Excerpts from the Introduction, 1987 edition

A brief history
of the Cold War
and Anti-communism

PP1

Our fear that communism
might someday take over most of the world
blinds us to the fact
that anti-communism
already has.

- Machael Parenti
  "The Anti-Communist Impulse" (Random House, NY, 1969) pg. 4

PP2

It was in the early days of the fighting in Vietnam
that a Vietcong officer said to his American prisoner:

"You were our heroes after the War.

We read American books
and saw American films,
and a common phrase in those days was
'to be as rich and wise as an American.'

What happened?"

- Washington Post, 24 October 1965 article by Stanly Karnow.

(*continued*)

PP3

An American might have been asked something similar by

- a Guatemalan,
- an Indonesian,
- or a Cuban

during the ten years previous,
or by

- a Uruguayan,
- a Chilean
- or a Greek

in the decade subsequent (*or following*).

The remarkable international

- goodwill
- and credibility

enjoyed by the United States
at the close of the Second World War
was dissipated

- country by country,
- intervention by intervention.

(*continued*)

The opportunity to build the war-ravaged world anew,
to lay the foundations for

- peace,
- prosperity,
- and justice,

collapsed under the awful weight
of anti-communism. _/_

(*Excerpts from the 1987 edition*
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 4 – 6)

PP4

The weight (*of anti-communism*) had been accumulating for some time;
indeed, since Day One of the Russian Revolution.

By the summer of 1918
some 13,000 American troops could be found
in the newly-born state,
the future Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics.

Two years and thousands of casualties later,
the American troops left,
having failed in their mission
to "strangle at its birth" the Bolshevik state,
as Winston Churchill put it.

-Winston Churchill, "The Second World War, vol IV, 'The Hinge of Fate'' (London, 1951), pg. 428

(*continued*)

PP5

The young Churchill was Great Britain's Minister for War and Air during this period.

Increasingly, it was he who directed the invasion of the Soviet Union by the Allies (

- Great Britan,
- the US,
- France,
- Japan
- and several other nations)

on the side of the counter-revolutionary "White Army."

Years later,
Churchill the historian was to record his views
of this singular affair for posterity:

(*continued*)

PP6

Were they [the Allies] at war with Soviet Russia?
Certainly NOT;

- BUT they shot Soviet Russians at sight.
- They stood as invaders on Russian soil.
- They armed the enemies of the Soviet Government.
- They blockaded its ports,
- and sunk its battleships.
- They earnestly desired and schemed its downfall.

But war… shocking!
Interference… shame!
"It was," they repeated,
"a matter of indifference to them how Russians settled their own internal affairs. "
They were impartial… Bang!

-Winston Churchill, "The World Crisis: The Aftermath (London, 1929), pg. 235.

(*Excerpts from the 1987 edition*
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 7 – 10)

PP 7

What was there about this Bolshevik Revolution
that so alarmed the most powerful nations in the world?

What drove them to invade a land
whose soldiers had recently
fought alongside them for over three years
and suffered more casualties
than any other country on either side of the World War?

(*continued*)

PP 8

The Bolsheviks had had the audacity
to make a separate peace with Germany
in order to take leave of a war
they regarded as imperialist
and NOT in any way *their* war,
and to try and rebuild
a terribly weary and devastated Russia.

But the Bolsheviks had displayed the far greater audacity
of overthrowing a capitalist-feudal system
and proclaiming the first socialist state
in the history of the world.

This was uppityness
writ incredibly large.

This was

- the crime the Allies had to punish,
- the virus which had to be eradicated
  lest it spread to their own people.

(*continued*)

PP 9

The invasion did NOT achieve its immediate purpose,
but its consequences were nonetheless profound
and persist to the present day.

Professor D.F. Fleming,
the Vanderbilt University historian of the Cold War,
has noted:

(*continued*)

PP 10

For the American people
the cosmic tragedy of the interventions in Russia
does NOT exist,
or it was an unimportant incident
long forgotten.

BUT for the Soviet peoples and their leaders
the period was a time of endless

- killing,
- of looting,
- and rapine,
- of plague
- and famine,
- of measureless suffering for scores of millions…

an experience burned into the very soul of a nation,
NOT to be forgotten
for many generations, if ever.

Also for many years the harsh Soviet regimentations
could ALL be justified
by fear that the capitalist powers
would be back to finish the job.

