



The President...up with which we will not put

by Charles Callan Tansill

Reprinted with permission from *American Opinion*, November 1963

The Moscow Treaty, for a “limited” nuclear test-ban, that has just been approved by the Senate of the United States has been defended by President Kennedy as a pact that will insure future peace and preserve the world from atomic destruction. He vehemently asserts that it is an imperative in American foreign policy. But an impartial observer may well wonder if patriotic Americans can safely accept these Presidential assurances. Can one really know the implications of this pact between a Soviet statesman who has sworn to bury the United States and a President who has lost faith in the importance of the continued existence of our country as an independent State? How do these Presidential promises of today stack up against Presidential statements that openly underrate American achievements since colonial times and which boldly assert that we have not proved our right to be an independent nation?

Can we accept these bland assurances of patriotic intent from a President who, on July fourth of last year, in Philadelphia’s sacred Independence Hall, contemptuously announced that he had come to that hallowed shrine of American patriotism, on Independence Day, not to confirm in an impassioned manner the Declaration of Independence which our founding fathers had bravely adopted, but to insult their treasured memory by announcing a new Declaration of *Inter-Dependence*?

He thus admitted that he has no pride in American achievement since the momentous days of July, 1776. The stirring story of American progress during two centuries — the epic narrative of American leadership in many fields of human endeavor — has failed to quicken his pulse and has left him coldly indifferent to a bright record of creative activity not equaled by any other nation. He has never cherished a mental picture of the price Americans paid for their independence; of the sacrifices of gallant patriots whose bloodstained footprints colored the snows at Valley Forge; of the last brave words of Nathan Hale which will always echo in the ears of patriotic Americans: “I only regret that I have but one life to give for my country.” Compare these moving, patriotic words with the stupid gibberish mouthed by President Kennedy on July 4, 1962. Dan Smoot, in his *Weekly Report*, correctly characterized this Presidential outburst as a “stab in the back on the Fourth of July.” And this Kennedy contempt for our greatest American document seems to have ample reflection in the writings of the President’s close advisers. Dr. Walt Whitman Rostow, a hyphenated American and devotee of internationalist ideals, is one of the White House staff who lays down diplomatic guidelines for our Chief Executive. In a recent book he spews a lot of questionable history that parades under the title, *The United States in the World Arena*. He has a distinctly equivocal attitude towards American disarmament and an equally false idea of the importance of the United Nations. Such an organization would serve world needs far better than the nationalistic United States, and he even goes so far as to advocate the disappearance of the American nation: “It is an American interest to see an end to nationhood.”



It is obvious that Dr. Rostow thinks it is highly desirable for him, through his books and his close association with the President, to preach American surrender to a Soviet-oriented United Nations and thus wipe out forever the American nation. During the American Revolution, Benedict Arnold attempted secretly to surrender to a British spy the single fort at West Point. Dr. Rostow would surrender the entire American nation to a dubious international organization like the United Nations and thus consign our nation to oblivion. Compared with Dr. Rostow, Benedict Arnold shrinks to the size of a disgruntled camp follower with a muddled mentality and a warped sense of values. But one must keep in mind the fact that Dr. Rostow has the attentive ear of the President, and it is probable that he passed upon the unpatriotic address the President delivered in Independence Hall on July fourth of last year. Surrender became a key word in the President's vocabulary.

This fact was amply confirmed in an article that appeared on March 30, 1961 in the *Chicago Sun-Times*. According to its top reporter, Thomas B. Ross, President-elect Kennedy sent Dr. Rostow to Moscow in November, 1960 to discuss Soviet-American relations. The most important topic under discussion was the question of disarmament. The Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily V. Kuznetsov, in confidential conversations with Dr. Rostow, complained that the United States had provocative weapons that disturbed the Soviet Government. He particularly named manned bombers like those operated by the Strategic Air Command, and missiles that could be fired at Soviet territory from missile bases that had been built by the United States in countries close to Soviet Russia. It was no secret that the main reason why Russia had not dared to strike at Europe was because of her fear of the effectiveness of the Strategic Air Command.

According to the article in the *Chicago Sun-Times*, Dr. Rostow hurriedly sent a memorandum to President Kennedy outlining Soviet desires that the American Government immediately abandon the further manufacture of these so-called "provocative weapons" that gave the United States an advantage over Russia. According to Mr. Ross, the ideas of Dr. Rostow dominated the thinking of President Kennedy and were reflected in the President's first defense message. It was not long before Dr. Rostow's advice had far-reaching effects. The super-bomber B-70 was not put in production, and other manned bombers were abandoned. Our chief offensive weapons were scrapped and so were our missile bases abroad.

