Cancel Culture: We Have Met the Enemy – Our Own Government



by Kathleen Marquardt

The last time or two that my home alarm system repairman was here, we were talking about Operation Paperclip, the secret, illegal ploy used to spirit Nazi scientists from facing charges at the Nuremburg Trials and bring them to the United States. Yesterday, he sent me a video of author Annie Jacobsen (an excellent writer, researcher and New York Times bestseller), giving a presentation on her new book Operation Paperclip.

I watched Jacobsen's talk and was bowled over by a statement she made in responding to a guestion from the audience. A gentleman asked about the scientists who were being held for the Nuremburg Trials, but were wanted by U.S. military and government officials to get these scientists brought to the US as "good scientists" i.e., not evil Nazis, instead of being tried for their war crimes. Jacobsen noted (not making excuses for the subterfuge of getting the scientists "off the hook"), that the hue and cry immediately after the war ended was "... .that the Soviet threat was considered extreme much earlier than we think. It was in the months after the war the Intelligence Committee, that reported to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, gave a document to the JCO that said, 'we must prepare for total war!' That was the quote they used. The war would be with the Soviets and would involve ABC warfare - atomic. biological, and chemical. So, we say, we must get these scientists into Paperclip or the Soviets will."

That was the political line if people heard about these scientists. Was it true? Were we really preparing for "total war" with the U.S.S.R?

Let's get into that.

I'm often quoting Sun Tzu's "know your enemy". Great advice, but when you realize the enemy is your government, it can make you wonder if you are crazy. Especially when said government is being the hailed as the savior of both the world and western culture, and, at the same time, is handing over everything to our supposed archenemy, Soviet Russia.

In the six-part series I did recently on Cancel Culture, I defined the enemy as cultural Marxism and showed how it was embedded into every aspect of our lives by Americans who, for whatever reason hate the liberty provided by the United States and its founding documents (I believe that is the one-world government globalists working with the Marxists to achieve this). But, as I studied cultural Marxism and its tools of asymmetric warfare – political correctness, Critical Theory, Critical Race Theory, and the plethora of other evil tactics to disable, then destroy, our culture, I just discovered what I think is equally as important and maybe more abhorrent than all of that. That a major part of our history was re-written. What we learned in school was such a distortion of the truth, it had to be written by masters of deception.

What's so abhorrent about that? And what does it have to do with Cancel Culture? Today, we are living in a world where, thanks to moral relativism, many of us feel like we are reeling every day when we read the latest news. There is no black and white. But there are socially and politically acceptable truths (which are lies), and condemned speech which is truth.

My reason for bringing it up now is that the highest people in our government changed the whole course of events in the world, making enemies out of friends, and friends out of those wishing us dead. Now I understand why we have been known as ugly Americans. A major event, WWII, was a defining period where those in our highest government offices were effecting these truths to lies and *vice versa*, lies to truth.

How do we know the truth? A few individuals in our government questioned things that were said and done. In this case it was a senator from the Russell Committee[1] who was "deeply disturbed" and showed McCarthy what were proven to be the complete and correct intelligence reports from Yalta – the intelligence report of 50 of Chief of Staff in charge of War Planning, General George Catlett Marshall's officers "all with the rank of colonel and above" – an intelligence report which urged a course directly contrary to what was done at Yalta and confirmed at Potsdam. Yet, Marshall, as Roosevelt's military advisor, approve the Yalta agreement, which was drafted by Alger Hiss, Andrei' Gromyko, and Gladwyn Jebb.[2]

The deeply damning report of April 12,1945, that was *not* seen by President Roosevelt:

The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic war would be a political event of world-shaking importance, the ill effect of which would be felt for decades to come. Its military significance at this stage of the war would be relatively unimportant. The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic war would destroy America's position in Asia quite as effectively as our position is now destroyed in Europe east of the Elbe and beyond the Adriatic.

If Russia enters the Asiatic war, China will lose her independence, to become the Poland of Asia; Korea, the Asiatic Rumania; Manchuria, The Soviet Bulgaria. Whether more than a nominal China will exist after the impact of the Russian armies is felt very doubtful. Chiang may well have to depart and a Chinese Soviet government may be installed in Nanking which we would have to recognize. To take a line of action which would save few lives now, and only a little time, at an unpredictable cost in lives, treasure, and honor in the future – and simultaneously destroy our ally China, would be an act of treachery that would make the Atlantic Charter and our hopes for world peace a tragic farce.

