THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XI, No. 6 † Sept. 1, 1990

Eisenhower: The Man and The Myth

John Kenneth Weiskittel

The centenary of the birth of Dwight David "Ike" Eisenhower (1890-1969) will be observed on October 14. We challenge the widely held notion that Ike is an individual worthy of extravagant praise and maintain that such an image can be fostered only by a willful avoidance of uncomfortable facts on the part of journalists and historians. In the following pages we intend to show the skillfully concealed side of the Eisenhower legacy, why that legacy should fill Americans with shame rather than pride and how it is a legacy with repercussions that are still felt in our own day. Robert Welch's *The Politician* (Belmont, 1963), an unflinching study of Eisenhower's career, has been used extensively as a research source for this article. Few books have ever received as harshly negative a response as was given to *The Politician*: Establishment critics attacked its "wild statements," particularly the charge that Ike was "consciously serving the Communist conspiracy" (this quotation was — and *is still today* — routinely taken out of context; in reality, the author had given it as but one of three possible explanations for Eisenhower's actions), and used it as a means to assail Welch's anti-Communist group, the John Birch Society; meanwhile, a campaign of tacit censorship kept the work off the shelves of most bookstores. Did Welch go too far, making allegations he couldn't possibly hope to support by fact? Quite the contrary, his arguments are buttressed with a bibliography of seventy-two pages and over two thousand books, articles, speeches and government documents. The sole reason *The Politician* has been suppressed, we believe, is because it has Eisehnower pegged so well. It is for precisely this reason that we make no apologies for using it as the primary source of the present work and for encouraging our readers to read it for themselves.

Whom So Proudly We Hail?

Over the first half of this year there was little in the way of news reports or commentaries regarding the Eisenhower commemoration. Two that there were, however, are of such significance that we should pause for a moment to consider them.

In the *1990 Facts on File* compilation is found an item containing the following facts: "U.S. Vice President Dan Quayle visited London May 7-8 as part of a trip commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Dwight David Eisenhower." (p. 366) Meeting there with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, Quayle affirmed the "special relationship" between the United States and Great Britain. The report concludes by stating: "Marking the 45th anniversary of VE (Victory in Europe) Day in World War II, the two leaders were joined by Eisenhower's granddaughter, Susan, and her Russian husband, Roald Z. Sagdeyev. Quayle and Thatcher hailed Eisenhower's vision of European cooperation and German reunification, which was now coming to fruition." Here we encounter a portrait of Ike as a great statesman with an almost prophetic vision of the future of world affairs.

A less flattering representation of Eisenhower appears in Canadian author James Bacque's new book, *Other Losses: An Investigation into the Mass Deaths of German Prisoners at the Hands of French and Americans After World War II.* (Stoddart, 1989) Don't feel bad if you haven't heard of this book because it has suffered exactly the same kind of black-out that greeted *The Politician*. Bacque is still searching for an American publisher; to date, no major publishing house in this country will touch it. Why? William F. Jasper gives the reason in the May 21, 1990 issue of *The New American*:

> Bacque places the blame for these deaths directly on Eisenhower who, he charges, personally ordered the inhumane treatment that violated the Rules of Land Warfare, the Geneva Convention, and "the common decency of the enormous majority of Americans" — knowing full well that this would result in a tremendous loss of life. Ike then orchestrated a massive and — until now — completely effective cover-up. ("American Death Camps," p. 5)

Establishment publishers, so keen on airing any and every scandal that fits their plans, have no interest in an expose that reveals that more than one million German prisoners-of-war (about 750,000 in U.S. camps) "died of starvation, exposure and sickness due to overcrowding and the complete absence of sanitation..." Apparently, they don't want to be a party to anything that rains on Ike's celebration.

