



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 5, 2018

Published in the March 5, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 05

John Foster Dulles: How This Early “Deep-Stater” Harmed America

Shortly after Adolf Hitler took power in Germany in 1933, some Englishmen were curious about this new political figure in central Europe, asking, “This Hitler fellow, where was he born?” To which Lady Astor replied, “At Versailles.”

By that time, it was widely understood that the harsh peace imposed upon Germany after the First World War with the Treaty of Versailles — with loss of historic German territory; unreasonable reparations; and the hated Article 231, the “war guilt clause” — had given birth to Hitler. Some argue that the “war guilt clause” was perhaps the most onerous provision of the hated treaty. Under its provisions, the Germans were forced to admit that they, and they alone, were responsible for the Great War.



The person who drafted it was a young American lawyer, John Foster Dulles. The clause said, “Germany accepts the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damages to which the Allied and Associated governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war *imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her allies.*” (Emphasis added.)

It would not be the last time that an action of the then 31-year-old Dulles would lead to “blowback” on his country. In fact, famed journalist Alan Stang concluded in his book *The Actor* on the career of Dulles — the ultimate “deep stater” — “Dulles deliberately did more damage to America while masquerading as a conservative Republican anti-Communist, than Gus Hall [long-time head of the American Communist Party] could have imagined doing.” Although the term was not in use at the time, John Foster Dulles and his brother Allen were key architects in the construction of what we now refer to as “the deep state” — the permanent state behind the visible government in D.C.

From his negative influence at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, until his death almost 40 years later while President Eisenhower’s secretary of state, Dulles continued to create policies that damaged America. As Eisenhower’s chief foreign policy advisor, his influence was immense. Stephen Kinzer wrote in his book on Dulles and his brother, Allen (director of the CIA), *The Brothers*, “On some days, Foster spoke personally or by telephone with Eisenhower as many as ten times. At dusk he often visited the White House for a chat over drinks.”

Dulles’ advice to Eisenhower was consistent with the views he held as a young lawyer: He was an ardent globalist (the term more used then was “internationalist”) who believed military intervention was justified to achieve his desired globalist world order. And while Dulles occasionally peppered his



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 5, 2018

Published in the March 5, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 05

résumé with conservative, anti-communist rhetoric, it was, as Stang concluded in *The Actor*, all for temporary political cover until he could achieve what he and other insiders like him wanted: a world socialist government.

Dulles came to his dogged pursuit of a global government naturally, via family connections and by educational training. His grandfather, John Watson Foster, was secretary of state to President William Henry Harrison. A pillar of the post-Civil War Republican Party, Foster helped direct the overthrow of Queen Liliuokalani of Hawaii by its American settlers and supported sending American troops to aid the rebels who declared themselves the new government. The Harrison administration ended before it could act on the new government's request for annexation (the next president, Grover Cleveland, quickly nixed the idea), but it did lay the foundation of the aggressive interventionism that would characterize Dulles' career in the 20th century.

His mother's sister married Robert Lansing, who replaced William Jennings Bryan as President Woodrow Wilson's secretary of state. Bryan had been pushed aside largely for his opposition to American entrance into the First World War, and replaced by Foster's Uncle Robert, who added his voice to Wilson's principal advisor, Colonel Edward M. House, in urging American entry into the European war.

The Rise of John Foster Dulles

When the war ended in 1918, young Dulles was in the American delegation at the Paris Peace Conference. How did this happen? In a word, Dulles had "connections." When he was just 16, he entered Princeton, where he soon became a protégé of a prominent history professor (and soon, college president), Woodrow Wilson. Dulles idolized Wilson, under whom he learned the virtues of globalism and the ability of government to correct evils — as Wilson and the progressives saw them anyway — of society. Wilson's interventionist policies as president reinforced the idea that it was the proper role of the United States to intervene in smaller countries, such as Cuba, Costa Rica, and Nicaragua.