(*continued*)

It is NOT strange that in his address in New York, September 17, 1959
Premier Khrushchev should remind us of the interventions,
"the time you scent your troops to quell the revolution," as he put it.

-D.F. Fleming, "The Western Intervention in the Soviet Union, 1918-1920,"
New World Review (New York), Fall 1967;
-see also Fleming, "The Cold War and its Origins, 1917-1960
(New York, 1961), pg. 16-35

(*Excerpts from the 1987 edition*
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 11 – 14)

PP 11

In what could be taken
as a portent of superpower insensitivity,
a 1920 Pentagon report on the intervention reads:
"This expedition affords one of the finest examples in history
of honorable, unselfish dealings...
under very difficult circumstances
to be helpful to a people struggling to achieve a new liberty."
-Los Angeles Times 2 September, 1991, pg. 1

(*continued*)

PP 12

History does NOT tell us
what a Soviet Union,
allowed to develop in a (*so called*) "normal" way
of its own choosing,
would look like today.

We do know, however,
the nature of a Soviet Union

- attacked in its cradle,
- raised alone in an extremely hostile world,
- and, when it managed to survive to adulthood,
- overrun by the Nazi war machine
- with the blessings of the Western Powers.

The resulting insecurities and fears
have inevitably led to (*so called*) deformities of character
NOT unlike that found in an individual
raised in a similar life-threatening manner.

(*continued*)

PP 13

We in the West are never allowed to **forget**
the political shortcomings (real and bogus)
of the Soviet Union;
at the same time we are **never reminded**
of the history which lies behind it.

The anti-communist propaganda campaign
began even earlier than the military intervention.

Before the year 1918 was over,
expressions in the vein of

- "Red Peril,"
- "the Bolshevik assault on civilization," and
- "menace to world by Reds is seen"

had become commonplace
in the pages of the New York Times.

(*continued*)

PP 14

During February and March 1919,
a US Senate Judiciary Subcommittee held hearings
before which many "Bolshevik horror stories"
were presented.

The character of some of the testimony
can be gauged by the headline
in the usually sedate *Times* of 12 February 1919:

> DESCRIBE HORRORS UNDER RED RULE.
> R.E. SIMONS AND W.W. WELSH TELL SENATORS
> OF BRUTALITIES OF BOLSHEVIKI
> - STRIP WOMEN IN STREETS
> - PEOPLE OF EVERY CLASS
>   EXCEPT THE SCUM
>   SUBJECTED TO VIOLENCE BY MOBS.

_/_

(*Excerpts from the 1987 edition*
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 15 – 16)

pp 15

Historian Federick Lewis Schuman has written:

"The net result of these hearings...
was to picture Soviet Russia
as a kind of bedlam inhabited by abject slaves
completely at the mercy of an organization of homicidal maniacs
whose purpose was to destroy all traces of civilization
and carry the nation back to barbarism."

-Federick L. Schuman, "American Policy TowardRussia Since 1917" (New York, 1928), pg. 125

(*continued*)

pp 16

Literally NO story about the Bolsheviks was

- too contrived,
- too bizarre,
- too grotesque, or
- too perverted

to be printed and widely believed;
from woman being nationalized
to babies being eaten
(as the early pagans believed the Christians guilty of devouring their children;
the same was believed of the Jews in the Middle Ages).

The story about women with ALL the lurid connotations of

- state property,
- compulsory marriage,
- "free love," etc.

"was broadcasted over the country through a thousand channels,"
wrote Schuman,
"and perhaps did more than anything else
to stamp the Russian Communists
in the minds of most American citizens
as criminal perverts."

-Ibid., pg. 154

(*continued*)

This tale continued to receive great currency
even after the State Department was obliged to announce
that it was a fraud.

(That the Soviets eat their babies
was still being taught by the John Birch Society
to its large audience
at least as late as 1978.)

_/_

(*Excerpts from the 1987 edition*
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 17 – 18)

pp 17

By the end of 1919,
when the defeat of the Allies and the White Army appeared likely,
the *New York Times* **treated** its readers
to headlines and stories such as the following:

30 Dec. 1919:	"Reds Seek War with America"
9 Jan. 1920:	"'Official quarters' describe the Bolshevist menace in the Middle East as ominous'"
11 Jan. 1920:	"Allied officials and diplomats [envisage] a possible invasion of Europe"
13 Jan. 1920:	"Allied diplomatic circles" fear an invasion of Persia
16 Jan. 1920:	A page-one head-line, eight columns wide: "Britain Facing War with Reds, Calls Council in Paris."
	"Well-informed diplomats" expect both a military invasion of Europe
	and a Soviet advance into Eastern and Southern Asia.

