



Written by **Gary Allen**

Reprinted with permission from American Opinion, April 1971

Making Plans For A Dictatorship in America

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets* – a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to *American Opinion*. Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

IN THE misty past of the Dark Ages the kings of old are said to have employed sorcerers who, after performing various incantations, would whisper the wisdom of the spirit world into the ear of their regent. These masters of mumbo-jumbo became, in effect, the power behind the throne. They were the court intellectuals. While centuries have passed, and pointed hats have been replaced by pointy heads, such sorcerers are still as important to dictators as ever. Now they are called Planners, and they look upon themselves as proven alchemists destined to provide the strategies by which a new World Order is to be established and ruled.

Such Planners are now to be found as Presidential advisors, in government bureaus, serving the foundations, and operating from prestigious universities, but their prime habitat is the some four hundred Think Tanks scattered across the land like nuts on a birthday cake. These are of course research centers, generally staffed with dropouts from university faculties who are ready at the signing of a cheque to produce radical reports and recommendations on any subject imaginable. In boasting of the political influence of these new sorcerers, Theodore White observed in *Life* of June 9, 1967:

No political reporter travels the campaign trail today without realizing that backroom bosses are steadily being pushed out by backroom professors who define the issues, draw up position papers, draft the speeches the candidates will voice. "We are a new establishment without initiation rites," says one of them....

From the back rooms of the double-dome domiciles come the plans which our politicians hoopla into socialist legislation. In October of 1967, Stuart Loory of the *Los Angeles Times* observed of their influence:

From 50 to 75% of the "bold" new programs developed by the . . . Administration during the last two years were generated outside the government.

"People in government are just too busy to think up bold new ideas," one White House



staff member said last week. In the last two years, the mail-order idea process has resulted in such proposals as the 1966 model cities program and the 1967 aid-to-children program that included such projects as Head Start.

Nationally syndicated columnist Edith Kermit Roosevelt, a longtime Think Tank watcher, has few illusions about them. As she put it in *The Wanderer* of January 26, 1967:

These supposedly “private” think factories produce a veritable flood of purportedly independent and objective studies. These actually are predetermined, disguised propaganda tracts. They are formulated secretly and written by think boys, usually on the Government payroll.

The intent is to persuade the American public both to support the Administration line and to initiate a “public demand” for Government policies and programs laid out in advance. This is sophisticated “news management.” In this way, the principle that “the people decide” becomes a fiction, while Administration propagandists build up a demand for a program already decided upon. The result is that the American public has become not only the unwitting target of Government propaganda but must even foot the bill for it.

Thus is a once-independent people managed while being programmed to march off a cliff into dictatorship. **The Radical Institute**

One of the most pungent of the brain barns working to create this New Order is the Institute for Policy Studies, based in Washington, D.C. It had its genesis in Arthur Waskow’s Peace Research Institute, which officially began cogitating in April of 1961, after announcing that it would serve as a private agency to undertake and stimulate research in all fields relevant to peace, security, and disarmament and international order. Waskow was twenty-eight at the time. Shortly thereafter he obtained from the federal government a fat contract to make a study for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, then newly created by President John F. Kennedy.

Late in 1963, Waskow’s Peace Research Institute merged with the Institute for Policy Studies, which had just been founded by Marcus Raskin, a former Congressional aide. and Richard garnet. who once served as deputy director of political research for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Institute for Policy Studies has since compiled studies for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, tutored the staffs of scores of radical Congressmen, and has more recently devoted itself to organizing revolution in the streets. The importance of the Institute to the New Left is described by Garry Wills, a onetime protégé of William F. Buckley Jr., who like Bill has taken a hard turn to the Left. Wills comments:

Conspiratorialists have to find the mastermind behind each evil development – in this case, the “headquarters ” of the youth rebellion. And some think they have found it in an appropriately seedy house off DuPont Circle in Washington. There a small group of



scholar-activists “hide” behind the grey title, Institute for Policy Studies. The place was oddly obscure for the Institute’s first six years of existence, but right-wing publicists raised the alarm against it in 1969....

Dr. Wills makes it clear that he is offended by right-wing “conspiratorialists” and their “publicists,” but he admits that this is the real thing, observing of the Institute:

Wherever things were happening on the Left throughout the Sixties, the Institute was bound to be represented by one or more of its Fellows. Civil rights, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, Black Power, campus reform, anti-war demonstrations, teach-ins, free universities, draft resistance, the Spock trial, the Chicago Convention, the New Party, Mobe marches, the Chicago trial, campus strikes – one way or another, it was involved in them all.

The primary mover and shaker at the Institute is a curious fellow named Marcus Raskin. Mr. Raskin is described by Wills as a frustrated piano virtuoso “full of nervous tics.” An accomplished philologist, Dr. Wills knows very well that *Webster’s New World Dictionary* defines tic as a “spasmodic contraction of a muscle, generally of neurotic origin.” What we have here is some kind of a twitchy neurotic who, if he were a conservative, would be derided by the Establishment media as a dangerous psychopath belonging in a mental institution. Wills is guarded about saying so because Marcus Raskin has one redeeming quality. He is a Leftist, and therefore his idiosyncrasies are to be treated by the Establishment media as manifestations of his genius.

