



## An Open Letter to Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North

Reprinted with permission from *The John Birch Society Bulletin*, August 1987

Dear Colonel North:

Congratulations to you for turning the tables on a ravenous wolfpack that intended to devour you. With few exceptions, both the elected officials and lawyers on the two select committees, and the swarms of media luminaries whose self-gratifying indignation seems to surface only when an American patriot is on trial, had their pre-conceived notions about you blown to bits. It was a delight to see so many of them back up, swallow hard and change their tune.

The way you handled your ordeal has electrified the nation. In huge numbers, the American people were overjoyed to hear someone speak forthrightly, knowledgeably and candidly—while under great pressure. Even more, they responded to the anti-Communist fervor and love of country that pervaded your entire testimony. It was a thrilling performance, made more thrilling because it was clearly not an act. Cynicism in America has suffered a setback, only one of the many positive accomplishments you have achieved. Many Americans are very grateful indeed.

The array of inquisitors and detractors who put you on trial frequently stated their breast-beating concern that your deeds and those of your colleagues amounted to trampling on the Constitution. How infuriating that so many men who make a regular practice of circumventing the supreme law of the land appeal to it when their will is challenged. If the Constitution were honored, would venal politicians have saddled this nation with foreign aid, massive deficits, and sovereignty-destroying submission to international bodies? Would they have injected federal presence and control into the fields of education, agriculture, energy, housing, health, welfare, etc.? Would such leaders have countenanced sending American fighting men into no-win wars, making them the policemen of the world, and posting growing numbers of America's sons as sitting ducks in a hostile world's shooting gallery?

In the aftermath of your stunning appearance, you have received mountains of cards, telegrams and messages—even cash for legal defense. The nation's media are reluctantly reporting that groups have formed to promote you for political office. Where early in June, Assistant Attorney General Charles J. Cooper told the Congressional panel he wouldn't believe you even if you were under oath, pollsters have reported that the American people have overwhelming confidence in your truthfulness. The media that delighted in reporting Mr. Cooper's vicious statement now ignore both it and the man who gave it.

As you are certainly aware, your own personal ordeal is not over. But neither is the assault on the Constitution that has gone on for decades, nor the continued growth of world Communist power, nor the steady erosion of personal freedom here in America.

A lot of good will has come your way. But it is obvious that you need something else that's good, some perspective that will explain what you apparently consider unexplainable, some of the



context that surrounds U.S. policy and steers virtually all of it toward defeat.

Two days after you wanted to give it, you were permitted to read your opening statement to the select committees. You chose to characterize the proceedings as a weird, Mad Hatter-type baseball game. After noting that the whole business was “a strange process” because the investigators made all the rules and controlled everything, you told the panel:

It’s sort of like a baseball game in which you are both the player and the umpire. It’s a game in which you call the balls and strikes and where you determine who is out and who is safe. And in the end you determine the score and declare yourselves the winner. From where I sit, it is not the fairest process.

Then you dropped a large skunk in the midst of their merry picnic when you said:

One thing is, I think, for certain: that you will not investigate yourself in this matter.

How right you are! But not only will a congressional panel not investigate congressional malfeasance, the one subject that no body will be convened to investigate is pro-Communist activity anywhere in government. Where there once were such standing panels as the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Subversive Activities Control Board, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee— all formed to guard our nation against Communist and pro-Communist activity within America— there are none today. Consequently, there are no routine investigations of various individuals and groups that are busily aiding the cause of world Communism. And, with the prevailing attitude in Congress, no special bodies like the Iran-Contra panel are ever formed for such purposes.

If the U.S. had not betrayed Nicaragua and Iran, there never would have been a Contra movement. There never would have been the costly and theatrical Iran-Contra hearings. And the liberals, leftists and anti-anti-Communists who dominate so much of government and the media would not have had any opportunity to stage their grand show for the purpose of punishing good Americans whose main goal is to strike a blow against Red terror.