After taking his law degree, Dulles' family connections landed him a job at the prestigious international law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, with such clients as the United Fruit Company, an important player in Latin American politics. Other important clients were J.P. Morgan, Brown Brothers, Standard Oil, and Goldman Sachs. Eventually, Dulles became the managing partner of Sullivan and Cromwell, and was, at one time, the highest-paid lawyer in the United States.

After the war, Dulles had extensive dealings with Germany, including the chemical giant I.G. Farben (responsible for making the infamous Zyklon B gas used in Hitler's death chambers). He designed the Dawes Plan that helped Germany begin to pay off its oppressive war reparations — ironic, since it was Dulles who had drafted the section of the Versailles Treaty imposing those reparations.

Dulles continued his financial dealings inside Germany after the National Socialists under Adolf Hitler came to power. Dulles' friend, Hjalmer Schacht, was even named minister of economics in the new regime. As Kinzer writes in *The Brothers*, "Working with Schacht, Foster [Dulles] helped the National Socialist state find rich sources of financing in the United States for its public agencies, banks, and industries.... Sullivan and Cromwell floated the first American bonds issued by the giant German steelmaker and arms manufacturer Krupp A.G."

By the mid-1930s, the partners of Sullivan and Cromwell decided they could no longer do business in



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 5, 2018

Published in the March 5, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 05

Nazi Germany. As Kinzer noted, “Since 1933, all letters written from the German offices of Sullivan and Cromwell had ended, as required by German regulations, with the salutation *Heil Hitler!*” All but Dulles voted to pull out of Hitler’s Germany. Dulles wept at the decision.

Going back to the aftermath of the First World War, Dulles had been an ardent advocate of liberal internationalism. The principle of non-interventionism — which internationalists such as Dulles slurred as “isolationism” — was the enemy. To Wilson and the rest of his globalist delegation, including Dulles, at Paris in 1919, the most important segment of the Treaty of Versailles was that creating the League of Nations. Colonel House wrote the first draft of the Covenant of the League. To promote the idea of the league, intended from the start as the foundation for a world government, House put together a group of sympathizers to inquire into the facts of global affairs, which was dubbed “the Inquiry.”

The membership of the Inquiry included Norman Thomas, a leader of the American Socialist Party. Another member was Dulles’ good friend, Walter Lippmann, a founding member of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. Two other members in the small, select group were John Foster Dulles and his brother, Allen.

Dulles Among Founders of the Globalist CFR

When Wilson failed (twice) to win ratification of the Treaty of Versailles, largely because the U.S. Senate was not yet prepared to merge the United States into a global government, the Inquiry became the core group of the world-government-promoting Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), founded in 1921. (The British had their own associated group, the Royal Institute of International Affairs.) As Kinzer explains in *The Brothers*, the defeat of the League of Nations “showed the Dulles brothers and others on Wall Street that internationalism had potent enemies. To resist those enemies, and to work toward a world that would welcome American corporate and political power, the brothers and a handful of their friends had decided to create an invitation-only club, based in New York, where the worldly elite could meet, talk, and plan.”

Photo: AP Images

This article appears in the March 5, 2018, issue of The New American.

Plan for what? Changing the views of the American public, which still held to the idea that America should remain an independent nation. Among their methods was the founding of a journal, *Foreign Affairs*, that would promote the goals of the CFR. Dulles’ friend Hamilton Fish Armstrong became editor in 1928, and Allen Dulles later served as CFR president, in the 1940s.

The views promoted by the CFR were basically identical to those of John Foster Dulles. By examining actions and comments by Dulles over the course of his life, we can clearly understand the ultimate long-range “plan” of the men, including Dulles, who founded the CFR.

Put bluntly, Dulles wanted a world government. In January 1942, not only was Dulles among those who signed an ad in the *Washington Evening Star* urging Congress to pass a resolution favoring the union of the United States with several specified foreign countries — *Dulles was the principal author*.

