

University of Mississippi

eGrove

---

Pamphlets and Broadsides

Citizens' Council Collection

---

2-20-1964

## Civil Rights and the Negro Revolution

William J. Simmons

Follow this and additional works at: [https://egrove.olemiss.edu/citizens\\_pamph](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/citizens_pamph)



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Simmons, William J., "Civil Rights and the Negro Revolution" (1964). *Pamphlets and Broadsides*. 10. [https://egrove.olemiss.edu/citizens\\_pamph/10](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/citizens_pamph/10)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Citizens' Council Collection at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pamphlets and Broadsides by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact [egrove@olemiss.edu](mailto:egrove@olemiss.edu).

Release at 12:00 Noon, Honolulu Time (4:00 p.m. CST) Thursday, February 20, 1964

*This copy given at meeting Mar. 4-65 in Assembly Hall by Citizens Council*

GREATER LOS ANGELES  
CITIZENS' COUNCIL  
P. O. BOX 75795  
LOS ANGELES 5, CALIF.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE NEGRO REVOLUTION

A Lecture

by

William J. Simmons

Editor of THE CITIZEN

Official Journal of The Citizens' Councils of America

Presented at

THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Thank you for inviting me to the University of Hawaii. It is a pleasure to visit these beautiful islands and a privilege to meet with you during your "civil rights week" discussions.

You are residents of our newest state, while I come from one of our oldest. I do not know how long the term "civil rights" has attracted widespread attention in your state. In mine it has been hotly controversial for a hundred years. I think it has quite different meanings in Hawaii and Mississippi.

I am a guest in your state, and as such I respect your customs. I welcome your desire to know more about the customs in my state. And this is good, for the understanding of customs leads to the understanding of people, and the understanding of people is perhaps the highest wisdom attainable by man. Certainly it is the most useful for an intelligent ordering of human affairs. Custom does not exist without reason. Rather, it is the product of reason, developed by our ancestors from their hard-earned

knowledge and distilled by the experience of many generations into well defined rules of conduct.

Several things impress the visitor about your state in addition to its natural beauty. One of course is its distance from the mainland, but perhaps the second would be the fact that, of all the states in the Union, Hawaii is the only one having a non-Caucasian majority. This may or may not have affected your point of view on the civil rights controversy emanating from continental America. In any event, it is a matter which I think we can profitably discuss together to our mutual interest and enlightenment.

If, for purposes of comparison, we may consider the federal district set aside for the national capital as a state, it too has a non-Caucasian majority. But there any similarity between the District of Columbia and the State of Hawaii ceases. Your ethnic majority is of Asiatic derivation, while that in Washington is of African descent.

Here we have the interesting situation where two of the three races of mankind predominate in separate states of a nation which was founded and is controlled by the third. We may learn something of profit about civil rights by first comparing the record of our African majority in the District of Columbia and our Asiatic majority in the state of Hawaii, and then looking at the negro problem as a whole. For let us speak frankly, the term "civil rights" would not exist at all if it were not for the fact of the negro race having become deeply involved in Caucasian power politics.

Later I would like to call your attention to the historical evolution of "civil rights," because the problem cannot be understood without such background. However, for the moment, let me simply describe "civil rights" as having been understood to mean legal rights during the post-Civil War period; then the term became synonymous with racial integration from the middle nineteen-thirties until recently (many people still belatedly cling to this concept); and now it has been unmasked by "civil rights" leaders themselves as the negro revolution.

I do not know to what extent, if any, the people of Hawaii have identified themselves with the civil rights struggle now raging in the rest of the country. If any have done so as an emotionally sympathetic identification with the imagined position of the American negro, they are in error. For even a cursory examination of the historical facts regarding civil rights will show that they do not concern people of Far Eastern ancestry in any way whatsoever. The contest over civil rights concerns solely the apparently insolvable problem of Caucasian-negro relations in the continental United States.