Raskin launched himself onto the Washington scene in 1960, when at twenty-six he served as a research clerk and free-lance writer to a number of “Liberal” Congressmen, including James Roosevelt (D.-California). Soon he and Arthur Waskow, now also a Fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies, were co-authoring a report for socialist Wisconsin Congressman Robert Kastenmeier. Copvrighted in 1961 it was titled “Deterrence And Reality,” and so far as can be determined, says Shirley Scheibla of *Barron’s*, it “constituted the first advocacy of U.S. unilateral disarmament on Capitol Hill.” Waskow subsequently expanded the report into a book called *The Limits Of Defense*.

With the advent of J.F.K. and the New Frontier, Marcus Raskin sensed what Wills calls “a rebirth of liberalism.” As a Kastenmeier aide, he quickly conjured up a working coalition between socialist professors and radical legislators, and named it “The Liberal Project.” Out of this came a book called *The Liberal Papers*. Raskin served as “group secretary” in the compilation of this series of essays by his dozen or so Leftist professors and legislators, while Jimmy Roosevelt was given credit as editor. Among other things, the book called on the United States to allow Russia to plug into our early warning defense system (D.E.W.); demanded U.S. recognition and admission to the United Nations of such Communist states as East Germany, Red China, North Korea, and North Vietnam; and, urged America to unilaterally abandon nuclear tests, break up N.A.T.O., abandon Berlin, and neutralize Central Europe under terms proposed by Communist Poland.

According to Dr. Wills, the ideas expressed in *The Liberal Papers* then “seemed too ‘advanced’ and



scared off other legislators.” But such talent was not to be ignored by the New Frontiersmen. Marcus Raskin became a White House aide to Special Assistant for National Security Affairs McGeorge Bundy.* It was while serving Bundy that Raskin was named a member of the American delegation to the eighteen-nation disarmament conference at Geneva in 1962.

But while the radical rhetoric of the Kennedy Administration tickled Marcus Raskin’s ever flinching fancy, the Fabian “patient gradualism” of the New Frontier was just too slow for him. He began to think about jumping ship.

Marcus was now working closely with Richard Barnet, with whom he served the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. They wondered why the revolutionary spirit had withered so quickly in the Kennedy Administration. Executive activism seemed to them to have failed. Both, says Esquire, “would later come to a deeper answer – to a belief that the military is at the center of all our national policy, even of liberal policy.” Raskin would help organize lawyers to counsel potential draft resisters, and write the “Call To Resist” which led to his indictment as a “co-conspirator” with Dr. Benjamin Spock in the Boston anti-draft trials. Barnet would write pro-Vietcong propaganda and (according to the *New York Times* of November 13, 1969) go so far as to address a Communist rally in Hanoi to voice what the *Times* calls his “solidarity” with the Communist troops killing American soldiers in the field.

In the sorrows and delusions arising out of the fact that America was not to be Communized on the morrow, Barnet and Raskin fled the New Frontier to frolic in the fields of Thinktankery. Perhaps they had only discovered how the world is run. The ideologically ambidextrous Garry Wills tells us all about it:

What was needed, then, was a channel of advice and information kept unsullied by government money, and Barnet and Raskin set out to provide this. All through 1963 they did the hard, ignominious work of beggars. Their Democratic contacts took them to Philip Stern, author, financial angel of the Party, heir to the Sears fortune. And he took them to an even bigger contributor, the late James Warburg, of the international-banking family. With money from them and others, the Institute was set up in the Fall of 1963, just before John Kennedy’s death . . .

Two more devilish angels one could not find in a plot by W.C. Fields – except, of course, these clowns were for real. Stern’s pedigree includes great-grandfather Julius Rosenwald, the Sears and Roebuck mogul, who was like Philip a major financier of Marxist causes. Over his lifetime he is authoritatively reported to have contributed some \$18 million to a “Liberal” reformer known as Josef Stalin. Philip’s uncle Alfred K. Stern fled behind the Iron Curtain in 1957 after a federal grand jury had returned a three-count indictment against him for spying for the Soviet Union.

Philip, himself, helped staff the Kennedy State Department (where he and Richard Barnet had worked together) and was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs at the time the Bay of Pigs debacle was planned. You will not be surprised to learn that Philip Stern participated in the planning. He had also played an important part in the persecution of Senator Joseph McCarthy



while an assistant to Senator Henry Jackson (President Nixon's first choice for Secretary of Defense) during the Army-McCarthy Hearings. And it was Stern who bank-rolled the early My Lai investigators who took their atrocity tales right out of Vietcong propaganda.

The background of the late James Warburg was even gamier. Here was a man who devoted much of his adult life to destruction of the sovereignty of the United States.** As he once told a Senate Committee: "We shall have world government whether or not you like it - by conquest or consent." Mr. Warburg was, after all, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the elite Establishment conspiracy working to merge the United States into a socialist world superstate. Both his father and uncle were deeply involved in bankrolling the Bolshevik takeover of Russia.

After Philip Stern and James Warburg got the Institute for Policy Studies on its feet, the usual giant foundations and wealthy Leftists began to pump cash into the tax-free Institute, permitting it to move into the revolution-promoting business in a big way. Edith Kermit Roosevelt provides some details in her nationally syndicated column of August 31, 1967:

The contributing foundations as listed by the Institute in its 1964 report and 1963-1966 reports are: the Ford Foundation, the National Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church, Institute for International Order, the Milbank Foundation, the Commonwealth Fund, Edgar Stern Family Fund, Fontenay Corporation, Joseph Ziskind Trust, Palisades Foundation, Community Research and Development, Inc., and the Samuel Rubin Foundation...

