

The Years of Betrayal

BY J. B. MATTHEWS



FOR more than one hundred and fifty years, the name of Benedict Arnold served a clear and single purpose. It was our nation's one and only symbol with which to express in a concrete and personalized manner the act of betraying one's country.

To us school kids of fifty years ago, Benedict Arnold was the sum total of disloyalty to country. He personified treachery. We believed, mistakenly of course, that the obloquy surrounding his name would deter, for all time to come, any highly trusted government official or any humble private citizen from following in his faithless steps.

We had many great and towering patriots (more, it seemed, than any other country in the history of the world); but of traitors we had only one. By the time most of us had reached the third grade, we knew the story of Arnold's perfidy. When primary and secondary educators in America were not afraid to indoctrinate the minds of the young with the noble sentiment of love of country, we were proud that, in the

formative years of our national independence, only one man had sunk so low as to attempt to betray America.

Now, that has all been changed in the brief span of twenty years. The school children of tomorrow will find their American history much more complicated — if they are allowed to study the subject at all. Instead of the simple picture of ten thousand illustrious patriots and only one traitor, they will be asked to view an America in which, for one generation at least, traitors were commonplace and, at times, made everyday headlines. They will surely wonder how this could have happened.

Let us go back a half century to a typical American schoolroom and imagine the teacher asking the question, "Who was it, pupils, who tried to betray America?"

The entire fifth grade of forty pupils replied instantly and in unison, "Benedict Arnold!" (I know because I was in the fifth grade of that American schoolroom fifty years ago.)

Now, let us go forward a generation — 1984 or any other year — and imagine the teacher of a fifth-grade class of forty pupils asking the same question, “Who was it, students, who tried to betray America?” Bedlam and babel, not unison, follow. If some mechanical device could unscramble the voices and the answers reflecting the diversity of viewpoints in what has come to be called the democratic way of life, we might hear the following:

“Whaddaya mean, America?”
(From a progressive student.)

“Whaddaya mean, betray?” (From a like-minded brat.)

“Julius and Ethel Rosenberg.”

“Aw, shut up, they wuz framed.”
(This, in reply.)

“Harry Dexter White.” (Probably from a Republican kid.)

“White? Shucks, he was murdered by the Un-American Committee.”

“Lee Pressman.”

“Nuts, he wrote Labor’s Magna Carta.”

“Frank Coe.”

“How’s about the Fifth Amendment?”

“Alger Hiss, don’t forget him.”

“Didn’t Dulles appoint him something’ or other?”

“Harry Gold, he got a raw deal.”

“Victor Perlo.”

“Nathan Gregory Silvermaster.”

“Klaus Fuchs.”

“Nonsense, that guy Churchill protected him.”

“Harold Ware, he started it all.”

“Harold Glasser.”

“What about Harold Velde and the Bill of Rights?”

“John Abt.”

“Nathan Witt.”

“Henry Collins, Jr.”

“Elizabeth Bentley.” (From an anti-anti-Communist.)

“Edwin S. Smith.”

“Charles Kramer.”

“John Stewart Service.”

“Owen Lattimore.”

“Joe McCarthy.” (From one infected with Trumanism.)

“Maurice Halperin.”

“Irving Kaplan.”

“David Weintraub.”

“Yes, the whole United Nations.”

“The New Deal.”

“Naw, it was the reactionary, fascist-minded politicians.”

“Remington.”

“Solomon Adler.”

“Michael Greenberg.”

“George Silverman.”

“Lauchlin Currie.”

“Zionism.”

And so on, endlessly, and in utter confusion — if the school kids of tomorrow reflect the views of their parents and grandparents.

SOME of the kids will wonder why so many traitors were coddled and promoted by men in high political office and, even when exposed and convicted, were the recipients of staunch support or maudlin sympathy from so many thousands of prominent citizens in all walks of life.

They may think — if progressive education has not done away with that unique function of the human mind — that the politicians of the opposition party were blind leaders of the blind when they refused stubbornly to raise the issue of traitors in government positions, when raising the issue would have counted for most. In the midst of the presidential campaign of 1940, one candidate for office wrote: "There are not less than two thousand outright Communists and Party-liners still holding jobs in the government in Washington." Those were not the words of Wendell Willkie, however. Willkie, like his Republican successors who ran for the presidency, side-stepped the issue of Communist infiltration in the Federal Government. Those were the words of a Democrat — Martin Dies. Dies' estimate of two thousand traitors in government jobs in Washington was conservative. Since he made that estimate, twice that number have been removed, on grounds of security, from Federal Government employment.