Mention of the idea of comparing Hawaii and the District of Columbia brings several points of difference immediately to mind. Most striking perhaps, is that despite the obvious racial heterogeneity of Hawaii, serenity prevails here while chaos reigns in the nation's capital. If one were to inquire as to the reason, he would have to find in all honesty that the answer lies deeper than in the over-simplified platitudes of modern environmentalist sociology.

The problem scarcely exists in Hawaii, where the number of

negroes is negligible. According to the 1960 census it was only 4,943, or eight-tenths of one percent, of your total population. By contrast, people of African descent comprise fifty-four percent of the population in the District of Columbia, and forty-two percent in my home state of Mississippi. Thus, our respective conditions are totally different.

Let us examine the record further. In Washington, D.C., which was exhorted by President Eisenhower to be a model of racial integration for the nation to follow, the school system has been wrecked. Prior to the United States Supreme Court's 1954 school integration decision, the Washington schools were segregated, and the white schools at least ranked well above the national average in terms of pupil achievement. You are familiar, I am sure, with what happened after the schools were integrated, and I will not go into detail here. Suffice it to say that discipline was ruined, the negro students pulled classroom work to their level, which lagged from two to four years behind that of the white children. Failure of the negroes to compete on favorable terms with white children resulted in anti-social attitudes. These attitudes then turned to outright savagery. Mistreatment and abuse of white children, especially girls, broke out of control. Vandalism and destruction of property became rampant.

The white people of Washington, most of whom work for the government and probably tend toward a theoretical liberal persuasion, voted in the only way they knew—with their feet and the moving van. An exodus of such proportions took place

that the Washington schools have become virtually re-segregated. During the ten-year period of 1950-1960 almost a quarter of a million whites voted for segregation in this manner by moving out of the District of Columbia to white suburbs in Virginia and Maryland. Eighty-five percent of the Washington public school enrollment is negro. The fifteen percent white enrollment is concentrated in the northwest part of the city where high government officials live in exclusive all-white neighborhoods while they order military invasions of the South to force us to do what their wealth and position enable them to avoid.

Negro hostility has become so aggressive in the school system that it boiled up into a full scale race riot at a football game on Thanksgiving Day, 1962. Northern papers tried to pretend race had nothing to do with it. But Washington police knew otherwise. School officials wondered why it had not happened sooner.

On the streets of our nation's capital life and limb are endangered. When you visit Washington, friendly porters at your hotel will warn you against venturing on the streets after dark. On Capitol Hill itself vicious muggings and other assaults are common. Conditions have become so bad that even the United States Supreme Court, in an act suggestive of ironic retribution, found it necessary to circulate a bulletin to its female employees last year advising them to obtain police escorts to the official parking lot or to hail a taxi when leaving the building after dark.

No one, not even the most ardent advocate of negro-white integration would deny that negroes are responsible for this condition.

Nor is Washington any exception. Throughout the North in major urban centers where the negro congregates the situation is almost identical.

The negro has been responsible for crimes at about three times the national average since the early days of our country. His propensity for law-breaking, especially for major crimes of violence, seems to increase with the greater permissiveness of the presumably integrated Northern urban environment. For example, Myrdal showed that the negro crime rate in the South in 1939 was 185% of the regional average, whereas in the North and West it was 463%. A similar calculation for 1950 showed 206% in the South and 429% in the North and West. Last year the Federal Narcotics Commissioner reported that an incredible 59% of the nation's drug addicts are negroes, virtually all of them in the North.

Various attempts have been made to excuse the negro's tendency toward crimes of violence by his being at the bottom of the economic ladder, a place he has occupied, incidentally, in every society he has lived in since recorded history began. This argument is easily refuted by the fact that the negro has made spectacular economic gains in recent decades, yet his crime rate has increased. The record of negro criminal tendency is so long and any attempt to attribute it to unfavorable environmental factors is so flimsy that one cannot avoid the conclusion that the cause must be genetic in origin.

This is all the more impressively reinforced by recent outbreaks of savage violence within the "emerging nations" of Africa.

These aimless outbreaks had no apparent motive other than to satisfy a spontaneous impulsiveness. Many of the unfortunate victims were liberal missionaries who had spent years urging us to integrate with these people. Furthermore, a comparison with other ethnic groups will also refute the contention that negro crime is due to poverty.

