

THE WORLD IN FALSE-FACE,

PART I

by Professor Revilo P. Oliver

July 1986

The current issue of "News of the New World" (Honeydew, South Africa) contains an excerpt from the issue of "Special Office Brief" for 20 June 1985. It is a clear statement of an important element in the elaborate swindle that is called "democracy."

The ambiguously named "Special Office Brief" is the confidential and extremely expensive report of a private intelligence service that is the successor of Kenneth de Courcy's ill-fated "Intelligence Digest." It is now published in Dublin for security from harassment by the gang of aliens and traitors who presided over the liquidation of the British Empire and are now presiding over the liquidation of Britain itself.

The editor, commenting on the function of the persons whom the public in a "democracy" regards as its political "leaders" and thinks it has chosen as Prime Ministers or Presidents, observes that "They are presented to us as actors. A great actor may portray Napoleon on the stage brilliantly without possessing the smallest knowledge of military strategy. He is an actor and we see only the actor. We know nothing of the real person behind the actor.

"Today the world's office holders are schooled by professionals, physically made up by experts, and produced on the screen by show business directors. The real person is deliberately concealed both in respect of his or her true physical appearance and as to his or her abilities.

"The speeches are written by professionals who themselves have no constitutional responsibility. Few, if any, statesmen now in office are capable of appearing on a public platform without make-up to deliver an explanatory speech about world affairs. Moreover questions and answers for television interviews are (for the most part) pre-arranged. The public never sees or hears the real person and cannot judge what the statesman himself really knows, believes or plans. (Furthermore, in the English House of Commons the true relevance of questions and answers and still more the worth of them is lost amidst a shouting and screaming staged for effect -- rather stupidly. The idea is to give an impression that a minister is caught out or confused.)

"Only a handful of people meet in private persons who hold exalted positions. They are not supposed to relate their genuine impressions or if they do are never again invited. Time and time again we learn only long afterwards that such a visitor discovered a Minister to be virtually ga-ga and to be a mere puppet. (It was only years afterwards that we learnt that when still Prime Minister Churchill had little idea where he was or what the conversation was about. We were told only long afterwards whereas one would have thought the British Nation was entitled to know that its Prime Minister was no longer mentally functional.)[\(1\)](#)

"It is very tough on Democracy to deprive it of a fair and true picture of the persons who aspire to lead it. One wonders whether it is proper for democracy to be invited to vote for Saatchi & Saatchi's make-up edition of a Minister without being permitted the least glimpse of the Minister as he or she really is. Ought we to be required to vote for the actor of a part rather than the true person? One does wonder. But the true person we now never see or hear. We see a made-up face and dyed hair and we hear a speech written by someone other than the speaker. We see a presentation arranged by show-business experts [and] rehearsed under tuition with intent to mislead and deceive us. Politics and show business are now inseparable. Perhaps that is why the stage idol we vote for turns out in practice to be a hopeless fool.

"Saatchi & Saatchi and the like are paid millions to produce an image and to conceal the reality. We vote for the image and then wonder why the image does not come up to the expectations aroused by its speeches which were also made-up and not the composition of the idol.

"Everyone concerned knew exactly what such persons as George Washington, William Pitt, or Gladstone really were. Only a tiny inner circle has the least idea of what our contemporary public personalities are composed. If we judge from the extent of make-up and stage management the reality must leave a good deal to be desired."

(In copying the foregoing, I have reproduced oddities of diction and punctuation that are surprising in a British writer.)

The editor's description of the "democratic process" holds true for all of the Aryan nations that God's Master Race is now liquidating, but the editor was, of course, immediately concerned with Maggie Thatcher, the "shabbat goyah" who now rules the ruins of Great Britain for the Jews. She is the English counterpart of our Ronnie, and although she did not have his experience as an actor in low-grade motion pictures, she had a natural talent for histrionics and was easily trained for her role when, as Colin Jordan says in his excellent article, "Kosher Queen of Britain," in "Spearhead" for June 1985, a team of theatrical experts "got to work

on her: her hair, face, clothes, voice, gestures, situations (namely the arrangement of 'controlled walkabout situations' where she was filmed talking to 'ordinary people' and doing vote-fetching things)."

