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Civil Rights
(An extract from the September, 1963, Bulletin of The John Birch Society)

On Pages 28 and 29 of the Blue Book is a transcript of what we said five years ago about one part of the Communist strategy for taking over our country. It included the following passage.

The second method would be by fomenting internal civil war in this country. . . .

In fact, it is clear that the Communists long ago made plans to have this method available, in whole or in part, to whatever extent it might be useful. The trouble in our southern states has been fomented almost entirely by the Communists for this purpose. It has been their plan, gradually carried out over a long period with meticulous cunning, to stir up such bitterness between whites and blacks in the South that small flames of civil disorder would inevitably result. They could then fan and coalesce these flames into one great configuration of civil war, in time, if the need arose. The whole slogan of “civil rights”, as used to make trouble in the South today, is an exact parallel to the slogan of “agrarian reform” which they used in China. And the Communists, who are pulling innocent and idealistic Americans into promoting this agitation for them, have no more real interest in the welfare of the Negroes and no more concern about the damage they actually do to our colored population, than the Chinese Communists had with regard to the welfare of the Chinese peasants. But you do not have to take our word for any of this. Let’s go straight to the horse’s mouth. In 1928 a Communist named Joseph Pogany, direct from Moscow, presented to the American Communists their program of racial strife. And writing under the name of John Pepper (one of his many aliases), he put it all down in a small pamphlet entitled American Negro Problems. In this treatise appear such guidelines as the following, with emphasis in the original:

“The struggle against white oppression of the Negro masses is a part of the proletarian revolution in America against capitalism.”

“The ‘black belt’ of the south . . . constitutes virtually a colony within the body of the United States of America.”

“The Negro national liberation movement has tremendous revolutionary potentialities. . . .”

“The Communist Party of America must recognise the right of national self-determination for the Negroes and must respect their own decision about the form of the realisation of this self-determination. The Negro Communists should emphasize in their propaganda the establishment of a Negro Soviet Republic.”

It was in about 1920 that the Communists had invented the slogan and begun their drive “against colonialism”, and for “self-determination”. For more than forty years they have been setting up native Communist guerilla bands in one so-called colonial area after another, to begin a demand for “independence” and “freedom”. In almost every case some European power was giving the “colony” both enlightened and beneficial rule, with the standards of living, of education, and of native participation in government, all rising gradually and as rapidly as the gains could be absorbed. And the natives, feeling themselves more and more a part of the nation to which the “colony” belonged, wanted no part of “independence”.

It was not until after all the chaos of World War II, therefore, and in its aftermath, that the Communists began to make any headway with this gigantic scheme, even in China. Even then, the natives everywhere had to be terrorised by these Communist guerilla leaders and their bands, through the massive use of atrocities and tortures, into giving enough support to the drive for “self-determination” to support any pretense that it was a civil war. And this pretense was necessary so that the British Colonial Office and our State Department, and other Communist-infested beds of treason to their own countries and to civilisation, could start giving their powerful help to the “underdogs” who were “fighting for their freedom and independence”.

Thus the once stable, prosperous, and happy colonies of French Indo-China and Dutch Indonesia and the Belgian Congo and dozens like them have been “liberated”—this being the technical Communist term for the transformation of such colonies from their former status into cruelly oppressed colonies of the Soviet empire. In this process, steadily repeated in one area of the world after another, the Communists have made the fullest and most vicious possible use of every conceivable racial or religious difference that could be fanned into bitterness and strife. Yet even then the massive cumulative terror and tortures, with which their agents have killed off literally millions of formerly peaceful natives in these “colonies” in order to impose “liberation” on them, has undoubtedly exceeded, in both cruelty and in the number of victims, all previous crimes put together, of all the most tyrants within men’s recorded history. (The Communists themselves have made this determination easy, because they have wanted both the extent and the brutality of their fiendish cruelties and mass murders known, the better to serve their purpose of frightening all opposition into hopeless obedience.)