The following morning, however, we could read:

	"No War with Russia, Allies to Trade with Her"
7 Feb. 1920:	"Reds Raising Army to Attack India"
11 Feb. 1920:	"Fear that Bolsheviki will Now Invade Japanese Territory"

(*continued*)

pp 18

Readers of the *New York Times* were asked to believe
that ALL these invasions were to come from a nation
that was shattered as few nations in history have been;
a nation still

- recovering from a horrendous world war;
- in extreme chaos from a fundamental social revolution that was barely off the ground;
- engaged in a brutal civil war against forces backed by the major powers of the world;
- its industries, never advanced to begin with, in a shambles;
- and the country in the throes of a famine that was to leave many millions dead before it subsided.

_/_

(*Excerpts from the 1987 edition*
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 19 – 22)

pp 19

In 1920, *The New Republic* magazine
presented a lengthy analysis of the news coverage
by the *New York Times*
of the Russian Revolution
and the (*u.s.*) intervention.

Amongst much else,
it observed that in the two years following the November 1917 revolution,
the *Times* had stated
NO less than 91 times that

"*the soviets were nearing their rope's end*
or actually had reached it. "

-New Republic, 4 Augst 1920, a 42-page analysis by Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz.

(*continued*)

pp 20

If this was reality
as presented by the United states' (*so-called*) "newspaper of record,"
one can imagine only with dismay
the witch's brew
that rest of the nation's newspapers
were feeding to their readers.

(*continued*)

pp 21

This, then, was the American people's first experience
of a new social phenomenon
that had come upon the world,
their introductory education about the Soviet Union
and this thing called "communism."

The students have never recovered from the lesson.
Neither has the Soviet Union.

(*continued*)

pp 22

The military intervention came to an end
but, with the sole and partial exception of the Second World War period,
the propaganda offensive has never let up.

In 1943 *Life* magazine devoted an entire issue
in honor of the Soviet Union's accomplishments,
going far beyond what was demanded
by the need for wartime solidarity,
going so far
as to call Lenin "perhaps the greatest man of modern time."

Two years later, however,
with Harry Truman sitting in the White House,
such fraternity
had NO chance of surviving.

Truman, after all,
was the man who, the day after the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union,
said: "If we see that Germany is winning,
we ought to help Russia,
and if Russia is winning,
we ought to help Germany,
and that way let them kill as many as possible,
although I don't want to see Hitler victorious in any circumstances."

_/_

Excerpts from the 1987 edition
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 23)

pp 23

Much propaganda mileage has been squeezed
out of the Soviet-German treaty of 1939,
made possible ONLY by entirely ignoring the fact
that the Russians were forced into the pact
by the repeated refusal of the Western powers,
particularly the United States and Great Britain,
to unite with Moscow
in a stand against Hitler;
as they (*the United States and Great Britain*)
likewise refused to come to the aid of the socialist-oriented Spanish government
under siege by the German, Italian and Spanish fascists
beginning in 1936.

Stalin realized that if the West wouldn't save Spain,
they certainly wouldn't save the Soviet Union.

_/_

(Excerpts from the 1987 edition
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 24 - 27)

pp 24

From the Red scare of the 1920s
to the McCarthyism of the 1950s
to the Reagan Crusade against the (*so called*) Evil Empire of the 1980s,
the American people have been subjected to a relentless
anti-communist indoctrination.

It is imbibed with their mother's milk,
pictured in their comic books,
spelled out in their school books;
their daily paper offers them headlines that tell them all they (*think they*) need to know;
ministers find sermons in it,
politicians are elected with it,
and *Reader's Digest* becomes rich on it.

(*continued*)

pp 25

The fiercely-held conviction inevitably produced
by this insidious assault upon the intellect
is that a great damnation has been unleashed upon the world,
possibly by the devil himself,
but in the form of people;
people NOT motivated by the same
needs, fears, emotions, and personal morality
that govern others of the species,
BUT (*rather*) people engaged in an extremely clever, monolithic, international conspiracy
dedicated to taking over the world and enslaving it;
for reasons NOT always clear perhaps,
BUT (*so called*) evil needs NO motivation save evil itself.