Under no circumstances should we pay the Soviet Union to destroy China. Theis would certainly injure the material and moral position of the United States in Asia.[3]

That was the catalyst for McCarthy's review of Marshall's actions during WWII which resulted in *America's Retreat from Victory*. (Perhaps one of the reasons he was later denounced and ridiculed – McCarthyism is the lie named after him, early Cancel Culture.)

Diana West, in her excellent book, American Betrayal, writes of the early 1945 period and a letter from Roosevelt to former governor of Pennsylvania, special representative of FDR abroad, and outspoken patriot, George H. Earle, "I have read your letter of March 21, ". . . and have noted with concern your unfavorable opinion of one of our allies at the very time when such a publication from a former emissary of mine might do irreparable harm to our war effort."

Really? Or was that harm to the Soviet war effort? The Roosevelt administration, penetrated, fooled, subverted, in effect hijacked, by Soviet agents, as a matter of national policy, mixed them up, much to the world's deep, vast suffering. This 'sell-out' to Stalin as critics tagged it (and they didn't know the half of it), would become a bone of sharpest and most vociferous contention that the conspirators of silence on the Left, in the Democratic Party, and among the Washington elites would bury for as long as possible, desperately throwing mud over it and anyone who wanted to let the sun shine in. Why? . . . the publication of the Yalta papers, for example, would 'embarrass' too many people and, in the acid paraphrase of Bryton Barron, fired Yalta archivist and author of <u>Inside the State Department</u>, 'lead to demands for publication of the minutes of other conferences.

By 1956, as Barron notes, only a heavily edited version of Yalta had been released, and only after a Soviet-style (Soviet-inspired?) disinformation campaign promoted the notion that the crucial role Alger Hiss played at Yalta was, au contraire, 'largely that of a notetaker."[4]

During WWII, the powers of the West were Churchill and Roosevelt, with a sidekick, Stalin, who was going to help the West stop the Nazis *and* the Japanese.

As the saying goes, history is written by the victors, but I doubt if most people understand the depth of the lying and scheming that is hidden from us - supposedly forever. A quote from McCarthy's introduction to the book speaks of truths virtually unknown today, "If I had named the men responsible for our tremendous loss, all of the Administration apologists and the camp-following element of press and radio led by the Daily Worker would have screamed 'the Big Lie,' 'irresponsible.' 'smear,' 'Congressional immunity,' etc., etc., etc. However, it was the Truman branch of the Democratic Party meeting at Denver, which named the men responsible for the disaster which they called a 'great victory' - Dean Gooderham Acheson and George Catlett Marshall. By what tortured reasoning they arrived at the conclusion that the loss of 100 million people a year to Communism was a 'great victory,' was unexplained."

Why was the president not given that report?

Marshall had been passed over and passed on in his early Army career and was expected to drop out and get work as a civilian. But chance(?), instead, advanced him over many more senior and experienced men, to be named Military Chief of Staff, reporting to President Roosevelt. Harry Hopkins and Mrs. Roosevelt were two of his backers. The federal government was riddled with communists.

Almost the entire plans of the war were being side-tracked or otherwise having a spanner thrown in to mess with the West's conducting of the war to achieve interests best suited to a free world.

First, we must consider what went on at Yalta. If, as Hanson John Baldwin observes, we lost the peace because of great political mistakes in WWII, (spelled out in first part of McCarthy's book) then it is clear that those mistakes culminated in the controlling decisions made at the conference of Teheran and Yalta. It is my judgement that we lost the peace in Asia at Yalta. At Teheran, Marshall's will <u>prevailed</u> <u>in concert of that of Stalin regarding the Mediterranean and</u> <u>Eastern Europe</u>. (emphasis, mine) At Yalta, Marshall's will prevailed, with that of Stalin, regarding Russia's entry into the far Eastern was as a full-fledged partner entitled to the spoils of such participation. . ..

The President, bearing the marks of his approaching dissolution, traveled the thousands of weary miles . . . to treat with the tyrant, to seek accord with him, and to make the bargains over Poland and China that today plague and shame us all. The principal, the most utterly damaging, of these bargains contained the bribe he paid to Stalin for his eleventh-hour participation in the war against Japan. (Which was by then, irrelevant.[5]

The one area I want address here is China. China was a great ally of the United States and the U.S. was, supposedly, working with China to keep the USSR from taking over Asia. Roosevelt thought and said so. But those working for him had other plans for China.