The most chilling aspect of *Other Losses* is that it charges that the deaths were not the result of mere negligence but were rather the implementation of a calculated and cold-blooded plan of *systematic extermination*. In Bacque's view, these heinous acts were motivated by Eisenhower's pathological hatred of the people whose blood he carried in his veins. ("God, I hate the Germans," he wrote to his wife, Mamie. And in a letter to General George Marshall he lamented: "It is a pity that we could not have killed more [Germans].") This, however, is only part of the answer. Jasper declares:

> Undoubtedly that was a factor, but it is more likely out of obedience to those in the shadows of power who had catapulted him from the rank of lieutenant colonel to Commander in Chief of all Allied forces with such mercurial speed. His purpose was to further the establishment of the New World Order advocated by the Insiders of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Under this plan, Germany had to be laid low so that (dictator Josef) Stalin's Soviet state could rise to preeminence in Europe. (p. 8)

But Jasper is by no means the only one to suggest such a nefarious motive behind the brutality. Father James Thornton, Russian Orthodox priest, reviewing *Other Losses* in the same issue of *The New American*, observes: "General George S. Patton blasted Eisenhower for using 'Gestapo methods' against German prisoners and accused him of trying to decimate 'the only semi-modern state in Europe so that Russia can swallow the whole.'" (p. 33)

So we find two diametrically opposed views: one (that of Quayle and Thatcher) praising Ike's "vision...of German reunification"; another (that of Patton) condemning his attempt to cripple Germany for the benefit of the Soviets. Oddly enough, it may be that the conflicting appraisals at some point can be seen to merge. It must be first recalled that the Allied plan for Germany also included dividing it and terrorizing the civilians with bombing raids of cities. Among such attacks, the firebombing of Dresden was the most infamous (and more devastating than the atomic strikes on Nagasaki and Hiroshima) but numerous other cities also suffered great loss of life and property, including the ruin of much great architecture (even churches were unspared). Aside from subduing the German spirit, these bombings also succeeded in reducing the nation's industrial might and rendering it more agrarian (or *pastoral*). Jasper points out that the three men responsible for drawing up the directive that authorized Eisenhower to implement the Morganthau Plan (concerning post-war Germany) were later identified as Communist agents (including the notorious Harry Dexter White) and that in 1945 a concerned State Department official, Howard Travers, speculated as follows about the plan:

> ...It would have been typical Soviet policy and practice to instruct American Communists to support vocally the dismemberment and pastoralization of Germany and to seek to determine American policy along these lines. In this way, contrary to the Americans, the Soviets could present themselves to the Germans as the champions of the German national cause, the ultimate aim, of course, veiled at first, being a United Germany under Communism. (p. 8)

We can only wonder along with Jasper as to whether it is "mere coincidence that this plan, set in motion 45 years ago, is coming to fruition in the year of Eisenhower's centennial?"

The Conquering Hero

On May 7, 1945, Nazi Germany surrendered and the European front of World War II came to an end after five-and-a-half years of fighting. When the cheering started, a large part of it was directed to General Eisenhower. Millions of jubilant citizens lined the streets of Paris and London to greet him. New York gave him a ticker tape parade. From such uninhibited enthusiasm one would have reason to think Ike had practically won the war single-handedly.

The military record of Dwight Eisenhower is remarkable, to say the least, when we consider the unlikely way he was able to reach the exalted post of Allied Commander. Certainly no one at West Point could ever have guessed it when he was a West Point cadet. "When he received his commission in June of 1915, 124 out of the surviving 164 classmates... could show better records than his was." (*Army Times* editors, *The Challenge & The Triumph: The Story of Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower*, Putnam, 1966, p. 26) In fact, no one could have predicted it when he was a mere lieutenant colonel as late as the fall of 1940. Establishment author John Gunther has written: "There is no record quite like this (Eisenhower's rise in rank) in the American Army." (Cited, Welch, p. cxii) How is such an improbable career advancement to be explained?

For an answer, let us turn back the calendar to a day sometime in late 1940. The amazing chain of events that catapulted an all but anonymous officer to the leadership of a massive international war machine began in a fittingly nondescript way. A few army officers from Washington's Fort Irving were invited to be part of a private dinner party at the Olympic Hotel in Seattle. Among the guests were President Roosevelt's daughter Anna and Lt. Col. Eisenhower, who ended up sitting next to each other. Ike took the opportunity to sing the praises of FDR. When convinced she'd found a loyal and even fanatical New Dealer, Anna put a call to the White House and told her father, "I've found the man." (Cited, Welch, p. 7) Within days this obscure soldier was meeting with Roosevelt in the White House. In March, 1941, he was promoted to the rank of full colonel. Space doesn't permit us to note every step of this incredible story, so we will content ourselves with quoting Robert Welch's conclusion on the subject: "On February 11, 1943, *less than two years from the time when he had still been a lieutenant colonel*, Eisenhower became a full general. And ten months later, although he had never been in combat command of even a battalion and had never seen a battle, General Eisenhower was made Commander in Chief of all the Allied forces in Western Europe." (p. 9)

