

ROBERT WELCH
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

April 21, 1967

Mr. Wm. J. Grede
c/o Grede Foundries, Inc.
1320 South First Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53204

Dear Bill:

The problems created for The John Birch Society by Le Fevre and by Bob Love, while related and overlapping, are still both distinct and different. It would be very helpful, and certainly more convincing, if I could find the time to prepare a reasonably full report on these matters, such as I made to the COUNCIL on the resignations of Dr. Oliver and Dr. Draskovich. That being out of the question, with all of the pressures that are on me now, I'll probably have to make this letter simply a series of notes to serve as a basis for discussion.

I About Robert Le Fevre

In connection with The Freedom School (and Rampart College), we have two reasons for concern. One is the impact of its philosophy and activities on The John Birch Society. The other is the involvement of my friend, Bill Grede, in what I am very much afraid will prove to have been a set of principles, purposes, and personalities not at all consistent with his own convictions and aims. But because of the haste with which these notes must be assembled, I shall be mixing together here various items as they come to my mind without any attempt to divide them according to these separate considerations.

1. Partly, but by no means entirely, through the activities of Bob Love, promotion of the Freedom School philosophy and literature has been seriously damaging to The John Birch Society in Wichita and Omaha, and to a lesser extent in Dallas and some other communities. See Exhibit A (Powers). Exhibit B (Richardson). Exhibit C (Last paragraph, about Leonard Banewitz). So let's take a brief look at what Le Fevre really preaches.

2. His unceasing and detailed attacks on the U.S. Constitution are exactly in support of the Communist line. They must undermine and destroy our Constitution, as a legalized means of converting us into a democracy and then a mobocracy. Le Fevre's teachings in this respect

have certainly aided and abetted what Earl Warren and the Supreme Court have been trying to do to advance the Communist cause. See Exhibit D (Berger).

3. In three days and nights of a "concentrated course" Le Fevre could not spare the time to say a single thing about the Communist conspiracy, nor even to mention it except when briefly but emphatically condemning me, for putting such a handicap on the effort of himself and others to oppose Communism in a sound way, on the ideological plane. He bitterly complained of the damage done the real anti-Communists by my emphasis on the conspiratorial aspects of the struggle. This is the exact Communist line -- that we are fighting simply and entirely an ideological war -- as followed so strenuously (and, I now believe, not at all innocently) by William Buckley.

4. But in the extremely "tight" schedule of this same three-day seminar, Le Fevre spent hours reviewing, analyzing, and glorifying the anarchists of the nineteenth century. And it is impossible for me to believe he does not know how well the work of these men fitted into the total Communist program.

5. Whether you call it "autarchy," or by some other fancy and disingenuous word, what Le Fevre is teaching today is plain and simple anarchy. And with Bob Love's help he is mesmerizing plenty of people who wear the label of Birchers into doing the same thing. They even had a Section Leader of The John Birch Society in Wichita, named Dan Foley, advocating or at least suggesting the abolishment of all police forces -- in the midst of our campaign to Support Your Local Police. Le Fevre and his followers write and preach constantly against "limited government" and for "no government" as the goal to be sought.

Again it is worth noting the exact parallel of this teaching to the long established Communist line: ". . . . there will no longer be any need for government and government will wither and die. There will be no need for a police force; there will be nothing for the police to do." See Exhibit E (Morse).

6. Even though he allocates no time for any direct discussion of the advance of the Communist conspiracy or of Communist power, he manages to insert "incidentally" into his lectures many important pieces of the Communist line. He told us, for instance, how Lenin, following the take-over by the Bolsheviks in November, 1917, of the Russian revolution and then of Russia itself, went out "stumping" (like a politician) and "stirring up support" for his regime. Actually it was through incredible terror, and terror alone, that Lenin and Trotsky established their rule in the period of 1918-1922.

By the murder of the Tsar and his family, by the ending of the war, by the disruption of all normal life and economic organization, and by other

circumstances unusually favorable to Lenin's purposes, a huge population was brought into a state of helpless confusion, chaos, fear, and despair. Under these conditions a comparatively few thousand utterly ruthless criminals, directed by Lenin, imposed their rule through incredible cruelties. By the time Lenin and Trotsky consolidated their tyranny, in 1922, into the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, more than ten million inhabitants of this "greater Russia" had been brutally murdered by Lenin's execution squads.

On one occasion, when just one member of one of these execution squads was himself killed in revenge, ten thousand entirely innocent people were immediately executed in retaliation, as a means of making the terror sufficiently impressive. By Lenin's specific and official command the people selected to be "executed," in the unceasing campaign of terror, carried out all over Russia for four years, were not chosen because of their opposition to the Communists, but simply because of the class to which they belonged (such as the kulaks, or small independent farmers), from which future resistance could otherwise be expected. And the forms of torture used, frequently involving cunningly plotted torture of the sexual organs of both male and female victims -- women, picked at random, had live coals thrust into their most intimate sexual parts, and died after hours or even days of incredible agony -- have been described by an official investigating committee as probably the most horrible suffering to which human beings have ever been subjected.

Yet LeFevre would have us believe -- as millions of Americans have been taught by Communist propoganda for decades -- that Lenin established his rule through ideological victories by "stumping" and "stirring up support." And I myself heard him plant these implications. Which, again, are the exact Communist line.

7. LeFevre would have us believe that there is a certain amount of acceptance of the Communist regime by the Russian people today because their economic condition is better than it was in the days of the Tsars. Once again, this is the exact Communist line. Not only is the premise false, but the conclusion is a part of the Communist libel, against the spiritual nature of mankind, that nothing is as important to any man as a full belly.

Even if the premise were true, and the Russians were today enjoying material prosperity superior to any they had ever known, there is no question but that they would throw it all overboard tomorrow if they could, for the sake of a return to even the limited degree of freedom, self reliance, and humanitarian environment which they enjoyed under the Tsars. Lenin was a known revolutionary, actively preaching and working for the overthrow of the Tsar's government by force. Yet when his actions became so flagrant and so criminal that something had to be done, his punishment consisted of exile to Siberia, where he was allowed to live in such reasonable comfort that he did much of

April 21, 1967

his most important writing there, and even got married while in exile. Compare that with what would happen to a similar leader of rebellion against the Communist regime.