Manchuria is the richest part of China. In terms of area and natural resources it may be described as the Texas of China. .

. .[6]

It was a rich, highly developed Manchuria that was at stake at Yalta. It was Manchuria which Franklin D. Roosevelt thrust upon the Russians; it was, moreover, conferred upon the new barbarians with full understanding that the United States was thereby satisfying an old imperialistic design of the Kremlin. The very language of the secret protocol which sealed the bargain at Yalta recognized this fact. What Roosevelt ceded to Stalin at Yalta, without the knowledge or consent of the Chinese, whose sovereignty there we always had upheld, was, and I quote from the work of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., in restoration of the "former rights of Russia violated by the treacherous attack of Japan in 1904." The testimony before the Russell Committee shows that Chiang Kai-shek was not invited to the Yalta Conference and that the terms of the agreement selling out Chinese interests were kept secret from him. At the Cairo Conference, however, it was solemnly agreed with him that China's rights in Manchuria would be fully respected and protected. When Wedemeyer appeared before the Russell Committee, he testified that when Ambassador Hurley informed Chiang Kai-shek of the Yalta agreement which sealed the doom of the Republic of China, Chiang was so shocked that he asked Hurley to repeat it before he could believe it.

The project was not disguised. It was a nakedly imperialistic aggression over the prostrate body of China. What Roosevelt sealed and delivered in the protocol agreed upon by him and Stalin in a secret parley consuming only eleven minutes, and thereafter kept locked away in White House safe for many months, were the historic levers of power over China. ...[7]

No wonder we are considered "ugly Americans" around the world. Obviously, deep in the bowels of our government, many Communists and commie sympathizers were working night and day to both sabotage the West's efforts in the war to keep the Russians as far away as possible from Western Europe, and to keep the citizens in the dark about the machinations going on to cancel us. With their singlemindedness, they were corrupting our entire government with their actions, and destroying the integrity of our once great nation.

What does this whole sordid transaction teach us about the good faith of the advisers of Roosevelt and the assorted liberals, Communists, Communist sympathizers. And agents of the Kremlin – the Achesons, the Lattimores, the Phillip Jessups, and the Institute of Pacific Relations – who have for so long been insincerely befuddling the people with talk of imperialism and people's rights in Asia.

Why, merely this, that in their minds the imperialism of the west, that decaying instrument of European expansion, is wicked and must be opposed. The imperialism of Russia is not only commendable but must be advanced by every means of diplomacy and war at whatever cost to the United States. That is the liber-leftist doctrine on imperialism. Have we heard one liberal voice raised in the Senate or elsewhere in condemnation Roosevelt's surrender to Russian imperialism at Yalta? This is the test, and by it we may measure the monstrous hypocrisy of the liberal elements in Congress and in the country which have assisted in and applauded the surrender of all China to Russia without the firing of a single Russian shot.[8]

There was a lot of talk of the U.S. trying to entice Russia into the Japanese war, which was pure disinformation. Russia wanted to attack Japan and, far more important, wanted a seat at the peace table where the spoils of the war would be divided. Back in 1942, in a meeting with Averell Harriman in Moscow, "Stalin told Harriman then that Japan was the historic enemy of Russia and <u>that her eventual defeat was essential to</u> <u>Russian interests.</u> (*emphasis, mine.*) Roosevelt was (falsely) advised by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that "we had a long, hard row to hoe with the Japanese and that without Russia's help we might not achieve victory". The Japanese were already out peace feelers, but this fact was kept from Roosevelt. As McCarthy sums it up: Was this a sincere endeavor by the master of global strategy to advance American interest? Did we sorely need Russian assistance? Or was it another in the baffling pattern of General Marshall's interventions in the course of the great war which conduces to the well-being of the Kremlin.[9]

Re China, McCarthy again lays it out so that we can't pretend not to understand: Was it to the Kremlin's interest to march its armies into Manchuria, from which they had been barred since 1905 by the Kwantung army, and to be in possession there when the war ended? If some Americans did not grasp the strategic importance of Manchuria, there is certainly abundant evidence that the Kremlin, faithful to Lenin's dictum that "**he who controls China controls the world**," never lost sight of it. . . Any intelligent American, after giving the matter sufficient thought, would know that the aim of Roosevelt and Marshall at Yalta should have been not how to get the Russians in, but how to keep them out."[10]