Elevation to the highest Allied post did not turn Ike into another Alexander the Great. General George Patton, one of the greatest military minds in history, viewed Eisenhower's abilities as a strategist with what amounted to contempt. "Actually, Eisenhower was so poor at strategy, tactics and all the necessary qualifications for *military* command," writes Welch, "that even his unceasing sponsor, (Gen.) George Marshall, once cabled him in disgust that he was entirely too weak for the position he held." (p. 10) If such was the case, how was it that he was given and was able to maintain his lofty position?

Of the several reasons which might be noted to explain this, the most telling of them is this: he energetically carried out a plan of operations that aided our Soviet "allies" at every turn. We've already seen an example of this in the atrocities suffered by German soldiers — but that only scratches the surface. As the head of the War Department's Operations Division, Eisenhower in 1942 drew up a plan that called for a permanent invasion of Northern France to commence in the spring of 1943, but urged an earlier preliminary landing that was acknowledged to be "probably sacrificial." (Welch, p. 19) The plan was rejected and the British Chief of Staff went so far as to term it "just fantastic." (*Ibid.*, pp. 19-20) Years later, Eisenhower, with, as Welch notes, "a reputation for military knowledge which now needed protection, acknowledged that critics who called the plan "unwise" were likely correct. (p. 20) But it must be stated that Ike's "error" was one that *corresponded precisely with what Soviet dictator Josef Stalin desired and with what the Communist front groups in the U.S. were clamoring for.* (*Ibid.*) "And it would be very difficult," writes Welch, "to find any 'mistakes in judgment' which Eisenhower made later in the war — of which there were plenty — that were not in Stalin's favor." (p. 20)

Is Welch being perhaps a bit harsh here? You be the judge. Although the plan for an immediate cross-channel attack had met with disapproval, Eisenhower continued to push for it even into 1943. Then came a *major* "mistake," again related by Robert Welch:

> Eventually, in 1944, Stalin, George Marshall and Eisenhower together were able to overrule Churchill and the British, stop the Allied forces which had invaded Italy from crossing the Po Valley into the Balkans, and open up their second front in France. This not only increased the relief for Stalin on the Eastern front, which was being provided by the Allied campaigns anyway, but, from Stalin's point of view, it accomplished what was now a far more important purpose. It left the Balkans wide open for the Soviet agents and Soviet armies to take them over in the chaos that accompanied the German collapse. (pp. 21-22)

As the war progressed, Ike's part in such decisions became more important and included "mistakes" committed solely on his authority as Supreme Commander or, in some cases, on his own initiative without proper authority. "Most notorious of these 'mistakes' was his stopping of our troops from entering Prague and Berlin, in order to give the Russians time to reach and take those capitals, when both cities were begging to be allowed to surrender to the Americans." (*Ibid.*, p. 21) The unspeakably foul conduct of the Communist forces entering those cities has been described by Austin J. App as "the most ghastly and enormous raping and looting orgy which Christian Europe ever had to suffer." (Cited, *ibid.*, p.23) Amazingly, Eisenhower arranged that Hitler's radio station and its building, though in the British sector of Berlin, be given to the Soviets. Later, Germans fleeing Communism and coming first to this building would be signing their death warrant if they entered it. (*Ibid.*, p. 25)

And we could not pass on to the next section without mention of those dark days in which millions of "displaced persons" were forcibly returned to the U.S.S.R. and the "tender mercies" of Stalin. In one instance, several thousand Hungarian patriots fought against the advancing Soviets, but retreated when the situation grew hopeless and surrendered to U.S. troops. The wife of one of these men, Mr. Lasio Endre, was assured that neither her husband nor any of the others would be sent over to the Communist government. Still fearful, she contacted an old friend, Countess Lili Alberti, who was working for the Allies. It was then she learned the bitter truth — *all* members of anti-Communist governments would be returned to the countries of their origin. Mrs. Endre's last bit of hope was dashed when the Countess explained: "*I have seen the order. It is signed by Dwight Eisenhower.*" (Welch, pp. 32-33; emphasis added) This forced repatriation of so many freedom-starved people — some of whom actually *fought with the Allies* — was called "Operation Keelhaul" and, along with the deliberate neglect of German prisoners, represents one of the most carefully covered-up events of the Second World War. (Welch devotes the whole of chapter four in his book to this betrayal.)