As envisioned by Dulles and his fellow globalists, this “Federal Union” would have the power to (1) impose a common citizenship; (2) tax citizens directly; (3) make and enforce all laws; (4) coin and borrow money; (5) have a monopoly on all armed forces; and (6) admit new members.



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 5, 2018

Published in the March 5, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 05

“Let us begin now a world United States,” the ad implored its readers, adding, “The surest way to shorten and to win this war [the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor had brought the United States into the war a few weeks earlier] is also the surest way to guarantee to ourselves, and our friends and foes, that this war will end in a union of the free.”

Using Religion to Promote World Government

One of the most important ways that Dulles championed the cause of world government was through religion. In *Religion in Life*, Dulles called for the “abolition of the entire concept of national sovereignty and the unification of the world into a single nation. All boundary barriers are thus automatically leveled.” One has to wonder: Would Dulles have been one of Nimrod’s biggest supporters at the Tower of Babel?

Dulles was raised in a Christian home, with a father who was a Presbyterian pastor. But after going away to college, Dulles became largely inactive in church affairs until the 1930s. When he became active again, the main thrust of that activity was to encourage Protestant Christians to take up the cause of world government, concentrating his efforts in the left-wing Federal Council of Churches (now the National Council of Churches). In 1941, he became the first chairman of the group’s Commission on a Just and Durable Peace. He even believed the effort for a global government sounded like “an echo of the Gospels,” according to William F. Jasper in his *Global Tyranny ... Step by Step*. The first resolution the group passed proclaimed, “A world of irresponsible, competing, and unrestrained national sovereignties, whether acting alone or in alliance or in coalition, is a world of international anarchy. It must make place for a higher and more inclusive authority.”

Dulles declared that the reason global organizations are needed is because of “self-defeating nationalism,” which he declared the “cause of global conflicts.”

And what would a Dulles-supported world government look like? In his 1942 report of the Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace, he was quite explicit. The report recommended “a world government, strong immediate limitation on national sovereignty, international control of all armies and navies, a universal system of money, world-wide freedom of immigration, progressive elimination of all tariff and quota restrictions on world trade and a democratically-controlled world bank.”

Readers should especially note that the goals of “world-wide freedom of immigration” and the “progressive elimination of all tariff and quota restrictions on world trade” are both clearly tied to the cause of creating a world government. Conservatives who tend to support the multilateral trade deals of today, and fail to see the importance of limiting immigration, should note the importance that globalists place on both in achieving the end of American independence.

The report also called for the worldwide redistribution of wealth in the push for world government. While we do not yet have a global system of direct taxation on American taxpayers, it must be understood that Americans will be expected to lower their standard of living if any such world government is created.

In the meantime, there is foreign aid, which Dulles always supported throughout both his private and public careers. The argument given for foreign aid is generally either that it will win us friends in the world (considered critical in the Cold War), or that it will serve some humanitarian purpose. Votes in the United Nations tend not to bear out the argument that it wins us any friends, and money sent for



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 5, 2018

Published in the March 5, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 05

humanitarian purposes ends up mostly in the bank accounts of foreign dictators. In either case, it is a transfer of wealth from Americans to other peoples of the world — in other words, a redistribution of wealth.

The Second World War and its aftermath brought a new opportunity for Dulles and his globalist comrades to guide recalcitrant Americans into a world government. Near the conclusion of the war, the United Nations was formed in San Francisco. Naturally, Dulles was a “Republican” representative at the conference, and he played an important role. As strong a supporter of the UN as Dulles was, however, he saw it as only a steppingstone to what he truly wanted. Writing in his book *War or Peace* in 1950, Dulles said, “The United Nations represents not a *final* stage in the development of world order, but only a primitive stage. Therefore, its primary task is to create the conditions which will make possible a more highly developed organization.”