Le Fevre knows all of this. And the only explanation I could find for him dragging in the well known Communist falsification of history and fact in this area of Communist propaganda was his desire to promote the Communist line.

8. One more illustration in the same category is worth mentioning. Le Fevre takes every plausible or convenient opportunity to smear Chiang Kai-shek. His brief account of Chiang's activities, and of Chinese history, especially in the crucial years of 1924-1927, were obviously delivered to our group without an awareness on his part that I had made a special and detailed study of the period, and had written a book on the subject (May God Forgive Us) which had been highly praised for its accuracy and understanding by General Wedemeyer, Admiral Denfeld, Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane and many more outstanding patriots in a position to know the truth. Le Fevre's account was a mixture of abysmal ignorance and brazen distortion. In notes scribbled right while he was talking (and which I still possess), I wrote: "I hope this man knows more of what he is talking about in connection with other things than about China. This is utterly incredible." Even more incredible, however, was the fact that what he said about Chiang -- and has kept on saying about Chiang -- has followed the exact Communist line.

9. There is a Communist technique, for destroying opposition, which I call the principle of "overshooting." (Like a cowboy dashing out of a saloon, and making a running leap to his horse's back, who overdoes it and makes himself look ridiculous by falling to the ground on the other side.) Le Fevre's insistence on carrying the reduction of government and the limiting of government to the absurdity of no government at all serves exactly that purpose for the Communists with regard to the whole "libertarian" philosophy.

10. Le Fevre does the same thing with regard to the concept of "property." Our founding fathers pledged to the cause of freedom "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." They were quite sound in these distinctions. Le Fevre's insistence that a man's body or his life or his liberty or his honor be considered and treated as property, the same as his hat or his farm, is a mischievous monstrosity in semantics. But it is also much more. By carrying the libertarian's justifiable and wise concern with property and property rights into an apparent obsession with property, which reduces everything in life to the same material level, he uses the principle of "overshoot" to weaken the whole case for property.

Actually Le Fevre is doing to the Conservative cause in the field of

April 21, 1967

economics exactly what George Lincoln Rockwell is doing to it in the area of politics. The Communists make great use of arguments and measures for the abolition of property. LeFevre makes the libertarian opposition to that theme become confusing and ridiculous, by stretching the term property to cover everything related to human life, and then glorifying "property" as the holy of holies. His whole philosophy serves as a reductio ad absurdum to the libertarian concepts of property and property rights, thereby effectively damaging the normal support of those concepts. And, in my present considered opinion, this effect is intentional.

11. LeFevre makes his atheism as militant as he dares under any particular set of circumstances. Under the surface he energetically promotes Ayn Rand's reduction of all altruism in human beings to simply another form of materialistic selfishness. He denies the very principles of morality and humanitarianism. He vehemently denies any and all inherited responsibility in any human being -- even though the individual may be the beneficiary of the privileges and comforts which have imposed that responsibility. In all of these themes, and many more, LeFevre is following, and is cunningly advancing, the Communist line.

12. LeFevre constantly preaches, and his whole "philosophy" is based on, economic determinism as the all-powerful and practically exclusive motivating force in human history. This, of course, is the exact Marxian line -- although LeFevre seeks to disguise the fact by pretending to believe, or at least by teaching, that economic determinism will lead to the opposite end from that sought by Marx, if we will only do away with all government.

Anybody who can study the religious wars of the Seventeenth Century, and come out with the belief that economic considerations were the chief motivating force behind them, is simply out of the ball park for any sensible argument, as far as I am concerned. And the sad truth is that LeFevre's whole preaching in this area simply helps to prepare the way, in the minds of many of his listeners, for the eventual acceptance of Marxist doctrines.

13. And now, after this entirely too brief a look at the real purport and effect of LeFevre's "philosophy" and his teaching, we must spare just a little time for a look at the man himself. And since, as it seems to me, truthfulness is at the very core of all human morality, it is worth noting first that LeFevre has simply no regard for the truth whatsoever. An easy illustration of this fact is the attached correspondence, which I have labeled Exhibit F, and which I shall let speak for itself. Other illustrations, of the same kind of deliberate distortions of the truth to support a Communist line, would not be hard to find.

14. No man is to be condemned for any shortcomings in his education, unless and until he starts posing and teaching in the role of a scholar. In view of LeFevre's pretenses to scholarship, however, his ignorance of even the elementary rules of grammar and of language breeds suspicion as to the rest of his "scholarship." He reminds me repeatedly of a famous and penetrating wisecrack by George Ade, about a man showing off his newly acquired erudition: "Whom are you?" he said, for he had been to night school.

During the three days that I sat in LeFevre's classes, I heard and noted a steady flow of revealing lapses, from a man who had set himself up as a teacher to some of the most able industrialists and some of the most serious students of our time. At one point he said: "Between my secretary and I"!!! At another point he said: "People will fall into certain stratum." (Why use the word at all if you do not know enough about it to be aware that it is sharply singular, and that the plural is strata?) In one of his papers he referred to a "coup de gras"!!! He obviously meant coup de grace, but the whole meaning of the phrase is lost by the misspelling. He gave considerable time to the theories of Proudhon, whose name he pronounced as proodone! There were dozens of similar revelations which I did not record and do not now remember.

15. None of the above items would be important except as indicators. But, as I scribbled in my notes at the time, this man is one of the most brazen and complete charlatans that I have ever known. He has studied certain aspects of certain periods of history in considerable detail -- such as the lives and activities of the anarchists, for instance. But his ignorance of general history is monumental, and leads him into ridiculous absurdities and generalizations. Or, more accurately, he boldly advances such statements because he does not think there are enough people in his usual audiences -- such as the six hundred foremen of the Deering Milliken Company -- who will know any better.