Shortly after the turn of the century impoverished Russian Jews crowded into the slums in New York. Their living conditions and incomes were substantially lower than those of most negroes today. Yet their crime rate was well below the national average.

Another case in point is offered by the Oriental population of the United States. Although many live under adverse conditions, their delinquency rates are low. In San Francisco, for example, the crime rate among Chinese-Americans is less than one-half that for the rest of the city.

Another problem often mentioned in connection with the chaos integration has brought to Washington is the deficiency in negro scholastic performance. Psychometric testing has consistently shown a major lag in negro intelligence behind the other races. The most comprehensive survey on comparative standings of American negroes and whites is Dr. A. M. Shuey's "The Testing of Negro Intelligence." The book covers forty-four years from 1913 to 1957 and analyses some 240 studies. Comparisons are made of pre-school children, grade and high school pupils, college students, and other groups. Dr. Shuey's conclusions are as follows:

(1) I.Q.'s of American negroes on the average fall fifteen to twenty points below those of comparable whites.

(2) About six times as many whites as negroes fall in the gifted children category and about six times as many negroes as

whites fall below I.Q.'s of seventy in the feeble minded group.

(3) Negro-white differences on test scores occur in all types of mental tests, but the negro lag is greatest in matters of an abstract nature. (Problems involving reasoning, deduction and comprehension.)

(4) Differences between negroes and whites increase with age, being largest in the upper age levels.

(5) Large differences in favor of whites appear even when socio-economic factors are equated.

From the foregoing, it will appear obvious that integration of large numbers of negroes into the Washington, D.C. schools presented the staff with virtually unsolvable academic problems.

By contrast, Japanese-Americans and Chinese-Americans do as well as native whites on intelligence tests where the language handicap does not exist, or where it has been eliminated. These groups, as indeed is the case with most native white Americans, have not had the sort of easy sailing which negro leaders seem to think will come miraculously with the snap of a finger in the face of an uneasy politician. Equality of opportunity is something which does not exist, has not existed and cannot ever exist in this world of ours. Such handicaps have not prevented Chinese-Americans and Japanese-Americans from attaining success. Rather, the challenges have spurred them to greater than average effort.

According to the historian Toynbee, of the twenty-one great civilizations of the past, not one was negro. On the other hand, Oriental people have proved themselves capable of the most advanced forms of self-contained culture.

But the man in the street needs no such clinical data. He continues, as he always has, to trust the more powerfully convincing evidence of his eyes and ears. Nor does he feel called upon to rationalize his preference to associate with his own kind by fabricating an elaborate philosophical system. He is not ashamed of his race, as some of his leaders seem to be, and he is for his own side in the showdown which is surely coming.

The man in the street does not like negroes who push themselves on white people. But he regards with suspicion and amazement those few whites who fraternize with negroes on terms of social intimacy. He thinks there is something unhealthy about them. That is not to say he is hostile toward the negro, for he is not, at least in the South. He will and does associate on friendly terms, but in accord with well established custom. His conduct toward his negro neighbor in the South is distinguished by a remarkable tact and courtesy which is equally returned. The all-important point to understand is that this is a form of personal recognition he extends himself of his own volition. There is no governmental power on earth which can force him to do it. Governmental power can, however, by treading roughshod in the area of human attitudes where it has no place, easily turn tolerance into bitter resentment. We have seen the exercise of that bureaucratic coercion already create scars that will not heal in our lifetime. What has happened is of slight consequence, though, compared to what will happen in this respect, if the present trend is not altered.

Regretfully, the presence of substantial numbers of negroes

in the United States has always been and is today the single most divisive factor in our country. In the early days of the nation such powerful opportunists as Aaron Burr envisioned coming to power through a combination of foreign intervention and domestic negro uprisings. North and South became increasingly divided over the race problem as the nineteenth century passed its mid-point. Not all of the great debate was by any means concerned with the extension of slavery. Northern states were afraid that they might be the targets of negro migration and indeed their fears were realized a hundred years later. Indiana, for example, provided in its constitution of 1851 that no negro might enter or settle in that state. It further provided that any person who employed a negro or otherwise encouraged him to remain in Indiana would be subjected to fine.