But it was certainly a start. Other globalists at the conference included future New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, future Democratic presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson, and *Foreign Affairs* editor Hamilton Fish Armstrong.

Dulles and Soviet Spy Alger Hiss

Fellow CFR member Alger Hiss even served as secretary-general of the conference. So impressed was Dulles with young Hiss that the next year, when Dulles became chairman of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, he asked him to serve as the group’s president. In their respective positions, Dulles and Hiss worked closely together. In Dulles’ own words, “We saw each other rather frequently.”

Two weeks after Hiss’s selection as president, in a letter dated December 23, 1946, a man named Larry Davidow wrote Dulles to warn him that Hiss was a communist. “The information in this regard comes to me from reliable individuals in Washington.” No doubt realizing that just asserting that a person of Hiss’s standing was a communist was not enough to convince Dulles, Davidow added, “If you are interested in becoming more familiar with this situation, these Washington friends of mine will be glad to arrange to have you meet with one or more persons who know the situation and will disclose it to you in full confidence.” Davidow told Dulles that he was writing confidentially so as to avoid any potential “embarrassment” for Dulles.

Dulles’ response, dated December 26, 1946, is curious. “I have heard of the reports which you refer to,” Dulles admitted, “but I am confident that there is no reason to doubt Mr. Hiss’ complete loyalty to our American institutions. I have been thrown in intimate contact with him at San Francisco, London and Washington and I doubt that the people you refer to in Washington know him any better than I do.”

Finally, Dulles noted that he himself had been the “victim” of “so-called documentary proof” that he was “various things that [he] was not.” He concluded in his response that he was “skeptical about information which seems inconsistent with all that I personally know.”

Had this been the only warning Dulles received, perhaps he could be excused with dismissing the accusations against his friend Hiss. But less than a week later, Alfred Kohlberg, an anti-communist businessman and member of the original council of The John Birch Society, personally visited Dulles to alert him about Hiss. After Kohlberg shared similar concerns about Hiss, Dulles waved off the warning. “Several people told me he was a sort of fellow traveler, but they had no first-hand proof, and I do not condemn a man without first-hand proof.” And apparently, Dulles did not see any need to conduct his own investigation.



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 5, 2018

Published in the March 5, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 05

Even after Kohlberg informed him that the information on Hiss was in the files of the FBI, Dulles still took no action to investigate, so far as we know. He made no efforts to use his powerful contacts to query the FBI, and he did not even ask Davidow what evidence he could provide him. According to his future testimony at Hiss's perjury trials, all he did was call Hiss and ask him if he was a communist. Hiss said no, Dulles testified, and that was apparently the extent of Dulles' investigation.

Of course, if Dulles already knew the truth — that Hiss was a communist — he had no need of an investigation. Because the truth was, Hiss lied before Congress in 1948 about his membership in the Communist Party, and was later convicted of perjury. In fact, it is now well established that Hiss was a spy for the Soviet Union, even while supposedly working in a sensitive position for the United States at the Yalta Conference under President Franklin Roosevelt.

Amazingly, this did not appear to damage Dulles' reputation as a "conservative anti-Communist Republican."

In 1944, Dulles tutored Republican New York Governor Thomas Dewey on foreign policy in preparation for his presidential run against FDR. Dewey lost, but the two men remained close political allies. In 1948, Dulles supported Dewey over Senator Robert Taft of Ohio. Taft was the champion of the traditionally conservative wing of the Republican Party, an opponent of the socialist drift of the country, and a non-interventionist. Taft rejected the globalism of Dulles and his allies, Democrat or Republican. It was not the destiny of Americans, Taft insisted in his presidential bid, to overspread the globe.

Taft explained his opposition to the impulse to interfere in affairs of other countries: "It is based on the theory that we know more about what is good for the world than the world itself. It assumes that we are always right and that anyone who disagrees with us is wrong. Other people simply do not like to be dominated, and we would be in the same position of suppressing rebellions by force in which the British found themselves during the 19th century."