For a simple illustration, he referred to the Babylonians as barbarians. And was obviously talking about the citizens of the Second Babylonian Empire, although it was equally obvious that he would not have known of any historical distinction between the first and second empires. The truth is, of course, that all of the terms we use today with regard to latitude and longitude and divisions of time we owe to the scholarship of the Babylonians. They were the first people, so far as we know, to realize the everlasting confusion caused mankind by the fact that some of our remote ancestors, having learned to count on their fingers, used ten as a basis for all of their enumeration; while others had adopted the twelve moons in a year as a numerical base, and counted everything in dozens. So the Babylonians solved the resulting problem by taking the lowest common denominator of both ten and twelve, namely sixty, as the basis for their enumeration. Which is why today we have sixty seconds in a minute, sixty minutes in an hour, and "sextants" for elementary astronomical observations,

and 360 degrees in a circle. And LeFevre thinks of these people as some kind of ignorant barbarian tribes.

His "lectures" were full of such nonsense. He was constantly spouting Greek history, obviously without knowing any Greek history. He gave no sign of any knowledge of Roman history whatsoever, although some knowledge of the early Roman republic is absolutely vital to an understanding of the government which our founding fathers planned for ourselves. For all of his obsession with "property," he showed no faintest suspicion of the way demagogues and collectivist tyrants have used attacks on the "haves" for the benefit of the "have-nots," as a means of establishing and maintaining themselves in power, throughout the nearly four thousand years since the days of Hammurabi in the first Babylonian empire, and probably long before.

Pretending to be an expert on the philosophy of government, he never showed any slightest interest in or knowledge of the most important principle in our form of government. It is what Cicero referred to as "the diffusion of power" in the early Roman republic, and what our founding fathers followed and extended and improved, by the "federal system" and by the system of "checks and balances" between the tripartite divisions of both our federal and our state governments. He ventured into mathematical phraseology once or twice, thereby making an utterly unnecessary revelation of his ignorance of the subject and of the real meaning even of the terms he was using.

The chief importance of all of these trivia is their support of my feeling that the man is a clever and audacious fraud. More specifically, he is a cunning actor and mesmerist, posing as a scholar, insidiously leading a lot of good people into gradually -- and unconsciously -- taking up positions basically opposed to the very principles and purposes in which they really believe.

16. Which brings us to the one piece of extrinsic evidence that I can offer to reenforce my appraisal. And unfortunately I cannot present this with the documentation and detail which a thorough investigation might make possible. But I cannot help wondering how much you may ever have looked into LeFevre's background before letting yourself become one of his most prominent supporters. For it seems to me likely, from what little I do know, that his past history will not stand comfortably too much careful scrutiny.

The one palpable piece of evidence is the report made on him about ten years ago by the Retail Credit Company. Maybe you are more familiar with it already than I am. For although the existence and nature of this report is pretty well known in Denver, I have never actually seen that report, nor do I know anybody who has. But from what I have been told from several different sources, each of which was reliable and was careful to point out the limitations on his own knowledge, this report was both detailed and devastating. It indicated that LeFevre had formed and operated a number of "religious cults" in California, and had more or less been run out of that state as a phoney. More important, the report

indicated a number of affiliations of LeFevre with Communist or pro-Communist organizations. The charges were so serious and so damaging that LeFevre brought a libel suit for a million dollars damages, against the Retail Credit Company. And his case was thrown out of court by a judge in San Francisco on the grounds that everything in the report had been proved to be true.

* * *

The Communists, always with less than three percent of the population, take over one country after another. They can do so only by using patient, brilliant, and almost infinite cunning to confuse and lead astray their opposition at every level of intelligence and of dedication to the cause of freedom. In my reluctant but honest opinion LeFevre is, at the worst, a conscious and clever agent of the Communists for carrying out this purpose. At the best he is simply an opportunistic phoney, who creates the impression on the surface of being very deep; but who, deep down, is extremely shallow. And in either case I think he is a serious danger to the anti-Communist cause, to The John Birch Society, and to the reputation and the principles and purposes of William J. Grede.

II. Robert D. Love

This part of this memorandum will have to consist of much that I only surmise, mixed with other items of actual knowledge. I shall try to make clear at all times to which category any statement belongs. But to put the whole combination into an orderly essay would take at least a hundred handwritten pages, and several days of time which I simply cannot spare. I shall have to jot down, therefore, a lot of disjointed items, no one of which proves anything or means very much -- especially since so many of them do rest on surmise -- but which altogether have built up in my own mind a conviction that has grown steadily stronger during the last two years.

The underlying foundation for this conviction, the base on which both surmises and facts must rest for their significance to become clear, is composed of the following fundamental observations, which I believe derive from actual knowledge.

(a) The most important element of Communist strategy is to keep the existence and the progress of their conspiratorial activities as unrecognized, or given as little attention, as possible. For this purpose they are not only willing to permit, but actually to encourage and even subsidize, opposition to themselves on all other fronts. The more some "Conservative" insists that the Communists must be fought on the ideological plane, or the more the patriotic

April 21, 1967

Americans can be made to worry about a military threat from the Soviets, for instance, the better the Communists like it. The dissipation of anti-Communist forces and energies into these two fields has provided the Communists with unceasing opportunities for their real and constant advance through their subversive conspiratorial efforts.

(b) With about three percent of the personnel involved, the Communists can -- with very rare exceptions -- control, capture, or destroy any group, any committee, any organization, or even the total population of a country. It is an unremitting part of their conspiratorial strategy, therefore, to try to achieve and maintain around a three percent representation in every national organization or association in America, and in any group -- no matter how small or of what nature -- that is or might be working in effective opposition to their plans. The COUNCIL of The John Birch Society has contained since it was founded, counting members who have died or withdrawn, approximately thirty-eight men. For us to assume that the Communists would not have planted one of their own within this group would be a naive and dangerous folly.