What all of this means is best indicated in the background of the third major founder of the Institute for Policy Studies, Arthur Waskow. (It rhymes with Moscow, which is coincidental, but appropriate.) Another of Congressman Kastenmeier's Kiddy Korps, Waskow wears a long, black beard in a perhaps conscious imitation of the caricatures of bomb-throwing anarchists once popular in the pages of the *Police Gazette*. Like Raskin and Barnet, his two main interests are disarming the U.S. military and arming the street revolutionaries. There is a contradiction here only if you assume that these boys don't know what they are doing.

In a study undertaken for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Arthur Waskow called for an international police force to maintain peace while forcing the nations of the world to disarm. He explained that disputes in a disarmed world could "be settled by reference to the International Court of Justice, to various mediation services, to various organs of the United Nations, etc." He then authored a pamphlet entitled "Keeping The World Disarmed," in which he described how the nice world police, working for the supra-government, could keep such colonies as the United States from rebelling against the world dictators. The pamphlet was published by the subversive Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, to which we devoted some twenty-one pages in *American Opinion* for March.

For the homegrown revolution, Waskow advocates what his Institute calls "creative disorder." Writing in *The Wanderer*, Edith Kermit Roosevelt comments:



Creative disorder means the use of illegal or nearly illegal techniques to force revolutionary changes in Society. Examples given by Waskow range from the popularized lunch-counter sit-ins of the early 1960s to the 1967 enemy-aiding drive in the Quaker movement to send medical aid to North Vietnam. For example, before the Newark riot, the Institute invited activists to view training films in community organization in Newark and to attend a seminar on "Poverty, Politics and Power."

The idea of "creative disorder," wrote Waskow in *Saturday Review* back in 1965, is that as revolutionists force the government to adopt more and more repressive measures to stop them, they will gain increasing acceptance and support. Whether Arthur Waskow really believes that by providing the excuse for an Establishment dictatorship he will bring about a genuine proletarian revolution, or whether he is consciously playing the role of a Judas goat, can only be a matter of speculation. But the man is not stupid. The *Washington Post* reports that he helped to plan the demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago which were used effectively to radicalize hundreds of thousands of the nation's young people.

Still, Arthur was an old hand at "creative disorder" long before the Chicago operation. In August of 1965, he represented the Institute at a meeting at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions near Santa Barbara, California, which produced the famous "Call for a New Politics." A year later the National Conference for a New Politics met in Chicago, and your reporter got his first look at Waskow in action as he paraded among the Communists who ran that show as the founder and leader of the New Politics. (See *American Opinion*, November, 1967.) The result was a political United Front with the Communists which organized college students to support radical candidates.

For grinding out such brilliant ideas for revolution and sharing the wealth, Arthur Waskow and the Fellows are paid some \$20,000 per year by the Institute, plus fees for speaking and royalties for writing which make their earnings at least triple the national average. They are doing well by doing ill.

The evolution of the Institute for Policy Studies is probated by Garry Wills. In the beginning, he says:

There was a student program, aimed at taking "interns" from progressive schools like Antioch and getting them jobs as congressional aides (to repeat the experience of the three Fellows in Kastenmeier's office). But the real students were to be politicians in the Capital - congressmen, civil servants, legislative aides. The seminar program was set up to give them the benefit of expert thinking in all areas of policy (hence the Institute's title).

Wills tells us that with Barnett's "connections in the State Department, and Raskin's at the White House and on the Hill, these men fed a stream of ideas to the right places" Big name radicals like Hans Morgenthau, Jerome Wiesner, Leo Szilard, Allen Ginsberg, and Paul Goodman were brought in to instruct "bright young bureaucrats." But the radicalizing of Congressional staffers



was not as easy as it first appeared. An ideological advisor is bound to be independent; and politicians, the Institute soon discovered, do not want advisors they cannot control. Not even the radical politicians closest to the ideals of the Institute. Something had to be done.

The transition from advocating a Communist government by degrees, we are told, came in the backwash of disillusionment after the 1964 Democratic Convention. As Wills describes it:

Raskin remembers going with Martin Luther King Jr. from delegation to delegation in Atlantic City, all through the night, though King was in pain from a broken foot. When Liberals like Humphrey and Joseph Rauh protected Johnson's tidy convention from [S.N.C.C. organizer Robert] Moses and King and Fannie Lou Hamer [of the radical Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party], the Institute lost much of its trust and hope in limited reforms. Disillusioned kids, blacks from S.N.C.C. and white workers from the South began to form a new constituency for the Fellows. No congressmen came, now, to their seminars. If the institute could not educate the Administration, perhaps it could enlighten the Movement (which sorely needed intelligence and inner debate).

From that time on the Institute devoted itself to training Stokely Carmichael and his boys from S.N.C.C., and S.D.S. types, and hairy hotheads, for the revolution in the streets.

The Institute for Policy Studies is now in the process of colonizing subsidiaries, despite the fact that, "living mainly on the margins of millionaires," its finances were pinched by 1970 market conditions. Thus far avatars of the Institute have opened their doors in Cambridge, San Francisco, and Atlanta. "The parent organization has blessed all these endeavors- supplied them with seed money, advice, connections, angels, lawyers . . .," writes the admiring Wills. In addition, as part of "building a counter-community program," the Institute has established a chain of "communes."

