

TACTICS

Vol. 1, No. 1

Jan. 20, 1964

• For three days following the President's fatal shooting, the United States Information Agency, America's official bureau of propaganda, sent reports on the assassination to its overseas offices without once mentioning that Oswald was a left-wing extremist. A USIA official in Washington claims copy on Oswald had to be cleared through Bobby Kennedy's Justice Department and department officials refused to give USIA permission to identify Oswald in this manner.

FBI FINDINGS TO BE GIVEN

Johnson Plans To Release
Data On Kennedy Death

Say All Share Blame

Dallas Breeding Ground For Endless Causes

By JULES LOH
Associated Press Staff Writer
DALLAS. — Some remind you quickly that it could have happened anywhere—and so, of course it could.
But most Texans are reluctant to press the point too strongly or find solace in excuses. For even

"One man may have pulled the trigger," said Mrs. J. H. Lowry of Dallas, "but all those who had hate in their hearts and wished him dead share the guilt."

Press Scored for Printing
Utterances of Extremists

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind., 26 (UPI) — Gov. Welsh, commenting on the assassination of President Kennedy, criticized Tuesday for right and far people to be very is a Mr.

**French Think Racists
Assassinated Kennedy**
PARIS, Nov. 27 — France believes that President Kennedy was assassinated by racists and that the Warren Commission is from the
WARREN BLAMES BIGOTS

Rightist Leader Quits
Over Kennedy's Death

TACOMA, Wash., Nov. 26 (AP) — A leader of the ultra-conservative Citizens Council here resigned today because of President Kennedy's assassination.

By William F. Buckley Jr.
The opinionmakers of the country, and probably large segments of the population, were getting ready to turn the president's tragedy into an excuse for a pogrom against the American Right.
Within a matter of minutes, nationally known radio and television commentators had started in, suggesting that the assassination had been the work of a right wing extremist.

**GOP HALTING
POLITICKING**
Activity

VINDICATED!



RICHARD WILSON

Assassination Evokes Odd Views

Many Seen Linking Kennedy Killing
To Racists, Rightists, Despite Facts

PROBE IS URGED
OF DALLAS GROUP

It Ran Ne

TACTICS

Vol. 1, No. 1, January 20, 1964

Publisher and Editor: Edward Hunter, 320 N. George Mason Drive,
Arlington, Va. 22203
Telephone: (code 703) 524-7857

TACTICS, a monthly publication for Anti-Communist Liaison, P. O. Box 3541, Arlington, Va. 22203. Telephone: (code 703) 524-7857. Subscription to include 15 reprints of other publications considered of tactical importance, \$10 a year, \$8 for gift subscriptions. Single copies of TACTICS, 40 cents each copy; up to fifty copies, 25 cents each; up to a hundred, 20 cents each; up to a thousand, 15 cents each. Advertising rates on request.

© Copyright 1964 by Edward Hunter

FEW WORDS ABOUT OUR COVER

Let us know if you like the cover. Look at it as a picture, and then read the bits of headlines and paragraphs that are clipped from publications ranging from the Baltimore Sun and the New York Times to the Washington Daily News and Human Events. They will convey the mood that characterized the communications field at the time of the assassination.

The cartoon of Otto Otepka was originally entitled: "Death of a Patriot (His crime...he tried to alert us.)"

The cartoon was drawn before the assault on the President, and preceded the encouraging manner in which Senators and Congressmen have come to his defense. After all, the Otepka case is the most important of its kind in our lifetime. The State Department, under Secretary of State Rusk's direction, is seeking to fire him because he put loyalty to his country before "organizational loyalty", and when called to testify by the Congress, and asked questions by Senators, did not lie to them, but told them the truth.

Basic documents on the case have now been published, and should be must reading for all, so we can understand what is being attempted in the national capital, and the extent of the threat to our Constitutional check-and-balance system. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee released the testimony of three State Department employees in publications entitled, "State Department Security". The first is the 41-page testimony of David I. Belisle, the second the 79-page testimony of John F. Reilly, and the third the 108-page testimony of Elmer Dewey Hill. They make sordid reading, and reveal a sore that must be cut out of our government by surgery in order to save the patient.