(c) Because of the origin, nature, and purposes of The John Birch Society, and however embarrassing it may be to myself to advance this argument, the one surest and easiest way for the Communists to destroy or tremendously weaken the effectiveness of the Society would have been (and still is) to get me out of it, or to create as much dissension, criticism, and obstructionism within its COUNCIL, for me to have to overcome, as they could contrive on any excuse or by any means.

Bob Love was never selected by me, nor intended by me, to become a member of our COUNCIL. Through his friendship with Fred Koch, and his continued attendance at COUNCIL meetings as a guest of Fred Koch, he managed to push himself onto the COUNCIL when I finally broke down and offered the obviously desired invitation for him to become a member. And almost from that very day our troubles within the COUNCIL began. The rest of this letter will consist almost entirely of listing steps, each one insignificant or unconvincing in itself, in what I now believe to have been a subtle, hidden, but continuous campaign on the part of Bob Love to accomplish any or all of the following objectives.

(a) To get me out of any position of actual leadership of the Society.

(b) To make as much trouble for me (in carrying out my responsibilities as leader, and in keeping the Society on its predetermined track) by all means and in every way that Bob Love could contrive without revealing his sinister purposes.

(c) To use the Society, and his membership on the COUNCIL, as a means of building himself up, both regionally and nationally, as one of the country's most important and most dedicated anti-Communist leaders -- so as to make it

April 21, 1967

easier for him to stultify anti-Communist efforts, not only of The John Birch Society but of other groups, with greater ease and with less danger of drawing suspicion to himself.

(d) Steadily to weaken the Society in Wichita, in Omaha, and wherever else possible, always under the guise of being helpful and of promoting its growth.

(e) To divert the activities of the Society as a whole, and especially of its members in some areas, to the fullest extent possible, from exposure of the conspiracy to debating against Communist positions in the area of economics or of other ideological differences.

(f) To create friction, frustration, and simmering discontent, however and wherever possible, among our members, among the members of our staff, and within the COUNCIL itself.

(g) To do everything possible to reduce and divert the flow of contributions to the home office of the Society, and the revenue, from whatever sources, which was so badly needed.

All of the items listed below will have fitted into one or more of those purposes.

1. In the fall of 1962, not long after Bob Love became a member of our COUNCIL, I received a long letter from Pat Manion. It was very friendly, and very complimentary. But its purpose was to persuade me, after "having done such a grand job of founding the Society and getting it started towards a position of importance," to step aside now -- as a noble personal sacrifice -- and let somebody else run it so that it could accomplish something. Pat stated that he was writing this letter, reluctantly, and not as his own original idea at all, but because he had promised somebody else to be the spokesman for this point of view. I have no way of knowing, of course, but I would now stake my life without hesitation on this letter having been prompted by Bob Love. It was so exactly in accord with so many of his later efforts.

2. Until the fall of 1966 anyway, when Ben McMillan was finally pulled into the fold, all of our dissension, criticism, and efforts to change the Society or its management or direction, within the COUNCIL, had come from one small group consisting of Draskovich, Oliver, Anderson, Manion, and Love. But it was Bob Love, always working quietly behind the scenes, and letting somebody else carry the ball for him, who kept the dissent active, gave it the semblance of a concerted organization, and guided its protests into troublesome directions. This was finally made crystal clear by the activities of this group, and of Love himself, in the spring of 1964.

April 21, 1967

3. Draskovich, who always has been simply a hypocritical and self-seeking opportunist, originally set out to have himself made the International Representative of The John Birch Society, so that he could travel around the world in style with considerable prestige at our expense, meeting with other "anti-Communists" in other countries. I fought this for a whole year, but finally said I would withdraw my opposition if he could raise the money specifically for that purpose. He assured me immediately that he could get the money from Fred Koch. I am certain that he tried to do so, that Bob Love thus knew all about it, and was brought into a working partnership with the disappointed and disaffected Draskovich when that effort failed.

Bob thus became very much a party to and, I am convinced, the leading spirit in, the effort of the dissenting group to have Draskovich brought to Belmont, theoretically -- in the beginning anyway -- as my righthand advisor and helper; but actually to run the Society and gradually push me out, or up as "Chairman," or into some position of innocuous helplessness. Tom Anderson was beguiled into becoming the chief ball carrier for this end run, but it was Bob Love who was calling the signals.

4. The opening play in this planned march down the field was the special meeting of the full COUNCIL which Draskovich insisted on calling Sunday morning after our regular Saturday meeting and dinner of the COUNCIL in Boston in September, 1963. Draskovich charged that the Society was falling to pieces because of my mismanagement, and because of my insistence on the absurd and futile program of creating understanding. I don't know that Bob Love was a party to this maneuver, but later events certainly indicate that he was.

5. The next step in this campaign was the chorus of criticism and dissent expressed, at our December 1963 COUNCIL meeting in New York, by Revilo Oliver, Dan Draskovich, Pat Manion and Tom Anderson. This resulted in the designation of a so-called "strategy committee," to meet with me in Belmont and try to pin down the complaints and clear up their causes.

6. Bob Love, as usual, had little to say at this COUNCIL meeting itself, except in his unceasing role of "being helpful": "Let's have a strategy committee which helps and guides Bob Welch so that we do not have these problems." (In other words, he was saying to himself, if I can't get him out I'll get somebody in there to hamstring him.) Nobody knew why, with an excellent Executive Committee already in existence, and meeting with me monthly, this additional "strategy committee" would be needed, or just what its functions should be. But once such a committee had been given informal approval, and asked to meet with me and then report to the COUNCIL at the next COUNCIL meeting in March, it became clear that Bob Love was the self-appointed chairman of the dissenting group.

April 21, 1967

He at first issued a call, on January 14, 1964, for a meeting in Belmont on January 24, 1964. (See Exhibit G.) This was fine with me. But for some reason or excuse which I have now forgotten, the meeting did not take place -- and it is my present belief that Bob Love never intended for it to take place. He had a better idea. For while this was the last I heard about the "strategy committee" for several weeks, and -- being terribly busy as always -- I actually thought that the whole project had either been dropped, or would simply be discussed informally again at the March COUNCIL meeting. Then lo and behold, shortly before that meeting, I received a copy, as did every member of the COUNCIL, of a five-page single-space typewritten "report," that was the most amazing document I have ever seen to which five able and intelligent men had put their signatures.