Past is prologue at the Institute for Policy Studies, and we can chart the future of the street revolution in this country by observing the trends being fashioned there. Interestingly, the Institute is now telegraphing word that the youth revolution is about to take a surprising new turn. Here is how Garry Wills makes the point after a long puff about how Arthur Waskow is the most amazing "prophet" since Jeremiah:

. . . Waskow roots his mad-rabbi image in the prophetic tradition of the Old Testament, and feels that a deep renewal of religion will take place during the Seventies. He has begun a series of conferences to bring together the spiritual energies of this movement, and to keep what he calls "Creative Disorder" nonviolent.

It would be a mistake to rejoice over any "religious revival" whose "spiritual energies" had been brought together by the Institute for Policy Studies from among its constituency of hippy and New Left elements. Though certainly this is brilliant dialectics! Who can criticize young people claiming to be deeply committed to religion? But these young people are being taught to believe that Jesus was the first Communist, and that his modern disciples are men like Che Guevara, who is already



being depicted in Communist literature as wearing a halo. Well aware of the game, Establishment propaganda organs like *Look* magazine are even now extolling the rise of religion among alienated youth and the advent of the "Christian revolutionary." In all reverence: God help us!

Operating on a vast budget contributed by millionaire Insiders, the Institute for Policy Studies is an excellent example of how the Think Tanks are used to prepare Marxist cannon fodder for the streets. The revolution for which they are working is carefully designed to supply a "justification" for the super-rich Insiders at the top to increase their control. **The Boys At RAND**

At the opposite end of the respectability spectrum is the granddaddy of all Think Tanks, the RAND Corporation of Santa Monica, California.*** Working the upper part of the socialist pincers movement, RAND is described by the regrettably indefatigable Theodore White in *Life* for June 9, 1967:

One must cross the entire continent, to the cliffs of Santa Monica by the broad Pacific, to observe another archetype of the new intellectual center. The RAND Corporation, first and greatest of the "think-factories," was created by the federal government in 1946 to gather thinkers who would ponder the nature of modern war.

In its red-tabbed safes are to be found every secret of American security: our intelligence on China and Russia, the number of our bombs, the deployment of our missiles, the design and technology of the thermonuclears. Out of such information RAND's economists, physicists, engineers, social scientists have woven theories that have already changed American history.

This operation, as important as it is, is of course largely secret. As David Smith observed in an Associated Press release for February 19, 1967:

A private corporation, RAND turns out just one product - advice - on a take it or leave it basis. Enough is taken that RAND, for 20 years, has exerted profound influence on the world of today and on the way the future is shaping up. Like an iceberg, what is observable gives you only the most superficial notion of RAND's real bulk.

When RAND was founded in 1946 as the brainchild of Air Force General H.H. Arnold, it was intended to develop weapons. Soon, however, it became the home of the so-called "defense intellectuals"- refugees from the universities who brought their Leftist prejudices with them. Thus its scope was widened from weapons development to military and cold war strategy. Almost immediately it developed interlocking directorates with the Ford Foundation (which donated \$100,000 toward its original incorporation), the Carnegie Corporation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and other tax-free institutions whose devotion to the Far Left is all too well known.

RAND is no small-time operation. It employs about eleven hundred people, half of whom are professionals. Its PhD's receive annual pay in excess of \$30,000. It's research contracts bring in \$23 million a year - seventy percent from the Air Force. At any given time at RAND there may be



as many as two hundred different research projects underway. The RAND Corporation has eleven research departments, paralleling the academic divisions of a university and including economics, physics, and social science. Over the years it has produced more than 7,000 publications, including 2,700 technical papers and 70 books.

Despite the fact that RAND is controlled by the Establishment Left and is staffed almost wholly by “Liberals,” it has served as a handy whipping boy for those who want to believe that the American Establishment is anti-Communist. Sol Stern of the New York Times reports that “RAND has never been able to shake a tainted image among Liberal intellectuals. Though most RAND scholars reject the notion of a conflict between their roles as defense advisors and objective academics, others have seen it differently. In a review in *The New York Review Of Books* once they were labeled as ‘megadeath intellectuals’ and described as mouthpieces for the military.”

And the shift is on at RAND from emphasis on purely defense matters to planning on domestic issues. As the Times-Post News Service disclosed of the Rand Corporation in a release for November 3, 1969:

Scholars still play war games on computers, and a lot of research continues to be done on strategic missile systems and other defense projects. But over the last two years there has been a large though littler-noticed shift in emphasis from military to nonmilitary research at the Rand Corporation here, the country’s best-known “think tank.”

The nonmilitary slice of Rand research, which includes international as well as domestic studies, has grown from nothing at Rand’s founding 23 years ago to 20 percent today.

The RAND Corporation is now deeply involved in “Civil Rights” and War on Poverty matters, as well as such projects as its million-dollar contracts to dredge John Lindsay’s Welfare Wonderland from, its fiscal quicksand and to devise a way to get Mayor Lindsay off the hook with New York’s policemen. The latter contract, says *Newsday* for January 9, 1968, cost the City of New York \$607,000.

Activities at RAND attracted considerable attention last year when William Howard, of the Newhouse Washington bureau, included the following item in his syndicated *NewsScope* column:

WASHINGTON - The White House is ordering up several hush-hush security studies and one of them is reported to address the question: What would happen if there is no presidential election in 1972?

