the imminent risk of nuclear war will lead to the annihilation of life on earth.

To achieve peace we now declare that:

- Wars increasingly involve the killing of innocent people and are, therefore, abhorrent and criminal.

- Killings in war are as criminal as the killings within societies in times of peace.

- Since killings in peace time are subject to the domestic law of crime, killings in war must likewise be subject to the international law of crimes. This should be so irrespective of whether these killings in war are authorized or permitted by domestic law.

- All commercial, financial, industrial and scientific activities that aid and abet war should be criminalised.

- All national leaders who initiate aggression must be subjected to the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court.

- All nations must strengthen the resolve to accept the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and institute methods to settle international disputes by peaceful means and to renounce war.
 - Armed force shall not be used except when authorised by a Resolution passed by two-thirds majority of the total membership of the General Assembly of the United Nations.
 - All legislators and all members of Government must affirm their belief in peace and pledge to strive for peace.
 - Political parties all over the world must include peace as one of their principal objectives.
 - Non-Governmental Organisations committed to the promotion of peace should be set up in all nations.
 - Public servants and professionals, in particular in the medical, legal, educational and scientific fields, must promote peace and campaign actively against war.
 - The media must actively oppose war and the incitement to war and consciously promote the peaceful settlement of international disputes.
 - Entertainment media must cease to glorify war and violence and should instead cultivate the ethos of peace
 - All religious leaders must condemn war and promote peace.
- To these ends the Forum resolves to establish a permanent Secretariat in Kuala Lumpur to:
- IMPLEMENT this Initiative.
- OPPOSE policies and programmes that incite war.
- SEEK the cooperation of [non-governmental organizations] worldwide to achieve the goals of this Initiative.

American nationalists—America's *real* patriots—share the spirit of the Kuala Lumpur Initiative. And Americans need to rally together—and with others around the globe—to stand in the way of the imperial warmongers. We need to take a very careful second look before “rallying around the flag” and jumping on the pro-war bandwagon—or bandwagons—being assembled before our eyes.

George Bush is scheduled to leave office in January of 2009. The question that remains is how much damage this Judas Goat has done to America (and to the world) and what lies ahead for us all.

There will be other Judas Goats—inspired by Israel's Natan Sharansky—who will attempt to further these dangerous imperial policies spawned during the Bush era of lies and misrule. And it is the job of all good Americans—and their many friends around the world—to work together to bring these intriguers to their knees.

A final word . . .

“Nationalism is the wave of the future and there’s no way to stop it.”

By virtue of what has been assembled in these pages, *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within* has been a work of more than 50 years in the making, founded upon an accumulation of more than half a century of solid (and often disturbing) evidence that confirms the loathsome history outlined in this chronicle—one that is by no means complete.

It is an ugly and often sordid story, but one which is most instructive instructive, however unpleasant it may be. The tales of treachery and deception not only give us insights into the machinations of our Enemy—and rest assured that is precisely what these Judas Goats are—but also provide us a panoramic overview of our history during the 20th century and a telescope through which we can observe the dangers that lie ahead on the horizon before us.

America has been subverted.

Traditional American nationalism has been twisted and distorted.

On multiple levels and through a wide range of deceptions, our nation has been set on a course that has warped our form of government and, in its place, a New World Order tyranny is slated (perhaps certain) to evolve. We say “perhaps certain” if only because there may still yet be time for real American nationalists to come together and clean out the stables and drive these traitors and criminals from our midst.

It’s time to identify and shun The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within, for, in many respects, they are indeed our worst enemies, precisely because they pretend to be our friends.

And that is why they are so dangerous in the first place.

We can no longer allow ourselves to be fooled and manipulated and ultimately harmed by these forces.

Although my conception of this book first began evolving well before the publication of my previous works, this volume, *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within*, seems almost a sequel to my books which preceded this one. If anything, those earlier volumes laid the groundwork for me to be finally able to produce this volume as it now stands.

With all due modesty, though, I must insist without hesitation that those other works, individually and taken together, already provided Americans (and the world) with a framework upon which we can fully understand the evil forces that have brought us to where we are today—and thus combat them:

- *Final Judgment* explained how President John F. Kennedy was assassinated for having the fortitude to stand up to the government of Israel and its powerful lobby in America, working relentlessly to prevent

Israel from assembling nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

Had JFK not been removed from office, he might have succeeded in his goal and, consequently, prevented Israel from emerging as the blackmailing global super-power that this tiny entity is today.

And, at the same time, Israel's American lobby would have been effectively checkmated, with a determined president standing in the way of the Zionism's now-virtually-unquestioned drive to achieve absolute power over our political system.

The fact that Israel played such a critical—really, primary—role in the assassination of John F. Kennedy is not as well known today as it should be. There is no doubt that if more and more Americans became aware of how and why JFK died that there would be a major reassessment (at least by the American people) of their attitudes toward unswerving U.S. support for the international Zionist cause. So *Final Judgment* is there with the facts that need to be told.

- *The High Priests of War* was the first full length (and, I might add, only totally candid) assessment of the history of the so-called “neo-conservative” network and how it accumulated so much influence to the point that it was able—with the fanatically willing support of an American president, who is almost certainly mentally unbalanced—to direct the United States into a war that need not and should not have been fought. This is a war that doesn't seem to have any end in sight and Americans are (rightly) becoming increasingly restless with the calamity in Iraq, despite their most determined efforts to “be patriotic and support the president.”

Many Americans are now realizing that the war is not in America's interests and never was, that it was based upon horrendous lies, and that there is, in fact, another agenda behind the war: namely the demands of Israel (and Zionism at large) on the American system.

Growing recognition of this reality, in the end, will play a major part in helping create a mindset among the American people who finally will be able to reflect upon what the war really means and who made it happen—and why. So *The High Priests of War* is there with the facts that need to be told.

- *The New Jerusalem: Zionist Power in America* is precisely what its name suggests: an up-to-date, no-holds-barred summary of the data—solid facts and figures, unlike anything ever compiled between two covers during our modern era—about the astounding assembly of wealth (and consequent political power) that the Zionist elite in America have accumulated. It is precisely this wealth and power that has made it possible for American policy to be directed—or rather, mis-directed—for aims that have nothing to do with “Americanism” but which have every-

thing to do with securing the United States as the unquestioned military, financial and geopolitical muscle for international Zionism.

As long as Zionism has a stranglehold on the American media (and the political power that arises as a consequence), the people of the United States can expect to see more and more American boys and girls being dispatched around the globe to fight wars and be killed or horribly wounded fighting on behalf of Zionist interests that are shamelessly and deceitfully hiding behind the American flag.

We can expect higher taxes to pay for these wars, and more and more political repression at home designed to silence the dissidents who dare to say “no” to Zionism’s demands on the American people. The list of likely consequences of all of this is frightening indeed. However, as more and more Americans come to learn of the immense Zionist influence, there will be a corresponding increase in public (not just private) discussion of this dangerous phenomenon. So *The New Jerusalem* is there with the facts that need to be told.

The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within is thus a supplement to what I have already written, a variation on a theme that most definitely underlies those three previous volumes.