It turned out that, some weeks before, Bob Love had called a meeting in Chicago (not Belmont), without me and without my even having any knowledge of the meeting, of this "strategy committee" and two or three other people. (The meeting lasted over eight hours but I never have learned exactly who was there.) And this paper was the "report" of that committee meeting, on which they wanted action taken at the forthcoming COUNCIL meeting in Los Angeles.

The essence of this report was two positions. The first was that I needed and must have "help" to run the Society, and that "Draskovich was available." The whole theme of this part of the report was exactly in tune with the letter from Manion in the fall of 1962 -- which I now believe was prompted and even largely written by Bob Love -- that I had done a great and patriotic job in founding The John Birch Society, but that it was now time for me to step aside and let somebody run it who really knew how. (And "Draskovich is available.")

The second theme was that our staff in Belmont was no good; and that somebody, presumably Draskovich, should come in there and get rid of the childish clerks with whom I had surrounded myself, and put in some able people. Here was certainly a case of the "six blind men of Indostan" sitting around all day, "prating about an elephant not one of them had seen." And this was what first opened my eyes to the possibility of subtle and intentional trouble-making on the part of Bob Love. For nobody else on this committee had ever been through our offices at that time, or even met and talked with any of the members of our home office staff, except in a most cursory manner at annual meetings of our COUNCIL in Boston.

Neither had Bob Love, for that matter, with one important exception. In September '63, after Bob Love had already started converting The John Birch Society in Wichita into primarily a sounding board for the Freedom School and a distributor of their literature, and had run into some polite protests and questions from Tom Hill, Bob Love had gone to Tom Hill's office, which was then in the basement of 395 Concord Avenue. They had quite a discussion, at the end of which Bob Love had brazenly stated: "Just let me tell you something,

young man. I'm running The John Birch Society in Wichita. Don't you forget it, and don't you interfere."

When Tom had told me of this discussion I asked him, without changing his own views of how our Sections and Chapters should be run, of course, to handle the matter and keep on handling it as smoothly and diplomatically as he could. Which means, in fact, that we let Bob Love have his way. But Bob Love knew that Tom Hill was, and would remain, a danger to Love's plans -- as I now see them, and honestly believe -- to sabotage The John Birch Society all he could in Wichita and Omaha, while always appearing to be its strongest supporter. So it was Bob Love's desire to get Tom Hill out of the picture which was behind this drive of the "strategy committee" to revamp our staff in Belmont.

7. What happened to, and in connection with, that five-page report, you already know. I had to put in a lot of time and effort to be sure that you and Bob Stoddard at least understood some of the background and purposes involved. One of the most serious and damaging effects of all of the activities of Bob Love over the past four years has been the total of time and energy they have cost me -- as in preparing this present memorandum -- which might otherwise have been devoted to more constructive purposes. In fact I desperately need the time I am using right now, for so many pressing and important matters. But there is no telling what subtle plans Bob Love may be brewing behind the scenes at present, to cause more trouble in the future, and this whole situation has now gone so far that I think we ourselves have to make some plans as to what to do about it.

8. After the March 1964 COUNCIL meeting in Los Angeles, for which you and Bob Stoddard had been prepared by our meeting at the Statler Hilton the day before, Dr. Oliver chiefly carried the ball of complaint, even though nobody could figure out exactly what he was complaining about. Thanks primarily to the forceful comments of Bob Stoddard and yourself, and to the visible support of all but the dissident group itself, nothing much came of the discussion, except a continuing unhappiness on the part of these members of the now more-or-less disregarded "strategy committee."

The one member of this group who I thought had been most gullibly and innocently misled, and whom I most wanted to straighten out, was Tom Anderson. So much so that I persuaded Tom by telephone to come from Nashville to Boston at our expense, to give me a chance to talk with him. But on the Monday morning when Tom showed up for that purpose, Bob Love showed up with him. Bob Love had, of course, heard about the meeting, undoubtedly by telephone from Tom himself. So Bob came all the way from Wichita, as my friend and to be helpful, but actually to make certain that I never did have any chance to talk at any length with Tom Anderson alone. Just as, more than two years later, he

went through such clever and helpful motions one day in Wichita with the result that first you and then Dick Ober never did have a chance to talk alone with Fred Koch.

9. Bob Love is one of the cleverest men at self-glorification -- and works the most continuously at it -- of all the practitioners of this art that I have known. He is not only busy all of the time convincing other members of the COUNCIL, and our official guests, of what a tremendous job he is doing for the Society; but he is constantly using his position as a COUNCIL member of The John Birch Society to build himself up as one of America's leading Conservatives. After the Los Angeles COUNCIL meeting in March of 1966 he stayed around Pasadena Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, having lunch or dinner with Nelson Shepherd or John Scott or others who were still there for reasons of their own, subtly selling each of these people on how unceasing and how effective was his work for the Society.

More typical, however, is the line in the letter he wrote me on December 5, 1966, about his "heavy speaking schedule for the Society and other activities." For this is the story he has been giving me, and other people too, since 1962. And it is true that he uses his position as a member of our COUNCIL to get a lot of speaking engagements. Many of them, as he will tell you, are not only for him to speak as a COUNCIL member, but on the subject of The John Birch Society. What he actually and almost invariably does on such occasions, however, is to give five minutes at the beginning to the Society, at the most. He then says: "But there is no sense in wasting your time in telling you of The John Birch Society, for you know all about it anyway. So let's go on to other matters." He then devotes his speech to the philosophy of the Freedom School, or to the necessity of fighting the Communists in the field of economics or on some ideological plane.