President Nixon’s advisers are understood to be increasingly concerned about the country’s internal security - and the chances of radical elements disrupting governmental operations, including national elections.

Naturally, both the Nixon Administration and RAND are swearing up and down that they have



never heard of such a study, but the *Wall Street Journal* for April 24, 1970, revealed that the report has proved “hard to spike.” The street-bunder Left is using the rumored study to rattle the cages of its animals, but it is impossible to obtain any solid evidence one way or the other as to whether this business is a hoax or for real. It does fit with the Insiders’ strategy of “pressure from above” and “pressure from below,” but we think the timing is wrong. Whatever the truth of the matter the Nixon Administration *has* ordered some highly interesting studies by RAND. As “Liberal” columnist Flora Lewis noted in her nationally syndicated column for August 16, 1969:

Henry Kissinger, the White House national security adviser, has ordered some secret studies from the Rand Corporation on some startling questions

. . . these are the questions Rand has been asked to study for the National Security Council:

1. Circumstances in which American nuclear weapons might be used in the Middle East.
 2. Circumstances in which the government of Brazil [sic] might be overthrown if it decides to expropriate American assets.
 3. Feasibility of restoring political, economic and cultural relations with Castro’s Cuba
-

A Defense Department agency has allocated \$222,500 for the above studies with another \$500,000 available if necessary. As Miss Lewis observes: “There has to be some policy purpose for spending the money. Kissinger isn’t telling what it is.” **Up The River At Hudson**

Possibly the nation’s most important Think Tank is the Hudson Institute, located outside of Croton-on-Hudson, New York. The Hudson Institute is fronted by a fifty-year-old intellectual dervish named Herman Kahn, who rose in this business as one of RAND’s prize savants. But Herman became restive at RAND and put together Establishment backing to go into the tax-free Think Tank game for himself.

William McWhirter comments on Kahn’s motivation in *Life* magazine for December 6, 1968:

While the conceits of lesser men have moved them to manipulate only regiments, ruling families and ball players, Herman Kahn decided in 1961 to help determine the entire future of the U.S. – and, time permitting, much of the world beyond. A year later, with contracts from the federal government and contributions from private industry, Kahn got possession of a rambling old estate in Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y.

The “old estate,” appropriately enough, was formerly used as a home for the mentally ill.

Herman’s specialty at RAND had been atomic war and he had recently achieved great notoriety with a book entitled *On Thermonuclear Warfare*. It painted extravagant pictures of imminent doom and advocated such tactics as “trading cities” as targets-say, in return for the Soviets hitting New York City we would hit beautiful downtown Leningrad. Kahn’s hyperbole was obviously designed to



appeal to the “better Red than dead” boys, and provided a major boost to the disarmers and promoters of World Government. Some suspicious souls have even speculated that this is why Kahn’s book, with its super-lurid and provocative chapter titles, was written. According to *Life*, loyal elements at RAND described this doom-tome as a dramatic device intended to force the U.S. to surrender its nuclear superiority.” As Richard Kostelanetz tells us in the New York Times magazine for December 1, 1968, Herman Kahn “concluded the book by advocating world government as an improbable ideal, and arms control as a realizable expedient.”

The Kahn book was written in 1960, when American Intelligence knew the Soviets had few, if any, nuclear warheads. But the Communist Line was then to create in the West a Ban the Bomb hysteria, and so effective was Kahn as a foil in the promoting of this Line that he was reputed to be the model for the crazed government advisor in the propaganda novel and film called *Fail Safe*. It was a convenient image of fanaticism in which Herman Kahn has acquiesced. As he told *Life*: “The average American may think of me as sick, traumatized by World War II and the atom bomb and he may be right.” But as Richard Kostelanetz observed: “It is faintly hard to believe that this homely mensch is, in Seymour Melman’s phrase, the ‘intellectual generalissimo of World Wars II to VI’ “

Why the image-making? Simple enough. In order to avoid “the holocaust,” Herman Kahn would use Hudson to help develop rationalizations for the sort of “no-win” perpetual wars in which we are now bleeding ourselves dry in Indo-China. Writing in *U.S. Catholic*, Bernard Bard explained what happened:

Kahn provided the defense establishment with a whole new set of rules, based on an almost infinite number of options, geared less to winning a war than to postponing defeat until the game ended by mutual consent played a big part in the Kahn strategy,

Indeed, Herman Kahn has been responsible for planning much of our remarkable military “strategy” in Vietnam, and made a number of trips there to help implement the disastrous “pacification program” which he designed. Kahn’s influence on Vietnam strategy is attested to in an article from the Communist Peoples World, which notes that just after the Tet offensive Herman Kahn proposed the following tactical moves:

(a) A sharp curtailment of bombing north of the port of Vinh; (b) Multiplied bombing in the panhandle south of Vinh; (c) Introduction of the battleship New Jersey to shell the coast and well inland. He claimed this would cut off all supplies southward, reduce the loss of planes to North Vietnamese defenses and reduce some moral and political pressure against U.S. aggression by appearing as a move toward peace. This new tactic was immediately applied by the Johnson Administration.

