

McCarthy's Visit

October 12, 2018

If you get down to it, there are only two axioms that made America the most powerful and most successful social experiment in history: "Innocent until proven guilty" and "Citizens' rights to bear arms". I purposely didn't use terminologies such as "Constitution", "Amendments" and "Law". These two are natural rights, creating a number of derivatives too long to list.

"Innocent until proven guilty" is the root for "unlawful search and seizures", the "right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury", the "warrants only upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation", the "State cannot deprive a person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law" –just to name a few. *The entire system of "we can accuse you only if we have evidence" theory.* Make no mistake; it has nothing ***(n-o-t-h-i-n-g)*** to do with legality. You cannot accuse your friend, business partner, relative (...) of something you have absolutely no proof of. This simple model places the "Innocent until proven guilty" thesis way outside of the spectrum of legality and makes it a simple fair and rational interaction between humans.

Countries and systems throughout history have proven that nothing will stop a government (of any kind) in its effort to regulate, rob, murder, harass its citizens than the presence of "Citizens' rights to bear arms". There is nothing that stops a government to visit misery on its citizens more than the "Citizens' rights to bear arms". Can you imagine Maduro would still be in power if Venezuela had our Second Amendment and the 30 million Venezuelans had 40 million guns, rifles and AK-47s at home? Because if you have imagination like that, you should be writing fictions. As I've been saying for decades, the only instrument between our freedom and wild, oppressive communism is our 2nd Amendment and nothing else.

In this paper, let's work on the "Innocent until proven guilty" thesis and its complete degradation, elimination in countries throughout history. Also, let's see ***"the one"*** unified outcome said degradation and elimination lead to, every single time it happened.

The way 90% of the Americans understand the full weight of "Innocent until proven guilty" on our society, the negligent way they handle the potential loss of it, and the constant abuse and disregard of it are a rough equivalent of the knowledge they have on the McCarthy area. So, let's have a crash course shall we?

House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC)

As per President Truman's executive order of 1947, federal employees had to be screened for association with organizations deemed "Totalitarian, Fascist, Communist or subversive" or advocating "to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means." It was a right decision; America was only two years after WWII; Nazis of all stripe from all directions tried to relocate to the US. Communist subversion was a real concern.

Formed in 1938 HUAC investigated a variety of "activities," including those of German-American Nazis during World War II. The Committee soon focused on Communism, beginning with an investigation into Communists in the Federal Theatre Project in 1938. A significant step for HUAC was its investigation of the charges of espionage brought against Alger Hiss in 1948. This investigation ultimately resulted in Hiss's trial and conviction for perjury, and convinced many of the usefulness of congressional committees for uncovering Communist subversion. HUAC achieved its greatest fame and notoriety with its investigation into the Hollywood film industry. In October 1947, the Committee began to subpoena screenwriters, directors, and other movie industry professionals to testify about their known or suspected membership in the Communist Party, association with its members, or support of its beliefs. During these testimonies a critical question was asked: "Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party of the United States?" Among the first film industry witnesses subpoenaed by the Committee (in October '47)

McCarthy's Visit

October 12, 2018

were ten who decided not to cooperate. These men, who became known as the "Hollywood Ten" cited the First Amendment's guarantee as a legal protection from being required to answer the Committee's questions. This tactic failed, and the ten were sentenced to prison for contempt of Congress. In the future, witnesses (in the entertainment industries and otherwise) who were determined not to cooperate with the Committee would claim their Fifth Amendment protection against self-incrimination. While this usually protected them from a contempt of Congress citation, it was considered grounds for dismissal by many government and private industry employers.

McCarthy

In the Senate, the primary committee for investigating Communists was the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, formed in 1950 and charged with ensuring the enforcement of laws relating to "espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States."