These books, along with others—not to mention countless videotapes, Internet websites, independent newspapers like *American Free Press* and historical journals like *The Barnes Review*—provide, in the words of my friend, that populist titan Eustace Mullins—“ammunition for the war of liberation for America that lies ahead.”

And a war it will be.

In the pages of *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within*, we have seen, time and time again, that our Enemy will not hesitate to use the most corrupt, vicious, deceitful—even violent—methods to pursue their agenda. And their agenda is the absolute and total destruction of the American nationalist movement and, if need be (and if they so choose) the destruction of each and every American who stands up to their insidious program.

And that’s not an exaggeration.

Remember: “they” killed John F. Kennedy and have gotten away with it—thus far. “They” destroyed the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City and got away with it—thus far. “They” staged the 9-11 terrorist attacks and got away with it—thus far. “They” orchestrated the war in Iraq and got away with it—thus far.

And this is only the tip of the iceberg . . .

The big question is how much longer we are going to sit back and continue to allow these criminals the freedom to exert their will at the expense of the American people and all the peoples of the world.

We have identified the Enemy.

We have all the knowledge about our Enemy that we need.

Now we must communicate that knowledge to others.

Naturally, we must work outside the realm of the elite Zionist-controlled mass media in America to do it.

Through word of mouth, through independent talk radio, the Internet, by distribution of books and newspapers and videos and by any other means available to “get the word out,” we can let people know that there is a New American Revolution under way, that there are many other folks who feel just as they do and who are finally speaking out.

It can be done. It is up to us.

By uniting, we can create a tidal wave of angry Americans and other good peoples around the globe—The Wave of the Future—that will swamp the enemies of nationalism and liberty and freedom.

Let us unswervingly move forward with the aim of winning over enough good peoples in enough places so that we can finally get the power necessary to break the back, once and for all, of The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within.

The mechanism of control and subversion can be vanquished only when—and only when—our Enemies are totally and thoroughly exposed for whom they really are.

We can no longer pull any punches and play games by trying to be politically correct or politely speaking in euphemisms. We must say what we really mean. We cannot be like the young man who told me, after reading my book, *Final Judgment*:

Well, I think you're right that the Mossad was involved in killing JFK, but when I talk about the JFK assassination, I just refer to “the CIA” since most people know that the CIA is controlled by the Zionists anyway and they'll *know* that I *really* mean the Mossad was behind it.

Someone actually said that to me.

He was completely serious.

He was also an absolute coward and an absolute fool.

Although the Zionists certainly have a lot of power in (and over) the CIA—to suggest that the Zionists control the CIA and then assume that “most people know that” is a very big assumption indeed.

We can no longer assume that the average American knows what better informed Americans know. For they *don't* know what we know. It's our job to make average Americans know what we know by simply telling them the truth in no uncertain, vague or “coded” terms.

That's exactly what I have tried to do in the several books and the thousands of published articles that I have written.

We can no longer continue worrying about offending "the nice Jewish man next door whose sister lives in Israel."

If that nice Jewish man resents the fact that grassroots Americans don't like the way the Israeli lobby is dictating U.S. foreign policy to the detriment of America's interests, that's his problem.

WE WILL NOT BE SILENCED.

As I have said before, we must look at ourselves as modern-day incarnations of the fictitious character "Howard Beale," the nightly news anchorman-turned-Hell-raising demagogue in the popular (and revealing) Hollywood film *Network*.

Although the film (written by outspoken Zionist ideologue, Paddy Chayefsky) had Howard Beale getting "mad as Hell" because "rich Arabs" were buying the broadcasting company for which he worked (a scenario that, in reality, would not likely happen) the point that an honest man should be distressed by alien interests controlling the media is one we should not dismiss. That is exactly what is happening in America today. But those alien interests are *not* Arab or Muslim interests.

Our major networks, not to mention academia, publishing, education, popular culture, even many "Christian" religious organizations—to name just a just few—have been infiltrated and subverted.

Now, as a consequence, the truth is that America's real patriots—and all other freedom-loving nationalists around the globe—are mad as Hell and *we aren't going to take it anymore*.

That's why—in the end—we will prevail.

Although George W. Bush and his Zionist friends claim God is on their side, we know better.

God is on *our* side.

Nationalism is the wave of the future. There's no way to stop it.

—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

About the sources . . .

Not Quite Your Usual Bibliography

My history of writing, for both the *Spotlight* newspaper and now for *American Free Press*, not to mention *The Barnes Review* as well as several other publications, has always been based on the concept that the best thing to do is “cite the sources.” And that I have always done. My record is quite complete, and those who are familiar with my writing—even my critics—know it. One will find hardly a single story—out of thousands I have written over the past 25 years—that does not contain solid documentary information that backs up the thesis of my work. Of course, my writing has always been guided by my progressive nationalist point of view and I’ve never denied my agenda. To do otherwise—as writers for “mainstream” media publications do—would be dishonest.

In my previous experience, with a number of published full-length books, I discovered—after the fact—that my critics, quite frankly, didn’t give a damn whether or not I accurately quoted a source or cited it correctly. The intent of my critics—and they all come from a singular source, I might add—has always been to defame me, to question my credibility, to smear with me particularly vulgar names of the scatological variety, and to generally just call me a liar.

Generally they assert with great authority that I have “no credibility” and that “No one takes Michael Collins Piper seriously,” but then they go on to belie their own claims by going to great lengths to try to discredit me. They spend much energy denouncing me, saying I need to be ignored, implicitly suggesting some people are paying attention to me.

In any case, in putting the finishing touches on *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within*, I made the conscious decision NOT to include a traditional bibliography, precisely because of the fact that throughout this work when I have referenced material from a newspaper story, magazine article or full-length book, I have very clearly cited the name of the publication in question within the text.

There is hardly a single relevant fact in this book—and I am not talking about “opinions”—that cannot be found in readily available sources. And while my opinions—and those of others—are quite frequently found in this book, those opinions (at least my own) are based on very real facts that provide a foundation for those assertions.

There are many naïve folks—who don’t understand the very clear difference between facts and opinions—who are quick to say, “That’s your opinion,” when confronted with unpleasant facts, but in the pages of this book, those “opinions” of mine that are expressed have a lot of research (in a wide variety of areas) to back them up.

The truth is out there for those who dare to look for it . . .

—MCP

Lots of acknowledgements—If you'll bear with me . . .

To Willis and Elisabeth Carto without whom this book—nor anything else I've published—would have been possible. They have blazed a trail for people to follow. Also, in fond memory of their loyal dog, Charlie, a nice fellow brutally maced by a thug working for the ADL.

To two friends, now gone, DeWest Hooker, who first pointed me in the direction of the truth about the Cold War, and Fred Blahut, who taught me some basics about writing and editing—although one might never know it. (And regards to Rikki and the Blahut Avalanche.)

To my energetic friend, the one and only Matthias Chang, for introducing me to the wonderful world and people of Malaysia.

To Dr. Mahathir Mohamad and his wife, Dr. Siti Hasmah, whose interest in my work is a great honor and much appreciated.

To Ryu Ohta, Grace Oyama, Yoshie Nakajima and Marie for being such terrific hosts during my visit to the Land of the Rising Sun

To those wonderful people in Abu Dhabi—from cabdrivers to royalty—who made me feel so welcome.

