

25¢



Distributed By
the BOOKMALLER inc.
Box 101 Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N.Y.

STIFLE THE LEGEND

By
Lyle H. Munson

STIFLE THE LEGEND

Copyright: 1964
by Lyle H. Munson

There are some things which we, as Americans, must stop and talk about. They are not pretty things. In fact, they are ugly and unpleasant. Death always is.

The very ugliest—and cleverest—of possible rumors is abroad in our land. It didn't just grow. Like all rumors, it was planted by someone. That someone had a purpose.

The rumor concerns our new President. Unchecked, it is going to become a legend—a legend that some of our children will believe and repeat openly, and that our grandchildren, and our President's grandchildren, will read books about.

It must be stopped.

None is so bold, as yet, to offer up this rumor openly at cocktails or dinner. It passes, instead, in confidential tones between intimates. It is not a "have you heard?" rumor. It is an "I can't get it out of my mind" rumor. "I know it's silly, but it keeps crossing my mind" says another. The next observes seriously that "you have to consider it a possibility, he had the most to gain."

There is in the making a legend that "Lyndon did it."

If President Johnson and his family have not been told this, then they are being shielded.

I, for one, respect the President as a

man who neither needs nor wants to be shielded. I am sure that he would rather face this ugliness than leave it for his children and grandchildren to face in ten years, or twenty or thirty.

Let us, then, get on with facing it. Follow me, if you will, through this clogged slit-trench of foulness. In composite, the "legend" goes something like this: "Lyndon was done. After Billie Sol Estes, the Korh affair, TFX, and the Bobby Baker mess, he was coming off the ticket in '64. He was headed for oblivion. Smathers of Florida was going to replace him as Kennedy's running-mate. Lyndon knew it. And where did it happen? In Texas, his home-ground, where he owns the Governor, and the police to cover up. Notice that he stopped Congress from investigating. He had to have a hand-picked Presidential Commission do the job, with Warren, who vacillates with Tito and Khrushchev, heading it. Brother! It's hard not to think about it, Lyndon had the most to gain . . . etc. . . etc. . . etc."

Does that sound demented? How many different theories have you read about the assassination of President Lincoln? Reflect for a moment on how the Kennedy assassination legend can grow in thirty years' time.

The timing, the locale, the circumstances fertilized the rumor. Unhappily, Lyndon Johnson nourished it, himself. He did pres-

sure the elected representatives of the people, the Congress, to abandon plans for televised public hearings into the whole affair. Then, in one of the most unfortunate coincidences in history, he implemented precisely the call of the Communist press for "an investigating committee, headed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. . . ." He insisted that the Justice Department and the Treasury Department, both of which are responsible to him, investigate themselves. He asked them to report their findings to seven men he hand-picked. And the public, denied prompt access to the official reports, said "What the hell kind of investigation is that? What is Lyndon trying to cover up?"

The suspicious were made more suspicious. The legend grew.

On the record, Chief Justice Warren had prejudged, without evidence, a case which ultimately could have come before the Supreme Court. He publicly blamed the crime on "forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the blood-stream of American life." Whatever the Chief Justice intended, the press interpreted his remarks as an attack on "right-wing extremists." And then there was the question of the position of the Chief Justice should the case against Jack Rubenstein come to the Supreme Court.

The "maybe Lyndon did it" speculations in that stronghold of the Democratic Party which is New York City may, in fact, be feedback from Communist inspired whisperings. They may be only a manifestation of distrust of political leaders bred by a long train of local usurpers of public trust. But the speculation goes on across the country as far as Washington State, too. I shudder to think what currency it has, or may come to have, in Republican party strongholds.

Any shadow on the succession to the Presidency of our Republic is a calamity. It must be recognized as such, by the President, by the Chief Justice, and by the Congress. A ghoulish legend that "Lyndon did it" would be worse than the fact of his having done it.

Lyndon Johnson owes it to his own family and to the people of his country to stifle any such legend. He now can do so only by stepping aside and insisting that the Congress investigate.

More than the dread deed in Dallas requires close scrutiny. A whole chain of omissions and commissions demands undismayed and unintimidated inquiry.