It was all so beautifully orchestrated that Kahn’s “no-win” themes on nuclear warfare were carried



over into his Vietnam symphonette. As Kostelanetz put it in the *New York Times* of December 1, 1968: “Not only were Kahn’s ideas partly responsible for cooling off the military establishment – the Vietnam conflict, one should never forget, is fought at considerably less than top capability – but he contributed to a chorus of warnings about accidentally initiated war ”

The Nixon “Vietnamization” and pullout may also have originated with Kahn, who prepared for the Air Force a similar scenario he called “War Termination Studies.” Credence is lent to this theory by the fact that top Presidential assistant Henry Kissinger has for years been a Fellow of Herman Kahn’s Hudson Institute. As of 1967, Hudson was doing \$1,220,000 in tax-free business with the Department of Defense, the Office of Civil Defense, and other unnamed “Government sources,” as well as a small amount of business with non-government firms and on private grants. One study by Hudson Institute, described by Arthur Herzog in the *New York Times* magazine of November 10, 1963, is entitled “Turn The Other Cheek.” It reads as follows:

Objectives: That in its relations with the Soviet Union the U.S. strive to attain the highest standards of traditional morality. Contribute to world peace and the development of brotherhood of man.

Assumptions: If we meet the Soviet Union with love instead of fear and hostility, she will be drawn to respond in a like manner, thus ending the conflict between us.

Tactics: Make only peaceful opposition to Soviet moves. Institute a program of aid and technical assistance to the U.S.S.R. where needed. Employ Gandhian tactics if Soviet Union takes advantage of our renunciation of resistance to invade us.

Of which Arthur Herzog of the Times comments:

If this. . . were interpreted as surrender – Hudson maintains it is not – it is conceivable that it would disqualify the study from being sold to the Government, for, in the nineteen-fifties, there was put on the books a law that forbids the use of Federal funds for study of the surrender of the United States.

One can only gasp that such a law would ever have proved necessary. Yet this business is all deadly serious. Describing the potential influence of such studies by Mr. Kahn and his Hudson Institute, *Life’s* William McWhirter observes:

. . . At its extreme this influence can commit a nation to social programs and military actions which have neither been fully explained nor publicly debated. One day, as that power pervades and grows more sophisticated, it may so affect the course of government that any nation’s policies may be locked in, as if by automatic pilot, years before the men who are elected to govern ever take office.

Little wonder that the *New York Times* says Herman Kahn “is also generally regarded as one of the



more influential men in the United States.” Well aware of the important role he is playing, Kahn laughs: “I am one of the ten most famous obscure Americans.”

Obviously Herman Kahn is just the sort of bright and ambitious operator the Insiders of the Establishment enlist to do their important work for them. They have certainly done so. Although of humble origins (his parents were immigrants from Russia), Kahn has already been brought into the Establishment Insiders’ Council on Foreign Relations. Yet, as *Life* magazine assures us, “His heart, if not his lot, is with the common men.” Which is perfumed offal to cover the fact that while Herman Kahn promotes socialism, he is not doing so for the “downtrodden masses” but for the purposes of the elite Council on Foreign Relations and the international financiers who expect to run the show if he is successful.

The buildup he has received is little short of hilarious. For example, Herman is reported to have an astronomical I.Q. “approaching that of John Stuart Mill.” (At least this is what the “Liberals” say, someone having apparently arranged a graveside I.Q. test for Mr. Mill.) But it gets worse. According to *Life*, “Herman Kahn is an atheist who still likes rabbis and a liberal who likes cops.” He is a lifelong Democrat, but he attempts to give the impression that he is above partisan politics. He claims expertise in many fields, and his colleagues assure the world that he devours books like a hungry dog attacking Gravy Train. *The New York Times* of July 7, 1969, bubbles that “Mr. Kahn has exercised his intellectual powers in the capacity of a military strategist, economist, mathematician, sociologist, geneticist and political scientist to influence governmental policy.”

Yet, as *Life* magazine admits, his interest is not scholarship but polemics: “A Kahn fact is trained to do only one thing: to lead to a Kahn conclusion.” Herman Kahn—member of the C.F.R., “Liberal,” atheist, Democrat, military strategist, and Superplanner – is just too bad to be true. Herman is a con man become professional Insider. Bright, no doubt, but built up by a public relations push to lend credence to his radical proposals. Consider.

While all the world apparently testifies to Herman’s genius, Mrs. Kahn seems to see him as an emotionally disturbed crackpot. Here are her words as quoted in *Life* for December 6, 1968:

Herman lives in a world all his own. He talks to himself in the shower. I don’t really understand him. I mean that. I don’t understand him at all. Herman does not live in the real world He draws from it, but he has no reality at all. Deep down in my heart I know that he is a blithering idiot. How he just gets around the world and back again in one piece is a mystery to me. If I didn’t know Herman was brilliant, I would have left him a long time ago.

Ah yes, the common touch. Here is a brilliant “blithering idiot” who does not live in the real world but travels around it doing good. Don’t bet on it. Bright, yes. Shrewd, yes. But, press agentry aside, it is clear that Herman Kahn is no lonely genius, but rather a top coordinating executive for the Insiders. The people with whom Kahn has surrounded himself at Hudson Institute provide the clue.