To Mikhail Kuznetsov and Boris Mironov and all of those nationalists who joined me in Moscow celebrating a new beginning for all peoples of the world working together to combat our traditional enemy.

To Paul Fromm, whose good humor, passion, and tremendous ability to articulate the need to fight for freedom of expression provides lessons for Americans who had better wake up real soon.

To Mordechai Vanunu, for his kindness and support for my efforts. The world owes this brave man its utmost gratitude.

To MK—who keeps me sane.

To Mark Glenn, Ted Pike, Stan Hess, Mark Farrell, Hesham Tallawi, Rick Adams, Victor Thorn and Lisa Guliani, John Anderson, Tom Valentine, Barbara Jean Whiteley, Dale Williams, Leuren Moret, Benjamin & Ursula Seiler, Roy Godenau, Bill Grimstad—among a host of others who have supported my efforts and who have done wondrous work of their own.

To John Tiffany—as always—for his malicious brain-teasing that proves to be a rather notable disguise for talented copy-editing.

To Paul Angel for tolerating my efforts to dabble in graphic design and to Chris Petherick for, in fact, interestingly enough, indeed, not editing too much and to Jim Tucker for publishing the first news story I ever wrote and for his all-around good sense of humor.

To Anne Cronin, Steve Lombardo, Julia Foster, Evangeline and the Andersons for doing the hard work getting my books in circulation.

To John Stadtmiller of the Republic Broadcasting Network for giving me a chance to host a nightly radio talk forum and to all the great folks at RBN who help keep that vibrant network thriving.

To Steve, James the Poet, Van Loman, Curt Maynard, Jerry Myers, Joe and Dee Fields, Tony Blizzard, and Paul Topete who keep me posted on things I need to know. And to George Kadar, Scott Winchester and Paul Christian Wolff for being the no-nonsense guys they are.

To A. G. Hassinger and Michael Williams—emerging leaders.

To Vince and Elaine Ryan—a dynamic duo.

To Dale & Mary Crowley—Christian Soldiers and my friends.

To Jim and Sylvia Floyd—the best.

To E and B who are simply great people.

To J and G for their enthusiasm.

To my friend—“Mother Earth”—who looks at the world as I do.

To KV—whose spirituality and friendship I appreciate deeply.

To J and E—who never forget my birthday.

To that gal from Little Chicago—and also her son—whose joint interest in my work has been particularly rewarding.

To W & E who understand the bitter truths that so many fail to recognize. Your encouragement has been much appreciated.

To “The Home Owner,” whose insights continue to amaze me.

To “The Home Buyer,” who knows the score as few do.

To the late Ken and Lucy Lehman who told me to never shut up—despite the opposition. I hold in trust for future generations the valuable legacy that Lucy bequeathed me.

To “Sis” who taught me how to use the card catalogue.

To Ginny, whose *opposition* to my work has *inspired* me.

To Kirk Lyons who—with his friend Andreas Strassmeir—helped many people finally understand what really happened in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995. Lyons’ performance in the courtroom in Pittsburgh confirmed to me that I was on the right track all along. Thanks also to Don Wassall for making the mistake of bringing him there.

To an assortment of Mossad-connected intriguers whose machinations provided material for this book and who—unwittingly and to their dismay—made it possible for the birth of two powerful publications, *American Free Press* and *The Barnes Review*, that will play a major role in defeating the forces that stand in opposition to American nationalism.

And last but very, very far from least . . .

To the ADL’s charming, skilled and clever longtime Undercover Informant #1, Roy Bullock, who gave me my first-ever first-hand training in knowing how to spot The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within.

—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER


Index

Ainsworth, Kathy, 54, 359
Ajaj, Ahmad, 258-262
Allen, Joe, 60-61
American Jewish League Against Communism, 163-169
American Free Press, 188, 207, 229, 273, 277, 366, 369, 375, 389, 390
Anderson, Jack, 226-228
Anti-Defamation League (ADL), 47-49, 51, 68, 77, 84-85, 96, 103-106, 110-142, 161, 258-266, 275-278
Angelton, James J., 44, 69, 156, 356
Balic, Matthew Peter, 121, 124-125
Barnes Review, The, 78, 85, 89, 146, 199, 389, 390
Baruch, Bernard, 163, 166, 354
BATF (Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms), 46
Bilderberg Meetings, 178, 183, 185, 207, 209, 222, 248, 249
Blizzard, Tony, 97
Brandt, Daniel, 43, 45, 232, 237
Bronfman Crime Family, 160, 178, 182, 207, 358
Brown, Robert K., 181-184, 355
Brownback, Sam, 311-315
Buckley, William F., Jr., 61, 176-179, 180, 182-183, 185-188, 190, 193, 199, 205, 206
Buchanan, Pat, 35-38, 207-208, 209, 248-249, 252, 352
Bullock, Roy Edward, 119-142, 362
Burnham, James, 179-180, 366
Bush, George W., 371-386
Carlson, John Roy, 73-77
Carroll, Tim, 316-319
Carto, Willis A., 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 67, 85, 89, 122-127, 133, 134, 146, 352, 363
Carto, Elisabeth, 316-317
CHAOS, OPERATION, 44, 47, 232, 233
Chavez, Hugo, 333-336, 366
Chertoff, Michael, 292-298, 363
Childs, Morris, 172-176, 354
CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), 43-45, 59, 61, 66, 69, 152, 155-156, 173, 175, 176, 182, 183, 186, 204, 211-226, 229-231, 232-239, 269, 270, 280, 288, 289, 371, Clinton, Bill & Hillary, 232-236, 364
Cohn, Roy, 165, 167, 168, 169, 354
COINTELPRO, 25, 42-63, 322
Communist Party USA (controlled by FBI), 172-175
Copley Press, 223-225
Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), 183, 202, 207, 222, 248, 250, 253, 254, 284
Dees, Morris, 43, 162, 271-273, 360
Dennis, Delmar, 61-62, 359
Dennis, Lawrence, 80-100, 352
Dickstein, Samuel, 108-109
Duke, David, 62, 292-298, 363
Edwards, Lee, 195-198, 355
Falwell, Jerry, 358
FBI, 42-63, 67-72, 84-85, 96, 103-106, 128-129, 133-134, 223-225, 258-62, 263-266, Fields, Edward, 28, 61, 122
Final Judgment, 44, 161, 182, 204-205, 288
Forbes, Ralph P., 229-231