(*continued*)

Moreover, any appearance or claim by these people
to be rational human beings
seeking a better kind of world or society
is a sham, a cover-up,
to delude others,
and proof only of their cleverness;
the (*so called*) repression and cruelties which have taken place in the Soviet Union
are (*allegedly*) forever proof of the bankruptcy of virtue
and the evil intentions of these people
in whichever country they may be found,
under whatever name they may call themselves;
and, most important of all,
the only choice open to anyone in the United States
is between the American Way of Life
and the Soviet Way of Life,
that nothing lies between or beyond
these two ways of making the world.

(*continued*)

pp 26

This is how it looks to the simple folk of America.
One finds that the (*so-called*) sophisticated,
when probed slightly beneath the surface of their academic language,
see it exactly the same way.

pp 27

To the mind carefully brought to adulthood in the United States,
the (*so called*) truths of anticommunism are self-evident,
as self-evident as the flatness of the world once was to an earlier mind; _/_

(*and*) as the Russian people believed that the victims of Stalin's purges
were truly guilty of treason.

(Excerpts from the 1987 edition
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 28 - 30)

pp 28

The foregoing slice of American history
must be taken into account
if one is to makes sense
of the vagaries of American **foreign** policy
since the **end** of World War II,
specifically the record,
as presented in this book,
of what

- the US military
- and the CIA
- and other branches of the US government

have done to the peoples of the world.

(*continued*)

pp 29

In 1918, the barons of American capital needed NO reason for their war against communism other than the threat to their

- wealth and
- privilege,

although their opposition was (*deceptively only*) expressed in terms of moral indignation.

(*continued*)

pp 30

During the period between the two world wars,
US gunboat diplomacy
operated in the Caribbean
to make (*so called*) "The American Lake"
safe **for** the fortunes of United Fruit and W.R. Grace & Co.,
(*yet*) at the same time taking care to warn
of the (*so called*) "the Bolshevik threat"
to ALL that is decent
from the likes of Nicaraguan rebel Augusto Sandino.
_/_

(Excerpts from the 1987 edition
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 31 - 33)

pp 31

By the end of the Second World War,
every American past the age of 40
had been subjected to some 25 years of anti-communist radiation,
the average incubation period needed to produce a malignancy.

Anti-communism
had developed a life of its own,
independent of its **capitalist** father.

Increasingly, in the post-war period,
middle-aged Washington policy makers and diplomats
saw the world out there as one composed of "communists" and "Anti-communists,"
whether of nations, movements or individuals.

This comic-strip vision of the world,
with (*so called*) righteous American supermen fighting communist evil everywhere,
had graduated from a cynical propaganda exercise
to a moral imperative of US foreign policy.

(*continued*)

pp 32

Even the concept of "non-communist,"
implying some measure of neutrality,
has generally been accorded scant legitimacy
in this paradigm.

John Foster Dulles,
one of the major architects of post-war US foreign policy,
expressed this succinctly
in his typically simple, moralistic way:

> "For us there are two sorts of people in the world:
> there are those who are Christians
> **and** support free enterprise
> and there are the **others**. "

As several of the case studies
in the present book confirm,
Dulles put that creed into rigid practice.

(*continued*)

pp 33

The word "communist" (as well as "Marxist")
has been so overused and so abused by American leaders and the media
as to render it virtually meaningless.

(the [*so called*] Left
has done the same to the word "fascist.")

But merely having a name for something...
witches or flying saucers...
attaches a certain credence to it.

_/_

(Excerpts from the 1987 edition
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 34 - 35)

pp 34

At the same time,
the American public, as we have seen,
has been soundly conditioned to react Pavlovianly to the term (*communism*):
it means, still, the worst excesses of Stalin,
from wholesale purges
to Siberian slave labor camps;
it means, as Michael Parenti has observed,
that "Classic Marxist-Leninist *predictions* [concerning world revolution]
are treated as statements of *intent*
directing all present-day communist *actions*"
It means "us" against "them."

(*continued*)

pp 35

And 'them" can mean

- a peasant in the Philippines,
- a mural-painter in Nicaragua,
- a legally-elected prime minister in British Guiana,
- a European intellectual,
- a Cambodian neutralist,
- an African nationalist...

ALL, somehow, part of the same monolithic conspiracy;
each, in some way, a threat to the American Way of Life;
NO land

- too small,
- too poor, or
- too far away

to pose such a threat,
the "communist threat."