Among those listed as “Public Members” of the institute are such members of the Establishment Left as Irving Brown (C.F.R.), William Burden (C.F.R.), Robert M. Hutchins, John Irwin (C.F.R.), James McCormack (C.F.R.), John Menke, the late A.J. Muste, the late Reinhold Niebuhr, Harvey Picker (C.F.R.), Oscar Ruebhausen (C.F.R.), Robert Sprague (C.F.R.), John Strachey, and Thomas J. Watson Jr. (C.F.R.). Ten of the twenty-one listed “Public Members” belong to the Insiders’ Council on Foreign Relations.

Fellows at the Hudson Institute include Doak Barnett (C.F.R.), Francis Bator (C.F.R.), Hans Bethe, Lincoln Bloomfield (C.F.R.), Roger Fisher (C.F.R.), William Fox (C.F.R.), Milton Friedman, Stuart Hughes, William Kaufmann (C.F.R.), William Kintner (C.F.R.), Henry Kissinger (C.F.R.), Klaus Knorr (C.F.R.), Leon Lipson (C.F.R.), Max Millikan (C.F.R.), Hans Morgenthau (C.F.R.), Thomas Schelling (C.F.R.), George Taylor (C.F.R.), and David Truman (C.F.R.). Fifteen of thirty-four Fellows at the Hudson Institute are members of the Insiders’ Council on Foreign Relations.

In short, Herman Kahn of the Hudson Institute is running the official Think Tank of the Establishment insiders.

To understand what that means, consider the *Report From Iron Mountain On The Possibility And Desirability Of Peace*, apparently produced by Kahn out of Hudson. In the form in which it broke into print the Report was said to have been prepared by an unidentified group of fifteen Planners who were commissioned in the fall of 1963 by an unnamed government agency to conduct a study of the problems the United States would face in the event of permanent peace. The Report was completed in 1966. One of the brain-trusters, believing the public should know of the study, provided writer Leonard Lewin with a copy of the Report, which Lewin promptly published.

There is considerable evidence that the Report is the work of the Hudson Institute and Herman Kahn, along with others. But formal anonymity was maintained because the recommendations were thought to be too controversial to be associated with the Hudson Institute. There are, however, continuing references to Kahn and his Institute throughout the Report. The name “Iron Mountain,” for instance, comes from the location of the initial meeting of the Planners. There is an Iron Mountain just a stone’s throw (literally) from the Hudson Institute near Croton-on-Hudson.

The mysterious Report From Iron Mountain was reviewed in the *Washington Post* on November 26, 1967, by “Herschel McLandress,” later admitted by the Post to be a pseudonym for Harvard Professor John Kenneth Galbraith (C.F.R.). Here is a part of the introduction to that review:

As to the authenticity of the document, it happens that this reviewer can speak to the full extent of his personal authority and credibility I was asked to attend a meeting. . . to discuss a project of high national influence at Iron Mountain in upstate New York I was forced to decline. I was then instructed to keep the invitation strictly confidential. On two subsequent occasions I was consulted

Then Professor Galbraith proceeds to emphasize his agreement with the conclusion of the Report that it is necessary to have perpetual war for perpetual peace in order to promote social welfare.



Here are his words:

The reaction to war, hitherto, has been moralistic, emotional and even oratorical. This is the first study of its social role to be grounded firmly on modern social science and buttressed by modern empirical techniques as extended and refined by computer technology. That it should find that war provides the only dependable system “for stabilizing and controlling” national economics; that it is the source of the public authority that makes stable government possible; that it is indispensable sociologically for the control of “dangerous social dissidence and destructive antisocial tendencies”; that it serves an indispensable Malthusian function; and that it has long “provided the fundamental motivational source of scientific and technological progress” is only what was to be expected from any soundly conceived scientific application of modern team research.

Little wonder that release of the Iron Mountain Report caused great consternation in government circles. According to the *Washington Post*:

. . . galley proofs of The Report found their way into the office of Walt W. Rostow, Presidential Special Assistant for National Security Affairs. The White House had received tense queries from within the Government about the origins of the document which pro pounded unspeakable, if not unthinkable, heterodoxies on the large issues of war and peace.

The gravity of the problem facing the President’s National Security Adviser cannot be exaggerated

The White House, through Rostow’s staff, conducted an inquiry into the authenticity of The Report. The National Security Advisers concluded, gratefully we might suspect, that it was a spurious work.. Washington, once again, breathed more easily.

Professor Galbraith held another view. Writing in the *Washington Post* he had put his reputation on the line:

...As I would put my personal repute behind the authenticity of this document, so I would testify to the validity of its conclusions. My reservations relate only to the wisdom of releasing it to an obviously unconditioned public.

Having run Galbraith’s review a month earlier, the *Washington Post* suddenly labelled the Report “delightful satire,” saying it is in fact “one of the finest pieces of social satire produced in this era It is so good because it is so plausible, as witness the spasm of gullibility it inspired at the White House.”

Yes, yes. It’s all a joke and we should forget it. But we wonder who is being gullible – those who



believe the Report is for real, or those who think it is satire. *The Washington Post* now tells us with great profundity that the author is freelance New York writer Leonard Lewin. The *Post* also treats the fact that Lewin wrote the introduction as if it were a great discovery and admission. But Mr. Lewin signed the introduction in the book. That was no secret.

Suddenly Herman Kahn chimes in to say the Report is a satire. Why Herman Kahn? You know why.