But for so many the Eisenhower myth was too great to confuse with the sordid record. Ike "the hero" became so firmly embedded in world consciousness that he was honored by many nations. In *Eisenhower, American Hero*, a book written by the editors of *American Heritage* magazine, a full page is devoted to a photo of some 44 medals he received from around the world, among them decorations from Argentina, Egypt, Haiti, Norway and the Philippines. (McGraw-Hill, 1969, p. 72) Although the book includes those he received from our allies Britain and France, the

Soviet Union is not represented at all. So, an Eisenhower apologist may ask, if Ike was so keen in aiding the cause of the Soviets, why didn't *they* show their appreciation for his efforts in this way? The answer is: they did, but none of *their* medals to him are to be found in the afore-mentioned photo!

The embarrassing fact is that Eisenhower in 1944 received the Order of Suvorov of the First Degree Medal, the highest honor given by the U.S.S.R., and in 1945 the Order of Victory Medal, then with an appraised value of $100,000. (Welch, p. cxvi) Another cherished keepsake, an autographed photo of Stalin, was, according to the great Polish hero, Gen. Bar-Komorowski, who visited him after the war, the only such photo that Ike kept on his desk. (*Ibid.*, pp. 23, cxvi) It seems only fitting, then, that, when Eisenhower published his book on the war years, *Crusade in Europe*, its main ghostwriter was Joseph Fels Barnes, a man identified as a Communist by such reliable sources as Whittaker Chambers and Louis Budenz. (*Ibid.*, pp. 216, clviii)

The Politician in Action

So great was Eisenhower's new-found popularity with a hero-worshiping public that success in the political arena was all but assured. The balding general with the wide grin had, in addition, a vital political skill: the ability to charm the voters. For many, he was like a kindly uncle. Three decades before Ronald Reagan, a politician remarkably similar in appeal (and in action), he was a figure America found almost impossible to dislike. Although during two terms as president Ike would push for socialism at home and One Worldism abroad, Americans didn't seem to care; they might have rebelled against Big Brother, but Big Uncle was just fine! But, as Shakespeare has written, "one may smile, and smile, and be a villian."

Before examining the Eisenhower presidency, we want to pause a moment to consider his tenure as president of Columbia University. Not long after he assumed this post in the spring of 1948, a list was submitted to him that gave the names of 87 members of Columbia's faculty who had Communist or Communist front affiliations. Undoubtedly, some were only dupes but others had an abiding loyalty to Marxism, the first five names on the list having 62, 38, 31, 19 and 33 front connections. Consider the following examples: Bernard J. Stern, using an assumed name, wrote a Marxist book released by the Communist Party's official publishing house; Gene Weltfish had been president of a group classified as Communist by the U.S. Justice Department; Goodwin Watson's activities filled 64 pages in exhibits from Congressional hearings. (Welch, pp. 101-102) Any responsible educator would have immediately conducted an in-house cleaning. But not Ike. He angrily stonewalled, declaring: "I found no trace of Communism among the deans, professors, and the rest of the staff at Columbia, and I met them all." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. 102) In February, 1949, the American Legion sent a delegation to personally present him with more information but he refused to meet them; the material was mailed to him but he never removed a single Red from Columbia. (*Ibid.*, p. 103) In addition, Eisenhower accepted a $30,000 endowment from the Communist government of Poland to set up a Chair of Polish Studies and accepted as well the comrade it sent to fill the seat. One member of the university's Slavic Languages Department resigned in protest. (*Ibid.*, p. 100) Regarding the claim by Ike that he found no Communists at Columbia, we are inclined to agree with Robert Welch's assessment: "You can explain any way you want to, but the easiest explanation is simply that it was a brazen lie to protect the Communists." (pp. 102-103)