In October, 1941, Martin Dies submitted to Attorney General Francis Biddle a list of 1124 Federal Government employees who were Communists or fellow travelers and whose records indicated the need for a thorough investigation by the FBI. The names of Alger Hiss, Donald Hiss, Harold Glasser, and Harry Dexter White were on that list. All of them remained in govern-

ment employment for years afterwards.

Typical of the characters in the Federal service who were exposed by Dies was a man who held the important position of deputy administrator of the Wages and Hours Administration. This man had written an article in a Communist magazine, in which he said: "Tell them they and their fancy pieces of paper and the whole capitalist shell game can sink and be damned. Tell them that we've got another war on, closer to home, a war to establish a workers' peace, a workers' government." (This man's name is not given here because of a reliable report that he has quit the Communist movement.)

FOR six and a half long and weary years, Martin Dies tried to alert the American people to the fact of Communist infiltration of the Federal Government. Every Gallup Poll taken on the subject showed that the people supported Dies overwhelmingly, a fact which is often forgotten by those whose thinking and memory have been conditioned by the editorials of the *New York Times*, the *New York Herald-Tribune*, and the *Daily Worker*. For example, the Gallup Poll of November 19, 1940, asked the question, "Do you think the Dies Committee should be continued?" The answers were: Yes, 65%; No, 7%; and No Opinion, 28%. Among those Americans who had an opinion about the

Dies Committee, the vote was almost ten to one in favor of the Committee.

The votes of confidence given Martin Dies and his committee by the members of the House of Representatives were consistently overwhelming, usually running about ten to one. Democrats and Republicans alike gave Dies their enthusiastic support; although the Republicans had a larger percentage favoring the committee and its work.

The belief, held in some quarters, that the issue of subversion in government can be made into an issue between the two major political parties is largely untenable. Senator Joe McCarthy has repeatedly stressed the fact that Democrats are as loyal as Republicans. The issue of Communist infiltration into government is non-partisan; the guilt for toleration and blindness with respect to this infiltration is bi-partisan. Essentially, the situation is mixed and highly confused. The issue cannot be fought out on strictly party lines. If the Republicans have their Joe McCarthy and Richard Nixon, the Democrats have their Martin Dies and Pat McCarran; and the whole American people, regardless of party lines, have their J. Edgar Hoover.

ONE of the most important documents ever issued by a committee of Congress is entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments." It is a report of the Subcommittee to Investigate

the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws, issued on July 30, 1953. The chairman of the committee which issued this sensational document is United States Senator William E. Jenner of Indiana. The report was a unanimously approved document, signed by five Republican and three Democratic senators. Credit for preparation of the report belongs to Robert Morris, the committee's chief counsel, and Benjamin Mandel, the committee's director of research. Any anti-Communist who has not taken the time to read and digest this report can hardly claim to be other than ignorant of the facts about the traitorous infiltration of the Federal Government by Communists during the past twenty years. It is something of a blot on American journalism that no newspaper has seen fit to reprint this report in its entirety. (The author is eager to be corrected on this latter statement.)

As of the middle of November, 1953, it appears that Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., has started a first-rate political brawl by his famous Chicago speech in which he laid responsibility at the door of Harry S. Truman for promoting a known Soviet agent, Harry Dexter White, to a position of larger importance and higher salary. Any political debate in which Harry S. Truman of Pendergastville is involved is certain to be a brawl. Any Democratic politicians who elect to

put a stamp of approval on Truman's action in the matter of Harry Dexter White must share his responsibility.

What the situation with respect to this political brawl will be by the middle of January, 1954, or early November, 1954, can hardly be predicted. If it turns out to be a real slugfest, the education of the American electorate is certain to be advanced.

It is quite possible, however, that the Republicans, running true to form, will back away from the Brownell-Truman controversy, and thus deprive the electorate of the education to which it is, and has been, entitled for twenty years. Already, a United Press dispatch from Washington has announced: "President Eisenhower today expressed hope that the issue of Communists in government would be a matter of history, rather than of continuing controversy, by the time of the 1954 congressional elections."