With this far-too-brief exposition of the formula in mind, please note that the Communists were already planning—as far back as 1928!—to apply that formula to the “Dixie” states of our own country. They were already making their purpose and their strategy clear, to all who followed the Communist
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Keeping Up With The Times

The London—no, not the New York—Times devoted more than nineteen column inches to besmirching, with subtle dexterity, the John Birch Society and its founder, Mr. Robert Welch. Could this have been motivated by our thesis on No Co-Existence?

On the same day, June 2, in the next column, The Times reported that on June 1 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled as unconstitutional “two loyalty oaths required by the state of Washington from university and school teachers and all state employees .

The first oath, required of all teachers, included the phrase ‘reverence for law and order and undivided allegiance to the Government of the United States’. The second required all state employees to declare that they were not members of the communist party or ‘knowingly of any other subversive organisation’.

In a second decision, the court ordered the Alabama Supreme Court to take all necessary steps to permit the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People to do business in that state. The N.A.A.C.P. has not been allowed to function in Alabama since 1956 . . .

Dr. J. B. Matthews, a leading authority on communist fronts, testifying before a state legislative committee in the U.S.A. in 1958, stated: “Public records show that 145 of the 236 persons, or 61 per cent, listed as national officers of the NAAACP have records of affiliation with communist organisations”.

A Newspaper Relaxes

On the principle apparently of allowing an assistant in a sweet shop to glut herself on sweets so that she will lose interest, The Daily Telegraph of June 26 carries several items of real news and comment.

Dorian Williams described a visit to Soweto, a township near Johannesburg built by the Government for the Bantu, which is a thriving and salubrious community. Their guide who was personally opposed to Dr. Verwoerd told them of a journalist whom he had recently shown round and who had been much impressed. “When he said he hoped that he would report favourably the journalist, who represented a well-known British national newspaper, replied that unfortunately he was unable to do so as he had been sent out to report adversely."

A doctor who has had experience of South Africa and is “conscious of the evils of apartheid” protests against the part taken by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the “hysterical” outcry over the sentence on Mandela, “in contrast to the printed rejection slip I received to my plea to the Archbishop for prayer for the victims of the Hungary trials.” He asks, “Where is reason?”

A British Guianese housewife, on holiday in Britain, gives a forthright comment on the government of her country. She says, “Ours used to be a happy country where six races lived side by side in peace. Africans and Indians had no racial feuds, but it suited Dr. Jagan and his party to set these races at each other’s throats to further the cause of international communism.” She ends with a statement of loyalty to Britain saying that the British Guianese have no desire “to exchange the Union Jack for the Russian hammer and sickle.”

A leader, headed “Chaotic Congo”, notes that the last of the U.N.O. forces will leave the Congo on Tuesday (June 30th), saying, “Four years ago they came to a country in chaos; so it has largely remained and thus they now leave it.”

One might say that this was a mission accomplished. The Daily Telegraph merely says that Thombe is “an able man who pursued a sensible policy of collaboration with Western capital and skill”.

Other headlines are, “Khruschev flaunts his atheism in quip”, and “Mikoyan boasts of arms for Indonesia—Better than Britain’s”. A paragraph also describes how Chinese “diplomats” are pouring money and advice into the Congo “to increase the difficulties facing Mr. Adoula’s Government”.

All this amounts to a formidable conspiracy against order and truth for the benefit of communist power, and the newspaper has done well to report some of the events and evasions that are really taking place.

CIVIL RIGHTS (continued from page 1)

line, by the use of their shibboleth phrases, “colony”, “self-determination”, and “liberation”, exactly as they are using these same semantic weapons today. And you can form a very clear idea of what is really planned for both the peaceful Negroes and the patriotic whites in our south-eastern states by what the Communist FLN did to both the eight million Moslems (who wanted no part of “independence” from France), and to the one and a quarter million patriotic Frenchmen, in Algeria. Since our State Department’s great friend, the Communist Ben Bella, was duly established in power—with all the prestige of our Government behind him—literally hundreds of thousands of the native Moslems who had remained loyal to France have been mercilessly tortured and killed.