- Fox News, 300-304
Foxman, Abe, 360
Francis, Sam, 37, 267, 360
Gingrich, Newt, 252-256
Gregory, Dick, 49-51, 362
Griffith, Sanford, 52-53
Grimstad, Bill, 62
Gunderson, Ted L., 67
Hall, Gus, 172-174
Hayes, Ace, 45
Helms, Jesse, 246-251, 357
High Priests of War, The, 40, 178, 380, 388
Hooker, DeWest, 158-171, 353
Hoover, J. Edgar 67-71, 105, 172-175, 354
Human Events, 206-210
John Birch Society, 61, 199-205
Kahane, Meir, 46-47
Kennedy, John F. (assassination), 44, 182, 389
Kerry, John, 236-242, 364
KGB (and Soviet intelligence affairs), 64-65, 108-109, 144-175
King, Martin Luther, Jr., 48-49, 362
KKK, 28, 54-59, 61-62
Kohlberg, Alfred, 163-169
Kristol, Irving, 176, 207, 354, 208-209, 292, 300, 325-326, 332, 353
Kristol, William, 36, 176, 178, 206-209, 354, 372, 373, 374
LaHaye, Tim, 358
Lane, Mark, 129, 186, 227, 228, 277
LaRouche, Lyndon, 59-60
Lerner, Michael, 243
Levy, Mordechai, 58-59
Liebman, Marvin, 181-184, 355
Libby, I. Lewis, 178, 356
Liberty Lobby, 33-36 44, 67, 89, 113, 115, 117, 119, 120-123, 124, 125, 128, 131, 133, 134, 135, 174, 175, 181-184, 185-88, 216-217, 221, 226-228, 253-254, 292-293
Lowenstein, Allard, 44-45, 238, 364
Lyons, Kirk, 26, 267, 269, 271, 272, 273, 274, 287, 288, 297, 347, 360, 376
Malcolm X, 51, 362
Martin, Malachi, 188-191
McCarthy, Joseph R., 158-171, 354
McVeigh, Timothy, 267-291, 361
Metzger, Tom, 60, 267-291
MK ULTRA Mind Control, 212-218, 266
Mohamad, Mahathir, 336-337, 366
Moon, Sun Myung, 218-222, 357
Mossad, 42, 44, 45, 47, 64, 66, 119, 125, 129, 134, 141, 155-157, 181-182, 186, 187-188, 204, 208, 210, 214-218, 220, 228, 232, 258-262, 267, 276-277, 281, 284, 286, 287
Murdoch, Rupert, 37, 178, 206-207, 279, 354-358
Newhouse, S. I., 246, 247, 279, 357
New Jerusalem, The, 39, 185, 357, 389
Oklahoma City Bombing, 26, 212, 266-291
Pearson, Drew, 226-228

- Perle, Richard, 178, 209, 279, 326, 333, 356
 Philby, H. R. "Kim," 155-158, 356
 Podhoretz, Norman, 320, 353
 Putin, Vladimir, 147, 330, 331, 366
 Reagan, Ronald, 160
 Roberts, Alton, 55, 359
 Robertson, Pat, 358
 Rockefeller Family, 183, 202-23, 219-222, 253, 357, 376
 Rosenberg, James, 57-58
 Rosenstiel, Louis, 167-168, 354
 Rothschild Family, 22, 23-24, 40, 142, 171, 178, 207, 221, 256, 302-303, 316, 358
 Rowe, Gary Thomas, 56-57, 359
 Santorum, Rick, 311-315
 Schiller, Rabbi Meyer (Jared Taylor's advisor), 321, 363
 Sharansky, Natan, 324-329, 351
 Seditio Trial of 1944, 78-101
 Shearer, William K., 126
 "Solo" (FBI control of Communist Party USA),
 Southern Poverty Law Center, 43, 66, 162, 267, 271-273, 281, 289, 291, 316
Spotlight, The, 33, 34, 44, 46, 67, 111, 117, 119, 126, 127, 128-129, 130, 133, 134,
 135, 136, 140, 153, 156, 157, 174, 184, 186, 187, 188, 191, 192, 201, 203, 204, 205,
 206, 207, 208, 209, 215, 219, 221, 226, 233, 34, 235, 236, 237, 247, 252, 253, 254,
 263, 267, 268, 271, 273, 274, 275-278, 280, 292-296, 297, 299-352, 363
 Stalin, Josef (vs. Trotskyites/Zionists), 143-154, 159, 164, 166, 169, 171, 172, 176,
 179, 180, 182, 330, 331
 St. George, Andrew, 155, 157, 203, 219
 Suall, Irwin, 125, 126, 134, 135, 136
 Strassmeir, Andreas, 28, 267, 274, 281, 287, 288, 290, 296, 297, 344, 360, 376
 Taylor, Jared, 320-323, 363
 Traficant, Jim, 292-298, 363
 Trilateral Commission, 207, 222, 248, 258, 323
 Trotsky Leon/Trotskyites, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 143, 144-154, 159, 165, 166, 167, 169,
 171, 176-178, 179, 180, 206, 292, 293, 320, 324, 326, 331
 "Trust"—Soviet subversion model, 64-66, 349-353
 Tucker, James P., Jr., 207
 Unification Church, 218-222
 Vatican II Conference, 188-191
 Venona decryptioins, 157
 Viguerie, Richard, 192-194, 355
 Waco Holocaust, 263-266
 Welch, Robert, 61, 199-206, 356
 Willkie, Wendell L., 240-241, 364
 Wilkinson, Bill, 62-63, 359
 Winchell, Walter, 102-107, 161
 Wolfowitz, Paul, 178, 279, 326, 356
 World Trade Center Bombing (1993), 258-262
 World Trade Center 9-11 Attack (2001), 291, 292, 293, 297, 313, 324

PHOTO SECTION




Soviet-born Natan Sharansky (above)—a power broker in Israel and a major voice for global Zionism—is a top advisor to America’s influential Trotskyite “neo-conservatives.” Most importantly, Sharansky is also the intellectual mentor of the world’s most powerful and dangerous Judas Goat, George W. Bush (right), who (by his own admission) listens carefully to what Sharansky tells him to do. Scion of a corrupt dynasty involved in arms deals, corporate chicanery and intelligence intrigue for over 100 years, Bush is particularly pliable in the hands of his masters, precisely because Bush is a religious fanatic who worships Zionism and apparently believes he is being directed by God.





The tradition of America First nationalism and opposition to U.S. meddling abroad was maintained well into the mid-20th century by such figures as two eminent United States Senators, Robert LaFollette (R-Wis.) and Burton Wheeler (D-Mont.)—top left and center—who teamed up in 1924 as the candidates for president and vice president of the Progressive Party. Prior to World War II, famed aviator Charles A. Lindbergh (top right) emerged as a leading nationalist spokesman, fighting efforts by the Jewish lobby, allied with pro-British forces, to drag America into World War II. A preeminent American nationalist theoretician of the period, Lawrence Dennis (below left), was actually charged with “sedition” for combating the war-mongering Franklin Roosevelt administration. Inspired by earlier American nationalists, Willis A. Carto (below center)—a friend of Dennis—kept the nationalist movement alive despite strenuous efforts to destroy Carto and his work. Following in the path carved out by Carto through the venue of Liberty Lobby, the Washington populist institution, long-time Republican Party stalwart Pat Buchanan (below right) dumped the GOP and emerged, at least for a time, as an outspoken nationalist voice in the electoral arena.






The split between Josef Stalin (above left) and his former Bolshevik ally, Leon Trotsky (above center), laid the groundwork for the rise of a Trotskyite Communist element in the United States (largely Jewish) that evolved into the modern-day “neo-conservative” movement. Today, these Trotskyite neo-conservatives are the vanguard of the Zionist movement in America. During the days of the Cold War, the split between the hard-line Russian nationalists surrounding Stalin and their Zionist-Trotskyite enemies began overflowing into the American political arena, but most American nationalists and anti-Communists failed to understand the division, precisely because they were being manipulated by Zionist Judas Goats. Among those American nationalists who did learn the truth about the split between the Stalinists and the Zionists was the late DeWest Hooker (upper right) whose own revelations appear in *The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within*. Irving Kristol (below left) and Norman Podhoretz (below center) were among the early Jewish Trotskyites in the United States who orchestrated the shift to so-called neo-conservatism and with Kristol’s son, William Kristol (below right), are among the most influential Zionist propagandists today.