The Democrats can, if they wish, do a lot of talking about how sensitive or alert Dwight D. Eisenhower has been on the question of Communist infiltration, on the basis of his pre-presidential record. If Harry S. Truman is fair game, so is Dwight D. Eisenhower; and all allegations in both cases go to the question of alertness, not loyalty.

IT IS FAIR, for example, to call attention to the fact that one of Eisenhower's collaborators in the

writing of his book, *Crusade in Europe*, was Joseph Barnes, then the foreign editor of the New York *Herald-Tribune*. For many years prior to this collaboration, the pro-Soviet record of Joseph Barnes was notorious.

Sworn testimony concerning Barnes is now voluminous. It was spread on the record by the McCarran Committee of the United States Senate. That record is worth some scrutiny.

Louis Budenz testified: "I did know Mr. Barnes was a member of the Communist Party." (page 541)

Robert Morris, counsel for the McCarran Committee, then asked Budenz: "Did you know that from personal encounters, as well as from official conferences of the Communist Party leaders?"

Budenz answered: "Yes, sir." The next several pages contain a description by Budenz of his meeting with Barnes and his knowledge that Barnes was a Communist.

Whittaker Chambers testified: "In that unit [meaning an underground unit of the American Communist Party which was meeting in a house belonging to Field's mother somewhere in Central Park West, New York City] were Frederick Vanderbilt Field and Joseph Barnes." (page 490)

Alexander Barmine testified before the McCarran Committee that General Berzin, head of Soviet military intelligence, spoke to him of Owen Lattimore and Joseph Barnes

as "our men," "meaning military intelligence."

Robert Morris asked Karl Wittfogel: "Doctor, was the conversation that you had with Mr. Barnes the kind of conversation that would take place between two people who accepted each other as Communists?"

Dr. Wittfogel replied: "He told me about the work he and Mr. Field had been doing in building up the student movement in Harvard which was under Communist influence." (page 286)

Hede Massing testified that when she was in conversation in Moscow with "a kind of NKVD official" named Peter Zubelin, she was perturbed at the presence of Joseph Barnes. Zubelin said to her: "Barnes? Oh, you needn't worry about Barnes." (page 244)

Following the testimony of Whitaker Chambers concerning Joseph Barnes, Robert Morris observed: "Mr. Chambers is now the fourth witness who has identified Mr. Barnes as a member of some Communist unit and Communist organization. . . ." (page 491)

DURING World War II, Joseph Barnes was employed in a key position in the Office of War Information. If that fact is to be held against the Democratic Party as a whole, then it is logical to emphasize that he was also employed by General Eisenhower in the writing of his book.

When Joseph Barnes left the New York *Herald-Tribune*, he became editor of the New York *Star*. By a striking coincidence, the New York *Star* of August 18, 1948, carried three feature stories on its front page. One story recorded the death of Harry Dexter White; another one reported the testimony of Alger Hiss in denying that he was ever a Communist; and the third was captioned, "Eisenhower Angered By College Probe Plan." The Eisenhower story led off with the following sentence: "Dwight D. Eisenhower, president of Columbia University, last night vehemently denied that the university, its staff and its textbooks bore any taint of Communism." In the interview which Eisenhower gave Joseph Barnes for the *Star*, he is directly quoted, as follows: "I found no traces of Communism among the deans, professors, and the rest of the staff at Columbia, and I met them all."

It would be interesting to learn how Eisenhower can tell whether or not a person is a Communist by "meeting" him.

Two of the faculty members of Columbia University, Gene Weltfish and Bernhard J. Stern, refused on the ground of self-incrimination to tell the McCarthy Committee last year whether or not they were members of the Communist Party. Both were on the Columbia University faculty during the Eisenhower presidency. Both have long

been known as Communists; and both were brought to the attention of Eisenhower by the New York *Journal-American*. In fact, a gathering of the American Legion, meeting in New York City on February 6, 1949, resolved to send a delegation to see Eisenhower personally about Gene Weltfish, Bernhard J. Stern, and other Communists on the Columbia faculty. Eisenhower declined to see the delegation — a rather interesting fact in view of his willingness to be interviewed by Joseph Barnes on the subject of Communists at Columbia.

