

Our Letter

**Our Letter No. 9
December 26, 1984**

For the Creative and the Productive

Editors: F.H. Ernst Jr., M.D.
F.H. Ernst III, Architect

Open Letter to
Congressman Barbara Boxer
House of Representatives
Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Boxer,

After reading the November 15, 1984 issue of MEDICAL WORLD NEWS we decided to write you about the following two items:

1. **CHILD ABUSE BY THE BOLSHEVIKS.**
2. **A SAFETY UMBRELLA FOR ALL THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY.**

CHILD ABUSE

The next time you visit one of the KGB legations or embassies, as they refer to them here in the United States, "to break down mutual barriers of distrust", would you please ask them about:

1. Their use of chemical poisons on the children and adults of Afghanistan?
2. Their booby trapping the toys they give to Afghan children, resulting in the killing and mangling of their bodies ?
3. Their practice of soaking the hands and arms of children in kerosene and then setting them on fire when their parents don't tell where the Afghan patriots and doctors are who are fighting the Bolshevik invaders?
4. Their kidnapping thousands of Afghan children "to send to Russian schools?"
5. Their contribution to the mass starvation of Ethiopian children (starvation always follows Bolshevism) and now their stooges feeding off the supplies sent and obstructing the distribution of the needed foods for the millions we here in the United States and other free nations have given?

We're sure you're not suckered in by the lies of the KGB and their local lobbyists. It is with a great sigh of relief that we learn of the Withdrawal of the USA from UNESCO. It was hypocrisy to belong to this KGB run "children's" organization, caring as little as they did about real child abuse and real human rights around the world (see Peter Lengyel report on his 30 years with that outfit).

Of course, we realize the danger to you and your person when they claim you're hurting feelings as you ask these questions. And then too, there is always the possibility they might blame you for making them angry and refuse to talk to you any more. They might even claim you are confusing them with these questions.

You see, in order to understand how the minds of the Bolshevik leaders work, we have to accept the fact that their thinking process is quite different from yours and mine. Whereas you and I, being free people, can be understood in terms of our own individual strivings, ambitions, wants, wishes, fears and guilts; this is not so with the rulers of Russia. The Bolshevik leaders of the Russians live, think, feel and behave as **symbiotically linked, networked psychopaths**. Not one of them uses, is allowed or dares to use his own separate stream of consciousness. **They are, above all, groupy-psychopaths.** This network of symbiotically linked psychopaths is held together by their mutual bonds of blackmail, bribery, bullying, the feeding of their individual lusts and appetites.


Briefly, these symbiotically-linked, power-hungry groupies see all other people, both their own subjects and those they do not yet control as animals to get under and keep under subjugation. They view us as "uncontrolled" people, much as a species of cattle. Their problem with the rest of the human species is its (potentially) strong desire for individual (non-compliant?) self-expression, self-determination, an unwillingness to be regularly herded along and periodically sacrificed to satisfy their lusts. The Bolshevik motives are to satisfy their own appetites and to protect themselves from the reasonable fear that eventually individuals do resent their bullying oppression and will strive to free themselves of it. This human quality of continual striving for self-expression and self-determination, in their view is a "wild streak" and, to put it mildly, IS NOT-OK. Regardless of whether these symbiotic Bolsheviks see themselves as OK or NOT-OK, they do see the rest of humanity as "in need" of the necessary amounts of control and oppression, no matter how harsh, in order to at least hold down these traits of individuality when they are not able to eradicate them. Their Gulags are filled with millions of individuals who, to them are "Not-OK" people. **Their goal is to bring about subservience to their rule.** Thus, in brief, to understand the symbiotic, psychopathic Bolshevik mind we have to keep in mind that they see personal freedom and individuality and those countries where freedom and individuality are valued and protected as NOT-OK, as "THE ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE.

From the Bolshevik's point of view, individuality and countries of the free, Are NOT-OK. Individuals, who think, feel and behave as individuals are truly seen as a danger to this clique of rulers. They themselves can be counted on to think, feel and behave, each member, as a part of a **gigantic symbiotic syncytium**. Biologists call this kind of primitive plant, a **coenobium**. They are organized much like a giant colony of ants. The Bolshevik viewpoint is readily apparent in the diagram on the next page.