Jewish “statesman” Bernard Baruch (above, far left), a war profiteer, never stopped grasping for power. During the Cold War, when Josef Stalin’s Trotskyite foes were establishing themselves as power players in America, Baruch and Jewish mob-linked liquor king Louis Rosenstiel—shown above (left) with close friend, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover (right)—set up the American Jewish League Against Communism (AJLAC), working to get the U.S. into a shooting war against the USSR or China or both. AJLAC was a Trotskyite-Zionist combine. Shocking evidence indicates that Sen. Joseph McCarthy was instigated and manipulated by AJLAC’s agent, Roy Cohn, who was installed as McCarthy’s “handler.” (The two are shown below left). These facts cast new light on the period when the Zionists and Trotskyites were whipping up Cold War hysteria in America, at the time when anti-Zionist Russian nationalists were rising to power in the Soviet military-intelligence system. Meanwhile, Cohn’s close friend, FBI chief Hoover (who received financial benefits from AJLAC’s Rosenstiel) was in effective control of the Communist Party-USA through an informant, high-ranking party officer, Morris Childs (lower right), an anti-Stalinist Jew.





Marvin Liebman, a Jewish Communist-turned-gun-runner for the Zionist underground in Palestine, worked assiduously in the Cold War era to extinguish traditional American nationalism in the name of a “new” conservatism. Liebman is shown (above left) with his best-known protege, William F. Buckley, Jr. After Buckley established *National Review* magazine, widely perceived today to have been a “front” for elements within the CIA, Buckley enlisted a host of “former” Trotskyites, foremost among them James Burnham (upper right), as the arbiters of what was “responsible” thinking for conservatives. This laid the groundwork for infiltration of the “conservative” cause by the Trotskyites and their Zionist allies. Other characters in the Liebman-Buckley sphere of influence included Richard Viguerie (lower left), who made a fortune picking the pockets of patriots through slick direct mail gimmicks, adventurer Robert K. Brown (below center), founder of *Soldier of Fortune* magazine, a fervent supporter of the Zionist cause, and the ubiquitous Lee Edwards (bottom right) who now hypes a museum to honor “Jewish victims of Communism,” apparently ignoring the fact that most Communist police state butchers were Jewish.





The famed British spy for the KGB, Kim Philby (above left), doubled as a spy inside the KGB itself on behalf of Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad. This was at a time when the split between Russian nationalists and the Zionist elements was intensifying inside Russia in the early days of the Cold War between the U.S. and the USSR. Not coincidentally, Philby was a close friend of top American CIA official James Jesus Angleton (above center), a devoted Mossad ally inside the CIA. Among other fantasies, Angleton promoted the theory that a communist assassin murdered President John F. Kennedy, a theme echoed by Robert Welch (top right), founder of the John Birch Society (JBS). Following the Angleton line, the JBS touted the claim that Israel was a bulwark against Soviet expansionism. The JBS received unusually widespread publicity in the controlled media in America. So-called "neo-conservatives" such as hard-line Zionists Richard Perle, Paul Wolfowitz and I. Lewis Libby (below left to right) echoed the Angleton-Birch line and it became the foundation of their advancement inside the conservative (and Republican) apparatus in the national security establishment, the think tanks, foundations and other policy-making pressure groups.





Billionaire Rockefeller brothers David and Nelson (above left and center), were enemies of the traditional nationalists in Republican Party ranks and—in alliance with the Rothschild family—pushed internationalist policies through groups such as Bilderberg and the Council on Foreign Relations (a “junior” branch of the Rothschild-funded Royal Institute of International Affairs in London). In a brilliant tactical move, to undermine traditional nationalism, the Rockefellers funded the American political ventures of Sun Myung Moon (above right), the Korean cult leader. Moon set up the “conservative” *Washington Times* newspaper and an influence-peddling network surrounding it, sprinkling money among conservative leaders, urging them to shift to internationalism. Although posturing as a conservative, Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.)—bottom left—was a “Rockefeller Republican” who rose to power through a secret deal with the liberal *Washington Post*. Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.)—bottom center—flip-flopped, going internationalist and feverishly supporting Israel after billionaire media baron S. I. Newhouse (bottom right) came to Helms’ rescue, intervening and curtailing the flow of Zionist money to Helms’ reelection opponent.





Although Australian-born Rupert Murdoch (top left) made billions as head of the global media giant, the News Corporation, parent of Fox News, the shamelessly imperialist-minded pro-Zionist propaganda network, it's long been known Murdoch and his media empire were essentially "created" by a joint effort of even wealthier billionaire Zionist patrons including Lord Jacob Rothschild of London (top center) and liquor king Edgar Bronfman of Montreal (top right). Like Murdoch, now a U.S. citizen, Bronfman—longtime head of the World Jewish Congress—owns a controlling interest in the Time-Warner media empire and has used its outreach to enthusiastically promote multiple pro-Israel propaganda ventures of television evangelist Tim LaHaye (bottom right). Like-minded pro-Zionist False Prophets such as Pat Robertson and Jerry Falwell (below left and center) receive valuable publicity in Zionist-controlled media, precisely because they are Judas Goats leading Christians into supporting the Zionist cause, even to the point of siding with Israel over fellow Christians among the Arab people. (For more details of how these "Christian" Judas Goats act on behalf of Zionism, see *The High Priests of War* by Michael Collins Piper.)






Delmar Dennis (upper left) was an FBI informant inside the Ku Klux Klan in Mississippi and was later highly praised by the John Birch Society for his efforts on behalf of the FBI. In another Klan group, the leader, Bill Wilkinson (above center), was a valued FBI informant whose handlers told him it was “okay” to condemn Blacks, but never Jews. Another FBI fink in a KKK unit, Gary Rowe (above right, hiding behind a mask while giving testimony to Congress), repeatedly instigated Klan violence, including the murder of civil rights activist Viola Liuzzo. Under the alias “Jimmy Anderson,” Anti-Defamation League (ADL) asset James Rosenberg (lower left) became a prominent KKK and “neo-Nazi” agitator organizing “hate” rallies widely noted in the press. Only later was this Jewish lad exposed as an ADL troublemaker. KKK man Alton Roberts (below center) and his brother were paid \$36,500 by New Orleans ADL chief A. I. Botnick, to set up a fellow KKK man in a “sting” that led to 26-year-old teacher, Kathy Ainsworth (below right), being killed. Botnick’s close ties to ex-FBI man (and CIA asset) Guy Banister—who deployed accused JFK assassin Lee Oswald as an ADL-style “fact finder”—have never been adequately explored.