Another Columbia University faculty member whom Eisenhower undoubtedly met was Professor Goodwin Watson. During the war, Watson held a high position with the Federal Communications Commission in Washington. When his long record of pro-Communist activity was brought to the attention of Congress, both the House and the Senate voted to attach a rider to an appropriation bill specifying that no part of the appropriated funds could be used to pay the salary of Goodwin Watson. This was clearly a "bill of attainder," and the Supreme Court subsequently so held; but the Court's decision in no way nullified the facts of Watson's long record of pro-Communist activity. The congressional exhibits establishing his close connections with the Communist movement filled 64 printed pages.

While General Eisenhower was

president of Columbia, the Red government of Poland offered to give the university \$30,000 with which to establish a chair of "Polish cultural studies." When Eisenhower accepted the gift, Dr. Arthur P. Coleman, for twenty years an assistant professor of Polish language and literature at Columbia, resigned in protest.

In an editorial entitled "Coddling Communists at Columbia," the Chicago *Herald-American* declared that the net effect of General Eisenhower's action in accepting Professor Coleman's resignation was "to put an anti-Communist out of the Columbia faculty and to let an alleged Marxist in."

TO TAKE a final example, Cedric Belfrage was press control officer at General Eisenhower's headquarters in Europe. Today, Belfrage is under a deportation order as an alien Communist. He has long been resident in the United States, and has been widely known as a Communist. His biography of the Rev. Claude Williams, a Communist Party member under the name of "John Galey," was written some fifteen years ago and disclosed Belfrage's Moscow ideology.

What does this all add up to? Simply, that Dwight D. Eisenhower has not always been alert to the facts of Communist infiltration.

John Foster Dulles played a decisive part in the selection of Alger Hiss as president of the Carnegie

Endowment for International Peace. Dulles had heard the widespread rumors of the Whittaker Chambers allegations concerning Hiss; but his investigation of the rumors was somewhat perfunctory and, consequently, he was badly deceived, with the result that the Carnegie Endowment was greatly embarrassed.

The naked truth about Communist infiltration is that, until fairly recent years, it was accomplished with amazing ease. In all professions, as well as in government employment, it was carried out successfully under the careless eyes of both Republicans and Democrats. The American people as a whole were ignorant of the operations of the Communist conspiracy, thanks largely to the poisonous pro-Communist propaganda channeled to them through the media of the mass communications. This was, of course, particularly true of the period of World War II when highly placed persons in all walks of life permitted themselves the costly illusion that the Soviet Union was an honorable ally.

ONE of the most ghastly acts of mass murder of all time, rivaling any ever perpetrated by Genghis Khan, was the Soviet murder of more than four thousand Polish Army officers and intellectual leaders in the Katyn Forest Massacre of May, 1940. Army intelligence in the Pentagon had a full and accurate report on the massacre from an Amer-

ican infantry officer, Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., who had been to the scene of the graves. The fact of the horrible brutality of the Soviet murderers was deliberately kept from the American public for years. The full facts were not revealed until a special committee of the House of Representatives published its report on the Massacre, December 22, 1952, more than seven years after the Pentagon, under the authority of Maj. Gen. Clayton Bissell, suppressed its information.

Mr. Elmer Davis, so-called news commentator, who is one of the most hysterical of the anti-anti-Communists' smear bund, was, the reader may remember, head of the Office of War Information. The recently published report of the House committee has this succinct statement concerning Mr. Elmer Davis: "Mr. Davis, therefore, bears the responsibility for accepting the Soviet propaganda version of the Katyn Massacre without full investigation." The committee might have added that Mr. Davis was also responsible for disseminating the Soviets' "big lie."

The published facts about the successful Communist infiltration of the Federal Government have already run to encyclopaedic proportions. There is, in fact, a veritable library of hundreds of volumes on the subject. They make shocking reading, and constitute a terrible indictment of the carelessness and blindness (in the face of clear warnings) of a lot of individual Demo-

crats who believe themselves to be anti-Communist.

Two of the most sinister Communist penetrations of official Washington were into the staffs of Senate committees: the committee headed by Senator Gerald P. Nye which investigated the munitions industry, and the committee headed by Senator Robert M. LaFollette which purportedly investigated civil liberties. Nye and LaFollette were Republicans, although it must be said in fairness to the Republicans that they were not "regular."

The Nye and LaFollette committees did incalculable harm; but they were the special pets of all stripes of left-wingers and were, therefore, never subjected to the abuse which has been the lot of the congressional committees which have exposed Communists and Communism.