The prevailing attitude was nowhere more clearly illustrated than in the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates. The future President of the United States made it plain that he fully supported the laws of Illinois which not only denied negroes admission to the state, but deprived them of the privilege of citizenship. Furthermore, in his debate with Senator Douglas at Charleston, Illinois on September 18, 1858, Lincoln said:

"I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes—nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference

between the white and black races which will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

As we all know, the greatest and bitterest war of our history was fought a few years later. It was in the truest sense of the word a fratricidal war. In the midst of the bloody conflict, Lincoln addressed these words to a deputation of negroes who called on him at the White House on August 14, 1862:

"See our present condition—the country engaged in war—our white men cutting one another's throats...and then consider what we know to be the truth. But for your presence among us there would be no war, although many men engaged on either side do not care for you one way or the other...It is better for us both therefore to be separated."

In connection with this remarkably frank statement, in which Lincoln's candor reads like a foreign language compared to the Madison Avenue double-talk turned out by presidential speech-writers today, we should recall what was uppermost in his mind at that particular time. August 14, 1862 was only five weeks prior to the great battle of Sharpsburg-Antietam, which served as a springboard for the Emancipation Proclamation. For some months Lincoln and his friends had been contemplating a move which would appeal to abolitionist sentiment in England

and at the same time encourage negro uprisings within the Confederacy. A Northern victory was desperately needed to set the stage for this move, for its issuance after the then recent series of Northern military defeats would have been regarded as an act of hollow desperation. Although Sharpsburg-Antietam was not a decisive tactical victory for either side, it did effectively check the first Northern advance of the Army of Northern Virginia and was the most reasonable facsimile of a major military victory which the Union Army had at that time achieved. The battle results therefore set the stage for one of the most remarkable propaganda moves of all time.

The Emancipation Proclamation itself stands unique among historical acts of record. In bold terms, couched in the propaganda idiom of the day, it proclaimed that all negroes within the jurisdiction of the Confederacy were free. However—and this probably is not sufficiently understood today, especially by liberals—the Emancipation Proclamation specifically did not free any slaves in those slave states remaining in the Union or in areas of the Confederacy then occupied by Union armies. Thus, the Emancipation Proclamation actually did nothing to alter the negro's status anywhere, for its provisions certainly could not be enforced within the Confederacy, and the North's own one million slaves were in no wise affected. It could not be enforced where it applied, and it did not apply where it could be enforced. It remained for the Thirteenth Amendment to alter the legal status of the negro both North and South.

In view of the anomalous provisions of the Emancipation Proclamation it is indeed curious that the observance of its

centennial should have been used by integration leaders to press their demands for special negro privileges under the slogan "Free by '63." Evidently they know more about mob psychology than they know about history.

Even more curious is the use of President Lincoln's name in current "civil rights" agitation. Lincoln was strongly in favor of a permanent solution to the American race problem by recolonizing the imported blacks in Africa—specifically in Liberia, the land already established for that purpose by Jefferson, Madison and Monroe. Considering his enormous prestige in the North at the end of hostilities in 1865, one of the great "if's" of history is the possibility that Lincoln's practical views might have prevailed, had he not been assassinated, and the country might thereby have been spared its present turmoil through an act physically separating the races on widely distant continents.

If recolonization did not take place, Lincoln made his views equally clear as to the alternative of negroes remaining in this country. In that event, he foresaw that one race or the other would dominate. Unlike Lyndon Johnson, Lincoln said that, being a white man, he naturally preferred for his race to be in that superior position. The "Great Emancipator" of 1862 was what would have been called a "white supremecist" in 1942 and an "extreme racist" in 1962.

Actually, the entire period of 1861-1877 was one of continuous war for the South. The first, or formal, war ended of course in 1865 with General Lee's surrender at Appomattox. The South lost that war. It settled the issues of secession and slavery. But it did not settle the issue of integration.