Never before have plain lies by officials taken so many subtle, sophisticated and circuitous forms. Besides this, there is the recent Defense Department testimony by Secretary of Defense McNamara to cover up his disarmament decisions, which have political, not military motivation. Every informed citizen needs to read the testimony about how our whole nuclear-powered, surface naval vessel program has been sunk by McNamara, at a time when the Soviets are secretly pressing forward in advanced naval construction. In the words of the official report, "no plans exist today for the future utilization of nuclear power" in surface vessels. In addition, existing plans for a nuclear-powered carrier were cancelled.

The testimony by McNamara on this regard is sickening. Read the 37-page "Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy" of the American Congress, entitled, (Please turn to page 3)

McNAMARA'S POLITICAL DECISION SINKS NUCLEAR SHIP PROGRAM

By Edward Hunter

Secretary of Defense McNamara, against the advice of all who have any direct connection with nuclear-propelled surface vessels, has decreed that the U.S. Navy shall not have any more such vessels. Everyone agrees, including himself, there is no question between the superiority of the nuclear-propelled warship over the old, oil-driven vessel. Meanwhile, Soviet Russia is known to regard the sea as probably the decisive area for maneuverable and invulnerable attack in any future war, and to be proceeding as fast as she is able to enlarge and modernize her fleet.

This sounds inconceivable and irrational, yet it is true. The "Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the U.S. Congress" tells about this in a publication entitled "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels", dated Dec., 1963.

If his decisions just do not add up intelligently, this is only natural, for the Congressional committee found McNamara anything but a straightforward man. The report is only 37 pages, but compressed within that short space is more indignation than can be found in practically any other Congressional-produced document. If the word "liar" is not repeatedly used, it is because protocol forbids it. The implication is frequently there.

The report flatly declares that McNamara's imperious decision "may portend a future of obsolescence for the U.S. Navy." In plainer English, this means McNamara is forcing an antiquated fleet on our Navy. This does not refer just to ships in existence, but to those to be built. He will not permit them to be as powerful as they might be.

Naval history contains example after example of mighty vessels of war and powerful fleets being utterly destroyed because the opposing side possessed a very slight edge in speed, power, or any other factor. Utter annihilation can come easily to a fleet through a slight inferiority. The U. S. Navy is being forced by McNamara into such inferiority.

Maybe his title should be Secretary of Disarmament.

The only conclusion that appears logical after analysis is that this is not a military but a political decision imposed on the Navy. The Department of Defense is being operated as an arm of the State Department, which is pressing the dangerous theories of its U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. At the hearings, the legislators seemed to be staring hard through opaque windows, for any clarity they were able to get out of McNamara. They approached this issue of Navy construction as a problem of how most effectively to equip and strengthen our fleet. They found themselves going in circles talking to McNamara. What he said did not make sense against the background of naval details they were discussing.

Their obvious frustration was in remaining within this military sphere. McNamara wasn't. He wasn't saying so, but his were political considerations, and the disarmament objective of the State Department. "It is fundamentally illogical and wasteful to fit out new first line warships with powerplants that are, perhaps, already obsolete", the Congressional report says. While McNamara was declaring

that a nuclear-power ship would cost immensely more than the old, immensely weaker type, the committee found the figures had been juggled and in effect falsified to give this impression. Actually, "the total lifetime cost" of a nuclear-propelled carrier was "only about 3 percent more" than the inferior type that invites disaster. To the Joint Committee's horror, it found that "no plans exist today for the future utilization of nuclear power." It was shocked by "the incalculable waste" incurred by McNamara's refusal to use the technology developed during the past 17 years by those such as Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

The unilateral disarmament trend has already been demonstrated in other military areas. Now it is the fleet's turn!