The late highly regarded nationalist Sam Francis (above left), was one of the first to suggest that Hebrew-speaking German immigrant Andreas Strassmeir (above center)—who was posturing as a “neo-Nazi”—was some type of undercover informant in the Oklahoma City bombing plot. When *The Spotlight* forcefully asserted Strassmeir was precisely that, many nationalists refused to believe “Andy the German” was a Judas Goat, since Strassmeir was warmly endorsed by his close friend, self-styled “nationalist attorney” Kirk Lyons (above right). Investigators have since found evidence proving Strassmeir was indeed an informant for the Southern Poverty Law Center of Morris Dees (below left). It’s also known that the Anti-Defamation League, headed by Abe Foxman (below center), was monitoring Strassmeir’s crony, confessed bomber Tim McVeigh, for over a year prior to the bombing. Strassmeir’s apparent “handler,” Kirk Lyons, was also a close friend of—and lawyer for—the enigmatic Don Wassall (below right), who shut down the Populist Party. Michael Collins Piper once publicly confronted Lyons in federal court, accusing him of being an FBI asset. (See page 288 for a description of Lyons’ hysterical, bizarre and quite telling response.)





TWO OSWALDS—TWO McVEIGHS? Ten days after the Oklahoma bombing, a “right wing” Israeli terrorist, 28-year-old Sharon Toval, was arrested in New York and deported to Israel. The one known photograph of Toval (top center) shows someone who—without beard and mustache—could be mistaken by a stranger for accused bomber Tim McVeigh (top right) and also bears a likeness to the famous “John Doe No. 1” image (above left) that authorities initially released after the bombing and which was used to implicate McVeigh. In fact, McVeigh’s attorneys were said to have been looking into the possibility “right wing terrorists” from Israel had a hand in the bombing. This postcard (shown below) featuring a famous Depression-era photograph, titled “Black Sunday” (which had been the name of a well-known 1977 Hollywood film about terrorism), was mailed—inside a hand-addressed envelope—to the Washington office of *The Spotlight* newspaper from Oklahoma City on April 17, 1995 (see postmark inset), two days before the bombing. An original caption on the photo noted “Dust Storm Approaching . . . April 14, [19]35.” The postcard arrived at *The Spotlight* the day after the bombing and was immediately turned over to the FBI, which was more interested in trying to implicate *The Spotlight* in the bombing than investigating who had sent the card, which clearly indicated foreknowledge of the bombing. The handwriting on the envelope was not that of McVeigh or his alleged co-conspirator, Terry Nichols. The card’s existence is proof positive of a very big plot by Zionist-run Judas Goats to implicate anti-Zionist forces in that horrible tragedy.






For decades, Roy Bullock (above left) was the foremost undercover operative of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, the American propaganda, lobbying and intelligence arm of Israel's clandestine services agency, the Mossad. Bullock's superior was Irwin Suall (above center), longtime chief of the ADL's so-called "fact finding" division. Bullock was first publicly unmasked as an ADL spy in an article by Michael Collins Piper in Liberty Lobby's weekly newspaper, *The Spotlight*, but it was years before Bullock's work for the ADL was confirmed by authorities investigating the ADL's criminal activity. Another longtime ADL operative was Sanford Griffith (above right) who also served before and during World War II as a top spy for British intelligence. Three prominent victims of ADL spying included (below, left to right): Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who the ADL considered a "loose cannon," according to a former ADL official; King's friend, the popular comic, social critic and assassinations investigator Dick Gregory; and Black nationalist leader Malcolm X, who complained about ADL spying to his mentor, Nation of Islam founder Elijah Muhammed (not pictured). The ADL spied on thousands of people and turned the data over to the FBI.





Rabbi Meyer Schiller (top left) brags that his close association with “nationalist” Jared Taylor (inset) has helped lessen opposition to Zionism among American nationalists. Yale man Taylor—whose wife had a friendly working relationship with ADL spy chief Irwin Suall—was wandering about Ghana when that country was of special interest to the CIA and the Mossad. Today, Taylor seeks to “denazify” the nationalist movement. Michael Chertoff (top center)—whose mother worked for Israeli intelligence—is now in charge of America’s “homeland security.” Previously, while in a top post at the Justice Department, Chertoff orchestrated trumped-up criminal charges against two outspoken critics of U.S. support for Israel: ex-Louisiana State Rep. David Duke (upper right) and then-U.S. Rep. Jim Traficant (D-Ohio) (right). The late Malachi Martin (below left) is now known to have been a spy inside the Vatican (in the early 1960s) for the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Committee (AJC). A close friend and collaborator of CIA asset William F. Buckley, Jr., Martin was a regular writer for the AJC’s *Commentary* (which also promoted Jared Taylor’s work). This magnificent German Shepherd, Charlie (below), was brutally maced by police officers raiding the home of Liberty Lobby founder Willis Carto. Charlie’s abusers were acting illegally at the direction of a “dirty” cop who was a known ADL asset. Charlie, now deceased, was a better creature than any two-legged Judas Goat.





An array of evidence suggests that not only Bill and Hillary Clinton but also Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.)—shown above—were longstanding covert CIA assets. Bill Clinton was (and Kerry was almost certainly) a CIA informant in the anti-Vietnam War movement. Like her husband, Hillary was immersed in the CIA’s weapons and drugs smuggling out of Mena, Arkansas, a pivotal corner of the Israeli-instigated Iran-contra affair. Hillary was also involved in the secret arming of Iraq at the time the U.S. and Israel were “tilting” to Iraq during the Iran-Iraq war. Allard Lowenstein (lower left) was an anti-war movement hero in the 1960s, but it turns out he was both a CIA informant and an asset of Israel’s Mossad. In the 1940 presidential election, British and Zionist agents foisted Wendell Willkie (below center) on the GOP in the same manner pro-Iraq war Zionist elements boosted John Kerry to the Democratic nomination in 2004. This satisfied the Zionist need to have both major parties field pro-war candidates in both critical elections. Today, predatory Zionist billionaire George Soros (lower right) is funding dissident “progressive” groups to make certain they do not stray out of line: Bought and paid for, they are the classic “controlled opposition.”




A gallery of Judas Goats in the “Conservative” Media. These are just a few of the more egregious voices for Zionist Internationalism, but there are many more.



Suzanne Fields



David Horowitz



Joseph Farah



Clifford May



Michelle Malkin



Oliver North



Linda Chavez



Arnold Beichman



Mona Charen



Forceful Russian President Vladimir Putin, Venezuela's outspoken President Hugo Chavez, and Syria's quiet but persevering President Bashar al-Assad (above, left to right) are all front-line targets of the Zionist neo-conservative Trotskyites who now rule in America under the George W. Bush regime. All three of these nationalist leaders—who represent opposition to the Zionist dream of a “New World Order”—have been accused of “anti-Semitism,” a charge that’s been leveled against some of history’s best and brightest scholars, statesmen, philosophers, and religious leaders of all races and creeds. Among other prominent figures on the global stage, Iran’s no-nonsense President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Belarussian President Alexander Lukashenko (below left and center) are also in the cross-hairs of the power-crazed plutocratic elite. Former longtime Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir Mohamad (bottom right) is a major—and highly respected—voice for worldwide opposition to Zionist imperialism which now makes its power felt through its abusive exploitation of American military and economic might. The fast forward moving nationalist wave of the future now roaring across the planet will ultimately swamp Zionism and all of its Judas Goats.