## **Why Not Investigate Pro-Communists?**

In a more sane day, Congress would have dealt severely with ten of its members who, in March 1984, sent the infamous “Dear Commandante” letter to Daniel Ortega, the Communist leader of Nicaragua. Signed by then-Majority leader Jim Wright of Texas, two of your inquisitors (Lee Hamilton of Indiana, Edward Boland of Massachusetts), and seven others, that letter praised Dictator Ortega and “the members of your government for taking steps to open up the political process in your country.” At the very time this letter was sent, the Ortega regime was oppressing clergy, destroying free press, committing atrocities against Nicaragua’s Miskito Indians, refusing to hold free elections, and welcoming Cuban and Soviet support.

The letter continued: “We have been, and remain, opposed to U.S. support for military action directed against ... Nicaragua.” Is it any wonder that Mr. Boland would concoct his amendment to block congressional funding for the Contras? Is it not a measure of the sad state of affairs that



Congress would pass it, forcing you to seek ways to help the Contras covertly?

Critics complain that your efforts violated the Constitution. Yet, these ten fawners at the feet of a foreign nation's Communist leader closed their incredible letter with "[we] pledge our willingness to discuss these or other matters of concern with you or officials of your government at any time." Both constitutional tradition and the Logan Act specify that negotiation with foreign governments is a prerogative of the executive branch alone. In other words, congressmen are not permitted to do what this letter says its authors will do and have already done. There should have been a televised hearing to investigate these ten, but, because their deed helped a Communist, the matter was forgotten.

In 1985, Colorado Representative Patricia Schroeder (who may yet be a candidate for the Presidency) signed a fund-raising letter for Nicaragua Network, a group formed by Sandinista agents and a man named Sandy Pollack, who happens to be a member of the national committee of the Communist Party USA. But there were no investigations of Mrs. Schroeder's pro-Communist deeds. Congress only investigates those who engage in anti-Communist activity.

Did you avoid informing Congress about the diversion of funds to the Contras because you knew how much these highly-placed lawmakers favored the cause of Daniel Ortega? You had every right to fear that individuals with such records would likely leak information about your activities to the press and to Ortega, thereby endangering the lives of both Americans and friends in other nations.

One of the most certain ways to raise the ire of the powerful elements in all branches of government is to take action that might possibly succeed in stopping the advance of Communism. When Communism is threatened, the engines of defeat and accommodation are revved up and put to work. The unwritten law in government and in most of the media is: **Thou shalt not interfere with Communists or their goals!**

You fought in Vietnam, and, like almost all Americans who served in that war, you tried to win. The horror that you witnessed and the hard-to-believe barbarism that resulted when the U.S. abandoned Southeast Asia have motivated you to do whatever your superiors would allow in order to reverse the Communist takeover of Nicaragua. But why did we lose in Vietnam? And why did very friendly governments in Nicaragua and Iran succumb, one to Communists and the other to fanatical America-haters?

You indicted Congress for its "fickle, vacillating, unpredictable, on-again-off-again policy toward the . . . Contras." Your indictment was well-placed. But other indictments are deserved. What has to be factored in here is that it was not Congress that helped the Sandinistas to triumph, or betrayed the Somoza government, or undermined the Shah of Iran's government, or insisted on a no-win policy that assured defeats both in Vietnam and in Korea. Decisions and actions of the executive branch brought about these debacles, even though many in the Congress supported what the various administrations were doing.

Let's return to the use of a baseball analogy to analyze only one of these horrible incidents.

The Vietnam War saw U.S. forces thrown into a contest where their manager forced them to



participate but not to win — until they were exhausted. Our side was made to play almost the entire game defensively. During our few chances at bat, management insisted that we take half swings, refrain from hitting the ball out of the park, use a bat made of mush, and run the bases in weighted shoes.