If the legislators comprising the Joint Committee had the time and the jurisdiction to engage in such inquiry, they would find the reduced construction program forced on the Navy to be political, linked to the Pugwash conferences and the Center for Democratic Institution's defeatist and "better red than dead" approach. Interlocking policy planners and theorists pushing unilateral disarmament fan out into the Disarmament Agency and the State Department.

The unprecedented scope of falsifications---lies, in old-fashioned, Anglo-Saxon English---told to the Congress by Pentagon and State Department civilians---are made necessary by the need to hide these interlocking policy and organizational relationships.

Some revealing declarations, that can help to clarify what lies behind this follow:

"If the price of avoiding all-out thermonuclear war should prove to be acquiescence in the 'Communist domination of the world' or any other of the unpleasant imaginings against which we cling, futilely, to the war system to preserve us, it seems probable that the price will be paid." --Walter Millis, on "Permanent Peace", a Center publication of 1961.

Millis is one of those commissioned by the Disarmament Agency to make studies for U.S. policy determination. In a report for which the taxpayers forked out \$20,000, he reached the vicious conclusion that the collapse of the Russian communist system "would be a good deal more catastrophic for world order than was the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918," and that its existence was necessary for "world order". He wrote: "One might say that if the Soviet empire did not exist something would have to be created to fulfill its role in the world order."

Mr. and Mrs. Reader, you paid for this outline for U.S. policy procedure.

If our government seems trying desperately to help Soviet Russia solve its otherwise fatal problems, as by our sale of foodstuffs and other supplies it vitally needs, in what is becoming a barely concealed aid program for the reds, here we have one of the answers.

Harrison Brown, California professor who is also a consultant for the Center and a Pugwash delegate, gave as "the first goal, the highest priority",..."clearly the elimination of the largescale retaliatory systems..."

"I believe these systems could be eliminated under a relatively simple agreement. The agreement would require subsidiary political agreement as well. ...The elimination of largescale retaliatory systems would of necessity involve the elimination of bases."

He outlined a system for Americans to operate as spies in the U.S. to detect secret arming, under such a pact. He recommended "the establishment of a permanent United Nations force armed with conventional weapons, a highly mobile force of well-trained, professional soldiers."

After Katanga, Alabama or New York?

Robert S. McNamara is listed as a "founding member" of the Center for Democratic Institutions. Joseph P. Lyford, who has handled the Center's public relations in

New York City, is quoted by Miss Edith Kermit Roosevelt, the analyst and columnist, as telling her "that McNamara had contributed to the Center to the tune of at least \$1,000 annually since it was founded in 1959 by the Fund for the Republic." He must believe in it, then, to be such a consistent backer.

These interlocking Centers, semi-official and official agencies, and consultants who link them together, and such basic policy studies as "The Phoenix Papers" recently produced for the Disarmament Agency, constitute U.S. "policy" as it has been operating for some time now.

Until our Senators and Representatives understand this network, they will be just as frustrated and puzzled over what appears as utterly inexplicable decisions as was the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The no-win policy, of which so much was heard during the Senate hearings that continued for a number of months in 1962, is part of this picture. Sen. Strom Thurmond (D-S.C.) was smeared then for putting up the curtain even that little bit. It has to be raised fully.

TACTICS shall make it its business to clarify as much of this interlocking situation contributing to secret policy as it can.

Few words about our cover.

(Continued from inside front cover)

"Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels," an unanimous report. I have never read anything comparable to it.

In the center of this emptiness stands Otto Otepka, believing in principles, providing inspiration and certainty of victory. If his simple standards on security had not been discarded, one John Fitzgerald Kennedy would be alive today. There would not have been people in the State Department willing to bring Oswald back from Soviet Russia to America, at public expense, after he had renounced his country.

Otepka is appealing his discharge. If the public and the Congress stand by him, he will not lose his job for fulfilling his duty. The published testimonies have already vindicated him, as has the example of what laxness can bring about in the assassination of a President.

Looking again at the cartoon, Otepka seems now to be walking back to his post.