The second period of warfare, however, known as Reconstruction, which lasted twelve years, was won by the South. This Southern victory established national trends and policies which have had just as profound an effect on the nation as the more strictly military result of the first war. The most enduring result of the Southern victory during Reconstruction was the establishment of a settlement with the North on the negro problem. This settlement became known as segregation. It ushered in a period, lasting almost 80 years, of racial peace and national unity until radical agitation, power politics and court action divided the nation again.

At this point let us examine the historical evolution of the term "civil rights." The phrase first came into widespread usage immediately following the Civil War when the first civil rights bill and the Fourteenth Amendment were under discussion. The Fourteenth Amendment is the so-called legal basis upon which all subsequent civil rights agitation has been built. Parenthetically, I should state that the Fourteenth Amendment was never legally submitted or adopted, as has been pointed out repeatedly by legal scholars. Students of history may recall the subject was as hot in those days as it is now. Many people in the North as well as in the South felt that the phrase "civil rights" was too broad in scope, and demanded that it be defined in specific terms.

As if they had the gift of prophecy, some argued that it might eventually be used as a lever to break down state laws forbidding school integration. The pressure for clarification

was intense, and finally won out, for the politicians feared that their legislation was doomed as long as doubts remained.

Senator Lyman Trumbull of Illinois, who introduced the civil rights bill in the senate, defined civil rights as: "The right to make and enforce contracts, to sue and be sued, to give evidence, to inherit, to purchase, sell, lease and hold property, and to convey real and personal property."

Senator Trumbull said his bill had nothing to do with social and political rights. The senator, who incidentally was not kindly disposed toward the South, insisted at the time that the imagined right of negroes to attend school with white children is not a civil right and never was.

The Judiciary Committee studied the proposed bill and recommended it. The chairman of that committee gave an interesting opinion on the phrases "full and equal benefits of all laws" and "civil rights and immunities." He said "...They do not include social and political rights. Negroes and whites attending the same schools are not civil rights and immunities."

Even Thaddeus Stevens, who advocated the most stringent kind of Reconstruction legislation said; "It (the Fourteenth Amendment) covers only civil rights...it does not touch on social and political rights."

Lest anyone think these are isolated examples, the records of debates in congress and public statements offer copious substantiating evidence. There were also special acts which provide additional proof that civil rights were never intended to have anything to do with the right of a state to operate its schools or other social institutions.

The same congress which approved the Fourteenth Amendment

established segregated schools for black and white children in Washington, D.C. Eleven state legislatures in the North and border states likewise provided for segregated schools. They were: California, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. Two years after the Fourteenth Amendment was in effect, two additional states established segregated schools. These were Indiana and Maryland, and Governor Oliver P. Morton of Indiana remarked with amazing prescience: "Placing white and colored children together in schools would cause conflict and impair the usefulness of the schools."

An interesting historical footnote is that one of the principal reasons advanced at the time for adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment was that it would protect Northern whites traveling through the South and pro-Union white Southerners against state statutes confiscating their property and banishing them to the North.

Thus the framers of the original civil rights bill and the Fourteenth Amendment clearly considered property rights to be fundamental, and intended to limit state power to impair these rights. Civil rights simply gave the negro equal status with the white man in the courts of our land, a position he did not enjoy prior to the Civil War in either North or South, and which the Fourteenth Amendment was designed to remedy. This point is not at issue anywhere.

But what has happened?

From the relatively modest beginning just outlined, which was nevertheless regarded as revolutionary at the time, and was

in fact used by the Republican party to establish negro political domination over the Southern states, the term "civil rights" has come to mean something quite different. Under the spell induced by the most massive propaganda campaign known to man the words "civil rights" have been transformed into a shimmering mirage which embraces a whole spectrum of social, political and economic privileges—not rights—as a magic cure-all for alleged wrongs visited upon the negro.