The theatrical experts trained the unscrupulous and clever, but fundamentally stupid, actress so well that, as Mr. Jordan says, "when the day of the great political sale arrived, and her promoters took their perfected product to the general election, this plasticized personality leapt to the top of the political pop-chart, and the Conservatives won the day." (Readers need not be told that there is nothing conservative about the gang of thieves and traitors in Britain who, in well-staged competition with other gangs, call themselves "Conservative" because the name enables them to enlist and exploit the demoralized and befuddled debris of the aristocracy and gentry who once made Britain Great, and to jabber about "free enterprise" and "privatization" as they sell, for the profit of the Jews, the industries that their "Labour" counterparts took from the owners and "nationalized" a few years ago.)

That Maggie was sold to the stupid British in the same way as soap and hamburgers is well-known in England. Even a periodical devoted entirely to business, "International Finance," in June 1984 remarked that "Margaret Thatcher's use of the Saatchis to mastermind her election campaign in 1979 marked the first selling of a British candidate by a professional advertising agency." If the editor of the journal had been interested in strict accuracy, he would have written, "The Saatchis' use of Margaret Thatcher," the synthetic image of a woman whom they had manufactured for the purposes of their predatory tribe.

The Saatchis, now recognized as "the leading British advertising agency," are a pair of porcine Sheenies, whose parents left Iraq a few years after the European catastrophe of 1945 and fastened themselves on the muddled and bewildered British. Within ten years after the brothers set themselves up as experts in "advertising" (i.e., coaxing boobs), they had seventy-four branch offices throughout the world and were taking in \$941,000,000 a year. Stupid people think such phenomenal success by Yids is won by business acumen and hard work.

Maggie is a well-trained "shabbat goyah" and a highly profitable investment for her creators. The Saatchis have been given a virtual monopoly of advertising for the British government, and it is known that just one such deal, the contract for British Airways, brought them a net profit of about \$6,147,000 in 1983. (I have not seen figures for later years.) And the Jews from Iraq have even commissioned a portrait of Maggie, painted by an artist named Hans Hacke, in which the actress is surrounded by other products of the Saatchis' advertising business and even by disks that bear portraits of the big Sheenies' repulsive features. But it is only natural for manufacturers to label their products.

Enriching the Saatchis is only a small part of Maggie's function, however. It is also well-known in England and even admitted by the press that she "prefers" Jews for public office, and her "predilection" for them is explained by the disingenuous remark that "They share her approach to life." It would be more honest to say that she has been taught her masters' approach to plunder. She has filled the government that rules Britain with grinning Kikes, most of whom try to disguise themselves under such pseudonyms as "Nigel Lawson" and "Leon Brittan," to name only the present Chancellor (who presides over the occupied nation's finances) and the Home Secretary (who controls the police, immigration, and what is called "national security"). Among the many other disguised Yids who are hastening the liquidation of the English people are "Sir"(!) Keith Joseph, Minister of "Education," Stuart Young, who operates the "British" Broadcasting Company, and "Sir"(!) Alfred Sherman, who teaches Maggie what to say when she pretends to have opinions of her own on public issues. To be sure, a few Anglo-Saxons, servile witlings devoid of self-respect, are included in the government for the sake of appearances.

In sum, what the British see of the "British" government is a stage show produced by the world-conquerors to keep their serfs amused and to provide a screen behind which they work their will on the country they have occupied. And, as Colin Jordan points out, Maggie so enjoys performing on the big stage that she sacrifices her own children and even sent her daughter to be petted in a "kibbutz" in the Chosen People's Chosen Land, the future capital of a world they are making One. Like all actresses, of course, Maggie is a star for only a season. When the public becomes tired of her act as Britain's Prime Ministress, she will be replaced by an actor or actress who is now being trained for a debut as a political "leader," probably billed as playing for either "Labour" or the "new" party called "Socialist Labour."

What was odd in the quotation from the "Special Office Brief" above is the editor's use of the term 'democracy' as though it designated a present form of government. As everyone knows, or should know, if words are used for their meaning, and not as sounds that soothe unthinking persons, a democracy is possible only when the franchise is very strictly limited to the comparatively small minority of citizens who have the intelligence, interest, and leisure to consider national policies rationally and with some forethought for the future. When the mass of inhabitants are all permitted to vote, the government becomes an ochlocracy, which necessarily becomes a kakistocracy, since the ignorant and stupid mass will, of course, be manipulated and herded by swindlers and thugs who use the techniques of advertising and evangelism to make the dumb brutes "want" to perform as their masters wish.