_/_

(Excerpts from the 1987 edition
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 36 - 38)

pp 36

The cases presented in this book
illustrate that it has been largely irrelevant
whether the particular targets of intervention – be they

- individuals,
- political parties,
- movements or
- governments –

called themselves "communist" or NOT.

It has mattered little whether they

- were scholars of dialectical materialism
- or had never heard of Karl Marx;
- whether they were atheists
- or priests;
- whether a strong and influential Communist Party was in the picture
- or not;
- whether the government had come into being through violent revolution
- or peaceful elections...

all have been targets,
all (*so called*) "communists."

(*continued*)

pp 37

It has mattered still less
that the Soviet KGB was in the picture.

The assertion has been frequently voiced
that the CIA
carries out its dirty tricks
largely *in reaction to* operations of the KGB
which have been "even dirtier."

This is a lie
made out of whole cloth.

There **may** be an isolated incident of such
in the course of the CIA's life,
but it has kept itself well hidden.

The relationship between the two sinister agencies
is marked by fraternization
and respect for fellow professionals more
than by hand-to-hand combat.

Former CIA officer John Stockwell
has written:

(*continued*)

Actually, at least in more routine operations,
case officers most fear

- the US ambassador and his staff,
- then restrictive head-quarters cables,
- then curious, gossipy neighbors in the local community,

as potential threats to operations.

Next would come

- the local police,
- then the press.
- Last of all is the KGB –
  in my twelve years of case officering
  I never saw or heard of a situation
  in which the KGB attacked or obstructed a CIA operation.

(*continued*)

pp 38

Stockwell adds that the various intelligence services
do NOT want their world to be "complicated"
by murdering each other.

It isn't done.
If a CIA case officer has a flat tire
in the dark of night on a lonely road,
he will NOT hesitate to accept a ride from a KGB officer –
likely the two would detour to some bar for a drink together.

In fact CIA and KGB officers entertain each other frequently
in their homes.

The CIA's files are full of mention of such relationships
in almost every African station.

_/_

Excerpts from the 1987 edition
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 39 - 40)

pp 39

Proponents of "fighting fire with fire"
come perilously close at times
to arguing that **if** the KGBV, for example,
had a hand
in the overthrow of the Czechoslovak government in 1968,
(***then***) it is OK for the CIA
to have a hand in the overthrow of the Chilean government in 1973.

It's as if the (*alleged*) destruction of democracy by the KGB
deposits funds in a (*figurative*) bank account
from which the CIA is then justified in making withdrawals.

(*continued*)

pp 40

What then has been the thread **common**
to the diverse **targets** of American intervention
which has brought down upon them the wrath,
and often the fire power,
of the world's most powerful nation?

In virtually every case involving the Third world described in this book,
it has been, in one form or another, a policy of "self-determination:"
the desire, born of perceived

- need and
- principle,

to pursue a path of development
independent of US foreign policy objective.

Most commonly, this has been manifested in

(a) the ambition to free themselves
from economic and political subservience
to the United States;

(b) the refusal to minimize relations with the socialist bloc,
or suppress the left at home,
or welcome an American military installation on their soil;
in short, a refusal to be a pawn in the Cold war; or

(c) the attempt to alter or replace a government
which held to neither of the aspirations:
i.e., a government supported by the United States.

_/_

Excerpts from the 1987 edition
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 41 - 43)

pp 41

It can**not** be emphasized too strongly
that such a policy of independence
has been viewed and expressed by numerous

- Third World leaders
- and revolutionaries

as one NOT to be equated by definition to

- anti-Americanism
- or pro-communism,

BUT as simply a determination
to maintain a position of

- neutrality and
- non-alignement

vis-à-vis the two superpowers.

(*continued*)

pp 41 (*continued*)

Time and time again,
however,
it will be seen that the United States
was NOT prepared to live with this proposition.

Ar-benz of Gua-te-ma-la,
Mos-sa-degh of Iran,
Su-kar-no of In-do-nes-ia,
Nkru-mah of Gha-na,
Ja-gan of British Gui-a-na,
Si-ha-nouk of Cambodia...
ALL, insisted

Uncles Sam, must declare themselves
unequivocally on the side of "The Free World"
or suffer the consequences.