The fact is that there is a precedent for the Iron Mountain Report. Investigators for the Reece Committee, a Congressional Committee looking into foundations in the early Fifties, discovered that as far back as 1908 the Trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace had done a Think Tank study on the question: "Are any more effective means than war known to men by which to alter the life of an entire people?" After a study spanning a considerable period of time it was decided that no more effective means than war exists. Whereupon, the second question was asked: "How do we involve the United States in a war?" This question was answered with the statement: "We must get control of the diplomatic machinery of the United States." The result was that the United States was maneuvered into World War I.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, of course, helped found the Council on Foreign Relations, which seems to control the Hudson Institute, and is heavily interlocked with it today. In my view, the *Report From Iron Mountain* is no more a satire than was World War I. It is certainly not funny - although a lot of people would now like us to believe that it is. Not Galbraith. The Associated Press carried the following dispatch from London on February 5, 1968:

Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith admits he was "a member of the conspiracy" that produced the book "*Report From Iron Mountain*," the *London Times* said today.

The newspaper said the Harvard professor and former U.S. ambassador to India told he was made privy to the plan at a certain point but was not its main author.

What Pavlov did with dogs, the Iron Mountain Report proposes to have the government do with people. In order for the Elite to institute their totally planned society, it is necessary to give people a believable reason to submit to controls. War is the most effective reason.

George Orwell, for one, understood this all too well. Orwell had joined the Communist Party out of misguided idealism only to learn that the radical Left was little more than a ploy by billionaire conspirators. So well did he understand this that, in his book *1984*, George Orwell writes of three world powers, Oceania, Eurasia, and Eastasia, which maintain a state of perpetual war with each other in varying combinations.

By thus having a permanent, but occasionally shifting, enemy, more and more dictatorial regimentation, and higher and higher taxes, are justified by the rulers of all three nations. Similarly, our Establishment Insiders, know that they must have an outside, enemy at which to point if they are to maintain internal control of America. As the Iron Mountain Report puts it:

The existence of an accepted external menace, then, is essential to social cohesiveness



as well as to the acceptance of political authority. The menace must be believable, it must be of a magnitude consistent with the complexity of the society threatened, and it must appear, at least, to affect the entire society.

First it was "German Imperialism" in 1917, then "Nazism" in 1941, and today it is "Communism." Yet Germany was no more imperialistic than England; Adolph Hitler was financed, if not created, by the Insiders: and, Communism as a world power has provably been created and sustained by the Insiders so that the West may have an enemy. Certainly our participation in the Vietnam War fits right into the Establishment's scheme, otherwise it would not perpetuate it by tying the hands of the military, as recommended by RAND and the Hudson Institute, while at the same time promoting the exporting of goods and technology to the Soviet bloc so that the enemy can obtain the supplies necessary to continue the war. After this one the warfare will be shifted back to Korea or possibly to the Middle East.

As the Iron Mountain Report explains, continued defense spending is necessary as a lever to maintain control over the economy. According to the Report:

Although we do not imply that a substitute for war in the economy cannot be devised, no combination of techniques for controlling employment, production, and consumption has yet been tested that can remotely compare to it in effectiveness. It is, and has been, the essential economic stabilizer in modern society .

War has provided both ancient and modern society with a debatable system for stabilizing and controlling national economies. No alternate method of control has yet been tested in a complex modern economy that has shown it is remotely comparable in scope or effectiveness.

The Planners conclude that it would be very difficult to expand domestic welfare programs to so well control and direct the \$70 billion we spend for "defense" every year-and, besides, the taxpayers might rebel. The Iron Mountain boys even suggested some possible non-war fields in which crusades might be promoted. These included fighting poverty and a worldwide war on pollution. The Report devoted considerable space to ecology four years before it became the "in" thing.

As Mr. Lewin noted in his introduction to the Iron Mountain Report: "It explains, or certainly appears to explain, aspects of American policy otherwise incomprehensible by the ordinary standards of common sense "

It certainly does.

The conclusion one must arrive at from the Report is that there cannot be a "one world government," world disarmament, and a world police force until the *war system* has produced an absolute dictatorship by the Insiders and their Planning Elite in the United States. When the citizenry and the economy are both totally controlled, the phony wars will no longer be needed.



As usual, we are provided with false alternatives. Either we must be prepared to live under the conditions of perpetual war with dictatorial regimentation; or, we must submit to dictatorial regimentation as the terms of peace. This is what the *Report From Iron Mountain* is all about. The book is widely read in college classrooms, and because students are shown only half the picture, many of them conclude that the street revolution is the answer. They do not realize that the street revolution is another of the pincers of the Establishment's drive for total government. The Institute for Policy Studies manipulates the mob in the street while RAND and the Hudson Institute run the perpetual wars for perpetual peace and plan for a world dictatorship by the Insiders.

Only when a sufficient number of Americans quit supporting protracted, limited wars in the name of misguided patriotism, and when those most vociferously attacking "war" realize that they too are being used by the people who are responsible for causing those wars, can this nightmare be stopped. What is needed is for Pavlovian "Liberals" and Pavlovian conservatives to quit barking at each other and sink their teeth into the Insiders who are ringing the bells.

* Mr. Bundy, as everyone knows, now dispenses funds to radicals, "Liberals," and revolutionaries from his position as head of the Ford Foundation. The Institute for Policy Studies is among Ford's beneficiaries.

** One of James Warburg's sons told a friend of the author's that his father had, accordingly, dedicated himself to destroying The John Birch Society.

*** The name RAND is a contraction of Research and Development.