In 1935 two other Communists, James W. Ford and James S. Allen, brought the Moscow line with regard to the “racial question” in America up to date, in a pamphlet entitled: The Negroes In A Soviet America. Here is a revealing quotation from that blueprint for the future:
"The Communists fight for the right of the Black Belt territory to self-determination. This means not only that the Negro people shall no longer be oppressed but shall come into their rightful position as the majority of the population in the Black Belt. It means equally the right of the Black Belt republic freely to determine its relations to the United States."

The booklet explains that, when the proper time comes, the Communists may either help the Negroes to set up their own Negro Soviet Republic in the South-east, before the whole United States has been sovietised; or that the Communist-led Negroes might first help to establish a Soviet central government over the whole United States. In the latter case, says Messrs. Ford and Allen, "one of the first steps of the central Soviet government will be to grant the right of self-determination to the Negro people in the Black Belt." And we might add that this question of which comes first, the American Soviet chicken or the Negro Soviet egg, appears still to be unsettled in the top councils of the Communist bosses. But there is no question about the plans to establish such a Negro Soviet Republic.

The New York Times of Sunday, March 7, 1954, published a long article outlining the contents of the "new draft program" for the Communists in the United States, which had just been issued in mimeographed form by Communist Party headquarters. (Despite the mimeographing, the Party's announcement said that the statement would be issued in a million-copy edition.) The following specific "policy goals" of the "new party line" are well worth notice in passing.

Identifying of 'anti-Communism' with 'pro-fascism'."

"Stigmatising all efforts to check and root out Communist subversion and Soviet espionage as 'McCarthyism' and 'McCarthyism' as 'American fascism.'" [Does this line sound familiar to Birchites? Only the word has changed!]

But the important Communist goal for our present discussion is:

"Achieving 'full support' for 'the fight for the liberation of the Negro nation'."

Finally, in this very small selection out of an immense total of the warning rattles that have been heard from the Communist rattle-snake, let's note what the Negro, Manning Johnson, tells us he was taught when he was a very important member of the Communist Party:

"Stirring up race and class conflict is the basis of all discussion of the Communist Party's work in the South. Black Rebellion was what Moscow wanted. Bloody race conflict would split America."

When the Communists tell you in advance what they are going to do and how and why and where, and you know they mean it because they are officially laying down the strategy for their own people; when the Communists can then be seen, over the years, making all preparations for, and leading up to, the carrying out of these schemes; when the Communists then start doing exactly what they have foretold and planned—you still find supposedly intelligent people saying: "Oh, we agree it is all horrible, but we don't believe the Communists are behind it!" And the only appropriate comment seems to be:

"How stupid can you get?"

According to The London Times, in a statement of a few years ago, a larger percentage of the Negroes in the United States acquire college educations than the percentage of Englishmen in the British Isles. According to the leading Negro-American magazine, Ebony, in a statement of a few years ago, the United States had made greater strides in solving satisfactorily a difficult race-relations problem than had ever been made by any other nation. According to a wealth of reliable statistics from many dependable sources, the living standard of the Negroes in the United States is not only higher than that of Negroes, or of the members of any black or brown or yellow race, anywhere else on earth; but it is higher than that of the total populations, of whatever color, of at least a hundred of the some hundred and ten nations of the world.

This writer was raised on a farm of 525 acres in the South. On one side of my father's farm there was a farm of about a hundred acres which belonged to a middle-aged Negro. He was a good farmer, a good neighbor, and highly regarded by everybody. In time of sickness, or stress or sudden need—as from flood or drought calling for extra hands or teams, or quick repairs—the good relationship worked both ways. The fact that we never dreamed of inviting him to supper, or vice versa, bothered him not at all. He had his social friends, his church and his school, and we had ours. And he and his friends would have been as reluctant to change that arrangement as we and our friends would have been—because it is more natural and more comfortable for human beings generally to be with their own kind.

But the point is that even then—fifty years ago—opportunities for advancement were already opening up, in every area of activity, for the American Negro who was thrifty and industrious and ambitious. And in every case I ever knew about, the white neighbors of any such Negro wished him well, and helped him along if they could. It was the white people, mostly of the South, who did so much to help Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver, and Lawrence Clifton Jones, in their noble efforts to help members of their own race to "get ahead", and to become more useful and prosperous citizens.