Even before his Columbia days, however, Eisenhower was considered electable on the national political scene. The *Army Times* editors note that in 1948: "The Americans for Democratic Action, dissatisfied with Truman as *too far to the right*, began a campaign to have the Democratic convention nominate Eisenhower. He refused to respond..." (p. 114; emphasis added)

How could a liberal Democratic group have sought to woo a man who would run as a "conservative" Republican only four years later? The reason, in part, is because he never publicized his politics. Only those close to Ike knew *what* he was. When he finally ran in 1952, his campaign manager claimed he had been a lifelong Republican, but this was not true. Welch provides evidence that as early as 1909 he denounced the GOP in a speech at Abilene's (Kan.) Young Men's Democratic Club, that he had voted for FDR at least once (1944) and that he had persuaded others to support Roosevelt. (p. 107) The list of 1948 Ike supporters reads like a *Who's Who* of left-wing Democrats: Eleanor Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt; Adlai Stevenson (who ran against him in 1952 and 1956); Helen G. Douglas (whom Richard Nixon dubbed "The Pink Lady" when she ran against him for U.S. Senate in 1948); Claude Pepper (the Communist *Daily Worker's* "best man in the Senate," p. cxxii); David Dubinsky (raised funds for the Reds in Spanish Civil War); and scandal monger Drew Pearson. (Welch, pp. 73-74). Such backing would have presented little problem for a Democratic candidate, but a comparative list of people for "conservative" Republican Eisenhower in 1952 ought to have spelled his political doom. Those included: Jacob Javits; Adam Clayton Powell; Norman Thomas (six-time *Socialist Party* presidential hopeful); Quentin Reynolds

(Communist front sponsor and editor of *United Nations World*); and Drew Pearson. (*Ibid.*, p. 76) Welch also mentions an allegation that three open Communists — John Abt, Nathan Witt, and Lee Pressman — were among Reds who quietly stated their support of Ike. (p. 80)

The 1952 campaign pitted Eisenhower against a true conservative, Ohio's Senator Robert A. Taft, in the GOP primaries. The story of how Taft had the nomination stolen from him is covered in *The Politician*. Below are but a few examples to show that, like later members of his party to ascend to the Oval Office, Eisenhower's preelection rhetoric bore little or no resemblance to the policies that he pursued as president.

Socialism: In 1952, Eisenhower rightly warned: "For the past 20 years, there has been a creeping socialism spreading in the United States." (Cited, David Wallechinsky & Irving Wallace, *The People's Almanac #2*, Bantam, 1978, p. 194) Americans expecting an end to the New Deal were in for a surprise. In his very first year in office, Eisenhower successfully pushed through Congress what FDR and Harry Truman couldn't — the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (known since 1980 as Housing and Urban Development). (Welch, p. 111) The fiscal insanity practiced by the Federal Government is largely a consequence of policies laid down by Ike. Robert Welch writes:

> In the President's economic reports at the beginning of 1955 he urged that the country accept a Keynesian doctrine now known as the "compulsory budget theory." By the plan, budgets would have little or no relation to the money actually needed to run the government, but their size would be determined by the need — in the minds of the central planners — for either expanding or contracting the nation's economy at a given time. (pp. 111-112; the "Keynesian" doctrine referred to here is taken from the theories of British Fabian Socialist John Maynard Keynes.)

Civilian employees of the Federal government rose by 80,000 a year under Ike. (*Ibid.*, p. 127) His proposed 1955 budget was sufficiently Keynesian to receive the support of Truman and Stevenson. (*Ibid.*, p. 131) The real truth about his policies came out when, in April, 1957, Socialist veteran Norman Thomas remarked that "the United States is making greater strides toward socialism under Eisenhower than even under Roosevelt." (Cited, *ibid.*)

Internal Security: The Communist infestation of the Federal Government was a problem that many Americans were just learning about. On the campaign trail in Milwaukee, Eisenhower warned that the "Communist conspiracy" was bent on the "subversion of government" and had penetrated "every section of our Government." "By the (Truman) Administration's appeasement of Communism at home and abroad," he charged, "it has permitted Communists and their fellow travelers to serve in many key agencies and to infiltrate our American life." And he attacked those leaders as too weak or naive "who have sneered at the warnings of men trying to drive Communists from high places..." (See Welch, pp. clxxi-clxxii, for a lengthy quote from the speech.) As soon as he became president he began taking the lead in the attack on Wisconsin's anti-Communist senator, Joseph McCarthy.