Alger Hiss worked on the Nye committee, as a legal assistant.

John Abt, Allan Rosenberg, Charles Flato, Herbert S. Schimmel, and Charles Kramer worked on the staff of the LaFollette Committee. All five of these men invoked their privilege against self-incrimination when they appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

Harry Magdoff, a Fifth Amendment case, served as consultant for the Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business.

Henry H. Collins, Jr., also a Fifth Amendment Communist, was direc-

tor of the Senate Small Business Committee.

Frederick Palmer Weber, who wouldn't say yes or no to the \$64 question, served on the staff of the House Committee on Interstate Migration. Charles Flato also served this committee of the House.

Alfred Van Tassel, who invoked his privilege against self-incrimination, was attached to the staff of the Senate Small Business Committee.

Margaret Bennett Porter, another who invoked the Fifth Amendment, was a staff member of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce.

IN THESE key positions on the staffs of Congressional committees, these persons who invoked the Fifth Amendment were able to "color" information and to "rig" the hearing schedules in such a way as to shut off anti-Communist testimony. The report of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security says: "In other words, the work of these staff members was slanted in every way possible to force Congressional opinion and reports in directions they would not otherwise have taken."

It will be remembered that the monstrous piece of legislation known as the Wagner Labor Relations Act was passed by an overwhelming vote of Congress, many Republicans joining the Democrats in its enactment. This legislation, which greatly facilitated the Communist infiltration of labor union organizations, was drafted by Lee Pressman, an admitted mem-

ber of the Communist underground cell in Washington.

The National Labor Relations Board was a veritable nest of Communists. Edwin S. Smith, a member of the Board, has been identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party. The chief executive officer of the NLRB was Nathan Witt, a member of the Communist underground cell in Washington. In 1940, Martin Dies called attention to the fact that fifty-five of the NLRB attorneys were members of the National Lawyers Guild. Last year, Attorney General Brownell officially cited the Guild as a Communist organization.

According to the report of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, the Office of Strategic Services included within its ranks the following persons who invoked the Fifth Amendment against self-incrimination: Leo M. Drozdoff, Irving Fajans, Maurice Halperin (Chief of the Latin American Division), Jack Sargeant Harris (in charge of military intelligence of South Africa), Julius J. Joseph, Paul V. Martineau, Carl Aldo Marzani (Deputy Chief of the Presentation Branch), Leonard E. Mins, Helen B. Tenney, Milton Wolff, and George S. Wuchinich. Much of this Communist infiltration of the OSS took place while a distinguished Republican was at its head. In some cases, notably those of Milton Wolff, Carl Aldo Marzani, and Leonard E. Mins, the facts of their Communist affilia-

tion were known long before there was any OSS.

HARRY DEXTER WHITE was not a lone Communist in the Treasury Department. His Communist associates in Henry Morgenthau's Treasury staff included Frank Coe, Harold Glasser, Victor Perlo, Irving Kaplan, Solomon Adler, Abraham George Silverman, and William Ludwig Ullmann.

On December 15, 1941, the Secretary of the Treasury issued the following order: "On and after this date, Mr. Harry D. White, Assistant to the Secretary, will assume full responsibility for all matters with which the Treasury Department has to deal having a bearing on foreign relations. Mr. White will act as liaison between the Treasury Department and the State Department, will serve in the capacity of adviser to the Secretary on all Treasury foreign affairs matters, and will assume responsibility for the management and operation of the Stabilization Fund without change in existing procedures. Mr. White will report directly to the Secretary."

That is quite a sizable delegation of authority to a Soviet spy; but there is the record. The dates are important. Two months prior to the issuance of this order by the Secretary of the Treasury, Martin Dies sent the name of Harry Dexter White, as a suspected Communist, to Attorney General Francis Biddle. On November 17, 1953, when he

appeared as a witness before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, J. Edgar Hoover disclosed the fact that the FBI interrogated Harry Dexter White in March, 1942. According to Mr. Hoover, White "spent more time in denouncing investigations of Government employes than he did in furnishing facts." It is now pertinent to ask for whatever FBI report on Harry Dexter White, as a result of this interrogation of March 1942, was made to Secretary Morgenthau.