Edward Hunter, who served our country for many years as a psychological warfare expert, stated recently: "President Kennedy was deluded by the line that Communism is no menace here in America. He paid for this illusion with his life."

His horrible death should warn us against a similar 'assassination' of our nation, by a red sniper in space. The effort to divert attention from the pro-Communist, Marxian motivation of the killer could make this warning vain; if we, as a people, come to believe that Communism is not a deadly peril right here, or anywhere else it exists, our country will pay the same price as President Kennedy paid. We already were being successfully conditioned into acceptance of this delusion. The consequences could be immensely more tragic than what happened at Dallas."

With that sobering warning in mind, read now this editorial which appeared in the *Richmond News Leader* on 25 November 1963—the morning after Lee Harvey Oswald was gunned down:

The news explodes before the eyes of millions. We would like to set aside today to tell sad stories about the deaths of kings. But the silencing of Lee Harvey Oswald, unconfessed, is a disaster that approaches the disaster of Friday. Although we live in an age of international assassination, it will be difficult to uncover the ramifications of the plot. There is no reason whatever to believe that the United States are immune to the international Communist conspiracy.

The prime suspect, in our opinion, is not Khrushchev, who was already making good progress toward his goals. The finger points to Fidel Castro, an old hand at assassina-

tion. While at the University of Havana, he wove the nets in three or four assassination plots; he wove them again at Bogota. In August of this year, as Castro rode through Matanzas Province in an open jeep, a bullet meant for the tyrant was stopped in the flesh of a bodyguard. Castro, probably with reason, accused the American Central Intelligence Agency. Two weeks later, he recovered his composure to talk to reporters at a reception in the Brazilian embassy. Every American who mourns our President today will want to read the dispatch as it appeared in September:

HAVANA, Sept. 8—(AP)—Prime Minister Castro said Saturday night "United States Leaders" would be in danger if they helped in any attempt to do away with leaders of Cuba.

Bitterly denouncing what he called recent U.S.-prompted raids on Cuba territory, Castro told a reporter in an impromptu interview:

"We are prepared to fight them and answer in kind. United States leaders should think that if they are aiding terrorists' plans to eliminate Cuban leaders, they cannot themselves be safe."

If there is any doubt which leader Castro had in mind, a UPI reporter at the same interview centered almost entirely on Castro's vituperation of the late President: "President Kennedy is the Batista of his time, and the most opportunistic American President of all times . . . Kennedy is a cretin, and a member

of an oligarchic family that controls several important posts in the government . . . Kennedy is thinking more about re-election than about the American people."

After the assassination of Diem and his brother, upon which the U.S. smiled, to say the least, there is every reason to assume that Castro reviewed his position. The parallel with the assassination of Trujillo is too close, and the CIA left too many clues around. Certainly Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia had second thoughts about the CIA, and his own neck.

Castro was rapidly approaching a crisis. The Soviets were withdrawing troops and aid. There were well-founded rumors that Averill Harriman's deal between Washington and Moscow dealt Castro out. On Monday the late President spoke in Miami, and offered to help a Cuban government, any sort of government, if foreign domination were thrown off. It was an open invitation to do away with Castro. He who lives by the CIA. . . .

We reject the theory that the late Lee Harvey Oswald needed to be insane to commit such a horrible crime. The Dallas police believed they had an airtight case against him. In the details released to the public, there was no mark of fanaticism. There was only a cold, calculated plan, performed by a man capable of a competent job of work. The amateur gets flustered. The fanatic regicide is eager to be acknowledged in his niche in history. The professional denies everything and calls for his lawyer.

Let us cut through the fog of stupefaction and unbelief. Let us make an opening on the left, for that is where the motivation lies. Was the suspect, Lee Harvey Oswald, really interested in Fair Play for Cuba? A trip through the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is a trip through the sewers of the liberal left. In the hearings before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, there appears a parade of Communists, Trotskyites, socialists, bleeding hearts, pacifists, and pious pornographers.