But Ike worked to suppress all those who sought "to drive Communists from high places." Still in 1953, he muzzled his own Attorney General, Herbert Brownell, who had begun informing the public with an exposition of the Harry Dexter White case. By silencing Brownell, writes Welch, "he made clear to all other members of his administration and of the Republican Party, whom he could control, that the surest way into the presidential doghouse was to expose Communists, past or present." (p. 83) In the same year he worked to have researcher J. B. Matthews dropped from the McCarthy committee after an article by Matthews charged that as many as three percent of Protestant ministers were following the Red propaganda line. (*Ibid.*, p. 84; Welch includes quotes of FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover from 1949 and 1954 that acknowledge Communist infiltration in the Churches. pp. cxxiv-cxxv) Eisenhower was instrumental in securing the Senate's censure of McCarthy. (*Ibid.*, p. 86) And far from overturning Truman's directives that hampered Congress in obtaining vital information concerning security risks in the executive branch, Ike added his own executive order in 1954, which forbade *any information* from getting to investigating committees, an action that Welch suggests "made the Truman gag rule look almost cooperative." (pp. 87-88. It should be noted that this measure was invoked no fewer than 44 times by the administration. p. cxxvi) As president, then, Eisenhower did what he had done at Columbia — *protect Communists*.

The Korean War: As early as 1950, Eisenhower contended: "The North Koreans must be defeated soundly. We must defeat them physically and defeat their intentions." (Cited, Welch, p. cxxii) During the campaign he wrote to a newspaper publisher: "We are not going to withdraw from Korea and have our boys in Communist prison camps." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. cxxiv) Despite the strong language, a truce was signed with the Communist North Koreans on June 26, 1953, and our boys *were* left to rot in their prison camps. Regardless of suggestions to the contrary, the war *was* winable and our failure to do so is due in part to the policy of Eisenhower. In 1955, five senior military commanders

testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that victory in Korea was possible and desirable; that it wouldn't have resulted in World War III; that politics were regarded before military needs; and that they hoped U.S. troops would never be asked to fight another no-win war. (*Ibid.*, p. cxxx) One of the five, Army Gen. James A. Van Fleet, stated: "Victory was denied us back in April and May of 1953, when we had the enemy on the run. We could have won here and we should have won." (Cited, *ibid.*, pp. 136-137)

The Iron Curtain: Speaking at the American Legion Convention in 1952, Ike exclaimed: "The American conscience can never know peace until these people are restored again to being masters of their own fate." (Cited, Welch, pp. cxxxiv-cxxxv) Fine sentiments, but not at all in keeping with the policies that followed. On the 38th anniversary of the Russian Revolution in 1955, Eisenhower sent a personal message to Kliment Voroshilov, "president" of the first captive nation, the Soviet Union, to offer "the best wishes of the people of the United States for progress toward a permanent and just peace." (*Ibid.*, p. 209) The "peace" invoked here would seem to be meant in the sense the Reds use it — elimination of any anti-Communist opposition. For example, in June, 1956, an uprising erupted at a factory in Posnan, Poland, that was ruthlessly quashed by the Marxist-Leninist slave masters. Our response? The State Department issued a mild statement on the workers' dissatisfaction, and Harold Stassen, the President's Commissioner of Peace & Disarmament, offered to send free food to Poland — to the government, that is, that shot its workers. (*Ibid.*, p. cl.) Later the same year, Hungarians succeeded in overthrowing the Reds but again America did nothing to insure that the new freedom would be kept. In fact, despite muttering sympathetic platitudes about how the U.S. "deplores the intervention of Soviet military forces (into Hungary)" and how "the heart of the American people goes out to the people of Hungary," the hard, cold truth of the matter is that Eisenhower could not have cared less. (Cited, *ibid.*, p. clxxviii) If he *had* cared, he would not have interfered with a joint Spanish-West German plan to deliver arms to the freedom fighters. (*Ibid.*, p. 270) During his two terms, the U.S. also aided Yugoslav Communist Tito to the tune of 750 million dollars. (*Ibid.*, p. 258)