In a kakistocracy, such as Little Britain and the United States, it is specially important to keep the big herd of eventual victims amused with exciting melodrama until it is feasible to drop pretense and rule by sheer terror. The editor of "Special Office Brief" mentioned the secrets of the dressing rooms, where the actors are prepared for their parts, but failed to continue with at least some mention of the kind of plays for which the cast was chosen and trained. His omission is odd because he must have remembered Maggie's most thrilling performance, one which gave an illusion of reality to many Englishmen, who were spellbound during the performance and cheered the new Sarah Bernhardt enthusiastically, believing that she actually was the character she enacted and that time had turned backward in its flight.

It is understandable that Englishmen were deceived by a performance that was novel for them and in which they desperately wanted to believe, but American observers, who could be objective and had seen such melodramas on their own stage, recognized a standard plot and mise-en-scene. It was from the first perfectly obvious that the purpose of the British expedition to recover the Falkland Islands from Argentina was to appeal to the manhood, patriotism, and national self-respect that has not yet been totally extinguished by the occupation government, and thereby to create the impression that the government was still British. Saatchi & Saatchi were going to make their creation appear an "Iron Lady," a miniature Elizabeth I.

The ploy was begun, of course, by semi-officially intimating to the government of Argentina, hard pressed by economic pressures put upon it by world Jewry, that Argentine occupation of the British islands would please the traitors in London who had for so long presided over the liquidation of the British Empire, and would be glad to see Britain despoiled of yet another possession. The occupation, it was indicated, would meet, at most, with only a "pro forma" protest. I have no doubt but that agents planted in Argentina pointed out to General Galtieri that occupation of the islands, to which Argentina had a tenuous claim, would greatly enhance his government's prestige and popularity. He stepped into the neatly prepared trap.

From the very first, observers who had read enough in Argentine publications to know that the government there was rashly showing itself insufficiently obsequious to the Master Race, anticipated that the British expedition would be successful and that the defeat of Argentina would overthrow its semi-independent government and permit its replacement with one selected by the race that is conquering the world by deceit and treachery. Every attentive observer knew that was going to happen, just as in his childhood he had known that when the heroine fell over a cliff at the end of one episode in one of the old-fashioned "serials" in the motion pictures, she would somehow be rescued at the beginning of the next week's episode to permit the show to go on.

=====NOTES=====

(1) The editor's reference to mental deterioration (as distinct from mere intoxication) evidently applies to the period 1951-1955. So far as I know, the medical diagnosis of Churchill's condition is still secret, but the symptoms belatedly reported by rumor remind one of the early symptoms of recrudescence of syphilis in his father, Lord Randolph Churchill. The well-known British historian, David Irving, has written what is doubtless the first honest biography of Winston Churchill, but the publishers have broken their contract with him and no other publisher dares to take the book, since everyone knows what happens to commercial publishers of books that do not bear the Kosher seal of approval. One wonders what the Jews feel they must keep secret about their half-English stooge. The publication of his correspondence by the Oxford Press has made it clear that after 1929 Churchill's income depended on the Jews, who had saved him from bankruptcy and took care of his finances thereafter, and it seems unlikely that there can be much to be added to what is already known about the man's ruthlessness, duplicity, cowardice, and piggish manners off stage.

PART 2

A secondary purpose of the naval expedition to the Falklands, of course, was further to increase the indebtedness of both nations to the international usurers and thus to make even more hopelessly unalterable the slavery to which they had been cozened into reducing themselves and from which they can escape only by repudiating their national debts, expelling their parasites, and taking back the property that was filched from them.

The Falkland show in Britain's national theatre was an overwhelming success, and Maggie's performance attests her ability as an actress. The play reached its expected denouement, as called for in the script, and there remain only a few details that are still obscure. It will be remembered that one British ship, the "Sheffield," was destroyed and many British seamen killed because its "secret" electronic equipment had been purchased from a manufacturer who sold the same equipment and the "secret" of defeating it to Argentina. One does not know whether that was in the script and planned to inflict a major loss on Britain and kill more British soldiers and sailors, or merely ordinary exploitation of both sides by international parasites and their confederates.

It had been so long since Englishmen had seen an ostensibly patriotic act by their government that we readily understand why they mistook the show for reality, but there is less excuse for Americans on the "right wing" who began to argue over the question whether Britain or Argentina had the better title to the islands, as though

that were relevant. They should have known better: Americans had seen such shows so often that the plot had become hackneyed.