In February 1950, appearing at the Ohio County Women's Republican Club in Wheeling in West VA McCarthy gave a speech that propelled him into the national spotlight. McCarthy's allegations shocked the nation. Finding himself in the spotlight, McCarthy held hearings in the Senate, relying on innuendo and hearsay to condemn members of the State Department of communist ties. Between 1950-54, McCarthy railed against supposed communists, eastern "establishment" Democrats, and homosexuals. He **never produced a shred of real evidence against anyone** ("evidence"; *do you all with law degree remember what's that?*), but even those powerful enough to stop him were afraid McCarthy would turn his accusations against them if they spoke out. "I will not get in the gutter with that guy," President Eisenhower reportedly said of McCarthy, thus leaving McCarthy to operate without challenge. **Despite a lack of any proof of subversion, more than 2,000 government employees lost their jobs** as a result of McCarthy's investigations.

McCarthy headed the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in 1953 and 1954, and during that time used it for a number of his Communist-hunting investigations. McCarthy first examined allegations of Communist influence in the Voice of America the overseas library program of the State Department. McCarthy's committee then began an investigation into the US Army. This began at the Army Signal Corps laboratory. McCarthy garnered some headlines with stories of a dangerous spy ring among the Army researchers, but ultimately **nothing came of this investigation**. Then came the fatal blow: the decision to broadcast the "Army-McCarthy" hearings on national television. The American people watched as McCarthy intimidated witnesses and offered evasive responses when questioned. When he attacked a young Army lawyer, the Army's chief counsel thundered, "Have you no sense of decency, sir?" The Army-McCarthy hearings struck many observers as a **shameful moment in American politics**. By the time the hearings were over, McCarthy had lost most of his allies.

This is in the nutshell. There are a good number of things we must learn from it (I mean those of us who are willing to even think about it).

- First and foremost the idea, how people equate McCarthy with "black lists", Hollywood, etc. McCarthy was a senator, HUAC was a House committee. They had nothing to do with one another.
- A few relevant dates must be observed here; McCarthy was not even on stage, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee wasn't even formed yet when HUAC already was investigating "Hollywood" (1947). McCarthy had his famous speech in 1950.
- On the Senate as well as the House side (based on Hoover's insistence) they kept the identity of the informers secret, most subjects of loyalty-security reviews were not allowed to cross-examine or know the identities of those who accused them. In many cases they were not even told what they were accused of.

McCarthy's Visit

October 12, 2018

- There are a number of documents ("Venona papers") surfaced after 2000 that proved: McCarthy was correct in a large number of cases he investigated.

As Wikipedia defines, ***"McCarthyism is the practice of making accusations of subversion or treason without proper regard for evidence"***. This definition is correct for HUAC and McCarthy's investigation.

Nazism

Hitler's National Socialist Party (incidentally Bernie "BS" Sanders is pedaling for "Socialism") had the same practice; they either needed no proof, or needed the "you are Jewish", or "you are (were) hiding Jews", "you are a communist sympathizer" proof to execute someone. No one needed evidence.

Communism

There is an estimated 100 million people died during communism; this number does not include WWII, that number comes on the top. 90% of the 100 million was falsely accused or the government didn't even bother to accuse the person (they just took him/her). There were hundreds of thousands of people executed on "show trials" where everyone knew the "sentence" before the trial started. Evidence? Proof? That wasn't a concern.

During the last hundred years of history, HUAC, McCarthy, Nazism and Communism have proven what can happen when we let the government take detour around a democratic system.

Throughout history innocent people lost their jobs, career, family and sometimes their lives when our nation forgot one of the two pillars ("Innocent until proven guilty") that keeps the nation's bridge in unshakable position. Today, we are back to that practice again. The Kavanaugh hearing has proven how far we have gotten again, how much we attempt to destroy the all important pillar. I don't worry about the Feinstein, Schumer, Booker, Durbin, Hirono, Leahy, Harris types. While it is sad that opportunists, gangsters, slime balls, liars and dumb-as-a-ditch-mud people are dirtying up our great institution the US Senate, I am far more worried about how our society has gotten used to the idea of questioning, abusing, disregarding "Innocent until proven guilty."