Over most of this section we have summarized a number of activities by Eisenhower and his Administration that are plainly at odds with positions he took as a candidate. (Space limits prevent a look at his sellout of Cuba to Castro. See Welch, pp. xvii-xxi) Please note that in no way can these be reasonably seen as mere aberrations. Rather, they form a pattern of conduct indicating a *deliberate and calculated strategy aimed at deceiving the electorate.* At this point in *The Politician* (pp. 276-278), Robert Welch suggests three possible explanations for Ike's behavior: (1) he was, as the book's title indicates, simply an amoral politician whose lust for power blinded him to the fact that he was used by the Reds as a tool; (2) he was a stupid man who didn't fully comprehend the consequences of his actions; or (3) he was consciously advancing Communism's global objectives. The degree of his culpability is open to debate but, even if one takes the most generous of the above theories and views him as an innocent manipulated by forces beyond his understanding, one still is left with the fact that for eight years irreparable harm was done to America and the world and he made little or no visible attempt to reverse the process.

Finally, we must consider Eisenhower's promotion of a One World Government. In December, 1953, he addressed the United Nations and called for "a control group" under U.N. supervision to study the "peaceful use of atomic energy," adding that the U.S.S.R. should be included. Communist delegates joined in applauding him. (*Army Times* editors, p. 135) He issued a statement with British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan on October 25, 1957, that averred: "The concept of national self-sufficiency is now out of date." (Cited, Welch, p. 184) According to the *London Times*, when in 1960 Eisenhower addressed the U.N. General Assembly, he asked them to consider giving the U.N. duties that would turn it "into something that is at least an effective nucleus of world government." (Cited, *ibid.*, p. clii) As Robert Welch points out, such pronouncements are in violation of his oath of office and are grounds for impeachment. Eisenhower was a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and his CFR appointees included among others: Secretary of State Christian Herter, Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, economic adviser Arthur Burns, ambassadors to Russia, France and West Germany. (Dan Smoot, *The Invisible Government*, Dan Smoot Report, pp. 187-201) And although not *known* to be a Mason, his Lodge appointees included Herter (33°), Anderson, Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren (33°), Chief of Staff Sherman Adams, and Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay. (Paul A. Fisher, *Behind the Lodge Door: Church, State & Freemasonry in America*, Shield, 1989, pp. 247-249)

A Rather Striking Similarity

As mentioned earlier, Eisenhower's presidency was remarkably similar to Reagan's. Each won easily in his first election, then enjoyed a landslide victory in his second. Each had a charisma making him almost universally liked, a quality that deflected any criticism of his policies from his person. Each as a candidate warned of the growth of government, yet each left office having presided over further expansion of it.

In the first term of each, Soviets shot down a plane carrying Americans (in 1953 a Navy plane was destroyed off the Alaskan coast; in 1983 a Korean airliner with Congressman Larry McDonald aboard was hit near Japan); in each case, the president followed with "business as usual" dealings with the Kremlin. (Welch, p. 153) Each greatly enhanced the prestige of Soviet dictators (Khrushchev and Gorbachev) by inviting them to our shores. Robert Welch suggested that Khrushchev's visit was perhaps "the one single event which was most damaging to the anti-Communist cause throughout the world" during Ike's final two-and-a-half years as president. (p. xxvii) And one need only consult today's newspaper to understand what the Gorbachev visit has produced: the widespread delusion that Communism is crumbling before our very eyes.

In Conclusion

The Eisenhower legacy is one of retreat before the forces of militant atheism, acceptance of measures at home that strike at internal security and foster socialism and promotion of the grand design of world government as our best hope for peace. But it is a *living* legacy, continuing to our day. "*The firm grip on our government*," writes Welch, "*of the forces that have worked through Eisenhower is more important than Eisenhower himself.*" (p. 278) That is why exposure of the real Eisenhower should be only a part of the larger strategy of revealing the conspiratorial forces still at work in our government. Far from honoring the memory of such a man, we should mourn how for so long we have been dupes of forces that seek our eventual enslavement. †