10. We have had two major problems with Bob Love, ever since he pushed himself onto our COUNCIL. The first has been the way in which, almost always working behind the scenes, he has insidiously fomented and sustained criticism and dissension within the COUNCIL itself. Most of this is done by the typical Communist tactic of "being helpful." I doubt if anybody else in the United States has caused me as many time-consuming headaches, or has done me as much damage, as has Bob Love, always under the guise of wanting to help me. And the same is also true with regard to his relations to the Society itself.

There is no doubt that he has been closely allied with both Oliver and Draskovich for years, egging Oliver on in his statements and activities and attitudes which caused us trouble, and encouraging Draskovich in that hypocrite's ambition to reap all kinds of personal benefits, profit, or position out of

The John Birch Society. I think, for instance, that Revilo Oliver actually believed I had said that there were three Communists on our COUNCIL, including himself; and I think that he had been cleverly fed this falsehood by Bob Love -- along with a lot of other subtly plausible misinformation which caused Revilo to believe that there was some kind of plot afoot, at my end, to make trouble between him and myself, and to get him out.

I honestly believe, although I could not so readily prove it unless these men themselves would cooperate, that practically all of the continuous problem we have had with Pat Manion, and the recurrent problem with Tom Anderson, has been fomented by Bob Love. Then we had the suddenly and surprisingly rabid and unreasonable attitude of Ben McMillan, with regard to the resignations of Oliver and Draskovich, and in support of the undermining activities in Chicago by Norman Thomas which led to the resignation of the Sheesleys, which produced such a storm in the Chicago area, and which made the resignations of the two COUNCIL members so much more damaging than they would otherwise have been. I soon surmised that Ben McMillan had been brought under the influence of Bob Love, fed misinformation by him, and egged on to taking the position that the COUNCIL had to push me aside and ignore me while the COUNCIL made all the decisions that would straighten out the affairs of the Society -- with regard to the staff, the COUNCIL itself, and everything else. And later, at a meeting of the Executive Committee which Ben attended, I received at least tacit confirmation of this surmise. Bob Love was simply pulling out all stops, everywhere, to make all the grist he could, and to damage myself and the Society all he could, out of this situation which he had helped so patiently and so cleverly to bring about.

11. This same destructive and damaging course, always carried on under the guise of helping the Society, has been equally effective and much easier to prove in connection with Bob Love's local activities. He subtly destroyed the Society's great potential for growth in Omaha, and has now all but wrecked it in Wichita itself. There are many facets to this activity on his part, which would require a volume to bring into one revealing mosaic. But one facet which can be briefly and partially exposed here is the matter of funds for the home office. For I can state with complete confidence that Bob Love has done all he could, for years, to prevent or decrease the flow of contributions, large or small, to Belmont.

During the last few months, since you yourself visibly scared Bob Love half to death by some frank conversation after the fiasco of your trip and Dick Ober's trip to Wichita, he has been so busy mending fences with so much sweetness and love and light applied to the surfaces, that this period must be considered as an exception to what I have to say. Up to this time, however, the record was quite revealing.

When Bob Love joined the Society some seven years ago he did so as a Home Chapter member, and sent us a check for twenty-four dollars with his application. Since then, not only has he never sent a single dollar of contribution to Belmont, but if he has ever paid even any dues, it has been to a local chapter without anything on our records to show it. He has sent me copies of letters, such as one he wrote Everett Dirksen, saying that because of his disapproval of something Dirksen had said he was withholding the five hundred dollars he had pledged to the Republican National Committee, and was sending it to The John Birch Society instead. (Which would have had the effect, especially at the time it was done, of supporting the bitter charges of some of the "Conservative" Republicans that the Society was draining off money which should go to the Republican Party.) But no such check ever came.

Bob Love may not know, of course, that a record of every contribution of twenty-five dollars or more goes across my desk. But in any event, I am sure his answer would be that he gave the five hundred dollars, and was otherwise contributing heavily, to the local activities of the Society there in Wichita. With how much justification, so far as the actual money is concerned, we do not know. We do know that he has done everything feasible to route all financial support of others into local activities, under his management, instead of to headquarters.

For the 1965-66 winter season he put out quite an elaborate Madison Avenue kind of brochure, designed to raise \$30,000 for the Society, all of it to be spent locally -- on a wide expanse of activities, among which the Freedom School was predominant. This was not only done without the knowledge of Tom Hill or myself or anybody else in Belmont, but Bob Love obviously took pains to ensure that we should never even see a copy of the brochure or know about it if he could help it. A copy was sent us by one of our angry members who was bitterly opposed to everything about the whole operation.

How much of the \$30,000 was actually raised and spent, we have no idea. But the similar appeal, for the 1966-67 period, was for \$5,000. (See Exhibit H). It is in the form of a letter, signed by Bob Love, and by Charles Koch who has been brought completely under Bob Love's influence and control. The letter states that "we" -- meaning Love and Koch -- had contributed \$3500 of the amount themselves. But, although Charles Koch entered the Society as a Life Member, there have been no contributions parallel to this for the Society as a whole, to pay, for instance, the salary and expenses of the local Coordinator of whom Love makes constant use. And the letter states, it will be noted, that "Although the fund is used, in part, for JBS functions, a much broader range of educational activities, particularly in economics, are supported." The letter does not point out that many of the most active and dedicated local Birchers are bitterly opposed to some of the "educational activities" to which they are thus urged to contribute.

Some of the hard feelings, and continuous discouragement, caused our

April 21, 1967

best members by Bob Love's high-handed tactics in connection with money for local activities, is indicated by the letter of November 16, 1966 from Perry Fleagle. (Exhibit I). Also, if our members want to sponsor Let Freedom Ring or the Birch Report on radio, or a local speaker's forum, or any of the regular Birch activities recommended in the bulletins, they have to raise that money separately. Most of the money in the Birch Fund is used for putting on Freedom School seminars or similar activities.