Here one finds leftist stalwarts such as Waldo Frank, who was paid \$25,000 by Castro to write Cuba, Prophetic Island; Robert Taber, the CBS news correspondent who recorded favorable interviews with Castro in the Sierra Maestre; Victor Rabinowitz, the civil liberties lawyer whose daughter Joni faces perjury charges in Georgia; Lyle Stuart, the iconoclastic publisher of erotica; Dr. Carlos Santos-Buch, who was paid \$3,500 by the Castro government to take a full-page ad in the New York Times. Here is where leftist ideas boiled up and were laundered and per-fumed for the liberal intellectuals. In no time the names of James Baldwin, Simone de Beauvoir, Truman Capote, the Rev. Donald Harrington, Norman Mailer became endorsers of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Altogether 7,000 members were taken in.

As early as 1961, the FBI's annual report stated: "FBI investigations have shown that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been heavily infiltrated by the Communist Party

and the Socialist Workers Party, and these parties have actually organized some chapters of the committee." But Robert Kennedy repeatedly ignored exhortations by Congressmen that FPCC be put on the Attorney General's subversive list.

On September 9, the very day that Castro's threats against the President were being reported, Senator Barry Goldwater pleaded before an audience in Cleveland: "The radical left poses an immediate serious threat close to the government of the United States, and here is where we must concentrate our attention and attack."

It is not hard to believe that Oswald's sympathies fell in this slough. The inclination of the left, at its deepest levels, is to destroy, to overturn civilization and morality. It is a destructive urge which poisons American liberalism even in its milder forms today. Everyone who knew Oswald tells of his dedication to Communism, to the Marxism of Castro. There need have been no hatred in his heart to perform the perverted view of the higher duty—Fair Play for Cuba.

Incredibly, the world may never know. There now will be no trial, no evidence, no cross-examining of witnesses. Already Castro doth protest his innocence too much, but to no need. As though with the quick dispatch of the hired killer, Oswald is silenced. Jack Rubenstein stands accused of the most daring crime of the century. The shooting of Oswald fits every pattern of Communist crime; but it

may be that, in the end, we have found in Jack Ruby our fanatic at last.

When Pulitzer Prize-winning newspapers begin to editorialize in this vein, clearly there are some things which we, as Americans, must recognize and analyze. I repeat: they are not pretty things; in fact, they are ugly and unpleasant.

Perhaps my own testimony will help us to begin. It happens that I have had some personal experience in this business of political assassination, at least enough to know something about the techniques. Some years ago, when I was an officer of our country's CIA, a query came to us in the field from Washington. It asked if we could mount a character assassination campaign against the head of a friendly government of sufficient violence to effect his overthrow. It happened that those of us on the ground didn't concur in wanting the head of the friendly government overthrown, or assassinated as a consequence of violence we might inspire. We successfully frustrated Washington's desires. The man survives, and continues to rule, to this day.

But there is one deposed head of a friendly government who has been telling all who would listen for the many months since his fall, that this same CIA made a clever (but clumsy) attempt to assassinate him by gunfire, failed, and then in-

12

spired his overthrow through a massive character assassination campaign.

The late Danish diplomat, Povl Bang-Jensen, came to be respected throughout the world for his honor in handling the United Nations Special Committee inquiry into the Hungarian revolt against Moscow. He died under mysterious circumstances here in New York. The police judiciously marked the case a suicide. Now Povl (or Paul) was known to me. I heard from his own lips the account of his efforts to act as an intermediary in the matter of certain top Soviet diplomats at the United Nations who sought to defect to the United States. I tell you it is my opinion that he was not a suicide. I tell you further that I am one of those who thinks that certain persons in our CIA had better reason—and opportunity—to assassinate him than did the Soviets, although there may have been some overlapping of interest and personnel in the matter of the death of this brave man.

In any event, his death was preceded by a sickening and concerted character assassination campaign against him; it continues even to this day.

In the case of the last Caesar of the Caribbean, Trujillo, the accumulated evidence is persuasive, indeed, that our CIA inspired, conspired, and for all practical purposes arranged his assassination, as a matter of official policy. The propaganda cam-

13

paign against Trujillo from Washington and elsewhere was too gigantic to have escaped any reader of these lines. Again, the pattern of character assassination followed by physical assassination stands out in bold relief.