If other so-called minorities think civil rights, as understood today, apply to them, they are deceived. How many times does one hear the word "Asiatic" mentioned in congressional debates? Who raises a hue and cry about Asiatics being integrated? The truth is that people of Chinese and Japanese origin have won respect in the United States through their own efforts, through their own industry and character and intelligence—the only kind of respect worth having. They have been accepted on their own merits, and have not considered themselves so inferior that they felt the necessity for favored treatment or that it was somehow shameful to associate with each other. For that matter, who has spoken up for the oldest minority in America—the Indian? And who has spoken up for the largest minority in America, the one to which I belong, the white Southerner?

The answer is that you do not possess the political power, nor do we, because of differences within our own ranks, and the American Indians certainly do not possess it.

On the other hand, negro organizations do have organized political power, but they have something else without which their power would be slight. The negro occupies a peculiar place in the mentality of the liberal element which controls

our government and which has bent the forces of education and religion largely to its will. It is hard to define this position which the negro occupies in the liberal psyche, but I assure you its privileges will not extend to other minorities such as you and we constitute. It had its origin in the abolitionist zealots of the last century who transmitted directly to latter-day bleeding hearts an emotionalism where the negro alone is concerned which blots out rational thought processes. Thus, such conditioned response has been developed that the mere mention of the word "negro" causes a liberal automatically to think, "Hate the South!"

During the past year we have seen the term "civil rights" changed again in its meaning. The mask has finally been lifted, and we see revealed the truth. Civil rights has now been clearly admitted by leaders of the movement to herald the negro revolution.

A year ago last Thanksgiving there was a three day "summit conference" of over one hundred negro leaders at Arden House of Columbia University. There, these wielders of negro political power in the United States decided to link the fight for integration in this country with the rise of the new African nations. In their words, these leaders, including Roy Wilkins, Martin Luther King, and A. Philip Randolph among others, agreed that this decision would represent a "new phase in the civil rights struggle."

A new phase indeed!

Let us remember what the new African nations have done. They have established a policy of complete black supremacy. The white man has been deprived of the most elementary civil rights—including the right to life itself. He has been stripped,

shamed, mutilated, murdered and driven into the sea. Nor have people of other races been spared. For example, in Tanganyika the sizeable Indian minority is at the mercy of roving bands of ex-Mau Maus.

And now, the integration drive in the United States is openly allied with the nationalist campaign in Africa to obliterate the white man.

The new negro drive, encouraged by repeated concessions in the face of threatened violence, has been well summed up by Reverend-Congressman Adam Clayton Powell. He said last year at Englewood, New Jersey: "This is a black man's revolution and we are in the middle of it...The negro has to learn all over again how to fight...Don't forget, it's God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Dollar...We have America by the throat."

And the day after he was named national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, James L. Farmer said: "Should non-violence fail, then violence is a better course than complete acquiescence to discrimination."

Negro author James Baldwin wrote in "The Fire Next Time," a book published in 1963: "The Negroes of this country may never be able to rise to power, but they are well placed indeed to precipitate chaos and ring down the curtain on the American dream..."

And what does our government do? It is for the negro, wherever he is, and whatever he wants, regardless of the consequences to the white man, or the yellow man, or the brown man, or the red man or anybody else. It supports at the same time Martin Luther King and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference along with Jomo Kenyatta and his Mau Mau terrorists. As one of my learned friends in Virginia has expressed it so graphically,

the only way the present policy of the Federal government can be described is "negro uber alles."

The reason is the negro bloc vote in Harlem and Southside Chicago, plus a propoganda campaign for over thirty years unrivaled in its intensity and self-righteousness.

I submit that this national policy of denigrating the white man and fawning upon the negro has led to a complete bankruptcy in foreign affairs. It has reduced our once proud nation to a position of enduring humiliations which a generation ago would have been unthinkable.

And all we have gained is the universal contempt of the very people whose friendship we have tried to buy, either with money or by prostrating ourselves at their feet.

As you may know, we in the South are repeatedly admonished that we must integrate to please "world opinion." (The world opinion that we are urged to appease is of course manufactured by the very collectivists who raise the scarecrow in the first place.)