But our armament was still very powerful and the morale of our armed forces was still rated as very high. Could the Administration have had in mind the reduction of this morale by introducing in the Pentagon a large number of so-called "whiz kids" who would gradually assume control over military policy? There is no doubt that these "whiz kids" did a splendid job in sowing dissension in the Pentagon with the consequent large numbers of resignations among the military personnel.

The policy of Secretary McNamara has been sharply criticized by Hanson W. Baldwin, a distinguished military analyst. In the *Saturday Evening Post*, March 9, 1963, he remarks: *The "unification" of the armed services sponsored by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara poses some subtle and insidious dangers . . . McNamara is, first and foremost, trying to make the armed*



forces speak "with one voice." . . . Objections or dissent, even to Congress, are discouraged, muted or, when possible, stilled. . . . He has censored, deleted and altered statements to Congress by the chiefs of the services and their secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Similar criticisms have been voiced by General Thomas D. White (former Air Force Chief-of-Staff) with reference to the "whiz kids" that have been placed into responsible positions in the Pentagon: *I don't believe a lot of these often over-confident, sometimes arrogant young Professors, mathematicians and other theorists have sufficient worldliness or motivation to stand up to the kind of enemy we face.*

But long before these "whiz kids" upset the military apple cart in the Pentagon, the real and most significant decline in our military power had already taken place. It began in the Administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. It has long been noticeable that conspiracies against the United States flourish during Democratic Administrations. In the last days of the Roosevelt Administration a very active conspiracy took place with reference to the work of three British scientists, Allan Nunn May, Bruno Pontecorvo, and Klaus Fuchs. They had been cleared by British Intelligence which had not been able to penetrate their disguise which covered their real identity as Soviet spies. One could understand this lack of British perception if any one of these spies had possessed the beauty and charm of Cristine Keeler. I have never seen such a defense offered by British Intelligence.

At any rate these British scientists came to America, mastered the secrets of atomic bomb manufacture, and sent them back to Moscow. These spy activities are the real reason why America was not able to enjoy the sole possession of this powerful instrument of war and thus have the means to dominate the world scene.

But the race for atomic supremacy between the U.S.S.R. and the United States was consistently in favor of the United States until President Eisenhower, in the fall of 1958, declared a halt to American nuclear testing. He "understood" that the U.S.S.R. would call a similar halt to nuclear testing. But Soviet scientists secretly continued their nuclear tests which vastly increased their knowledge of nuclear weapons. Then, suddenly, the Soviets began to conduct a series of open tests and these, thanks to three years of secret testing, were signally successful and productive of significant results — particularly in the production of high megaton bombs whose tremendous impact would cripple the missile-firing systems used in the United States. In this way the Soviets distinctly passed the United States in the race for atomic supremacy; some responsible American scientists estimate that today the U.S.S.R. has a two to one superiority over the United States in nuclear weaponry.

It has also been stated that during these tests the Soviets were able to produce a successful anti-missile-missile. This led the Kennedy Administration to abandon our Nike-Zeus anti-missile program despite the fact that Senator Strom Thurmond, supported by Senator Barry Goldwater, presented classified testimony from Air Force officials indicating that our own Nike-Zeus program is *necessary* for our national defense. Under Presidential pressure the Senate, April 11, 1963, by a



vote of seventy-three to twenty, defeated the Nike-Zeus program. This act gives the Soviets a tremendous advantage over the United States since further United States tests to produce a successful anti-missile-missile cannot be carried on because of restrictions in the test-ban treaty. Were the nineteen U. S. Senators right in their opposition to the test-ban treaty, and will President Kennedy's defeat of the Nike-Zeus program mean eventual incineration of the United States because of Soviet bombs that could have been exploded with American Nike-Zeus anti-missile-missiles?

It is evident that some American scientists believe that Russia has perfected an anti-missile-missile. Is this one of the fearful fruits that the U.S.S.R. gathered from her secret nuclear testing between 1958 and 1961?

II

President Kennedy realizes that the U.S.S.R. did gain a certain advantage over the United States through its secret betrayal of the first test-ban agreement in 1958. This was the reason why he denounced Russian perfidy in November, 1961. He declared that "if they fooled us once, it is their fault; if they fool us twice, it is our fault." In January, 1962, Kennedy returned to this theme of Soviet betrayal and sharply criticized the Soviet Government's prolonged preparations to betray the test-ban agreement of 1958 while they were conducting "negotiations" with the United States. He then gave assurances that any future agreements with the Soviets would contain "methods of inspection and control which could protect us against a repetition of prolonged secret preparations for a sudden series of major tests." Needless to say, the recently approved test-ban treaty has no provision for methods of inspection and control of atomic tests.