But the main point here is the (in my opinion) deliberate arrangement for draining off practically any and all contributions which might otherwise go to Belmont. And there are other measures in this effort. It is well known, for instance, that Fred Koch has been a generous contributor to the Society in the past, and might have become or still become an even larger contributor in the future. Enclosed, however, is a letter written me by Fred Koch on August 19, 1966. (Exhibit J). This is the first evidence that had appeared, of a campaign since carried on vigorously by Revilo Oliver and others, to convince everybody who would listen that I had grown senile. It is not without some justification, other than a mere guess, that I would stake my life on this concept having been planted in the minds of both Fred Koch and Revilo Oliver by Bob Love. And while this letter from Fred Koch shows -- see Page 2 -- that other trouble-making reports and thoughts had also been put into Fred's mind, for exactly the same purpose as in the letter written by Dean Manion way back in 1962 (which Manion admitted he had written for, and at the request of, somebody else), it is the definite effect of shutting off further contributions from Fred Koch with which I am concerned here.

There is one further item in this connection which deserves at least passing comment. That is, the testimonial dinner given to Fred Koch and Bob Love together in Wichita last spring. This dinner served extremely well two of Bob Love's constant purposes. For one thing it glorified Bob Love as a great and leading Conservative. In the second place, it shut off the possibility of any testimonial dinner being given in Wichita to Fred Koch, or to myself as in other cities, or to anybody else, from which the proceeds would go to Belmont. In other words, as part of a deliberate and continuing scheme to starve the national headquarters of the Society, this was a highly successful maneuver. And I would be willing to stake my life without hesitation that the idea and original suggestion for this dinner were carefully planted somewhere by Bob Love himself.

12. It is the second prong of Bob Love's activities, however, that is by far the more important and the more revealing. As an introduction to this discussion let me remind you again that nothing is so important to the Communists today as having the attention of their enemies distracted from exposure

of the conspiracy, and put into other means and methods of "opposing" Communism. Ever since Bob Love has been in the Society, and I am sure since long before that, he has exerted his energies to make of this whole struggle simply a debate over questions of economics. And he has certainly done everything he could to turn the efforts of the Society and of its members away from its pre-determined course of exposing and opposing the conspiracy, to a concern with economics and economic theory as the one battleground of real importance.

It is in this activity that Bob Love's close association with, and support of, LeFevre and the Freedom School become so important. For, despite a certain amount of ostensible reform and improvement during the past three or four months, it has been Bob Love's visible purpose for years to make of The John Birch Society in Wichita primarily a medium for the propagation of the Freedom School ideas and philosophy. He has tried by all means, little and large, and by both general policy and specific acts, to steer the energy, enthusiasm, and dedication of our members away from the projects and aims of The John Birch Society, into activities of his own choosing.

When this diversion of both funds and labor became so continuous and so blatant as to cause the protests and then the resignations of a number of our most devoted members, and the gradual dropping out of many more, I am sure that Bob Love actually rejoiced inside, and felt a thrill of sinister accomplishment. Certain it is that he did not change his course any to overcome this rising frustration of our members, and their abandonment of the cause, until he discovered last fall that he was endangering his own very position in the national counsels of the Society which made it possible to pursue his continuous measures of skillful sabotage from the inside. Even now the reform in his policy is, I am sure, both superficial and temporary. And even now, while his present activities show an ostensibly increased concern for the welfare and progress of the Society, they involve organizational procedures which are well known by him to be directly contrary to the policies laid down by Tom Hill and myself.

Despite the early strong interest in The John Birch Society in the basically conservative cities of Wichita and Omaha, there has never been a two-day seminar of the Society, or any seminar of the Society, held in either city by myself or anybody else. During the last five years no opportunity has been provided for me to speak in either city. But seminars of the Freedom School have been of constant recurrence. Seminars by FEE, or by practically anybody else, dealing with economics, have been welcome, and our members have been encouraged and all but coerced to support them. But seminars or even speeches dealing with the conspiracy have been taboo.

April 21, 1967

The display and pushing of Freedom School literature, and of books by Ayn Rand, at the American Opinion Library, and the "playing down" of our own literature there, have been so marked and so continuous that our members, who staff the bookstore as volunteers, have felt that they were actually working for the Freedom School. They have threatened to resign, or to quit working at the store, because of this situation, and have been kept from doing either only by their loyalty to myself -- which has, however, been steadily weakened by their inability to understand why I would allow such conditions to continue.

In this particular area of the problem, Bob Love has been quite high handed -- feeling apparently that he could get away with it because he was raising the money to keep the bookstore in existence. But a quick illustration of the policy he is carrying out is offered by what happened to the last book by Louis Budenz before Budenz died. It was an excellent summary of the progress of the Communist conspiracy -- with which, of course, Budenz was quite familiar from having long been a part of the conspiracy. And although Budenz, having swallowed some of the Buckley line, had a couple of paragraphs at one point in the book which were not complimentary to The John Birch Society, I thought it could do our cause a lot of good in creating understanding, especially on the part of our Catholic members and friends they could reach.

So I recommended this Budenz book -- I have forgotten its title -- emphatically and at length, in one of our bulletins. And I urged our members to push it all they could, explaining that they should not be disturbed, nor deterred from making full use of so excellent an educational tool, by the few lines Budenz had inserted which were unfavorable to ourselves. So somebody at the bookstore in Wichita promptly ordered a shipment. As soon as the books arrived, however, Bob Love discovered them, looked one over and found out how effectively it exposed the conspiracy, and promptly shipped them all back and forbade anybody to buy any more. This was despite my having urgently recommended the book. His excuse was that he didn't like what Budenz had said about the Society!

The above illustration could be expounded into a whole pattern. But it is time to start bringing this letter to a close with a few miscellaneous and general observations. One specific development, not touched on so far, which was quite disturbing and also quite revealing, was having my good friend Ben McMillan -- after you had already straightened him out on a number of matters, and the executive session of the COUNCIL on Saturday afternoon had straightened him out on some others -- come over to my office on Monday following the September 1966 COUNCIL meeting, and start reading the riot act to me about all kinds of things.