In an article published in *Life* magazine, Dulles said that the United States was not going to have a "purely defensive policy," but was instead moving to a "psychological offensive, a liberation policy which will try and give hope and a resistance mood within the Soviet Empire."

Dulles expected Dewey to defeat incumbent President Harry Truman and make him secretary of state, but in one of America's biggest political upsets, Truman bested Dewey, relegating Dulles to continued status as a private citizen. But that soon changed, when an opening for senator occurred in New York State. Governor Dewey tapped Dulles for the position, but he lost the special election to Democrat Herbert Lehman, despite Dulles running a campaign in which, as Kinzer wrote, Dulles rode around "in an open car bedecked with a banner reading, 'Enemy of the Reds.'"

"I'm glad that duck lost," was Truman's response upon hearing the news.

NATO and the Push for Global Government

Actually, Dulles had little difference with the foreign policy of the Truman administration. In fact, Dulles was an avid champion of Truman's request that the Senate ratify the treaty creating the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO was sold to the American Senate and public as a necessary military alliance to keep the Soviet Union out of Western Europe. And what a military alliance — entanglement, actually — it was! Under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the United States "agree[d] that an armed attack" against any NATO member nation "shall be considered an attack against them all." This



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 5, 2018

Published in the March 5, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 05

incredible provision obligates the United States to go to war if *any* member of NATO is attacked — in contravention of the U.S. Constitution, which assigns to Congress the power to declare war.

But NATO is not just a military alliance; it is *political* as well. Dulles candidly told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the treaty should be ratified “not as a military instrument but as a step in a political evolution that has behind it a long and honorable history and, before it, a great and peaceful future.”

A reading of Article 2 of the treaty confirms Dulles’ contention that NATO is more than a military alliance. It states that the parties “will encourage economic collaboration between any and all of them.” Dulles’ fellow globalist Clarence Streit, in fact, had written a book in 1939 entitled *Union Now* in which he recommended the creation of regional groupings with the eventual goal of putting them together into a functioning world government. Not surprisingly, Streit formed the Atlantic Union Committee to push NATO as a regional government working “within the framework of the United Nations.”

Indeed, Articles 51 and 52 of the UN Charter actually encourage the formation of regional groupings.

By 1952, the Democratic Party’s long dominance of the American presidency was coming to an end. Facing problems of communist infiltration in the government (such as with Dulles’ friend Hiss), corruption in government, and the continuing war in Korea, it appeared that the Republicans had a good chance to win. In a closely fought battle for the Republican nomination, General Dwight Eisenhower defeated Taft. Eisenhower fulfilled Dulles’ long-time dream, naming him secretary of state.

The official policy of the Truman administration in response to any Soviet attempt at expansion was *containment*. First enunciated in *Foreign Affairs* (naturally) by George Kennan, the theory was that the United States would contain the Soviet Union and the communist world to its present borders. If the communist forces were to attempt to venture forth beyond those borders, the United States would meet them with enough force to contain them, but no more. While there would be no attempt to “roll back” the present Soviet Empire, Kennan argued that, if kept contained, the Soviet system’s inherent weaknesses would lead to its eventual collapse. This is the policy that led to the Berlin Airlift in 1948, the way the Korean War was conducted in 1950-53, and of course, the failure in Vietnam.

Dulles railed against containment, promising that he instead would “roll back” communist gains, and that he was willing to take the country “to the brink” of war to do so. He called Soviet Communism “the gravest threat ever faced by the United States,” and added, “We shall never have a secure peace or a happy world so long as Soviet Communism dominates one-third of all the peoples that there are.... Therefore, a policy which only aims at containing Russia where it now is, is in itself an unsound policy; but it is a policy which is bound to fail.... It is only by keeping alive the hopes of liberation, by taking advantage of that wherever opportunity arises, that we shall end this terrible peril.”

