

# AMERICA, 1969

## Why The Score Is So High

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets* — a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Mr. Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

■ You probably wouldn't believe the past year if you hadn't lived through it. If some would-be Nostradamus had submitted a history of it to a science-fiction magazine five years ago it would have been returned with a curt note of rejection stating that the story was too fantastic even for the buffs of science fiction. Indeed, it was a year in which the Fickle Finger of Fate Award went to America.

It was a year of assassinations and gun laws; of repeated international monetary crises; of roaring inflation and increased taxation; of escalated guerrilla warfare on our nation's campuses and in our streets; of increasingly violent criminals and increasingly permissive judges; and, of meaningless negotiations over Vietnam while American aid to the Communist arsenal of the Vietcong continued and American soldiers died in ever greater numbers. It was a year in which political personalities changed, but political policies remained the same.

But, it was also a year in which it was increasingly difficult to be a "Liberal"

keeping up with the latest Leftist line. Many "progressives" found it traumatically difficult to adjust to the switch from advocating forced integration to forced separatism. It was especially disconcerting to "Liberals" to have to advocate integration in some instances and segregation in others — according to the whims of whatever "Civil Rights" leader was momentarily in vogue. This situation caused more schizophrenia in the ranks of the Left than any event since the Hitler-Stalin pact. But, alas, America's "Liberals" seem always to have felt that consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds, and many actually adjusted to their madly shifting double standards without the absolute necessity of a strait-jacket.

During the past year we have moved more than twelve months closer to George Orwell's 1984 — which keeps threatening to arrive early. As the gothic Professor Russell Kirk was moved to write:

*Just now, let me inquire whether we are indeed only fifteen years away from a hideous totalist society ruled by brutes who enjoy stamping upon a human face; a society in which "war is peace" and in which history and literature are corrupted to serve the interest of the total state . . .*

Yes, this was the year that "Liberals" offered "positive proof" that God was dead — and our astronauts reminded us from outer space that He is not only alive but Lord over a vastness beyond even "Liberal" imagination. It was a year,

nonetheless, when the American Left continued to "whore after false gods," endowing the State with the qualities of Vishnu — thought by Hindus to be both man's preserver and destroyer — as their satrap politicians and guru social scientists moved to implement plans for 1984. Typical of those plans is one discussed by New Jersey Congressman Cornelius Gallagher:

*The social scientists, in their zeal to discover more and more about disadvantaged citizens, proposed to use low-cost housing as a great pool of research — and those who lived in it, as guinea pigs.*

*They seriously proposed to bug each room in each apartment of a federally-sponsored low rent project.*

*They would then feed every single sentence uttered by the apartment dwellers into a computer. This computer would then deliver a profile of these Americans and their habits — and compare these statistical profiles to Americans who have "made it."*

Congressman Gallagher became so outraged at the project that it was stopped, but the example does provide an insight into the mentality of contemporary social scientists and what they can accomplish by working in alliance with totalitarian bureaucrats and politicians. There is no end to how far it might all have gone: If we are going to bug the poor, surely we should bug the rich to find out how they got that way. And, after all, since most Americans are of the middle class, one can't make accurate comparisons unless he has extensive information on them as well. So, Big Brother, or Big Mommy, or Super Sibling, as our expanding State is sometimes called, might soon have been our ever-present electronic companion. After all, we might be reading magazines like AMERICAN OPINION, or muttering

anti-social thoughts, or discriminating as to sex with our wives or husbands. The social scientists should know about it.

One remembers that in Orwell's 1984, also, every citizen was assigned a number so that the government could keep track of all his activities. *U.S. News & World Report* revealed this year that on July 1, 1969, the armed forces of the United States will help Big Brother by assigning numbers to our servicemen that are the same as their Social Security numbers. *U.S. News* explained as follows:

*First major agency to fall in line was the Internal Revenue Service, which has already reassigned individual tax numbers that are, in fact, the same as Social Security numbers.*

*And the Federal Government is not the only body to take such action. Some State and local governments, schools and private firms are using the numbers to help cut back the flood of digits assigned to the average American.*

*A wider use. Some officials foresee the Social Security number as the all-inclusive identification — on drivers' licenses, bank accounts, employee personnel records, credit cards, and dozens of other numbered documents.*

*Some federal officials are considering a plan to make Social Security numbers the ultimate in identification — by putting them on newborn babies' birth certificates.*