A realistic view of how "world opinion" truly operates was illustrated on a television show last year. Three members of the Peace Corps were being interviewed by a panel of newsmen. The Peace Corpsmen had just returned from Africa—one from Sierra Leone and two from Tanganyika. They were all asked the same question: "What do the natives of Sierre Leone and Tanganyika think of Americans for coming half way around the world to help them?"

In all cases the answer was the same: "They have never heard of America!" So much for "world opinion."

In the United States itself this Alice-in-Wonderland approach is rapidly turning the country's system of values upside down. It has led to such unbelievable happenings as the Gesell Report setting forth the racial policies of our armed forces. No longer are military decisions to be made on the basis of national security. They will be made to soothe negro inferiority complexes. Military installations are to be moved from communities where negro soldiers and sailors are not accorded special social deference, regardless of the strategic location of such bases. Rates of promotion for officers are to be determined by the initiative shown in hastening privileges extended to negro personnel by other ranks in their command and by the civilian populace where they are stationed. Thus, it would seem that West Point, Annapolis and the Air Force Academy have been superceded by Tuskegee, Howard, Fisk and Dillard as training grounds for our military commanders. Discipline will be undermined through the revolutionary approach that a private, if he is a negro, may by-pass the chain of command by being encouraged to take complaints directly to the political "commissar" appointed to supervise the preferential treatment of negroes in his unit. In the words of the report itself:

"All personnel, officers and enlisted men should be free to contact the officer designated to receive complaints at any time without the consent, knowledge or approval in the chain of command. Communications between servicemen and this officer should be privileged and service regulations should prohibit the disclosure

of such communications, or the identity of the complainant without the serviceman's consent."

Abraham Lincoln was more prophetic than he could have known. Today the country is divided as it has not been since he spoke. And the reason is the same. Because of the negro a civil rights bill is now pending in congress. It would convey to the Federal government power to supervise and regulate our daily lives in a way undreamed of in our entire history. Hotels, restaurants, theaters, boarding houses, all types of business serving the public would be required to accommodate negroes because of their race. Negroes would get preferential treatment in employment because of their race. The Federal government could finance and initiate lawsuits to compel schools to accept negroes because of their race. Voting would come under Federal supervision in an unabashed move to build up a negro political machine in the Southern states, regardless of the violence such a move would do to the integrity of local government and the inevitable corruption of politics which would follow.

In connection with this program the congress has been boldly threatened with marching in the streets and large scale violence if it does not bow to the demands of the negro leaders. And all of this has been done under the benign mask of "civil rights."

Thus, on June 4, 1963 Reverend E. Franklin Jackson, President of the Washington branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, stated: "Unless America is willing to come to grips with the problem of liberty and justice for all

(his term for the negro revolution) there is the grave possibility that blood will flow in the streets of our cities like it has not since the Civil War." And Martin Luther King was quoted in an Associated Press dispatch as saying that he foresaw "a season of terror and violence" unless the new civil rights program became the law.

The jungle beat of propaganda has risen to such a cadence in Washington that a Congressman was recently led to remark that Mein Kampf could be railroaded through the congress today if it were labelled "civil rights." This, then, is the pass to which our great nation has been brought by the drive for mis-named civil rights. I say mis-named, because every citizen already possesses the civil rights which entitle him to litigate his differences in the courts of our land on an equal footing before the law.

Whether a civil rights bill passes or not, it is a frightening thing to realize that such police state legislation could even be seriously considered by our nation's leaders, including the President himself. Whether such a bill passes or not, white and negro relations within the United States will not be helped. For, regardless of the temporary power now held by those whites who place the negro revolution not only above the interest of their own race, but above the interest of the country itself, the overwhelming majority of whites in the United States will not tolerate the loss of their personal freedoms. White public opinion is a sleeping giant. True, it has been sleeping; but also true, it is a giant. And under the irritation of an overt negro racism directly oriented to Africa, the giant is

beginning to stir.

If the civil rights bill should pass, the giant will be stung bolt upright. And politicians who tried to regiment America will face a day of reckoning when the people realize what has been done to them.

Thank you for your kind attention.