This was the rhetoric, but the reality was far different. As historian Stephen Ambrose explained, “Eisenhower and Dulles continued the policy of containment. There was no basic difference between their foreign policy and that of Truman and [Secretary of State Dean] Acheson.”

Dulles’ Failure to “Roll Back” Communism

In 1956, no doubt partly inspired by such rhetoric, efforts were made in Hungary to cast off the domination of the Soviet Union. Stang wrote, “It was an amazing performance. It included the incredible spectacle of 16-year-old girls fighting and destroying Soviet tanks.” The Soviets responded



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 5, 2018

Published in the March 5, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 05

with a vengeance. The director of a Budapest hospital recalled, “Modern history has no equal to the Soviet barbarity here. They burned 20 ambulances coming to the aid of the wounded. They have killed or wounded half our personnel.” And 17-year-old Josef Mikori’s life was ended by being crushed against a wall by a Soviet tank. When rebel commander Pal Maleter went, under a flag of truce, to negotiate, he was kidnapped and murdered.

There would be no assistance from the United States under the leadership of Eisenhower and Dulles, not even with words. Dulles even told Yugoslavian communist dictator Josip Broz Tito, “The Government of the United States does not look with favor upon governments unfriendly to the Soviet Union on the borders of the Soviet Union.” To his own officials, Dulles provided instructions that they were not to refer to the Hungarian communist government as a “puppet” government, but rather as simply “the Hungarian government.”

Despite his tough anti-communist pronouncements, Dulles never lost sight of his ultimate goal of pushing for a world government. And nothing, including the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights, would be allowed to stop it. In 1952, Dulles told the American Bar Association (ABA), “The treaty making power is an extraordinary power, liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty laws can over-ride the Constitution.” He even asserted that a treaty can “cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights.” A closer reading of the Constitution reveals this to be untrue. The Constitution states that treaties made “under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.” Of course, the “authority of the United States” is the Constitution itself. And like any other law, a treaty must conform to the Constitution.

Senator John Bricker (R-Ohio) was concerned that the U.S. government was imposing “socialism by treaty,” and after Dulles took office the next year, he called upon Eisenhower and Dulles for their support for an amendment to the Constitution that would make clear that a treaty could not “override the Constitution.” He even cited Dulles’ ABA speech to enhance his case in his speech before the Senate.

Dulles and Eisenhower, however, vehemently opposed the Bricker Amendment, promising that their administration would never abuse the treaty-making power in such a way. With their opposition, the Bricker Amendment failed to get the necessary two-thirds vote in the Senate to enact a constitutional amendment. After all, the American people could trust the Eisenhower administration to never abuse the treaty process in such a way. Of course, even if that were true, Dulles did not address what *future* administrations might attempt.

Despite these solemn assurances, Dulles soon announced his support for the UN treaty known as the Genocide Convention, calling it “a valuable contribution to the development of international law.” Under the proposal, *genocide* was defined not just as race murder, but as any act or word that would cause serious *mental* harm to members of groups. Most dangerous, the convention would provide that any person charged with violating its restrictions could be tried by an “international penal tribunal.” So much for Dulles’ promises that he would not support any treaty that violates Americans’ rights protected by the Constitution.



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 5, 2018

Published in the March 5, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 05

The Lasting Legacy of John Foster Dulles

Dulles' tenure as secretary of state would end with his death from cancer in 1959, but he did leave behind a legacy in at least two more areas that would plague Americans for years to come, Vietnam and Cuba.

After the French signed the Geneva Accord of 1954, partitioning Vietnam into a north and a south, divided at the 17th parallel, Dulles was convinced it was the role of the United States to, as Kinzer quoted Dulles, "fill the vacuum of power" left by retreating colonial powers. As such, Dulles went to work to find a leader for South Vietnam.