As everyone now knows, Washington for years conducted a mock war in Korea for the purpose of getting many young Americans killed or crippled for life, vastly increasing debt-slavery to the international usurers, oppressing the tax-paying serfs with more crushing taxation, and convincing the world that the United States was a horde of imbeciles, not a world-power, as it had seemed after it wrought the European catastrophe in the service of Jewry. That melodrama had the appeal of novelty, and it was so well staged that the performance seemed real, even to men in Military Intelligence, for many months, and, as will be remembered, General MacArthur was so naïf that he imagined that the alien government in Washington would permit Americans to win the war. When he was recalled and the Congress failed to impeach the sleazy, half-White shyster(2) in the White House, no rational observer could longer entertain a hope that they were witnessing more than a costly extravaganza to delude the boobs while afflicting them. And thereafter, any pretense of "anti-Communism" by the cast on the stage in Washington was obviously only ranting by bedizened players on a stage, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

The act was repeated in Vietnam, when the peanut-headed peanut-vendor who was then serving as chief "shabbat goy" pretended that some shots had been fired at an American vessel by the Communist vermin whom the United States government installed in Indo-China when it betrayed the French at Dienbienphu. (Whether or not such shots were actually fired is an irrelevant detail.)

The script for this act was well-plotted, and an objective critic of stagecraft must commend the cleverness of the playwrights, who filled the stage with mobs of young punks and hooligans to protest the "war in Vietnam" because dear Mongolians were being killed, thus creating a murky atmosphere in which rational objection to the obscene and bloody farce could be stigmatized as "pro-Communist" -- as though anyone could be more pro-Communist than the directors of the pseudo-war, who had, of course, contrived it to kill and cripple many more young Americans, vastly increase the profits of usurers, provide ample boodle for politicians, and irreparably disgrace Americans in the eyes of the rest of the world. It was obvious from the first that a crushing defeat of Americans had been planned,(3) and it is even possible that the show was from the first written to include the importation into the United States of great swarms of our racial enemies, some of them seasoned veterans of the Viet Kong, who are impatiently awaiting the time to exhibit here their skill in torturing White men, while the rest of the filthy immigrants merely hate and despise us for what we did in their country and for the feeble-mindedness that admitted them to "our" country. The extravaganza in Vietnam was an unqualified success, a theatrical masterpiece.

Some details of the show remain in doubt. It is well-known, at least since the publication of James Fallows's "National Defense" (New York, Random House, 1981; see pp. 76-95), that American troops in Vietnam were supplied with rifles (designated M-16) that were accompanied by ammunition for which the rifle had not been designed and which, as the manufacturers of the rifle explicitly informed the Defense Department, made the rifles frequently malfunction. The ammunition, which could have been designed to make a rifle jam very frequently and in such a way that the rifle could not be made serviceable again in the conditions of combat, thus effectively disarmed many young Americans and made it safe and easy for Mongolians to kill them. Since the conscripts had been shipped to Vietnam to be killed or crippled (if they did not first die of the Oriental diseases to which they were knowingly exposed), perhaps the question of why the American victims were given that deadly ammunition doesn't matter very much, but some of us may nevertheless be curious. Wicked "racists," indeed, think it regrettable that the government that rules them directly caused the death of a great many young Americans who were killed in combat and probably facilitated the capture of the young men whom Washington naturally left to rot in Communist captivity while paying "indemnity" for our "war crimes" to our implacable political and racial enemies.

The investigation by Mr. Fallows made it certain that the Defense Department well knew that the ammunition it insisted on supplying was costing the lives of many young White men, who had been conscripted for the fake war. What is uncertain is whether the ammunition was specifically designed, as it could have been, to maximize the killing of young Americans, or was designed to make it procurable from only one manufacturer and thus ensure handsome profits to the executive officers in the Defense Department, in keeping with what has been the great tradition in our "democracy" ever since the newly formed Republican Party promoted the war of aggression against the Southern states and grew rich from vast corruption and looting of the national treasury while supplying the invading troops with defective arms, shoddy clothing, and rotten food. The example was set by Lincoln's Secretary of War, Simon Cameron, of whom it was said that the only thing he would not steal was a red-hot stove. (He, by the way, will always be remembered for his concise definition, "an honest politician is one who stays bought.") (4) After the invasion of the South to gratify the blood-lust and malevolence of the Abolitionists and the greed of "financiers," it became axiomatic that Americans should be induced to wage "righteous" and therefore self-defeating wars as often as feasible, because wars yield such lovely loot for God's People and their accomplices. (5) So it may be that the young Americans were killed merely to increase boodle in Washington.