Pray The Rosary Daily

"The unholy trinity":
George Bush
Mikhail Gorbachev
John Paul II

SUBSCRIPTON RENEWALS

The date on the envelope address label indicates the month and year in which the recipient's subscription is due for renewal. At the proper time, a subscription envelope will be enclosed with the newsletter. One may enter a new subscription at any time, of course, and will then receive the eight following newsletter issues. †

My contribution to the Traditional Catholics of America is $_____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State and Zip _____

The Catholic Church and The Conciliar Church

Fr. Oswald Baker (England)

It remains eternally true that the Catholic Church under the Papacy is the only Church instituted by God, endowed by God with authority to convert the world. All other Churches are of merely human foundation, without any authority from God. They were all set up as rivals to God's Church and, therefore, however unwittingly, in opposition to God. Catholics have always prayed for non-Catholics "that God deliver them from all their errors and vouchsafe to bring them to our Holy Mother the Catholic Church."

For some years before Vatican II the possible use of the vernacular in the Mass was openly discussed. Some Catholics, with wisdom and foresight, gave warning that, if ever this should be allowed, the Catholic Church would in the eyes of the world lose its dominant status and come to be regarded as no longer unique but just one of the many Churches, cooperating with them in a joint search for religious truth. Vatican II brought about precisely this result, and it did so by sanctioning the use of the vernacular in Mass and by its grossly heretical declaration that non-Catholic sects enjoy divine approbation. To believe that is, quite certainly, to cease to be a Catholic. Many who still profess to be Catholics do believe it and act accordingly by, for example, taking part in united services.

Those who accept Vatican II with its errors form the new Church, the Conciliar Church. The Conciliar Church is thus not the Catholic Church but a new institution. It approves un-Catholic beliefs, un-Catholic practices and un-Catholic morals. The traditional and true Catholic Church consists solely of those who retain the traditional Catholic Mass and the integral Catholic Faith — and who are sedevacantists. The new Conciliar Church has by far the larger membership and is regarded still — by the non-Catholic world and by millions of misguided former Catholics — as the Catholic Church. Inevitably, the result is confusion and grave misunderstanding. The Conciliar Church, under the leadership of John Paul II, is merely another non-Catholic sect. It is reasonable and proper that members of the Conciliar Church accept ecumenism, that is, amalgamation with other sects. A woman Catholic priest is a sheer impossibility. A member of the Conciliar Church might understandably be allowed to become a Freemason. A Conciliar Church member cannot reasonably be expected to heed his superior's lip-service to the divine ban on birth prevention, for they assure him at the same time that he is entitled to follow his own conscience in the matter. The Protestant custom of hand Communion is perfectly appropriate for the Conciliar Church and the "new Mass."

The only religious body to which the Conciliar Church cannot fittingly extend the hand of friendship is that of authentic Catholics who preserve the unchanged Mass and the unchanged Catholic Faith. These must, logically, be abhorred and shunned and, as far as possible, suppressed, for they are an obstacle to progress as charted by Vatican II.

Like the "new Mass" and the true Mass, the Conciliar Church and the Catholic Church are poles apart. The fallacies of the new Church are pernicious and satanic. It is for us who remain Catholic to preserve the Catholic tradition of combining hatred and intolerance of error with compassion for its victims. The errors into which countless innocent Catholics have been seduced by Vatican II constitute as detestable a heresy as any that has ever previously assailed the Church. †

THE ATHANASIAN

Published by Traditional Catholics of America

Eight issues a year: (Jan. 15, Mar. 1, Apr. 15, June 1, July 15, Sept. 1, Oct. 15, Dec. 1)

Subscriptions: $12.00 per year (via First Class Mail) for the USA, Canada and Mexico;
$16.00 per year (via Air Mail) for all other countries

Additional Copies: Single copy - $1.50; 10 copies - $12.00; 40 or more to same address - $1.00 each

Mailing Address: P. O. Box 38335, Colorado Springs, CO 80937

Telephone: (719) 636-1575

Articles appearing in this newsletter may be reproduced providing no changes of any kind are made in those articles and adequate credit is given to *The Athanasian* for them. The adequate credit preferred would be the inclusion with the articles reproduced of the information contained in this box.

Manuscripts sent to us for possible publication in *The Athanasian* should be typewritten, double-spaced and no more than seven pages in length. If not accepted, they will be returned to the sender.