John Stewart Service was one of the men whose job was to assure the Departments of War and State that "the Chinese Communists were moderate reformers, <u>simple agrarians in the</u> <u>style of Thomas Jefferson</u>, *(emphasis, mine)* with no subservience to Moscow. Service sent a report to the State Department in 1944, stating:

Politically, any orientation which the Chinese Communists may once have had toward the Soviet Union seems to be a thing of the past. The Communists have worked to make their thinking and program realistically Chinese, and they are carrying out democratic policies which they expect the United States to approve and sympathetically support. [11]

I could add ten or 50 more pages of notes and quotes, but I think anyone who wants to see can read the writing on the wall – or in the reports. The point I want to make is that Soviet Russia was never the enemy of the Deep State and the upper

echelons of our federal government. So that statement: 'we must prepare for total war!', was pure disinformation, an asymmetrical warfare tactic that they have now pulled off for 80 years.

West said: . . .we were, the whole lot of us, with precious few exceptions, a nation of Captain Hillses, a nation of Roosevelts, a nation of Hisses, a nation . . . manipulated, inured, numbed, cushioned, silenced – continually protect from the sharpest of timely revelations, continually told to be afraid of them. We were impervious to the cries of the most plaintive Cassandras, who themselves were often pressured or consigned to mumble into their memoirs or grumble off to Samoa. Only the most principled, the most shrill, the most desperate, or the most stubborn were constitutionally (in the personal sense) able to rise above the overwhelming buss and static. It was on this level where the battle royal really began, pitting the long truth-teller against the forces of suppression, in a political and informational landscape that had been denuded of all vital context. This reality vacuum, this echo chamber of lies, was both created and preserved by what Kent Cooper (executive of AP) quite intriguingly paints as <u>autocrats in charge of both governments</u> (U.S. and USSR). "Clothed with autocratic powers," he writes, 'individuals in charge of both governments demonstrated how political censorship had helped Russia to win the war and the peace while England and America helped Russia win the war but lost the peace."[12]

Everything we thought we were taught about history is a lie. Our country betrayed Chaing Kai-Shek, China, Eastern Europe, so many areas, and would have done so to more places like Japan, if we hadn't had Generals with integrity in those places. All because we let our guard down and allowed people like the Rockefellers, Carnegies, Rothschilds, Harry Hopkins, Acheson, members of the Communist Party USA (CPUSA), and George Catlett Marshall have any control. I certainly haven't covered all the lies, misdirection, and treachery here, but I hope I have shown enough to help you understand that there is a confederacy of evil men and women working against everything we represent. They should be hung.

Are we now preparing for total war? Now that we gave China (Stalin's key to world power), and it has become such a powerful force of Marxist Communism, will they, perhaps with Iran, realize it is time to finish up the business started in the 1940s to destroy America with its Liberty loving people? We are the last bulwark. If America goes, Liberty may survive, for a while, in some small areas of the world. But not for long.

As we are working to take back our local governments, we need to be sure to remove any Marxists, Communists, or those who abet them to the detriment of our Republic and our Liberty. Otherwise, we are moving backwards.

© 2021 Kathleen Marquardt – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Kathleen Marquardt: koikpm@yahoo.com

Footnotes:

[1] During World War II, Richard Russell chaired a special committee that traveled extensively to observe the quality and effectiveness of war materiel under combat conditions.

[2] Alger Hiss, an American Communist, Andrei Gromyko, a Russian emissary, and Gladwyn Jebb, who helped set up the United Nations and served as temporary Secretary General until the first Sec/Gen was named.

[3] McCarthy, Joseph R., *America's Retreat from Victory*, The Devin-Adair Company, NY, 1954. p 5.

[4] West, Diana, *American Betrayal*, St. Martin Press, NY, 2013, pp 320-321.

- [5] McCarthy, p. 348.
- [6] Ibid, p.349
- [7] Ibid. pp 350, 351.
- [8] Ibid. pp 52-53.
- [9] Ibid. p. 15.
- [10] Ibid. p. 35.
- [11] Ibid. p 69.
- [12] West, p. 326