I retitled the cartoon, "Vindicated!". Events surely have vindicated him. Now it is up to regulations to catch up with the realities.

Please make out your
subscriptions this way:

Please enter my subscription to TACTICS

Full name _____

Full address _____

City or town _____

State _____ Date _____

(Add zone or zip number)

Please make out your gift
subscriptions this way:

This is a gift subscription to TACTICS

From: _____

For: _____

Send to _____

City or town _____

State _____ Date _____

TELEVISION'S ROLE

By Edward Hunter (In two parts)

An objective reappraisal of television's role is needed on the basis of its technically fine but politically loaded coverage of the Kennedy assassination. Television's behavior would be understandable if it were a matter just of presenting a posture of national unity at time of crisis and showing the natural sympathy that should go to a comparatively young man, at the peak of his power, slain so horribly. But it was something else entirely.

I have allowed sufficient time to elapse since then to be able to reconsider what I saw and heard, and I still cannot escape what my ears told me and my eyes saw. Television's coverage was deliberate incitation against those called conservatives or "rightists", who were being equated with racists, bigots and pro-Nazis. At the same time, television's approach whitewashed communism.

The inevitable result of this feeding of hot coals into the officially abetted anti-anticommunist propaganda climate would have been a political purge and physical violence if a rightist had been implicated.

My analysis of television's coverage of the assassination falls into these conclusions numerically given:

1. We would be foolhardy to expect more of television than its restricted medium and easily maneuverable technique can provide. At present, it is acting primarily as the semi-official voice of the government. Only an organizational and professional overhaul could change this. What this means to the viewer is that he must not regard what he sees and hears by television as a rounded, objective account of any issue. He must spot such devices as a discussion supposedly between opposing sides when the participants are really exponents of varying positions on the same side---the so-called "liberal". He must spot a loaded panel that confronts a conservative---or anyone vocally anti-communist---with loaded, one-sided questions. He must detect the tell-tale points not referred to at all, or given the brush-off.

Today's viewer must realize that television as of now is not geared for balanced news coverage, or even for unbiased entertainment, that it is not the mentality of the major commentators, announcers and others with fancy titles, who often double up as advertising men. A good show is put on of presenting the news, but it is almost always a show, and the plot is fairly regularly "news managed". I recall a stirring documentary of Haiti that was obviously part of the U. S. government's effort to stage-manage a change in its regime. Such presentations are important for what they disclose of how the Administration wants us to think. The viewer should then gather background material on the subject, if it interests him, making sure to get firsthand material, especially sworn testimony presented to Congressional committees, or what legislators say about it as recorded in the Congressional Record. Such source material should be available nowadays in our public and college libraries, and can be personally obtained at small cost.

Under our traditional form of government, which "news management" is now violating, each of us must realize that he requires much more information than television can provide on any matter before he takes any important action.

2. Television, much more easily than hitherto suspected, can be suddenly employed as a channel for the incitation of national, political hysteria, which could be accompanied by violence and arrests, and the deprivation of our Constitutional protections. This Administration, or rather the Kennedy part of it, instituted the "speaking with one voice" ritual. Even before, crude pressures, particularly on such matters as "organizational loyalty" versus national loyalty, and every trick in propaganda planning, began to impose this throughout the

government bureaus, in everything from defense policy to agricultural programs. No government, with the best will in the world, can use this approach and not become a dictatorship. If we have a dictatorship, it will sneak up on us under the hallowed name of "liberal". Television has permitted itself to be an important arm in this process. The single-mindedness in it seems to reflect an establishment---maybe with a capital letter, Establishment. ABC, NBC and CBS are too alike in this for the safety of our Constitutional check-and-balance system. They are Tweedle-dee, Tweedle-dum and Tweedle-doo in political news coverage.

Knowledge by viewers of this slanted situation can prevent such a coup as we narrowly escaped this time from succeeding next time in a similarly prepared propaganda climate.