Many of our star players complained about these incredible rules and were speedily removed from the team. When a game that could have been won with relative ease dragged on and on, the players, in addition to the game of baseball itself, were vilified by the sportswriters and many of the fans. And worst of all, those same managers and owners kept supplying the sponsors of the other team with whatever they needed to score more runs and proceed to victory.

The Vietnam War could have been won in a matter of weeks any time U.S. leaders gave the word. [A rapid win would have required a complete change in strategy and objectives, e.g. invading North Vietnam and putting the North Vietnam government at risk. -Editor] But the advocates of accommodation and defeat prevailed. And they are still in charge.

## Nicaragua and Iran

Only ten years ago, Nicaragua was a thriving nation with a growing middle class. The press was free, the churches were open, there were elections, and the nation posed no threat to any of its neighbors. Nowhere on earth could anyone find a government more friendly to the United States. There were dissidents, yes, and there were political forces strongly opposed to President Anastasio Somoza. Nevertheless, with the kind of help from the U.S. he had a right to expect, Somoza could have prevailed.

But what did the U.S. government do? It undermined Somoza in every way imaginable. After decades of relying on U.S. friendship, Nicaragua found herself unable to purchase U.S. arms; she saw our government sever long-standing military ties; and the nation and its leader became the victims of an incredibly widespread smear campaign. On June 18, 1979, a full-page advertisement in the *New York Times* signed by 125 U.S. Congressmen and five U.S. Senators begged the Carter Administration to stop driving Nicaragua into the arms of the Cuban- and Soviet-supplied Sandinistas. Their collective plea was ignored.

American small arms that were left behind in Vietnam and sent across the Pacific by Communist Vietnamese showed up for use by the Communists in Nicaragua. U.S. helicopters given to Panama's government were employed to supply the Sandinistas. When the final showdown came, a ship from Israel laden with small arms for Somoza's forces was met by U.S. vessels before it could reach Nicaragua and turned away. U.S. diplomat William D. Bowdler then forced Somoza to leave his country. All of which led former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba Earl E. T. Smith—who had reluctantly participated in the U.S. betrayal of Cuba to Castro in 1958—to state publicly, “Nicaragua is Cuba all over again.”

Almost simultaneously with events in Nicaragua, the U.S. government, in the name of “human rights,” targeted the Shah of Iran's government. The Carter Administration forced the Shah's acquiescence to a never-ending series of demands that undermined his leadership, encouraged



his enemies, and forced his downfall. No similar demands are ever made of Communist or Marxist regimes. In the end, a decidedly pro-U.S. nation that permitted U.S. military installations on its soil was replaced by fanatical anti-Americans whose regime has spawned terrorism, hostage-taking, and a Middle East war that still threatens to involve our nation.

The simple and comforting explanation is to indict former President Jimmy Carter for bad judgment, and then to rejoice that he was voted out of office in 1980. But that explanation deals only with the office of President, and not the powerful policymaking bodies at the State Department and other elements of the executive branch. And it ignores a pattern of pro-Communism that stretches back over a generation.

## **And So Much More**

Why did the leaders of our nation subvert Nicaragua and Iran? Why did they turn the U.S. Canal in Panama over to the pro-Communist Torrijos regime? Why did they undermine and subvert the pro-Western government in what was once Rhodesia?

Prior to the Carter Administration's numerous disasters, why did our leaders betray Chiang Kai-Shek; "snatch defeat from the jaws of victory" in Korea; abandon the 1956 Hungarian Freedom Fighters we had pledged to help; stand truth on its head to favor Castro's takeover of Cuba; betray the courageous anti-Communists at Cuba's Bay of Pigs; send 50,000 brave Americans to a fruitless death in Vietnam; and so much more?

Why has the U.S. supplied food, technology, equipment, credit and legitimacy to the Soviet Union for decades? The high-level thugs who run the USSR continue to crush Poland, ravage Afghanistan, support Cuba and Nicaragua, destroy unarmed civilian aircraft and foster terrorism and insurrection on every continent. It can be shown to anyone willing to take a look that U.S. support for the two Communist giants, the USSR and Red China, has grown larger during the Reagan Administration—despite whatever images may have been created about it.