Since the full-stage performance in Vietnam, Americans have been entertained by some entr'actes, notably the farce on the bump in the Caribbean called Granada,

which the yokels thought proof that old Ronnie was "anti-Communist," and the comedy now being played in Nicaragua, with some sense of dramaturgy. Packs of holy men, filled with Christian hatred of our race and civilization, are constantly howling for the dear Communists, whom the United States put there in the first place by undermining and overthrowing the civilized government of the little country, while old Ronnie registers "anti-Communist" sentiments and wants his tax-paying animals bled some more to subsidize the "contras" until it is time to betray them to their enemies, with the treachery that has been habitual and notorious in American governments since 1945. An objective observer must know that the comedy will end with the Communists firmly in control of Nicaragua, as part of the well-planned and scheduled Communist encirclement of the United States. The completion of that encirclement is deemed requisite as a precaution against a belated revolt by the Americans before the occupation of their country has been fully consolidated and their plight made patently hopeless.

The little shows in San Salvador and Nicaragua are only entr'actes, like those staged in the Eighteenth Century to hold the attention of the audience while scenery was shifted behind the curtain and the players changed costumes in preparation for the next act of the real drama on the boards. It is not entirely clear how soon these entertaining interludes will be followed by another full-scale production. It would seem that Ronnie is under orders to drive a big herd of his American cattle into the Mediterranean to help God's Race kill Semites, but it is not clear how the requisite mindless enthusiasm can be generated in the American livestock. It appears that several good opportunities were allowed to pass, perhaps because "public relations" experts reported that the American populace remained stolid and disinclined to become righteously bellicose.(6)

As I write, Ronnie is trying very hard to provoke the Libyans by acts of the lawless aggression that the world expects from the Jews' big colonial possession in North America, and it has just been reported that an American plane, violating the territorial integrity of Libya, has been shot down, either by a Libyan plane or, more probably, an American plane suitably disguised for the purpose. But the boobs still seem apathetic, and as yet no Aryan covets the honor of sending his son to die for Yahweh's brood.

It occurs to me that a clever playwright may have produced a scenario calling for the assassination of our favorite ham actor by an agent of the C.I.A./Mossad combine, suitably disguised as an agent sent by Muammar al-Qaddafi, the Libyan who is so evil that he does not worship the Masters of the World. The assassination of Jackanapes Kennedy was very successful, and, despite a few minor slips in the performance, produced the desired results. (Cf. "Why They Killed Kennedy," reprinted in "Liberty Bell," February 1982). But it will not be easy to repeat that "coup de theatre." There are important, perhaps, crucial

differences. Kennedy was a young vulgarian who had expert cosmeticians and had been trained to appeal to fatuous women, who called him a "dear boy," some because they did, and others because they did not, know of his sexual omnivorousness. Old Ronnie is sadly shelf-worn by now and no one, not even a sentimental woman, could imagine that he was "cut off in his prime." The Kennedy show owed much of its success to a really talented actress, Jacqueline, who gave a superb performance at the funeral. So far as I know, Ronnie does not have anyone who could display convincing lacrimation after his demise, and I doubt that Americans are ready to boo-hoo all over the streets and countryside, if deprived of their Ronnie. (7) It may be they are becoming "blase. So perhaps some other scene is planned for the opening of the new play.

One wonders whether any theatrical ploy, however clever and spectacular, could again rouse Americans to the frenzy of righteousness that made them run amuck in 1917 and 1941. Despite much babble about "peace-keeping operations" and "fighting Communism," they bore the treasonous operation in Korea with a kind of stoical resignation, and the more flagrant treason in Vietnam has left them with a bitter taste, although they do not perceive how and by whom they were betrayed or how they were used to further the Judaeo-Communist conquest of the world. There is, so far as I can learn, a general disinclination to repeat such bloody folly. But any optimism must be tempered by allowance for the hypnotic power of the boob-tubes.