3. Television is a natural medium for entertainment and public spectacles. The latter can as easily be pure theater, or the kind of public shows put on by a Stalin or a Mussolini. The daily newspaper cannot compete in this area. The newspaper and the television, in their intense competition, have invaded each other's field, greatly damaging themselves. Newspapers seek to become entertainment, while television tries to be a news medium. Each can provide some of the speciality of the other, but when it does more than this, it spoils its own format and sacrifices its true role. This is what has happened. The viewer must recognize what television can achieve as well as its limitations. It can propagandize beautifully, but can provide a rounded picture only with difficulty. For the latter, it requires only experienced professionals without pro-Marxist or submissive motivations.

Subtly, by a process that can correctly be called sophisticated, television news more and more has come to mean the public and private life of the people in and around the White House. The Capitol has become a second thought. An Administration lobby has facilitated this. Important data is covered as if it were society news. This makes a spectacle of it. The Presidential campaign, almost from the day a new President is inaugurated, is reported in as much detail as a racing season. This is out of proportion. Viewers must see the danger in having their focus shifted from the Congress to the White House. We are witnessing a calculated downgrading of our Congress and an upgrading of the Executive, as if the former is the vehicle of the latter, instead of both being separate vehicles of the people

4. Television was an astounding success mechanically from the start, but policy-wise it began its career off-balance, which has handicapped it ever since. It got off on a wrong foot by violating the fundamental tenet in journalism that a strict and always visible line must be drawn between advertising and news or features. These separate functions are mainly weaved together on television in wordage and personnel. This is an un-American practice, subversive to the needs of a free society, and would be so if communism did not exist. Viewers must resist and protest against being spoonfed advertising in the guise of entertainment programs or news, and advertisers and advertising men must be induced to be sufficiently patriotic, if only for selfish reasons, not to demand such a distortion of our values. Leaders in business and television should long ago have drawn up a formula assuring a dividing line, restoring this democratic safeguard.

5. Viewers must remain alert against being exploited by "news managers". Television intrudes into our privacy in a manner impossible and impermissible in any other field. The acceptance of an ever-present Big Brother can take over our subconscious unless we deliberately remain the master. Incomplete and selected information given in slanted form over the air contributes to our softening-up. The traditions and convictions that characterized America's growth are called "corny", and regarded as not being a selling commodity by advertisers, and as out-of-date by program directors. The exception is rare, indeed.

The real danger in this was shown by the ease with which the assassination was presented first as a "rightist" plot and then as partly "rightist" and partly "collective guilt" brought on by "hatred" and "bigotry", in effect absolving the reds. Actually, if everyone in the United States were members of the Democratic Party, and adherents of the element now in power, Oswald as a Marxist-imbued fanatic would still have murdered Kennedy. His action was sheer communism, demonstrated everywhere from Viet Nam and Malaya to Cuba and Panama. Television has demonstrated its adherence to the "speaking with one voice" heresy of the Washington policy-makers by excluding this from its programs. This perilous unanimity makes a mockery of the truth about the assassin and his record.

The above are the five major conclusions left me by television following the assassination. Television belongs to the people, not to the government. Television and Washington officialdom are ignoring this in their own battles. Viewers should press their desires politely but firmly. There is far too much "network" and too little local enterprise allowed by television. The public is paying for television, through its purchase of the instruments and the products it advertises. If we, the people, pay, we should insist on calling the tune. The contempt with which the viewer is regarded is shown by the almost unendurable excess of advertising pap inserted into programs, and the nerve-wracking intensifying of sound during many commercials. This contempt is shown too, by the manner in which "managed news" dominates.

Television cannot replace reading, and we should not ask this of it. It can supplement reading, though. A speech read over, and time given to consideration and comparison of its points, often leaves a vastly different impression than when heard. Television won the Presidency for Kennedy. What difference should it make to a responsible voter whether his candidate has on the proper powder or lipstick or whatever cosmetics are used to help create what is termed "the proper image"?