HUMAN INDIVIDUALITY THROUGH THE EYES OF THE BOLSHEVIK WARLOADS

As shown in

The OK Corral: Grid for What's Happening



BOLSHEVIK WORLD VIEW SHOWN IN
THE OK CORRAL: GRID FOR WHAT'S HAPPENING


Bolsheviks and their trainees, are extremely gifted at putting the blame for their show of unpleasant feelings onto the other person. Technically, this is called psychological racketeering.

A psychological racket is a very skillfully programmed putdown, what some have even referred to as **THE IMMACULATE PUT-DOWN:**

=====

BOLSHEVIK PSYCHOLOGICAL RACKETEERING DIAGRAM

Individuality is OK



**PSYCHOLOGICAL RACKET DIAGRAM
IN THE OK CORRAL: GRID FOR WHAT'S HAPPENING**

=====

A psychological racket is a repetitive, specialized show of feeling with fraudulent, coercive and intimidating qualities which brings about the outward consent of the victim. A psychological racket is a show of feelings that lacks authenticity, victimizes the recipient and restricts his choices to either inaction or avoidance. From the racketeer's point of view he either gets-rid-of the victim or gets-nowhere-with him, mires him down much like Brer Rabbitt in the famous tar pit. A psychological racket is a specialized show of feeling that places a burden on the other person. Most real individuals use a psychological (put-down) racket at sometime or other in their dealings with others. To use your psychological racket in public is generally considered to be bad manners, to be in poor taste.

BUT the symbiotically organized Bolsheviks and their trainees have become very adept and adroit at using these rackets in their public dealings in unabashed, shameless, intimidating power displays; for the very powerful, dramatic, psychological impacts and damages which these weapons really do cause to so many of their victims. Bolsheviks continually use their assortment of

psychological racketeering weaponry as one of the principal assault weapons in their psychological warfare arsenal: at conferences and at meetings both structured and social. It is almost an addiction with them. Just ask Jean Kirkpatrick.

We do feel that child abuse should be investigated in all lands not just in the democratic countries. Notwithstanding the markedly difficult task of dealing with these racketeers, we request that you, as our Congressional representative, keep these above issues in mind the next time you are sent to one of their embassies.

A SAFETY UMBRELLA FOR ALL OF US

Instead of Nuclear Abuse or Blackmail

I appreciated very much your personal response to my question on candidates' night in San Rafael at the High School Auditorium, Friday October 26th. Your response was: "An anti-missile defense would only be 50% effective." **See Our Letter No. 8.** Actually you missed the point of my question. The High Frontiers anti-missile defense can be 90% effective if allowed to be deployed. The technology and **most of the hardware are already available NOW, non-nuclear Sprint, Midgetman, radar technology, etc.** **High Frontiers** is to be distinguished, you know, from Star Wars where the technology is still in the developmental stage.

I was a little dismayed that night with your slip of the tongue calling High Frontiers, "New Frontiers." As we both know, New Frontiers is a term used by the President of the United States referring to some of his social and political proposals. I'm sure you wouldn't let the fact of the President being from "the other party" influence you against the citizens of our country having a **"SAFETY UMBRELLA"** against the myriads of enemy missiles now aimed at us (see National Security Record, Oct. 1984, Heritage Foundation). "SAFETY NETS" for the 30% "less fortunate" are, we know, important to you personally. We ask: What good will all the SAFETY NETS be if we have no SAFETY UMBRELLA WHEN THE NUCLEAR Missiles start raining down on us. I have not met very many of your constituents who are not concerned for the safety of their families and themselves. Once they learn about the current total absence of any anti-ballistic-missile defense, AND the [lack of] immediate availability of existing technology, they will demand your honest re-appraisal of your priorities. **The fact that there was once such a defense and that it was dismantled (?by Congressional order?) during the Watergate hearings, comes as a surprise to most everyone hearing it. As you know, there hasn't been ANY DEFENSE against incoming missiles since the last base in the Dakotas was dismantled then.** We contrast this with the very extensive Soviet anti-missile defense systems built up over the last five to ten years.