Nk-ru-mah put the case for non-alignment
as follows:

(*continued*)

pp 42

The experiment which we tried in Ghana
was essentially one of developing the country
in co-operation with the world as a whole.

Non-alignment meant exactly what it said.
We were NOT hostile to the countries of the socialist world
in the way in which the governments of the old colonial territories were.

It should be remembered that while Britan
pursued at home co-existence with the Soviet Union
this was never allowed to extend to British colonial territories.

Books on socialism,
which were published and circulated freely in Britan,
were banned in the British colonial empire,
and after Ghana became independent
it was assumed abroad that it would continue to follow
the same restrictive ideological approach.

When we behaved as did the British
in their relations with the socialist countries
we were accused of being pro-Russian
and introducing the most dangerous ideas into Africa.

(*continued*)

pp 43

It is reminiscent of the 19th-century American South,
where many Southerners were deeply offended
that so many of their black slaves
had (*so called*) deserted to the Northern side of the Civil War.

They had genuinely thought
that the blacks should have been grateful
for all their white masters had done for them,
and that they were happy and content with their lot.

The noted Louisiana surgeon and psychologist Dr. Samuel A. Cartwright
argued that many of the slaves suffered from a form of mental illness,
which he called "drape-to-man-ia,"
diagnosed as the uncontrollable urge to escape from slavery
(*and which sounds as patently absurd*
as so-called Trump-derangement syndrome).

In the second half of the 20th-century,
this (*so called*) illness,
in the Third World,
has usually been called "communism."
_/_

Excerpts from the 1987 edition
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 44 - 51)

pp 44

Perhaps the most deeply ingrained reflex
of kneejerk anti-communism
is the belief that the Soviet Union (or Cuba or Vietnam, etc, acting as Moscow's surrogate)
is a clandestine force
lurking behind the façade of self-determination,
stirring up the hydra of revolution, or just plain trouble,
here, there, and everywhere;
yet another incarnation,
although on a far grander scale,
of the proverbial "outside agitator,"
he who has made his appearance regularly throughout history...

- King George blamed the French for inciting the American colonies to revolt...
- disillusioned American farmers and veterans
  protesting their onerous economic circumstances after the revolution (shays' Rebellion)
  were branded as British agents out to wreck the new republic...
- labor strikes in late-19th century America were blamed on "anarchists" and "foreigners,"
- during the First World War on "Germain agents,"
- (*and*) after the war on "Bolsheviks."

(*continued*)

pp 45

And in the 1960s, said the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence,
J. Edgar Hoover "helped spread the view among police ranks
that any kind of mass protest
is due to a conspiracy promulgated (*or promoted*) by agitators, often Communists,
'who misdirect otherwise contented people.'"

pp 46

The Last
is the key phrase,
one which encapsulates the conspiracy mentality
of those in power;
the idea that NO people,
except those living under the enemy,
could be so miserable and discontent
as to need recourse to revolution
or even mass protest;
(*and*) that it is only the agitation of the outsider
which misdirects them along this path.

(*continued*)

pp 47

Accordingly, if Ronald Reagan were to concede
that the masses of El Salvador
have every good reason
to rise up against their god-awful existence,
it would bring into question

- his accusation,
- and the rationale for US intervention,

that it is principally (only?) the Soviet Union and its Cuban and Nicaraguan allies
who instigate the Salvadoreans:
that seemingly magical power of communists everywhere
who, with a twist of their red wrist,
can transform peaceful, happy people
into furious guerrillas.

The CIA knows how difficult a feat this is.
The Agency, as we shall see, tried to spark mass revolt in

- China,
- Cuba,
- the Soviet Union,
- Albania,
- and elsewhere in Eastern Europe

with a singular lack of success.

(*continued*)

pp 47 continued...

The Agency's scribes have laid the blame for these failures
on the "closed" nature of the societies involved.
BUT in non-communist countries,
the CIA has had to resort to military coups
or extra-legal chicanery
to get its people into power.
It has never been able to light the fire
of popular revolution.

(*continued*)

pp 48

For Washington to concede merit and virtue
to a particular Third World insurgency
would, moreover, raise the question:
Why does **NOT** the United States,
if it must intervene,
take the side of the rebels?

Not only might this better serve the cause of

- human rights
- and justice,

BUT it would shut out the Russians
from their alleged role.

What better way to frustrate
the International Communist Conspiracy?
But this is a question
that dares NOT speak its name in the Oval Office,
a question that is relevant to many of the cases in this book.