What of the successful liberation of Grenada, something about which you are obviously well-versed? Can we at least score one for the good guys? Yes indeed, and the proper action taken there means that our nation can indeed stop the Communist advance. On October 27, 1983, only days after the operation had been completed, President Reagan correctly assessed events in both Grenada and Lebanon. He said in a speech to the nation: "Not only has Moscow assisted and encouraged the violence in both countries. But it provides direct support through a network of surrogates and terrorists." And he described Grenada as "a Soviet-Cuban colony" that had to be liberated.

But, if Grenada had to be liberated, why is the Communist presence in Cuba allowed to fester? And why does the administration assist the Soviet Union that props up Cuba to the tune of \$5 million per day? If there is justification for taking action in Grenada—and there certainly was—why is nothing done about Cuba? Why, instead of causing Castro problems, do we 1) honor President Kennedy's 1962 pledge to Khrushchev that the U.S. would not work to overthrow Communist power in Cuba; 2) enable Castro to be so secure that he can send tens of thousands of troops to



advance Communism in Africa; 3) effectively ignore the Cuban role in supplying and guiding the Sandinista Communists in Nicaragua; and 4) continue to aid the Soviets while they keep the Communists afloat in Cuba and Nicaragua?

## Some Answers

We have asked many questions. Now, let us offer some answers. The major reason why U.S. policies are self-defeating, even pro-Communist, is not because there are Communists running important agencies of our government. America is run, we are sad to conclude, by individuals who are committed to the creation of an all-powerful world government. This supranational “new world order” that is steadily being created will, if allowed, encompass the Communist world and all other nations. It will be led by powerful individuals who always run interference for Communists and whose efforts result in both government and private entities financing, dignifying and legitimizing Communists in a variety of ways. Their goal, which not surprisingly happens to coincide with the goal of Communism, is a one-world, socialist superstate.

There are several organizations here in the United States that exist to carry out this ambitious and far-reaching plan. Chief amongst them is the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) begun in 1921. Its influence over the conduct of U.S. foreign policy during the past 50 years has been immense. For just one indication of CFR clout, the past ten Secretaries of State have been CFR members— from Dean Acheson who aided in the Red takeover of China and helped mismanage the war in Korea; to Dean Rusk and Henry Kissinger who led our nation to defeat in Vietnam; and on to George Shultz who occasionally utters a few harsh words about Communists but who can always be counted on to excuse their barbarity, overlook their lying, and deliver for them when a need arises.

These one-world internationalists occasionally throw their weight behind the imposition of Socialism in foreign nations. Both Socialism and Communism are acceptable in their view. What they will not tolerate is anti-Communism and strict independence. Hence, such nations as South Africa and Chile have become targets of both government and the media. Meanwhile, immense Communist barbarity— such as the Soviet rape of Afghanistan, the anti-family programs of Red China, etc.—is swept under the rug.

In 1982, the election of anti-Communist Robert d’Aubuisson in El Salvador was followed immediately by intense U.S. pressure that forced him to step aside in favor of a “provisional president” and required the nation to hold new elections.

Prior to those 1984 elections, the U.S. Agency for International Development and the CIA helped to organize Socialist Jose Napoleon Duarte’s campaign. When the administration-backed Duarte won a narrow victory, Secretary of State George Shultz journeyed to El Salvador to celebrate his victory. The Communists did not gain control of El Salvador, the Socialists did. But the new world order gained another nation just the same.



## A Very Powerful Group

In its 1986 *Annual Report*, the 2,427-member CFR can boast that 266 of its members are U.S. government officials. Another 258 are “journalists, correspondents and communications executives” who make it a practice to ignore the Council’s enormous clout. Yet, most of America’s mass media takes its lead about important issues from CFR-controlled organs or from CFR-member journalists.