On what basis are you voting against saving 50% (or 90% according to Daniel Graham, Gen, USAF, Ret, author of High Frontiers) of casualties from enemy nuclear missile attack? You mentioned expense. At a conservative 20,000,000 casualties

from such an attack on our undefended country you seem to be **arbitrarily condemning 10,000,000** (50% of 20,000,000); families and individuals, PEOPLE WHO DO NOT NOW NEED A SAFETY NET. No matter how hard Ted Koppel keeps pushing Carl Sagan and that San Quentin doctor, you still cannot persuade us over here in Vallejo that it is better to be slaves than to activate the defenses NOW READY to use as a NONNUCLEAR DEFENSE AGAINST A TREACHEROUS NUCLEAR ATTACK. Is that what you meant to convey? Are you for giving in to the **Helpless-Hopeless amateur psychologists, giving up our freedoms in response to this KGB program?** Do we all have to live through another, a missile, Pearl Harbor? We hope this is not what Congressmen mean by "having (Congressional) compassion for the less fortunate."

At \$5 to \$10 billion to get High Frontiers going NOW, that is \$500 to \$1,000 per preventative maintenance, per saved casualty. **From a purely economic point of view the HIGH FRONTIERS plan has merit;** lives saved, fewer maimings, physical and genetic deformities and radiation sickness. A hospital bed, for just one day, for just one sick or injured person, costs about \$500. (That is if any hospitals are still left standing after such an attack. The Medical World News article on the Afghans told that one of the Bolshevik's favorite targets is any places resembling medical assistance centers.)

On innumerable occasions the Bolsheviks have shown themselves to be unreliable, tricky, ruthless and fully living up to their action mottos of WORLD CONQUEST and THE ENDS JUSTIFY THE MEANS. As any authentic student of Bolshevik history knows, when dealing with people with no conscience, when dealing with psychopaths, it's their deeds, not their words that count. **It is the grossest of misconceptions (and naivete ?) to believe this enemy thinks and reasons in the same way you and I do.** They only use words to charm, bamboozle, fool and take the advantage of any leeway given to them in what we regard as a contractual relationship. They use words as tools for pulling the wool over our eyes, lulling us into complacency, while preparing to take the next slice out our hides.

Your Congressional Office of Technology Assessment: Ashton Carter, Peter Sharfman and John H Gibbons have only brought discredit and shame onto Congress with their MISLEADING, pseudo-scientific, Pentagon security circumventing publication, claiming the non-feasibility of a defense against incoming enemy missiles. **We ask you again how about CONGRESS GIVING THE ENTIRE NATION a "SAFETY UMBRELLA" regardless of the special interest "SAFETY NETS."**

Anyone would have a hard time convincing us that your chief, Tip O'Neill, is preventing Congress from voting FOR a SAFETY UMBRELLA for spite, meanness or political reasons. We don't believe it is your own personal conviction that we all have to burn if the we don't want to; contrary to what so many of TV and Newspaper prominence are inferring we should be ready to do. As if we should be ready to give up our freedoms out of fear of defending ourselves against attack WHILE dealing with the Bolsheviks ? We do want a defense that will spare our children and grandchildren. Incoming missiles "taken out" in the pre-explosion phase will not cause nuclear fall out; should have a very high priority in Congress. I am sure you believe at least half of us deserve to be spared.

Almost parenthetically, the Vallejo Taxpayers were very sorry you were not able to join us on our candidates night, October 18th last. Twenty-five or so calls by various members of our association were made to your offices to invite you, calls made over a period of 3 months. These members were, you might guess, quite upset at the total breakdown of any responsiveness from any of your district offices during that last four weeks of intensive efforts to inform you of that event. People over here hold you in high regard; could never be persuaded that you take Vallejo for granted or were just ignoring the constituents from here.

For your information you are also referred to OUR LETTER No. 8 of 10/29/84, copy previously sent your office and to the book BAD GUYS and PSYCHOLOGICAL RACKETEERS by Franklin H. Ernst, Jr. M.D.

Copyright © 2009
Franklin "Harry" Ernst III

Permission is hereby granted to any person, magazine, newspaper, other periodical, or media to reprint this monograph in any single issue of the periodical in question, so long as two conditions are met: (1) the monograph is printed word for word, including diagrams, figures, and footnotes, and (2) the following reference is given at the bottom of the first page on which the reprinted article begins:

"This article is taken from OUR LETTER No. 9, titled "Open Letter to Congressman Barbara Boxer", December 26, 1984. Published by Addresso' Set Publications, P.O. Box 3009, Vallejo, California 94590."