(*continued*)

pp 49

Instead, the United States remains committed
to its all-too-familiar policy of establishing and/or supporting
the most vile tyrannies in the world,
whose outrages against their own people
confront us daily in the pages of our newspapers:

- brutal massacres;
- systematic, sophisticated torture;
- public whippings;
- soldiers and police firing into crowds;
- government-supported death squads;
- tens of thousands of disappeared persons;
- extreme economic deprivation...

a way of life that is virtually a monopoly
held by America's allies,
from Guatemala, Chile and El Salvador
to Turkey, Pakistan and Indonesia,
all members in good standing of the (*so called*) Holy War Against Communism,
all members of "The (*so called*) Free World,"
that region of which we hear so much
and see so little.

(*continued*)

pp 50

The restriction on civil liberties
found in the communist bloc,
as severe as they (*allegedly*) are,
pale by comparison to the cottage-industry Auschwitzes
of "The (*so called*) Free World,"
and, except in that curious mental landscape
inhabited by The Compleat Anti-Communist,
can have little or nothing to do
with the sundry American interventions
supposedly in the cause of a higher good.

(*continued*)

pp 51

It is interesting to note
that as commonplace as it is for American leaders
to speak of freedom and democracy
while supporting dictatorships,
so do Russian leaders speak of wars of

- liberation,
- anti-imperialism and
- anti-colonialism

while doing extremely little
to actually further these causes,
American **propaganda** notwithstanding.

The Soviets like to be thought of
as champions of the Third World,
but they have stood by doing little more than going "tsk, tsk"
as progressive movements and governments, even Communist Parties, in

- Greece,
- Guatemala,
- British Guiana,
- Chile,
- Indonesia,
- the Philippines
- and elsewhere

have gone to the wall with American complicity.
_/_

*Excerpts from the 19**87** edition*
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 52 - 66)

pp 52

During the early 1950s,
the Central Intelligence Agency
instigated several military incursions
into Communist China.

In 1960,
CIA planes, without any provocation,
bombed the sovereign nation of Guatemala.

In 1973,
the agency encouraged a bloody revolt
against the government of Iraq.

In the American mass media
at the time,
and therefore in the American mind,
these events did NOT happen.

(*continued*)

pp 53

"We didn't know what was happening,"
became a cliché used to ridicule those Germans
who claimed ignorance of the events
which took place under the Nazis.

Yet, was their stock answer
as far-fetched
as we'd like to think?

It is sobering to reflect
that in our era of instant world-wide communications,
the United States has, on many occasions,
been able to mount a large-or-small-scale military operation
or undertake another, equally blatant, form of intervention
without the American public
being aware of it
until years later,
if ever.

(*continued*)

pp 53 *continued*

Often the only report of the event
or of US involvement
was a passing reference
to the fact that a communist government
had make certain charges...
just the kind of "news"
the American public
has been well conditioned
to dismiss out of hand,
and the press (*has likewise been conditioned*) NOT to follow up;
as the German people were taught
that reports from abroad
of Nazi wrong-doings
were NO more than communist propaganda.

(*continued*)

pp 54

With few exceptions,
the interventions never made

- the headlines
- or the evening TV news.

With some,
bits and pieces of the stories
have popped up here and there, but
rarely brought together
to form a cohesive and enlightening whole;
the fragments usually appear
long after the fact, quietly
buried within other stories,
just as quietly forgotten,
bursting into the foreground
only when extraordinary circumstances
have compelled it,
such as the Iranians holding
US embassy personnel and other Americans hostage in Teheran in 1979,
which produced a rash of articles on the role played by the United States
in the overthrow of the Iranian government in 1953.

It was as if editors had been spurred into thinking:
"Hey, just what did we do in Iran
to make all those people hate us so?"

(*continued*)

pp 55

There have been a lot of Irans
in America's recent past,
BUT in the absence of the New York *Daily News*
or the Los Angeles *Times*
conspicuously grabbing the reader by the collar
and pressing against his face
the full implication of the deed...
in the absence of NBC putting it all
into real pictures of real people on the receiving end...
in such absence the incidents become non-events
for the large majority of Americans,
and they can honestly say
"We didn't know what was happening. "

(*continued*)

pp 56

Former Chinese Premier Chou En-lai once observed:
"One of the delightful things about Americans
is that they have absolutely NO historical memory."

pp 57

It's probably even worse than he realized.
During the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant accident
in Pennsylvania in 1979,
a Japanese journalist,
A-tsu-o Ka-ne-ko
of the Japanese Kyoto News Service
spent several hours interviewing people
temporarily housed at a hockey rink; mostly

- children,
- pregnant woman
- and young mothers.