This was also a great year for Newspeak,\* the Esperanto of the Orwellian set. As my colleague Alan Stang is so fond of saying: *Observe!* In America those who would continue to move us towards the all-powerful State, or Communism, are called "Liberals." Those who are anti-Communist, who oppose collecti-

\*Not to be confused with *Newsweek*, a weekly magazine published in Newspeak.

vism in all its forms, are called (at best) "conservatives." Yet, in Czecho-Slovakia those who allegedly want to reduce the power of the State and move away from Communism are called "Liberals." Those who want to magnify the terrors of Stalinism are called "conservatives." Are you confused? Well, you are supposed to be. Just remember that, in the vernacular of Newspeak, the "Liberals" are always the good guys and the conservatives are always the bad guys.

The War in Vietnam, which is now the longest war in U.S. history, is also right out of 1984. During the past year of "peace talks," American casualties have accelerated and now total 34,835 killed, 223,525 wounded, and more than 1,300 listed as missing or captured. Since America has stopped bombing the North, Ho Chi Minh is no longer under any pressure to reach a settlement, and talks drag.

Meanwhile, through aid and trade with the nations of the Soviet bloc, America continues to equip our enemies by proxy. *Human Events* of March 15, 1969 quoted President Nixon as stressing that the Soviets "furnish . . . 85 per cent of the sophisticated military equipment for the North Vietnamese forces. Without that assistance, North Vietnam would not have the capabilities to wage the major war they are against the United States." *Human Events* of May 17, 1969, reports that "word has leaked from the White House that the President wants to loosen restrictions and promote the flow of goods between Communist nations and the United States. Key officials recently picked by Nixon [all members of the Council on Foreign Relations], moreover, have been vigorous advocates of expanded Red trade." This report was confirmed in *Business Week* for May 24, 1969.

During his campaign, Richard Nixon promised faithfully and vigorously to stop aid and trade with the enemy. But, in the Newspeak of 1984, things mean just the opposite of what they appear to mean, and "War is Peace."

It is obvious that to make the nightmare of Orwell's 1984 a reality in America, we must be driven to reduce ourselves to a totally socialist State. And, to do that, the *Insiders* and their puppet politicians and bureaucrats must wage war on private ownership. Karl Marx said it, oh so succinctly, in the Communist Manifesto of 1848: "Our objective can be summed up in one sentence — 'abolition of private property.'" Most Americans think of the Soviet Union when Marx or Communism is discussed, but the deadly principles of Communism have nothing to



The dollar continues to shrink under Mr. Nixon, do with geography, and could as easily be applied to Burnt Mattress, Idaho, or Elephant Breath, Arkansas, as in Moscow or Peking. It was the sagacious Admiral Ben Moreell who observed:

*Communism with a "Made in Moscow" label is not popular in America. It doesn't need to be, if only we can be induced to accept Marxism under some other label. This we are now doing . . . Slavery is commonly thought of as owner-*

*ship of one man by another. But no slaveholder would quibble about owning the man if he can own the products of the man's labor. A slave is a person to whom economic freedom is denied. From this premise, the denial of all other freedoms follows.\**

The bench-marks on that road to the sort of total government foreseen by Admiral Moreell mark our progress toward 1984. One such bench-mark is the number of those directly employed by the federal government — persons who are not likely to ever vote for the abolition of their own slot at the trough. In mid-1930, civilian personnel employed by the Hoover Administration totaled 605,000 — a ratio of one to every 203 Americans. At the beginning of the current year, there were 3,055,000 civilians on the payroll (excluding "hush-hush" agencies like the C.I.A., of whom the Civil Service Commission keeps no record). This represents a ratio of one employee for every sixty-seven Americans, and does not include military, state, and local workers who are now for all practical purposes federal employees.

In short, the national bureaucracy has grown by five hundred percent during a period in which the population has increased by only sixty-three percent. According to the authoritative *Weekly Labor Forecast*, total government employment now runs over 14 million — meaning that at least one out of every five employed persons in the United States must be totally supported by the other four.

\*How are things done in "the Workers Paradise"? The *Los Angeles Times* recently reported that the "Soviet people were jubilant over the news that minimum wage for factory and office workers had been raised to the equivalent of \$66 a month. That is about 55 cents an hour for a 40-hour, four-week month." In an America rapidly becoming the "Loafers' Paradise," shiftless bums do four times as well by simply applying for Welfare.