Then, there is the case of the Columbia University lecturer-professor, Dr. Jesus de Galindez. He disappeared off the streets of New York City one night. Instantly, the leftist-liberal press charged the above-mentioned Dictator Trujillo with the crime. Hundreds of thousands of words issued from official and unofficial sources seeking to brand Trujillo with the deed. Acting on a tip, I began to have a look at the whole Galindez affair, with a view to publishing a book on the case. Several weeks, and several hundred dollars later, I abandoned the project. In my investigations, I had arrived at the front door of our CIA. Galindez had been a highly-paid secret employee of the CIA, but simultaneously, it appeared, he was a double-agent and an instrument of a foreign intelligence service (not Trujillo's). Galindez has been reported seen in East Germany and other European countries in recent months. But these sightings are unconfirmed. It seems more likely that he was done in by one of his employer governments who felt assassination was the only solution to a suddenly embarrassing relationship.

14

A famous and respected lawyer in New York City conducted an investigation into the disappearance. He concluded that there was not a shred of evidence to support Washington's contention that Trujillo had murdered Galindez. But the generous lawyer cooperated with the CIA in withholding from public view the CIA's involvement in the case. His reward was an unbelievably irresponsible attack upon his findings and his integrity in the public print.

More recently, as mentioned in the quoted editorial, there is the totally amoral assassination of President Diem, in Viet Nam. This case is so fresh in the public mind, surely, that it requires no extended comment. The massive, orchestrated character assassination campaign against that brave anti-Communist leader, followed by his physical assassination, is clear and revealing in our memories.

There are other cases. But these will suffice for now. What strikes you about all these cases?

The two surviving heads of government (one deposed) were seasoned and successful world leaders against the Communists. Povel Bang-Jensen was one of the great anti-Communist martyrs of our generation. His honorable dealings had commended him to the would-be defectors. Trujillo, whatever else he may have been, denied Communism a foothold in his country.

15

Galindez? His publicly avowed mission was to finance and organize the overthrow of the anti-Communist government of Generalissimo Franco of Spain. Over a period of seven years, or thereabouts, he had collected several million dollars for this purpose, most of it, it would appear, from the CIA.

Diem? He was hailed as the George Washington of his country. And he was. Engaged in a bloody and decisive war for survival against the Communist invaders, he focused on the enemy, and doubtless neglected civil liberties, and perhaps other niceties. A man attacked in an alley does not survey the curbing to see if there are ladies present who will be offended by the sight of his spitting out the teeth his opponent has just knocked loose in his mouth.

The terrible truth is that Washington dictated Diem's fall and by act and deed directed it. The Democratic Administration was an accessory to the crime of his assassination, concurred in by a Republican Ambassador who should have resigned and come home to speak his protest and apology to the American people he represents.

There was a time when our CIA subverted the enemies of America—not the allies. Let us return to that intended policy.

Our national prestige and honor have suffered grievously by these events.

Let there be no uncomfortable looking

about for neighbors, officials, or political organizations to blame. I am talking to you. It is your honor which is at stake. It was your silence which condoned these reprehensible acts of violence against God-fearing friends.

Permit me two examples: It happens that the nationally-known attorney who conducted the inquiry into the Galindez disappearance was a prominent liberal. This carefully correct citizen publicly acknowledged that he had not revealed all that he had learned about the Galindez affair. But, he stated that he would be willing to do so if a Congressional Committee would call him to testify under oath and, in its wisdom, ask him to do so. The Congress demurred. The public silence was deafening.

The widow of Povl Bang-Jensen testified publicly on her oath concerning her dead husband's efforts as an intermediary for Soviet diplomats who wanted to defect to our CIA. Bang-Jensen's attorney corroborated her testimony in all material respects. That public record reveals incredible delinquencies in high places. The facts surrounding the case strongly suggest that covert U.S. government employees either caused his death, or, at the very least, refrained from protecting his life.

If you were a Communist official, sickened by the perfidy and brutality of your conspiracy, would you try to defect to the

United States? The would-be defectors in the Bang-Jensen case are dead; so is Bang-Jensen. Why do we not have a policy to aid and encourage defectors?