He discovered that none of them
had heard of Hi-ro-shi-ma.
Mention of the name
drew a blank.

(*continued*)

pp 58

And in 1982, a judge in Oakland, California
said he was appalled
when some 50 prospective jurors
for a death-penalty murder trial were questioned
and "none of them knew who Hitler was."

pp 59

To the foreign policy oligarchy in Washington, it is more than delightful.
It is Sine qua non (*the Latin term "**without which, not**"
commonly used to refer to an essential or indispensable condition or element
that is necessary for something to exist or function properly*).

(*continued*)

pp 60

So obscured is the comprehensive record
of American interventions
that when, in 1975,
the Congressional Research Service
of the Library of Congress
was asked to undertake a study
of covert activities of the CIA to date,
it was able to come up with
but a very minor portion
of the overseas incidents
presented in this book
for the same period.

pp 61

For all of **this** information
that has made its way into popular consciousness, or into

- school texts,
- encyclopedias,
- or other standard reference works,

there might as well exist
strict censorship in the United States.

(*continued*)

pp 62

The reader is invited to look through the relevant sections
of the three principal American encyclopedias:

- Americana,
- Britannica,
- and Colliers.

The image of encyclopedias
as the final repository of objective knowledge
takes a beating.

What is tantamount to a non-recognition of American interventions
may very well be due to these esteemed works employing a criterion
similar to that of Washington officials
as reflected in the Pentagon Papers.

The New York Times summarized t
his highly interesting phenomena thusly:

(*continued*)

pp 63

Clandestine warfare against North Vietnam,
for example,
is NOT seen...

- as violating the Geneva Accords of 1954,
  which ended the French Indochina War,
- or as conflicting with the public policy pronouncements
  of the various administrations.

Clandestine warfare,
because it is covert,
does NOT exist as far as

- treaties
- and public posture

are concerned.

Further, secret commitments to other nations
are NOT sensed as infringing on the treaty-making powers of the Senate,
because they are NOT publicly acknowledged.

(*continued*)

pp 64

The de facto censorship (*existing in actuality, especially when contrary to , or NOT established by law*)
which leaves so many Americans functionally illiterate
about the history of US foreign affairs
may be all the more effective
because it is NOT so much

- official,
- heavy-handed,
- or conspiratorial,

as it is woven artlessly
into the fabric of education and media.

NO conspiracy is needed.

The **editors** of Reader's Digest and U.S. News and World Report
do NOT need to meet covertly with the representative from NBC
in an FBI safehouse
to plan next month's stories and programs;
for the simple truth is that these individuals
would NOT have reached the positions they occupy
if they themselves had NOT all been guided
through the same tunnel of camouflaged history
and emerged with the same

- selective memory
- and conventional wisdom.

(*continued*)

pp 65

"The upheaval in China
is a revolution
which, if we analyze it,
we will see is prompted
by the same things that prompted the

- British,
- French and
- American

revolutions."

A cosmopolitan and generous sentiment
of Dean Rusk,
then Assistant Secretary
for Far Eastern Affairs,
later Secretary of State.

At precisely the same time
as Mr. Rusk's talk in 1950,
others in his government
were actively plotting the downfall
of the Chinese revolutionary government.

(*continued*)

pp 66

This has been
a common phenomenon.

For many of the cases
described in the following pages,
one can find statements of

- high
- or middle-level Washington officials

which put into question
the policy of intervention;
which expressed misgivings

- based either on principle
  (sometimes the (so called) better side of American liberalism)
- **or** concern that the intervention
  would NOT serve any worthwhile end,
  (*and*) might even result in disaster.

(*continued*)

I have attached little weight
to such dissenting statements
as, indeed, in the final analysis,
did (***not***) Washington discission makers
who, in controversial world situations,
could be relied upon
to play the anticommunist card.

In presenting the interventions in this manner,
I am declaring that American foreign policy **is**
what American foreign policy **does**.
_/_

*Excerpts from the 19**95** edition*
A brief history of the Cold War and Anti-communism
paragraphs 67 - 66)

pp 67

(*continued*)