The resuscitation of the case of Harry Dexter White by Attorney General Brownell has served to explode, for all time, one of the main contentions of the anti-anti-Communists. These unwitting helpers of the Kremlin conspiracy have been yelling for the abolition of all Congressional investigations of Communists, and demanding that the entire matter be left to the FBI. That the FBI is powerless to effect the removal of Soviet agents from government employment is crystal clear in White's case. The FBI did all that was within its proper function and authority; but, despite this, White's promotion went through.

Those imaginary school children of 1984, about whom we speculated at the beginning, may think it strange that the people — the sovereign people with power to make political decisions — heeded the voices of scores of radio and television commentators who persisted in throwing the protective cloak of their false

interpretations around the persons of traitors. Or unbelievably strange that the sovereign people should be guided by lying newspaper reports of the most crucial events affecting the security of the nation.

THESE children of tomorrow will never be able to comprehend the viciousness of the attacks made upon those who exposed the traitors and their operations, attacks made by large and influential sections of the press, radio, television, school, and church. To make the observation explicit, they will never comprehend the editorial slant of the *New York Times*, the *New York Herald-Tribune*, the *New York Post*, the *Washington Post*, and the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. They will never understand that Drew Pearson once had a radio and newspaper following. Or believe, except on documentary evidence, that such pro-Communists as Johannes Steel and William S. Gailmor were for years permitted to sell their ideological wares on the air waves. It may be entirely beyond the powers of their comprehension that a so-called First Lady of the World once wrote a syndicated newspaper column whose chief ingredients were tripe and calumny — and unfalteringly on the wrong side of the issue of subversion. They may be inclined to doubt, until shown the record, that Robert Maynard Hutchins was once the chancellor of a great American university or that the Reverend G. Bromley Oxnam

and the Reverend John A. Mackay were top-ranking ecclesiastics.

The calling of the entire roll of that vast company of opinion-makers who have perverted their functions, however unwittingly, to the uses of the Communist traitors would nauseate many of my contemporaries and certainly be incomprehensible to many of those in the generation to come.

In closing, it is fitting that credit

be given to a distinguished Democrat, Representative Howard W. Smith of Virginia. Congressman Smith is the author of the Act which bears his name and under which the leaders of the Communist Party have been convicted and jailed. Congressman Smith's anti-Communist alertness led him to write that legislation in 1940, long before the Johnny-come-lately's discovered the Communist menace.



"I always want your mother to feel at home, darling, and she can do that by staying there."

Did Lincoln Dream of His Death?

BY
JERRY KLEIN

DID Abraham Lincoln ride knowingly to his death the night he went to Ford's Theater in Washington? There's reason to believe Lincoln had forebodings of his own doom the evening in 1865 that he was murdered.

"I believe I feel trouble in the air before it comes," he'd told his secretaries. And on the afternoon of the day he was shot, just five hours before the tragedy, Lincoln told his Cabinet they would soon hear some "important news."

They observed that the President looked especially grave as he said he'd again had the dream which so often preceded important national events. In the dream, Lincoln saw himself in some strange vessel, drifting quickly toward some "indefinite shore."

Lincoln told his Cabinet he'd had the same ominous dream just before the battles of Bull Run, Stone River, Antietam, Gettysburg, Wilmington, Vicksburg and Fort Sumter.

An old friend of Lincoln's had said the President long believed he would be suddenly cut off at the height of his career and the fullness of his fame. The friend added that Lincoln fully expected he would

fall by the hand of an assassin.

To Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, which helped to focus attention on the abuses of slavery, Lincoln said: "I shall never live to see peace. Whichever way the war ends . . . I shan't last long after it's over."

And to a Boston newspaperman, Lincoln had said a year before his assassination: "I feel a presentiment that I shall not outlast the rebellion. When it is over, my work will be done."

Partly to please Mrs. Lincoln, the President had long carried a heavy walking stick tipped with iron bolts taken out of *Old Ironsides*. Mrs. Lincoln thought the stick would help her husband protect himself should he be attacked on one of his frequent night walks to the War Department. But Lincoln had said nothing would foil a serious attempt to kill him.

So the President warned his Cabinet to expect "important news." And afterward, Navy Secretary Gideon Welles noted: "Great events did, indeed, follow."

Lincoln had gone calmly, perhaps knowingly, to meet destiny in a box at Ford's Theater.