Not only are government employees multiplying like Welfare Mothers, their pay is skyrocketing. According to *U.S. News & World Report*:

*Working for the U.S. Government is getting to be more and more rewarding. Federal employees have just been told details of a new pay raise being proposed for them — averaging 9.1 per cent for white-collar workers. . . . If the boosts go through on July 1, as expected, the typical employee's pay check will have risen 19.5 per cent in 21 months.*

This little boondoggle will cost those of us who work for a living an extra \$3 billion, and will make a total of \$6 billion given to government "workers" in three separate raises since September of 1967. A federal employee rated at "G.S. 18" (Government Service), for example, will receive a fat \$33,495 a year. This becomes alarming when one realizes that, percentage-wise, there are more bureaucrats now at top-rated G.S. jobs than ever before in our nation's history. Is it any wonder that more and more of our fellow citizens want to quit work and take a job with the government, where it is almost impossible to get fired? Some of these people will be in for a real shock when, as in ancient Rome, they learn that it is an economic impossibility for the entire population to live as certified government pick-pockets.

In discussing the federal pay hikes, we would certainly be remiss not to mention our Congressmen, those gallant inflation fighters who this year voted themselves an annual pay raise of \$12,500. Don't you wish that *you* could vote yourself a raise? Try telling your boss tomorrow morning that your family took a vote and it was unanimously decided that this year your salary will be raised by \$12,500. Senators now receive \$42,500 in salary, with benefits amounting to something



Another year in which America continued to trade with arsenal of Vietcong — even as our sons died.

like \$10,000, plus junkets and various "insider deals." Sorry, can't end the surtax this year. We've got to keep the trough full you know.

Naturally, all of these expensive government employees take up office space. According to *U.S. News & World Report*, the federal bureaucracy has offices in more than 421,000 buildings — and, "Nobody quite knows what all the civil servants in these buildings are doing or trying to do." Of course, even our federal bureaucrats know that you can't just hang all of those buildings in thin air . . . so, with admirable foresight, the U.S. Government has managed to obtain 760 million acres of land — ownership of a mere one-third of the nation. Then, too, all of those bureaucrats in the 421,000 office buildings must also sit at desks and pound on typewriters or other machines. *U.S. News* admits that nobody knows their number or value. It has been established, however, that the government does own 380,000 motor vehicles — since our precious bureaucrats cannot be expected to walk or use public transportation.

How successful are these bureaucrats at spending your money? Just at the federal level they manage to tip-toe through your fiscal tulips at the rate of \$350,000 a minute, or \$3.5 billion dollars a week, and \$184 billion last year.

The Tax Foundation has computed that to pay his tax bill the average American had to work twelve more days for Uncle Sam this year than he did last year. The Foundation revealed that the average American must labor 117 days — from January first through April twenty-seventh, to meet all tax "obligations." Of this, eighty-one days of work go to pay federal taxes, and thirty-six days of labor must be devoted to the benefit of state and local bureaucrats.

This year Americans will spend eight minutes more of their average eight-hour working day earning the money to pay the additional tax bills they did not have in 1968. The time consumed this year working to pay the tax man will be more than an hour and a half longer than the estimated working time required to pay for housing and household operations,

and an hour and thirty-eight minutes more than the time needed to earn money for food, tobacco, and liquor.

Thirteen years ago, according to the Tax Foundation, taxes collected by all governments were only \$1,897 per family. Taxes now come to about \$3,927 per American family — up \$370 from fiscal 1968. Of course, not every family is average. "Liberal" economist Sylvia Porter recently pointed out that many Americans in the middle-income brackets are now paying almost half their earnings in taxes. Part of the escalating tax load is made up of Social Security taxes — which started out at two percent and now amount to 9.6 percent, with a proposal currently pending to raise Social Security taxes to 10.4 percent in 1970. The "free goodies" are getting a little expensive.

The Tax Foundation estimates that the total government tax take will be \$247 billion in fiscal 1969 — \$147 billion higher than in 1956. Tax receipts of \$170 billion in fiscal 1969, for the federal government alone, will exceed those of fiscal 1968 by \$24 billion, and will have more than doubled since 1956. Meanwhile, state and local collections (\$77 billion in 1969) will have increased about \$5 billion over the previous fiscal year, and will be about \$13 billion greater than in fiscal 1957. The state and local tax take for fiscal 1969 will come close to tripling that of 1956.