If the American people insisted on their representatives and themselves going back to the old maxim, to be yourself, instead of trying to be "images", we would feel much better, and be immensely better off, from the White House to the apartment house. The softening up now taking place would stand out plainly, and be eliminated. We would go back to stamina, not swank, and to principles, not popularity, for our standards.

One of the major tasks of the voter nowadays, along with finding out if a candidate is pursuing a behind-the-scenes policy being indoctrinated in us by double-talk and the "soft sell", is to unravel the man from the public relations image of him created by hucksters and make-up men. We can no longer accept an increasing number of our public figures at face value, because their faces are changed for the television show. They're made up. This is what "creating an image" means, and it is part of the deceit inseparable from the "sophisticated" approach so popular in Washington. If we insist on plain English for this, using such words as disguises and lies, we could save ourselves from a medley of double-think and double-talk. Let us demand as simple and clear English as our rich and extensive language makes possible. Let us find out about the man, not his "image", using the same standards of judgment as serve in appraising one's acquaintances. If this approach be called "controversial", let's be controversial. Actually, it's a misuse of the word. Let us regain the healthy outlook that produced such colloquialisms as, "I'm from Missouri; you got to show me."

The first news flash about the attack on the President came to me by radio, and I at once turned on the television. I decided to observe how it handled this crucial event, switching channels from time to time for comparison, but keeping NBC on most of the time during those three days. This really made little difference, as ABC, CBS and NBC covered the same details or pooled their resources for major developments.

Quite soon I became horrified to detect a propaganda theme in the coverage. This was not only an event being televised but a political build-up. Commentators all but said, helped by tone and gesture, that the President had been shot by a "rightist", or an "extremist of the right". The same commentator was put on at least three times on NBC, even long after Oswald's identification, to stress that President Kennedy was killed on his way to making a speech about the "extreme rightists". The first time there was no doubt that he was indicating the type of man the killer would prove to be. Even in the evening news, Chet Huntley went into a meandering dissertation with this slant, that included some fancied call for the hanging of Chief Justice Warren by a magazine. This propaganda twist sought to show that no matter what Oswald's politics, it was "rightist" guilt that pulled the trigger. Agronsky, whose slant is of years standing, was sent for a bedside interview with Gov. Connally as soon as the Texan was sufficiently recovered from his wound, and of course it fit into the same pattern of shifting blame away from the extreme left and focussing it on anti-communists generally. In this general setting, it meant Sens. Goldwater and Dodd, or the Birch Society, for instance. Nobody explained that the "extreme" right hardly exists in America. Joseph C. Harsch was brought on from London to say that what worried Europe about the assassination was that it might trigger "a new anti-communist hysteria" in the United States. Moscow could hardly have done a better job of whitewashing itself. I watched panel discussions, including one on ABC in which a Senator spoke of himself as being the target of rightist "hate" and then switched at once to Oswald, as if he were an "extremist of the right". These were "news managed" forums, for any reference to communist complicity was kept off the air, and the emphasis put on "collective guilt" or the conservatives, in effect.

The role of such set-ups as Group Research, Inc., in fomenting an atmosphere of hate was never mentioned. Chief Justice Warren set the tone by promptly prejudging the whole affair. Later, I read the full text of the speech President Kennedy was to have given at the Trade Mart in Dallas that unhappy Nov. 22, 1963, but which he never delivered. In it he was obviously taking a slap at Sen. Goldwater's policies as supposedly outdated, was defending Secretary of Defense McNamara, and supporting such matters as foreign aid. It was a political, campaign talk, of course against the conservatives or rightists, but to label it a speech against "the extreme right" was untrue, and under the circumstances, incendiary.

In that propaganda climate, "rightist" and "extremist of the right" were Pavlovian words equating them with Nazi, Goldwater, Republican, Birchite, fascist, anti-Semite, McCarthyite, conservative, or any other person or group not favored by the Americans for Democratic Action, the Reuthers and Bob Kennedy, Kuchel and Javits.