Apparently, President Kennedy did not wish to continue to press the Soviet Union for effective methods of inspection and control so he did not insist upon them. It would be much easier to place some new-found faith in Russia; or just to surrender. And he had plenty of advice along this line.

Betrayal has been a constant feature of State Department policy for several decades. This fact was given clear demonstration on April 28, 1960 when Paul H. Nitze presented a paper to a seminar held at Monterey, California. Mr. Nitze was an important official in the State Department under the questionable American, Secretary Christian Herter. In his seminar paper Mr. Nitze expressed the opinion that the United States could never hope to attain a position of nuclear superiority over the Soviets. After this defeatist statement, he proposed that the American Government should take a series of "uni-lateral actions designed to produce a reciprocal action on the part of our Allies and also on the part of our *enemies*." The United States should then go farther in this suicidal program and scrap its missile and bomber bases and place its Strategic Air Command under NATO control. Finally, we should inform the United Nations that NATO will turn over ultimate power of decision on the use of these military systems to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

To many loyal Americans, in the Spring of 1960, these radical proposals of Mr. Nitze bespoke a strong ring of treason. Many thanked God for the coming change in the national Administration; and were certain that President Kennedy would give no consideration to the startling proposals of



Mr. Nitze. But they were naive. As soon as Mr. Kennedy assumed the office of President he immediately placed Mr. Nitze in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense. The man who had strongly argued for the destruction of our armed forces was the very man selected by the new President for a key position in the Defense Department. His dangerous proposals were adopted by our Chief Executive as an important part of his own disarmament program. They were rephrased a bit and then, on September 26, 1961, were presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations as a plan for American disarmament.

This Nitze-Kennedy plan provided for American disarmament in three stages. Eventually, American military forces were to be turned over to the United Nations as a police force that would insure world peace. The United States would retain only enough military strength to maintain order within its own borders. The remaining military establishment would be used by the United Nations as it saw fit; and it was possible that it might be used against the United States itself if there was rebellion against United Nations decrees.

It is obvious that President Kennedy, as the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, should have been impeached at once when he sponsored a plan to disarm the United States and place this country under the government of a Soviet-controlled United Nations. It is amazing that resolutions of impeachment were not introduced at once in the House of Representatives, and it is clear indication of how far the last three Administrations have gone toward the destruction of American patriotism and devotion to our flag and to our country.

With regard to the Kennedy Administration it is well to remember that Dr. Rostow, the President's closest adviser on international relations, is ardently advocating the abandonment of *our nationhood* and the transfer of our loyalties to an international organization like the United Nations. And what was the real meaning of the President's own words on July fourth of last year in Independence Hall, when he openly challenged the centuries-old American devotion to American independence and announced that he is in favor of Inter-dependence? Was not this, as Dan Smoot rightly declared, "a stab in the back on the Fourth of July?"

III

Unfortunately the President is not alone in his distaste for old-time American patriotism. The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, J. William Fulbright, has eagerly caught this dangerous infection of anti-Americanism. In a pamphlet ("The Elite and The Electorate") sponsored by The Fund for the Republic, he bitterly attacked the Constitution of the United States as an out-of-date instrument of government. His particular criticism was centered on the fact that under the Constitution the President has only limited powers. These limitations annoy the Senator. This Senatorial saboteur would run, not walk, to the extreme Left and give the President far-reaching powers that no patriotic President should want and no bad President should have.

And yet, these unprecedented powers are just what President Kennedy wants. But he is clever. This drive for dictatorial powers is artfully concealed under the humanitarian label of "*Civil Rights.*" If these extraordinary powers are once vested in the President they will never be



repealed. The pending bill on so-called "civil rights" would violate the Constitution in many fundamental regards. It is really ten percent "civil rights" and ninety percent extensions of federal control over our most cherished individual rights. It would implement the "commerce clause" of the Constitution in a way never intended by the founding fathers. It would wrongly invoke the Fourteenth Amendment. It would undermine precious rights of property. It would raise serious questions about the rights of citizens to a jury trial, and it would vest in one vindictive individual, the widely-hated Attorney General Robert Kennedy more naked, raw power over life and property of the citizens of this nation than has ever before been held by anyone ever holding that or any other office. It would bestow upon the President's younger brother almost unlimited power and authority to interfere with and intrude upon the most sensitive phases of our society and national economy.

Let us take a brief look at Title II of this bill, the section dealing with *Public Accommodations*. This section makes a shambles of the Constitution and destroys the safeguards of individual property rights. The "commerce clause" of the Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendment are invoked in such a marplot manner that individual property rights are wiped out in every hotel, every motel, every theater, every stadium, every retail shop, every market, and every drug store. The owners of these establishments pass under a stringent form of federal control.