The staggering amount of money being spent raises the question of whether it is being spent wisely and frugally.

According to U.P.I. Senior Editor Louis Cassels, no Rightwing Extremist by a country mile:

*The U.S. government is wasting huge sums — at least \$10 billion a year and probably much more than that — by spending money blindly. That is the conclusion of a month-long investigation of federal budgetary practices by United Press International.*

One official at the General Accounting Office estimated that as much as \$30 billion a year is being wasted — even by federal standards.

At a time when we are reminded by the *Wall Street Journal* that the jobless rate is at a fifteen-year low, that there is a manpower squeeze and a labor shortage with many Americans moonlighting at two jobs, and countless jobs going begging, the number of those on Welfare continues to multiply. The *Wall Street Journal* of April 24, 1969, revealed that "the relief rolls are rising almost 10% a year, with no letup in sight . . ." The *Journal* continues: "In short, the Great Society enlarged the demand for welfare and also increased its supply." Then, the *Wall Street Journal* quotes an official of the Nixon Administration: "My main conclusion is that the increase in the caseload is a good thing. More eligible families are getting assistance, so that system is in this sense working better." The *Journal* added: "This judgment is shared by many other Nixon Administration officials."

That hardly sounds like last year's electioneering rhetoric, but one must keep in mind that spending is flagrantly wasteful only when the other gang is in office, but vitally necessary when your mob takes power.

An example of what is happening to Welfare, nationwide, is to be found in the case of New York City. The Department of Social Services there has asked for \$1.7 billion for aid to New York City's "needy" during the next fiscal year. This is \$600 million over the current Welfare budget, and four times the budget for 1964-1965, the last full year before John Lindsay became Mayor. It is more than seven times as large as the Welfare budget of only a decade ago.

According to *U.S. News & World Report*, New York State will spend about \$2.2 billion on Welfare this year, whereas in 1965-1966, the cost was \$983 million. Still, New York trails California in the



On Easter weekend Communists delivering clenched-fist salute marched 50,000-strong in New York.

Welfare Grand Prix. California, where the state Budget is up thirty-three percent since voters there elected a "tight-fisted conservative" Governor, will this year spend \$2.3 billion on Welfare handouts. And, now that the Supreme Court has held that when writing the Constitution the Founding Fathers intended that there be no residency requirements for Welfare payoffs, California is preparing to be blitzed by the nation's indigents. What "Welfare client" would not delight in wintering in sunny California at the expense of generous California taxpayers? The result will undoubtedly be the establishment of "federal Welfare standards," followed by federal financing of state Welfare programs. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert Finch (sometimes known as Nixon's "Seventh Crisis"), has already accepted the recommendations of a committee set up by President Nixon and announced his belief that the federal government should impose minimum standard payments to the nation's 8.5 million "Welfare clients."

In the eight years of the Kennedy-

Johnson Administrations, according to a Johnson aide, the number of domestic federal aid programs increased from 45 to 435. In his Budget for 1970, President Johnson told us that the estimated \$27.2 billion for aid to the poor "represents . . . almost three times the level of 1961." Also, "Outlays for health and welfare programs are estimated at \$55 billion in 1970. . . . This represents an increase of \$6.1 billion over the 1969 level and is more than double the level prevailing in 1964."

Economist Henry Hazlitt reveals:

*In the fiscal year 1968 the federal government spent for education, old-age pensions, veterans pensions, health, relief and all other major "social welfare" and "antipoverty" programs a total of \$61 billion. If we add the cost of similar programs to the states and cities in 1968 of \$51 billion, we get a total government welfare cost in 1968 of \$112 billion.*

*It is officially estimated that the*

*costs to the federal government alone of these programs will increase from \$61 billion in fiscal 1968 to \$68 billion in 1969 and \$76 billion in 1970. There will no doubt be a similar increase in state and local costs.*

Hazlitt makes no guestimate of Welfare spending by 1984.

Naturally, the politicians and bureaucrats want to expand history's biggest leachathon. As a recent U.P.I. release noted: "President Nixon's chief urban affairs advisor [William Moynihan] suggested Thursday that the federal government double its aid to state and local governments after the Vietnam war ends. He said this would amount to about \$40 billion per year." So far no politician from whom we have heard has suggested that after the Vietnam War ends (if it ever does, or if we are not soon in another) producers be left with the product of their own toil by reducing taxes.