The editor of "Special Office Brief" was certainly right about one thing: in what is so deceptively called a "democracy," the public is permitted to see only a world in false-face, a theatrical production with hired actors in the service of the hidden powers who rule. And so long as the ignorant victims are befuddled by the primitive Christian drivel about "equality" and want "majority rule," they will suffer the fate they have brought upon themselves -- until the illusion ends and they have at last to face the terrible reality of a universe that has no pity for fools.

=====NOTES=====

(2) For the racial composition of Truman, it will suffice to look at the portrait of his parents that appeared in "Life," 5 July 1968. His mother was evidently a White woman, so by the Jews' strict criteria, he was not a Jew.

(3) The exact way in which the defeat would be arranged was not clear. When I wrote in June 1965 an article in which I considered the possible ways in which the fake war would be ended after it had been prolonged for some years to assure the maximum loss of American lives and squandering of American resources, I listed three possible solutions: (1) "finally the United States will slink out of Vietnam, probably after paying a handsome tribute to one of the standard 'coalition

governments' for the privilege of doing so" -- this, of course, was what was done in 1973, eight years later. The alternatives were: (2) "Mao Tse-tung (or his successor) will stride on the stage, as soon as Washington gives him the cue, and mouth a few threats.... The curtain will come down on the old farce of peace-by-surrender amid thunderous applause -- except, perhaps, from the hundred thousand or so spectators who may remember that their sons or husbands lie in unmarked graves in an enemy land"; and (3) "Washington could...arrange American defeats...followed by a war with Communist China, which, although begun with an exchange of winks between Peking and Washington, would be a real war in the sense that many Americans and Chinese would be killed.... An American army in Asia (which would, of course, have to keep Washington informed of its exact position and the state of its defenses) could have dropped on it some really first-class nuclear bombs, manufactured (as were the first Soviet bombs) in the United States or, possibly, in the Soviet Union.... Missiles from Cuba could produce some damage and much terror (such use of Cuba was undoubtedly contemplated when the State Department installed the Communists there)." The desperate situation of the United States would authorize another alliance with the Soviet Union, "this time to 'save the world' from the yellow beasts in Peking." This third alternative would have permitted the final liquidation of the American suckers. I ended with the observation that of the three alternatives I had listed, "At the moment [in June 1965] No. 1 seems the most likely, while No. 3 seems positively apocalyptic. The important point is that Americans can expect "only" defeat so long as they are commanded by their enemies." That is still tragically true.

(4) Cameron regretted that so many politicians did not remain loyal to the criminal who first bribed them, but were always ready to sell out any briber to a higher bidder. He thought that immoral. Oddly enough, Cameron may have been the most honest member of Lincoln's cabinet: at least he did not always hide behind a screen of canting hypocrisy, and I think it likely that he, unlike his more cautious and wily successor, Stanton, would have refused to be the manager of the assassination of Lincoln, when the time came for it.

(5) For a nice example of some looting by "Barney" Baruch and his gang, see "The Saga of Hog Island," by the distinguished and courageous American historian, James J. Martin (Colorado Springs, Ralph Myles, 1977).

(6) The best opportunity, it seemed to me, came when the huge battleship "New Jersey" was close inshore and using its eighteen-inch guns to kill Lebanese, chiefly Druses (Duruz), who perversely do not want to be killed by Yahweh's Bandits. The ship could have been destroyed by internal explosions, and many experts could have been found to prove, for a small fee, that the Druses had destroyed it with a super-rocket or a super-torpedo or a submarine mine. Americans have forgotten the "Maine," which, whether by plan or a fantastic

coincidence, provided so satisfactory a "casus belli" for the attack on Spain, and I think destruction of the "New Jersey" would have produced some sentiment for a righteous Crusade against the supposed authors of it.

(7) Assassination of Ronnie is in the air in governmental circles. A highly respected lawyer reports in the "Champaign" [Illinois] "News-Gazette," 6 February 1986, that a party of Americans went secretly to Vietnam and Laos and located forty-five of the young Americans who were taken captive by the Communist government there and naturally left to suffer there by the Judaeo-Communist government here. Terrorists from Washington confiscated the party's documents and threatened them with dire consequences if they disclosed what they had learned in Laos. One member of the party, who has passed several tests with a sphygmomanometer ("lie-detector"), says that the threat that silenced him was a promise to "frame" him for an attempted assassination of Reagan.