Under Title III, public education is largely placed under the regulations of the United States Commissioner of Education. It is significant to note that under other related sections federal financial assistance to education carries with it Congressional approval of federal control of education by administrative and executive orders without limitation. "Assistance" means federal control which would be implemented by federal personnel, employed by the Commissioner of Education as "specialists," who would outline courses for teachers, supervisors, counselors and other elementary or secondary personnel." The Federal Government would thus move from "managed news" to managed education," and the children of our nation would be brainwashed according to standards of the Kennedy whim. If any bold individuals had the sturdy Americanism to refuse to carry out these federal prescriptions Bobby Kennedy, as the Attorney General, could promptly reply with suits and injunctions instituted in the name of the United States with penalties of fine and imprisonment. Even Hitler never dared to go this far in time of peace.

IV

But it is not only in the field of Education that the Kennedy Administration is helping to destroy America and all that it should mean. It is high time that the American public read between the lines of the test-ban treaty that has just been approved by the Senate. And, sad to re-cord, only nineteen Senators resisted the Presidential pressures for this shameful sellout. Will the next step of this Administration be some move to turn over to the morally and financially bankrupt United Nations a significant portion of the American armed forces in order to give it some respectability? Right now our State Department is supporting a drive for nations that are members of the United Nations to assign some portion of their armed forces to this international organization to form the nucleus of a strong world police force. Will America immediately respond by turning over to the UN



a considerable part of our armed forces? Is the Kennedy plan for American disarmament about to begin its last stages?

And finally, is it wise to place much faith in Soviet promises to carry out a test-ban treaty when we remember the Soviet breach of the 1958 agreement, after three years of secret testing? Senator Richard B. Russell, in a recent speech, calls this Kennedy faith in Soviet promises “the height of folly,” and he further remarks: “I am unwilling to risk any part of our security upon trust in Russia. I cannot support the beginning of a program of general and complete disarmament that can endanger all that we hold dear.” He believes that trust in Soviet good faith at this time is especially dangerous in the light of certain recent statements published in the Moscow Press. On July fourteenth, the following statement published in the Soviet Government’s official newspaper, *Izvestia*, is illuminating: “We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism, but we are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible.” Is the recently approved test-ban treaty with Russia one of the instruments for this destruction? This would be a very sure way of attaining one of the prime objectives of Dr. Rostow – the destruction of American nationhood.

There can be no doubt that America now faces the most critical cross-roads in its history. We have a President who is openly scornful of American independence, and some of his advisers are equally scornful of the American way of life. The question then arises, what are the plans of the President with reference to America’s future? Are these plans being slowly developed in the secret correspondence that has been passing between Khrushchev and Kennedy for some months? Many Americans rightly view this correspondence with definite and understandable apprehension. They can recall that some seventeen-hundred secret cablegrams were exchanged between Churchill and Roosevelt ³/₄ and they led directly to war. They also remember the secret diplomatic correspondence that governed the proceedings at the Conference at Yalta; where President Roosevelt fell under the dangerous charm of Premier Stalin and made such a dreadful series of devious deals with the Soviets that he was fearful lest they be made public. For that reason he appeared before a joint session of Congress on March 1, 1945 and brazenly lied about the results of the Conference at Yalta.

Will the report that President Kennedy will make some day to Congress on his Soviet deals be as full of lies as that of President Roosevelt? What can America believe of a President who is so intent upon making secret deals with the man who has boasted that he will bury us?

Let us turn for just a moment to the attitude of our first President toward the America he did so much to make independent. At the close of the American Revolution, after a continuous service of eight years in promoting American independence, Washington spoke to a group of military officers who had assembled at Newburgh, New York, to discuss military problems in time of peace. He knew that it was a critical moment for there had been many rumors of widespread discontent in the Army. As Washington rose to speak he slowly drew from an inside pocket his written address. He paused for a moment and carefully surveyed his audience. Before reading the prepared address, he decided to say a few words aimed straight at their hearts: “Gentlemen, permit me to put on my glasses, for I have grown not only gray but almost blind in the service of my country.”



There was no need for him to say anything more. The officers knew what he wanted and they were ready to die to carry it out.

It is obvious that President Kennedy has not the fervor of George Washington with regard to an independent America, and many of his close advisers are equally wanting in the slightest feeling of fervor for anything traditionally American. The salvation of America can be assured only through the untiring efforts of patriotic organizations, recruited from the entire ranks of alert and alarmed citizens. We will have to work unceasingly if we are to save this country from the Kennedys, the Fulbrights, the Rostows, and the Nitzes. We will have to find other leadership that does not scan the future through internationalist eyes; leadership that does not follow the guidelines of surrender; leadership that today is being demonstrated by only a handful of dedicated Americans in political life.