While it is certainly true that not every member of the CFR is deliberately working against the interests of the American people and for the Communist-style new world order, it is beyond doubt that many are. Our small book *The Insiders* provides a good look at the background and purposes of this powerful organization and its allied group, The Trilateral Commission.

The CFR mindset explains why Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige (CFR) spends so much energy pressuring U.S. firms to supply the Soviet Union; why Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger (CFR) arranges to keep our nation’s space-based defense capabilities sealed tightly in the research phase, instead of in the building and emplacement phase; and why American foreign policy under Secretary of State George Shultz (CFR) continues to legitimize, through diplomatic recognition, the Communist governments of Nicaragua, Angola, Mozambique and Afghanistan—each of which is facing anti-Communist opposition that would welcome American support.

Of particular interest to you should be the role played by over 200 CFR members of the Carter Administration in subverting Nicaragua and Iran. During that period, U.S. foreign policy was directed by Secretary of State Cyrus Vance (CFR), Secretary of Defense Harold Brown (CFR), National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski (CFR), CIA Director Stansfield Turner (CFR), and scores of Assistant Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Ambassadors whose names also appear on the CFR roster. No sooner had the Sandinistas triumphed than aid to Nicaragua— cut off during the reign of anti-Communist Somoza—was resumed.

As has already been noted, the CFR internationalists who dominated the Carter Administration have extended their domination to the Reagan team. The names are changed but the policies are not. The rhetoric coming out of Washington is far more appealing to the average American, but the performance is virtually unchanged. President Reagan, who was expected by many to wrest control of our nation’s government from the eastern liberal establishment’s CFR and similar groups, filled his administration with individuals possessing the same pedigrees.

One deadly result of this control is that the Contra movement never had a chance to succeed. Many who have guided its destiny are ideological bedfellows of those who installed the Sandinistas in Managua in the first place, even the late CIA Director William B. Casey (CFR) about whom you spoke so favorably during the hearings. CFR-led Team B (under Reagan) was not about to reverse the successes of CFR Team A (under Carter)—in Nicaragua or anywhere else.



## What Now of Oliver North?

When an energetic field-grade military officer operating in the bowels of the White House threatened to achieve anti-Communist success where defeat and stalemate is preferred, he is personally vilified, accused falsely by the media, deserted by many who were thought to be friends, and subjected to star-chamber proceedings designed to punish him for breaking that unwritten rule: **Thou shalt not interfere with Communists or their goals!** As a by-product of the plan to make an example of you, other anti-Communists were to be intimidated into silence and inactivity.

But so far, you have successfully withstood all that has been thrown at you. Your candor and determination far exceeded the expectation of your oppressors, and also of the American people. You have deflated those who sympathize with Communists, and you have elated huge numbers of ordinary Americans who salute you for your genuine love of country and detestation of Communism.

Your ordeal is not over, however. Having won a very big first round, you may now find yourself the target of more intense grilling, more vicious smears, and perhaps even a more determined enforcement of the unwritten rule about interfering with Communist goals.

Millions of Americans have experienced a resurgence of patriotic fervor and a lessening of enfeebling cynicism. This is a great victory for America. It is our hope that Oliver North will win more victories. If you possess a more complete understanding of the subversive nature and dominant influence of our nation's most important enemies—those within the gates— additional victories are far more likely. Without it, you will be fighting shadows, chasing down blind alleys, and experiencing betrayals on all sides.

If the fight to preserve freedom and defeat Communism were indeed a game of baseball, no one should expect to win the game without identifying the opposition and knowing the rules. The John Birch Society long ago discovered the rules and then listed the players in a readily available scorecard. We will happily share everything with you, just as we are delighted to share it with anyone in this great country. When enough Americans learn who their enemies are, how they operate, and how they can be defeated, the game can indeed be won. And then the world, now full of Communist-style oppression and slavery, will begin the steady climb toward freedom and opportunity.

Thank you for all of your efforts to date. May God bless you, and may God bless America.

Sincerely,  
John F. McManus