Suppose you were an embattled head of an anti-Communist government, like Diem? Would you continue to resist Communist enslavement while "the leaders of the free world" rescue the Communists from the famine and failures inherent in their false doctrines? Suppose you were Chiang Kai-shek or Generalissimo Franco?

Suddenly and incredibly, political assassination came to shroud our entire nation on November 22, 1963. The head of our government was struck down in his prime. The Communist enemy is expert at the assassination game. The demonstrable truth is that a Communist assassinated the President of the United States. The particulars of his motives are unclear. There are certain circumstances suggesting a conspiracy which requires the fullest possible impartial inquiry by men who understand Communist tactics and techniques.

Let me repeat: the evidence is overwhelming that a Communist assassinated our President. Yet, were space to permit, I could copy here an encyclopedia-sized volume of verbatim quotes alleging or implying that this dread deed actually was the by-product of "right-wingers". Some of the highest-placed Congressional and

18

Judicial officials in our land have joined in this chorus.

I have before me a Communist newspaper which required the facilities of two printing presses to produce in sufficient quantity for the party's purposes by Saturday morning, November 23. It was distributed by the tens of thousands to my fellow-citizens in subways and on street corners. It says, in part: "We do not think that this unspeakable crime was the work of the fevered brain of some madman. We think it was the long-deliberated and planned-for deed of the fascist-minded forces of the political ultra-right. . . ."

How close is this language to the words you heard endlessly on the radio and TV, and read in the newspaper columns, or listened to from the mouths of public officials?

Suppose you were a German, or a Frenchman, or a Japanese, or a Peruvian. A Communist kills the President of the United States, and the political right is charged with the crime. No hue and cry against the Communists ensues. What would you think?

Every school-child in Europe, Asia and South America knows the Constitutional processes of the United States. He probably thinks that brash talk about "impeachment" of high officials is pretty silly. But, he also knows the difference between right-wing legal demands for impeach-

19

ment and Communist employment of the assassin's bullet. And he must wonder at your complacency in permitting the attacks on the "right" to dominate the atmosphere while the simple truth of the terrible tragedy is covered.

Mark well the breast-beating alarm-crier who harangues of "our national guilt" and "collective responsibility" for the assassination of our President. This man is not a fool; he is a purposeful demagogue. Identification of the contributors to the crime is simple. Moscow and Havana fed the sick soul of the assassin and trained his skills. The Supreme Court of the United States rendered decisions forcing issuance of passports to known Communists for travel to the Moscow headquarters, and return. Incredibly, the Department of State actually financed the return of the assassin to the United States. The leadership of the Senate of the United States effected no legislation against the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, despite exhaustive hearings by one of its own subcommittees proving its subversive intent, and Castro's control. The brother of the slain President, the Attorney-General of the United States, took no action—asked none of the Congress.

Read these Fair Play for Cuba Committee statements: "The United States is a cruel aggressor, bent on mayhem. . . ." Or, "We denounce before the world the inter-

20

vention of our government in Cuba's domestic affairs. If this be treason, we stand condemned. If our Government's activities are, as we believe, illegal and immoral, then we as a nation stand condemned. And—"As for me, I would rather see Cuba Communist than an American Colony. If Cuba were invaded, I would aid Cuba. If this be treason, may a Carnegie study make the most of it."

Lee Harvey Oswald read and distributed these statements.

On November 22, he fancied that he was aiming a "revolutionary rifle" defending Communist Cuba and Castro.

His Communist mentors have such a rifle ready for all who oppose them. Communist firing squads tattoo death on dissenters, in lands they control—that is the record. Their agents assassinate, their propagandists divide, everywhere in the world. The Communist Manifesto of 1960 declares: ". . . it is indispensable to wage a resolute struggle against anti-Communism."

Here in the United States, the boldest assassination campaign in all history has been unleashed. The target is you. The Communists and their sympathizers have mounted this campaign. Any opponent of Communist aims is being branded as a bigot and a "rightist". The character assassination will end in physical assassination. It always does. This time, the victim

21

will be you, and your way of life.

In the eternal words of Winston Churchill: "Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of survival, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

The cost of honor—and survival—is going up, every hour.