Since that time the Negroes of the United States have made tremendous strides. Today the American scene is full of Negro doctors and merchants and lawyers and teachers and preachers; of Negro bank presidents, and college presidents, and presidents of large insurance companies, and presidents of industries of every kind. This success has been achieved with the help and good will of white people; and despite one tremendous and increasing obstacle over the past three decades, which has been recognised by only a few. This obstacle has been the efforts of the Communists, by every conceivable means, to discourage Negro ambition and prevent Negro success in business or the learned professions: For every Negro millionaire and every highly respected Negro lawyer or doctor has been a serious handicap to the Communists' shrill unceasing propaganda about the downtrodden race, and to all of their plans to make capital out of racial differences. Up until the present progress of the Communists, and their present power in high places, had closed most of these mouths with fear, almost every really successful Negro could have told you of roadblocks thrown across his path by Comsymps—usually other Negroes—who did not want him to succeed. But the opportunity in America was simply too great for those who really wished to take advantage of it—and succeed they did, by the tens of thousands.
There is no slightest question but that the Negroes alone in America today own more homes, have more automobiles, have more bathtubs, have more television sets, own more pianos, have more churches, subscribe to more magazines, have more savings, carry more insurance, and probably spend more on clothes, than the total population of Soviet Russia, which is many times larger. (Herbert Hoover has pointed out that the 15,000,000 Negroes in the United States actually own more automobiles than all of the 150,000,000 Negroes in Africa plus all of the 200,000,000 Russians in Russia put together.) And their only conceivable complaint—which not one percent of them were making or wanted to make until the Communists began to build and fan fires of resentment—was that in some parts of the country some of their fellow citizens preferred to have separate but equal facilities. And even this discrimination was surely but slowly breaking down, with regard to public facilities, wherever Negroes earned the right by sanitation, education, and a sense of responsibility, to share such facilities—in the schoolroom, or on a train, or on a municipal golf course.

In the light of all of the above, what are we to think of the raucous cry of “freedom”, being raised by and over many Negro assemblages as the goal they are seeking? The implication, of course, is that those demanding freedom are now in slavery. But the idea being planted is that of a separate and “independent” Negro nation.

What are we to think of the trucks full of innocent Negro children, trained to shout their pleas for “freedom”, without having the slightest understanding of what they are doing, or of how they are being exploited?

What are we to think of the placards demanding a Negro Soviet Republic, which have been carried by Negro pickets at some recent organised “demonstrations”? What are we to think of an Attorney General of the United States who says the Government “has no evidence that any Negro assemblages as the goal they are seeking? The implication, of course, is that those demanding freedom are now in slavery. But the idea being planted is that of a separate and “independent” Negro nation.

What are we to think of the trucks full of innocent Negro children, trained to shout their pleas for “freedom”, without having the slightest understanding of what they are doing, or of how they are being exploited?

What are we to think of the placards demanding a Negro Soviet Republic, which have been carried by Negro pickets at some recent organised “demonstrations”?

What are we to think of an Attorney General of the United States who says the Government “has no evidence that any top leaders of the major civil rights movement are Communists or Communist-controlled”, in view of the long Communist-front records and pro-Communist activities of many of these leaders and of their associates and assistants?

What are we to think of the fact that every “civil rights” demonstration or riot or proposal is glorified in the Communist press as a huge victory or a glorious undertaking in the Communist action program?

What are we to think of the recent “march on Washington”, and of any similar “spectaculars” in the future, in view of the injunction currently being hammered home in the Communist press that one of their great needs now is “to put masses in motion”, and that the other is to get Negroes “out onto the streets” and keep them there?

What are we to think of the incredible distortions in reporting, and even vicious outright lies, of the Establishment’s “kept” press, with regard to the actual riots that are instigated, such as those in Oxford, Mississippi or in Birmingham? When, as in Mississippi, the rioting was deliberately caused and precipitated by a bunch of hooligans sworn in as federal marshals, obviously in accordance with designs formed in Washington.

The answer is easy, and is the same, to every question. It is that the Communists are running the whole show, for their own purposes, and exactly in accordance with the plans they have laid out, announced, and perfected since this racial agi-