One was my having put the passage about Nixon back in the Blue Book when we brought out the dollar edition as the fourteenth printing. It was obvious that Ben could have got the basis of this complaint only from Bob Love -- Ben himself not having been at the COUNCIL meeting at which it had been decided to restore the Blue Book to its original complete context. Ben seemed surprised when I told him that the COUNCIL had deliberated over this matter at considerable length; that Bob Love had been the only member who voiced opposition; and that the COUNCIL had voted unanimously for this restoration except for Bob Love's vote.

Other complaints and condemnations on Ben's part were over the folly of my having called such people as de Gaulle and Betancourt Communists. The truth is that I not only could furnish documentary proof in both cases which would satisfy any reasonable person, but that my having advised our members correctly about both de Gaulle and Betancourt, well in advance of any general recognition of the truth about them by the American public, had already proved to be almost as beneficial to the Society as my having done the same thing with regard to Sukarno in 1956 and with regard to Castro in the summer of 1958 -- six months before Castro seized Havana. There is no doubt that the instigation of all of these complaints and criticisms, on the basis of which Ben was threatening me that he might resign (and assuring me that he was going to bring Arla up to date on such follies, obviously for the effect on her contributions), had come from Bob Love. And their whole purpose, as usual, had been simply to make as much trouble for me as he could, by any means and in any manner that he could.

* * *

The next point is of a more general and far more important nature. For while 99.44% of the Masons in America are as innocent of any conscious support of Communism as are the Elks or the Lions, the clear fact remains that ever since Weishaupt succeeded in making the Grand Orient Lodge in Paris a part of his Illuminati, the very top members of the Masonic hierarchy throughout the world have also been among the very top members and controlling authorities of what we now call the international Communist conspiracy.

This fact has had many ramifications in American history: The "Citizen Genet affair" at the end of the Eighteenth Century; the assassination of William Morgan in about 1830, when he set out to reveal some of these really top-level conspiratorial secrets; the resulting rise of the anti-Masonic political party, which played a considerable role in American politics during the administrations of Jackson and Van Buren; and the powerful reach and activities of Albert Pike for about thirty years from around 1845 to around 1875. It was Pike, as the virtual head of all American Masonry during that time, who masterminded and even controlled revolutions in Europe, and who eventually succeeded, in 1870, through his stooge Mazzini, in overthrowing in Italy the

temporal power of Communism's greatest enemy up to that time -- and until fairly recently -- namely, the Catholic Church.

The dividing line between the innocent Masons, and those who were on the inside of the conspiracy or had been carefully selected to be brought inside, has for generations been at the 32nd Degree. That Degree can be attained, through sufficient work and patience, by practically any non-Catholic American citizen of reasonably good standing. But beyond that point there is only arbitrary selection, and the whole Masonic order becomes truly secret. How far the Degrees continue beyond the 33rd, in accordance with Weishaupt's strategy of having each echelon of his organization think it is the top, until sufficiently promising and ruthless prospects are then selected and inducted into the next and smaller level, nobody on the outside knows. But there is no slightest doubt that the members of the higher levels of the Masonic orders throughout the world are today among the most powerful Insiders who are guiding and controlling the whole conspiracy.

One dominant feature in all of these people is their intense feeling and enjoyment of power, coupled with their bitter frustration at not being able to let their ordinary friends and acquaintances see just how powerful they are. Some few of them -- such as Robert Cutler, for instance, who was visibly assigned the job of guiding Eisenhower in every step throughout the 1952 campaign, and of staying physically with him during practically every minute of that campaign -- have first revealed themselves as Communists, or Insiders, so far as I was concerned, by their petulant manifestation of this frustration, or by their brazen exhibition or boastful hint of the power itself.

It is of extreme importance to note, therefore, that Bob Love stands somewhere above the 33rd Degree in Masonry. For I once heard him boast, when he had no idea that I or anybody else would grasp its significance, that he had spent the previous day inducting some Masons into the 33rd Degree. And I have a feeling that he may well be a much more powerful and more sinister figure than the known facts would lead us to suspect.

* * *

Finally, with a great deal of pertinent material still omitted, let me introduce a comment which may seem to you out of place, and of very doubtful validity in this discussion. I introduce it because of what seems to me to be a very remarkable facility on the part of my wife for sizing people up correctly. She is not always right, of course. And sometimes her feminine prejudices enter, unfairly and misleadingly, into her appraisals. But over the years her percentage of early accuracy, as verified by later events and developments,

Mr. Wm. J. Grede

-22-

April 21, 1967

has been such that I have come to give her opinions about people very careful attention. (And you can certainly figure this approach to clairvoyance on her part as strongly supported by her opinion of yourself!! She regards Bill Grede as "tops" among human beings, in every respect -- with the other members of our Executive Committee and John Brown and Bill Cies coming very closely behind.)

At any rate, it seems to me worth noting, because I confess that it has to some small extent undoubtedly affected my own thinking, that about three or four years ago she remarked to me about the subject of this discussion: "Bob Love has the most evil face of any man that I personally have ever known." And if you catch that face in an unguarded moment, or when -- for whatever reason -- Bob Love is letting his true feelings reveal themselves, I think you can see what she means.

III. Conclusion

It is through thousands of men like Robert LeFevre and Bob Love, and James Burnham and Bill Buckley, each one working away steadily and subtly in his particular area of the struggle, that the Communists succeed in so dividing, handicapping, and frustrating their opposition, that eventually three percent of a population can insidiously impose their rule by force over the other ninety-seven percent. I submit that both Bob Love and Robert LeFevre, working hand in hand, are doing tremendous damage to the anti-Communist cause in general, and to The John Birch Society and myself in particular.

There is nothing I can do, or want to do, about LeFevre. Whatever you might wish to do, if anything, about your continuing support of his activities, is of course entirely up to you. But I do want to get Bob Love off our COUNCIL, and preferably out of the Society, as quietly and smoothly but as promptly as it can be arranged. And any ideas and help you can give me to that end will be much appreciated.

Sincerely,

RW:jg

Robert Welch