Sen. Goldwater is no more an "extreme rightist" than the pronouncements of President Johnson make him an "extreme leftist". The use of these terms in those cases is a smear allied to guilt-by-association and character assassination. Television allowed itself to be the tool of this approach.

We must insist on a return to the correct meaning of words. A "rightist" and a "leftist" are proper citizens, for those terms refer to different approaches within the framework of our free society. An "extreme rightist" and an "extreme leftist" refer to those outside this framework, the totalitarians, whether communist or nazi---communazi. We must not allow ourselves to be trapped into the pattern of using words in their imprecise, pro-red manner. Words are employed this way, creating hatred and bigotry, by fake "liberals" and pro-communists. We should spot and expose this on every occasion.

The impression grew as I listened and watched that all that was lacking for all stops to be pulled out in the elimination from public life---in some cases even physically---of those conservatives and anti-communists who are for the most part Jeffersonian Democrats, was the announcement that an actual "rightist" was implicated in the assassination. Television perilously lost its bearings in those hours, and became an incitation to a purge and violence.

(To be concluded in next issue.)

FIRST ISSUE OF TACTICS

Welcome to our family of subscribers! You do not compose a very large battalion in numbers, but this much you can be sure of. You have accumulatively tremendous impact. I believe that few publications with circulations that range into six figures have the impact that the readers of TACTICS possess, and we certainly do not yet have a paid circulation reaching near four figures. But if the word "elite" has any meaning, you constitute an elite in demonstrated influence, patriotism, and a willingness to stick your necks out on issues that vitally concern our survival as a free and progressing people. Your willingness to stick your necks out is what is saving not only your necks, but those of the rest of our population. As you might detect, I am terrifically proud of the paid circulation.

You put your money out for a pig in a poke, for I asked for subscriptions before our first issue had appeared.

This, of course, is a modest issue, because we have received only enough money in subscriptions to make a start, but frankly, not enough to go on without a big increase in paid circulation, and without some paid advertising. A distressing number of other Contacts of our's whom I fully expected to be among the first so subscribe have not yet done so. Perhaps the Christmas-New Year's season distracted them, or maybe they just neglected to read the two "Letters to Contacts" I sent out to our list, explaining the critical situation. This first issue is going out to all on Anti-Communist Liaison's Contact list. Please send in your subscriptions; we need them promptly.

Our first and primary attention will go to providing the tactical background and the strategic information required to enable us to spot and destroy the propaganda booby traps set up for us in modern psychological warfare by the communists and the opportunists and their dupes. This is why TACTICS will always focus on the person who has some basic background about communism, is patriotically motivated, and has leadership impact that he or she is using. This is why our "Letters to Contacts", out of which TACTICS developed, has had such an immensely greater influence than numbers would warrant. Our's is the cream of the goodwilled Americans who abhor communism and fascism and who are the true descendants of the genuine liberal tradition of Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin and George Washington. What a world of difference between them and the quacks who call themselves "liberals" nowadays? Our people are conservatives, for they are determined to conserve these traditional American principles that created our Constitutional, check and balance system of government. They are to be found in both parties, the Republican and the Democrat, most refer to themselves as rightists, but it would horrify the Americans for Democratic Action to realize how many so-called "liberals" are waking up to realize that they have been taken for a ride and who are edging their way back to the road they lost. We are going to help them, even though the Kuchels and Group Research, Inc., use every blackguard term in the guilt-by-association and character assassination book to hurl at us.

We have the facts, based on truth, and a correct analysis, and any exaggeration would only reduce their impact. This is why TACTICS shall stress exact information, urging our readers to make sure they obtain it, and make sure it is firsthand and accurate. We shall strive to let you know where information is located and tell you how to get it. Before we can win this cold war---and we shall win it---we have to be informed, which means that we have to know enough about psychological warfare as it is waged against us to pull the carpet out from under the intriguers. We can do so easily. Knowledge is vaccination against brainwashing.

Please, before anything else distracts you, if you haven't done so, make out a subscription blank---and add others if you can.