More “Must-Read” Best-Sellers
By America’s No-Holds-Barred
Author, Lecturer &
Radio Talk Show Host

MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER



Zionist Influence on the American Media

Michael Collins Piper's Historic Address to the Arab League

On March 10, 2003, Michael Collins Piper sparked a firestorm of frenzy from the Zionist lobby in America, when he addressed the topic of "Zionist Influence on the American Media." Piper was the featured speaker at the Arab League's official think tank, the distinguished Zayed Centre for Coordination and Follow-Up based in Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates. Here's the un-censored text of Piper's historic speech—the first ever in more than fifty years by an American nationalist to an official assembly of the Arab League. Read for yourself what journalists, ambassadors and opinion-makers from around the globe heard in Abu Dhabi. Piper upset the Zionists for daring to say who really controls the media in America and how they have used that power to shape the course of American and world affairs. There is no copyright on this document. This 8.5 x 11 document is yours to reproduce at your own expense for widespread distribution. *Zionist Influence on the American Media*, soft-cover, Six two-sided pages (numbered 1-12). Donation: \$10.00



Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to Visa or MasterCard.


THE NEW JERUSALEM

Zionist Power in America

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

Unlike anything ever published in the modern day, this explosive study combines in 184 pages, for the first time ever between two covers, all of the amazing facts and figures which document the massive accumulation of wealth and power by those who have used that influence to direct the course of U.S. foreign and domestic policy today. While there are many historical books

on "the Israeli lobby" and about Zionist intrigues, etc, this is the only book that brings things "up to date" and constitutes a bold and thorough inquiry. Chapters include a list of prominent figures throughout history accused of "anti-Zionism" and "anti-Semitism," a detailed dissection of the Bronfman family, who are often called "the Royal family of American Zionism," an eye-opening summary of some 200 little-known, immensely wealthy Zionist families in America; a fascinating inquiry in to the infamous Enron and INSLAW affairs, documenting the suppressed "Zionist connection" plus more. *The New Jerusalem*, softcover, 176 pages, \$19.95.



Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to Visa or MasterCard.


THE HIGH PRIESTS OF WAR

The Secret History of How America's Neo-Conservative Trotskyites Came to Power and Orchestrated the War in Iraq as the First Step in Their Drive for Global Empire

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

The secret history of how America's "neo-conservative" Trotskyites came to power and orchestrated the war against Iraq as the first

step in their drive for Global Empire, the so-called New World Order. This is the only full-length book on the "neo-cons" that tells the entire story—no holds-barred. The book is now being circulated internationally and is being translated into a variety of languages, acclaimed as the one book that explains the "who, what, when, where, why and how" of the tragic involvement of the United States in the Iraq war. This fast-reading, carefully-documented 144-page volume has helped spread the word about the REAL reason for the Iraq war and how it is all part of a grand design that is being suppressed by the Controlled Media. Large photo section shows who these neo-cons are and the role they play in the plot. *The High Priests of War*, softcover, 144 pages, \$19.95.



Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to Visa or MasterCard.

DIRTY SECRETS

Crime, Conspiracy & Cover-Up in the 20th Century

Based on the Writings and Interviews of Michael Collins Piper
Compiled and Edited by Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

Mordechai Vanunu, the man who blew the whistle on Israel's illegal nuclear weapons program and served 18 years in an Israeli prison for doing so, has called Michael Collins Piper one of the most "brave and honest" journalists writing today. And now, at long last, "the best of" Michael Collins Piper has been gathered together in one place! This collection includes essays not found on the Internet, previously unpublished writings, interviews (including the long-lost *Final Judgment* tapes), reviews and insights into the JFK assassination, the Oklahoma City bombing, the Federal Reserve, FDR and Pearl Harbor, Israel's deliberate attack on the *USS Liberty*, Israel and Islamic fundamentalism, the murder of Martin Luther King, the Holocaust and much, much more.

Besides the essays by Piper and the Piper interviews, this book also includes synopses of Piper's three major works—*Final Judgment*, *The High Priests of War* and *The New Jerusalem*. *Dirty Secrets*, softcover, 250 pages, \$22.



Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to Visa or MasterCard.


FINAL JUDGMENT

The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

This massive 768-page volume is just now back from the printer in the second printing of its Sixth Edition, containing explosive new material.

More than 45,000 copies of previous edition of this book are in circulation here and around the world, documenting—just as Israeli nuclear whistle-blower Mordechai Vanunu has said—that JFK's obstinate efforts to prevent Israel from building nuclear weapons of mass destruction played a critical role in the conspiracy behind JFK's assassination. On the strength of this amazing book, Piper has been invited all over the world to discuss his findings—everywhere from the Arab world to Moscow to Malaysia and Japan. Find out what the rest of the world knows about JFK's assassination and what the Controlled Media wants to keep under wraps. This is definitively the last word on the subject, endorsed by former high-ranking Pentagon and State Department officials and endless numbers of independent researchers who aren't afraid to utter the dreaded word . . . Mossad. *Final Judgment*, softcover, 768 pages, 1,000+ footnotes, \$25.



Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to Visa or MasterCard.

Here's what some big names have said about Michael Collins Piper's underground best-seller, *Final Judgment—The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy:*

"As one who has read over 200 books on the JFK assassination, and engaged in research both as an individual and as part of various teams, I can say without fear of contradiction that Piper's book is now the definitive work on the JFK assassination. *Final Judgment* is the most thorough, most honest, most penetrating, most factual, and most analytically complete and systematic of all that I have read so far. Michael Collins Piper has struck gold. JFK assassination research has a new standard bearer. It will never be the same again. *Final Judgment* is a masterpiece."

—HERBERT L. CALHOUN, PH.D.

(Dr. Calhoun retired as deputy division chief of the Policy, Plans and Analysis Office of the State Department's Bureau of Political-Military Affairs and formerly served as a senior foreign affairs specialist for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.)

* * *

"I think you've pinned the tail on the donkey. In my estimation, *Final Judgment* ranks as the most important book of the 20th century."

—WILLIAM J. GILL

(The former executive director of the Allegheny Foundation and author of such books as *Trade Wars Against America*, *The Ordeal of Otto Otepka*, and *Why Reagan Won*, Gill was a journalist with UPI and

the *Pittsburgh Press* and also wrote for *Life*, *Fortune*, *The Saturday Evening Post*, *Reader's Digest* and *National Geographic*.)

* * *

Here's what Colonel Donn de Grand Pré has written in his own book, *Barbarians Inside the Gates*, citing *Final Judgment*, which Grand Pré describes as "brilliant". . .

"Several high-level military officers believed that the killing of JFK was in fact a coup d'état carried out by elements of the CIA working with the Israeli Mossad. Kennedy was attempting to halt the development of nuclear weapons by the Israelis, while simultaneously planning to disband the CIA and disengage our military troops from the Indo-China area. (Read *Final Judgment* by Michael Collins Piper for more details.)"

—COL. DONN DE GRAND PRÉ

(In 1967 Grand Pré was named Director for Ground Weapons Systems in the Pentagon's Office of International Logistics Negotiations, responsible for negotiating sales contracts with heads of foreign nations for military weapons systems. On Sept. 30, 1979, *The Washington Post Magazine* wrote of Grand Pré: "If you had been a Middle Eastern ruler in the 1970s in search of American weapons systems, you would have called Donn de Grand Pré, Pentagon arms peddler.")