Within the last week I was at a gathering, where we talked about the "Kavanaugh case." I naturally insisted on the vitality of "Innocent until proven guilty" when a close, highly intelligent and deep thinker friend of mine replied: "Well, the democrats wanted to get back for Judge Garland." His working thesis was the "they had a good reason and basis to do this with Judge Kavanaugh." The *"there are situations when subversion of 'Innocent until proven guilty' is morally acceptable"* thesis. By creating this morally reprehensible, false argument, it was OK by him that Judge Kavanaugh's life can be destroyed like under HUAC, McCarthy, Nazism and Communism in order to "get back for Judge Garland." This is not only morally unacceptable, but totally un-American, and highly dangerous for our country. There is no situation (none) when "Guilty until proven innocent" can come to play. That is communism, Nazism, and contemporary American liberalism (which essentially is the same or in close correlation with the previous two)

And this is far more dangerous for the country than the slime moves Feinstein is doing. The attempted destruction of the all important pillar has gone to the nation's preeminent schools, such as Georgetown, Yale and others setting them on a journey, when in a generation their diploma will be nothing short of garbage (it is already shameful today). It is more dangerous than anything, because –as I said– "Innocent until proven guilty" is one of the two pillars the entire American structure and society were built on. Close to 90% of American "high" (at least; in name) education has become un-American garbage generator with the sole purpose of undermining the country.

October 12, 2018

How fast can we go how far? Just let me remind everyone: toward the end of the shameful eight years Obama and his gang spent in the White House, large store chains such as Macy's, Lowe's, Banana Republic Toy's R Us (...) forbade anyone to say "Merry Christmas", schools forbade students to wear Christmas outfits or American T-shirts on Fourth of July, Bloomberg declared war on large drinks, and Obama's government created great shortage of ammunition (after they wanted but couldn't violate the 2nd Amendment); just to name a few roads, all lead to or already have met the definition of "communist" oppression (I mean... what authority Bloomberg had exactly to tell me what size of Pepsi I can drink?). All in the name of "Political Correctness" which is a code word of oppressive, mindless communism.

Do not ever think that just because **t-o-d-a-y** you are not falsely accused, other people's problem is just that; other people's. That road is going to reach you, but here is the problem you will face: you neither will be able to turn around, nor will be able to turn the road around.

Just think the Kavanaugh story through Then go to vote in November.

While editing this piece, I read the following article in the WSJ:

WSJ 10/11/18

"In state Supreme Court in Manhattan on Thursday, Justice James Burke dismissed one count of first-degree criminal-sexual act that stemmed from allegations of a 2004 sexual assault, made by then-aspiring actress Lucia Evans. Mr. Weinstein forced her to give him oral sex, the indictment says. New information from a witness contradicts that claim.... ...The new information, detailed in a letter dated Sept. 12 and made public Thursday, comes from a witness account that prosecutors said is at odds with what Ms. Evans told them. The letter says the witness, a friend of Ms. Evans, said Mr. Weinstein had offered her and Ms. Evans cash in exchange for exposing their breasts. According to the witness, Ms. Evans later said she did so in the hallway of a Manhattan restaurant, the letter states.

On another occasion, according to the witness, Mr. Weinstein told Ms. Evans that he would arrange for her to receive an acting job in exchange for oral sex, the letter says. Ms. Evans said she then gave him oral sex, the witness said. **The letter notes that Ms. Evans disputes the witness's account.**

The letter also says a draft email that Ms. Evans wrote to her husband in 2015 contains details of the alleged sexual assault that differ from what she related to prosecutors."

Let me see if I got this one right:

*** **"Ms. Evans" has her own witness.**

*** **"Ms. Evans" disputes her own witness' testimony**

*** **Case is dismissed by a state Supreme Court judge**

(where did I hear the "accuser and her witness cannot agree on facts" lately??)