Ngo dinh Diem had not held political office in Vietnam since 1933, and was living in America. "When the time came for American leaders to choose a savior for South Vietnam, they knew no one else," Kinzer wrote. The emperor of South Vietnam, Bao Dai, had disdain for Diem, referring to him as "a psychopath," but realized he had to select Diem as prime minister to get assistance from the United States.

Thus, with virtually no political support inside the country he was to lead, Diem — who came to be referred to derisively in South Vietnam as "the parachuted one" — was given the reins of the South Vietnamese government.

While sold as South Vietnam's only hope to save it from the communist Ho Chi Minh of *North* Vietnam and his Viet Cong terrorist allies in the South, Diem was hardly a libertarian figure. In fact, his brother, Ngo dinh Nhu, had announced, "We are working towards a socialistic state." Hilaire du Berrier, an eminent expert on the internal workings of Vietnam, noted that Nhu persecuted any *non-communist* opposition to Diem.

While the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon presidencies bear their own responsibilities for the disaster that eventually culminated in the loss of South Vietnam to communism, the imposition of Diem upon the country in the 1950s, thanks to Dulles and Eisenhower, played a huge role in the ultimate defeat of 1975.

But at least Vietnam was thousands of miles away. Dulles also played a critical role in bringing a Marxist-Leninist dictator to power in Cuba, only 90 miles from Florida.

One of the prevailing myths of the history of Fidel Castro's communist takeover of Cuba is that almost no Americans realized he was a communist. But solid evidence existed as early as 1948 of Castro's ideological commitment to communism. Following the assassination of political leader Jorge Eliécer Gaitán in Colombia on April 9, 1948, William Pawley, a former American ambassador to Brazil and Peru, heard Castro announcing his support of the murder on his car radio. "This is Fidel Castro from Cuba. This is a Communist revolution." That seems clear enough.

In 1953, Arthur Gardner became the U.S. ambassador to Cuba. He informed the Dulles State Department that Castro "talked and acted like a Communist, and should not be supported by the United States." He added that Fidel's brother, Raúl, was also a communist.

A 1957 letter written by Castro was intercepted by Chilean authorities. In the letter, in which he praised the communist systems of Russia and China, Castro promised that if his revolution was successful in Cuba, he would "impose" a similar system in his country.

Ambassador Earl Smith also denounced Castro as a communist in 1958, noting his association with



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 5, 2018

Published in the March 5, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 05

communist activist Che Guevara.

One would think that, if Dulles were such a strong anti-communist, he would take action to prevent the communist takeover of Cuba. Instead, Dulles' actions were all in the direction of driving from power the presiding government, led by Fulgencio Batista, going so far as to embargo arms that Batista had already purchased from America. Dulles also pressured other governments to join in the embargo against Batista's government. In addition, the State Department, led by Dulles, allowed military supplies to be shipped from Florida to Cuba *for Castro*.

Smith lamented, "There can be no doubt that the decision by the State Department to suspend the shipment of arms to Cuba was the most effective step taken by the Department of State in bringing about the downfall of Batista."

It did not have to be a choice between Batista and Castro, Smith insisted. "It is incorrect to assume that the only opposition to Batista was Castro and his followers. A powerful anti-Batista element existed that was not terroristic."

Yet, Dulles chose to support a communist — Fidel Castro — to replace Batista, and impose a communist dictatorship on an island only 90 miles from our shores.

What could be the possible motive behind Dulles' words and actions? Perhaps the best way to answer that is to quote a famous American, who said, "Well, I don't like to make charges about the motives of other people. But there is a legal doctrine which says that 'a man is presumed to intend the natural consequences of his acts.'" The famous American? John Foster Dulles, in 1956.

From the time Dulles wrote the "war guilt clause" into the Treaty of Versailles, to the time his actions aided the conquest of Cuba by a communist tyrant, John Foster Dulles brought great damage to his own country, and much of the world. We cannot read his mind, but we can let his own words speak for him.

Photo: AP Images



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on March 5, 2018

Published in the March 5, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 05

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.