FINAL JUDGMENT—the one book that, if read by enough people, will turn American politics upside down . . .

A gutsy newspaper with some powerful enemies

A no-nonsense independent weekly alternative to the “processed news” of the corporate Media Monopoly.

The one news outlet that dared to publish this book!

American Free Press (AFP) is the maverick national media voice that’s been in the forefront reporting the uncensored news that the Controlled Media in America either ignores or suppresses.

You can count on AFP to bring the news that the major media either can not or will not report. Employee-owned-and-operated with no partisan axes to grind, AFP’s reporters are committed to the truth, no matter whose ox gets gored.

AFP is the one national newspaper that’s dared to tackle the Israeli lobby head on and challenge that clique of neo-conservative warmongers—that well-financed ring of arms dealers, lobbyists and “ex-Trotskyites”—who forced America into the no-win debacle in Iraq. AFP brings its readers the important stories consigned to the Orwellian Memory Hole by the self-styled “mainstream” media.

Each week—20 pages of uncensored news and information on a wide variety of topics, ranging from civil liberties and the fight against the police state to alternative health and holistic therapies, taxes and finance, trade and foreign policy. You name it. AFP is on the cutting edge.

Big-name political figures and a host of powerful special interest groups have worked overtime to silence AFP’s unswerving journalists whose track record is one that’s unmatched by any other independent media voice today. If you have any doubts, why not take a look at AFP for yourself.

Isn’t it time you subscribe?

American Free Press: \$59 for ONE year (weekly issues) OR try out a 16-week introductory subscription for only \$17.76.

Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) today and charge a subscription to Visa or MasterCard. Send your check, money order or credit card information (including expiration date) to:

American Free Press
645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20003

Check us out at www.americanfreepress.net



Israel lobby behind Iraq war plan

Khaleej Times 3/12

By Syed Qamar Hasan
ABU DHABI — President
American journalist Michael



inflamed upon the Palestinians
by Israel. He said that the
Americans were now con-
cerned that any cooperation

action," he said.
He also said that the Anti-
Defamation League was hand
in glove with Masoud and was

U.S. scribe urges concern for Palestinians

Piper denounces U.S. double-standards in dealing with issue of mass destruction weapons

By A Staff Reporter

destruction weapons issue. He
said the "American citizens in con-



clude that with Israel's Masoud
and functions as an informant

Worldwide Media Praises Michael Collins Piper, But Controlled Media in America Vilifies Him . . .

In March of 2003—on the eve of the American invasion of Iraq—Michael Collins Piper, the author of *The New Jerusalem*, was in Abu Dhabi, the capital of the United Arab Emirates (UAE), as the invited guest of the distinguished Zayed Centre for Coordination and Follow-Up, the official think tank of the League of Arab States. Piper's lecture, on the topic of American media bias in favor of Israel, received highly favorable news coverage in the Arabic and English-language press in the Middle East (above). In August of 2004, Piper traveled to Kuala Lumpur, the capital of Malaysia, where he spoke before numerous audiences of industrialists, intellectuals, attorneys, journalists, diplomats and others, and received similar, straightforward and honest coverage in the local media (below). In stark contrast, however, Piper has been viciously attacked in major American media outlets in his native land. This is no surprise, since Piper—a media critic for the independent *American Free Press* (AFP) newspaper—is an outspoken advocate of measures to curtail the increasing concentration of ownership of the media in the hands of a select few families and financial interests.

Free speech can be costly, author finds



Upsetting the establishment

Author publishes and is damned

MICHAEL Collins Piper is an independent
American writer, author and commentator who
is best known for his books and articles on
the Middle East, the United States and
the world.
He is a "GODSEND" figure for some
because he speaks into forgotten issues which
others in the US prefer to ignore or deny. His
remarks typically provoke a hostile reaction
between both the general public in US history
and the US establishment.

At one such event in Abu Dhabi, the Arab
think-tank at which Piper spoke was targeted
by Israel.
More recently in Malaysia, where he gave
several talks, he presented at the Sun Linn
in Kuala Lumpur was presided by a well known
"non-journalist source" to record the event.
The Malaysian for Christ used to ground-
keepers before he is mentioned such member-
ship.



A LETTER FROM THE AUTHOR . . .

MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER
P.O. Box 15728
WASHINGTON, DC 20003
EMAIL: PIPERM@LYCOS.COM

Dear Friend:

Although my previous books were considered "controversial" because I challenged the power of Zionism in America, this latest work, *THE JUDAS GOATS*, seems to be the one that will be upsetting to some patriots . . .

Some who read advance copies of this book were disturbed that I've suggested that certain folks--generally reckoned to be "patriots"--are instead Judas Goats leading real patriots to the slaughter. *I make no apologies. I call it as I see it, based on the evidence . . .*

To those who say I'm "paranoid" or "getting conspiratorial," I hasten to add that I was the first person ever to put in writing the charge that Roy Bullock was an undercover agent of the ADL. It took nearly eight long years but the truth finally came out. *I was right.*

And when I charged that Andreas Strassmeir--assisted by his friend and handler Kirk Lyons--was an undercover informant, I was hysterically attacked by many who refused to believe those two were anything but the "nationalists" they proclaimed themselves to be. *Now the truth has come out--too late for those good Americans who were taken in by these Judas Goats.*

How many times do I have to be proven right? I don't make any claims of any special prescience in these matters, but my track record is pretty good.

Thanks to those of you who stood by me through some contentious times. Your good wishes and prayers have been most valued. I know I have real friends out there!

And to those of you who have made financial gifts that have helped make it possible for me to survive as a free-lance writer, that's also much appreciated.

Best Wishes and God Bless You!



MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

In a time of tsunamic ideological shifts, in which audacious propagandists are relentlessly engaged in frenzied efforts to rewrite the facts of history, to challenge these truth-twisters Michael Collins Piper arrives: the American Voltaire, an enlightened thinker and polemicist who has no fear of confronting harsh realities, doing so with elegance and verve.

In recent years Piper has emerged as the unrivaled ambassador of the American nationalist movement to peoples all across the planet: from Moscow to Abu Dhabi to Kuala Lumpur and on to Tokyo and Toronto. In no uncertain terms, he has issued a clarion call—a rallying cry—for all of us to join together, to reclaim our heritage and to sweep away the corruption of international capital and the consequent malign force that's come in its wake, driving our world to the brink of nuclear annihilation.

Piper's message is loud and clear: Real Americans do not support the Zionist scheme to exploit America's military might to conquer the globe; that good people who oppose the Zionist Imperium must put aside differences and close ranks, united for the final battle. Passionate, making no pretense of being without bias, Piper identifies and savages those who manifest attitudes of open hatred for nationalism and freedom. Having fashioned historical writing into an art form, Piper has few peers. Nor are there many who speak truth to power as Piper does so well.

Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the Simon Wiesenthal Center has said that, because Piper criticizes Israel, he is "anti-American." In fact, Piper's work proves precisely how pro-American he is.

—Ryu Ohta, Chairman of the Society for the Critique of Contemporary Civilization, based in Tokyo, Japan