It seems ironic that in last year's political campaign Republicans were giving dire warning that only Richard Nixon could save the nation from the socialism of Hubert Humphrey. Now we read a report in the *Wall Street Journal* of May 7, 1969, which informs us:

*In a message to Congress . . . Mr. Nixon called for a massive increase in food-stamp spending to provide free stamps for families in the lowest income brackets . . . The package would cost "something in excess of" \$1 billion a year beyond present food-aid spending, the President said . . . Mr. Nixon's proposals would seem to go a long way toward satisfying liberal demands for a bigger Federal antimalnutrition role. They certainly exceed by far the food spending approved by President Johnson, who had voiced skepticism about the extent of malnutrition in this country.*

Now, Heaven help us, Big Mommy is preparing to spend better than \$2 billion a year of our money to run about making certain that every last Appalachian gets the "minimum daily requirements" of things like leafy vegetables and cod-liver oil. One can only gasp at the thought of a federally enforced menu, with hordes of new female bureaucrats screeching things like, "Eat your spinach, Luke!"

Last year President Johnson's Budget was \$183.7 billion, and represented an increase in the federal Budget of eighty-eight percent during the Kennedy-Johnson years. "Reckless spending," shouted Republican Congressmen; "Dangerous fiscal madness," echoed Republican Senators. During the ensuing political campaign Americans were treated to the usual oratorical bunkum and political promises about slashing wasteful government spending. Now, with the frugal Republicans controlling the White House, last year's profligate spending is this year's bare-bones Budget. It all depends on whose gang of socialists is doing the spending. Of course, Mr. Nixon is cutting down here and there. For instance, he noted that President Johnson kept seventy official Presidential photographers around the White House to record for whatever history we have left to us L.B.J.'s every itch, smirk, and ear-wiggle. Mr. Nixon finds that to take his photograph he requires only forty official photographers — no doubt at a considerable "savings" to the taxpayer.

The *Los Angeles Times* of May 14, 1969, tells us that "The Nixon Administration and House Democratic leaders have agreed to place a \$192.9 billion ceiling on the amount of federal spending in the fiscal year starting July 1." The article goes on to state that the Nixon Administration "would have preferred none [no ceiling] at all." The net result was a \$9.2 billion increase over L.B.J.'s last Budget, which the Republicans had denounced over and over again for its extravagant wastefulness.

House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills argues that the Budget will windup being even higher than this. As the *Los Angeles Times* reported on May twenty-first: "Mills argued that if Congress approved a 1970 budget total of \$192.9 billion, as the President has asked, 'before the end of the year, there would still have to be \$5 to \$6 billion more appropriated.' " This would mean that Republican Nixon would in but one year have boosted spending over the Johnson expenditures by \$15 billion. Irreverent wags in Washington are saying that those who still call Richard Nixon a cheap phony have not seen his Budget.

The Republicans have denounced every increase in spending by the Democrats since Ike's last Budget of \$99.5 billion. After all, only \$500 million of that increase was for defense costs. The balance was for domestic spending, with an extra \$800 million added in increased interest costs on the swelling national debt. It is curious to note that the newspapers played up the Nixon Budget as a cut from L.B.J.'s proposed Budget of \$195.3 billion — and made no mention of the fact that the Budget represents an actual visible increase of \$9.2 billion in spending over last year.

The deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, was an enormous \$25.4 billion — the biggest since World War II. President Johnson, the man who wanted Honest Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice, claimed that there would be no deficit for the year ending June 30, 1969. Most monetary students were extremely skeptical about this claim, but the Republicans, apparently hoping to open the Nixon Administration on a harmonious note, did not challenge this absurdity from the man who last year predicted a deficit of \$8 billion and delivered one amounting to \$25 billion. President Nixon, as I have noted, has already persuaded Congress to raise the limit on the national debt by \$12 billion! When the Democrat socialists

were in power, Republican Congressmen voted consistently against raising the national debt; but, now that the pink elephants are stampeding into fiscal irresponsibility, the tune has changed.

President Nixon didn't even blush when he claimed that the raise in the debt limit was "in the interest of responsible management." If it were already 1984, all of Nixon's old speeches about the government squandering our money could be shoved into the "memory hole."

This government borrowing, which has ballooned the national debt, is the prime



**Harvard Bulletin flaunts Red symbol on cover.**

cause of inflation, since banks buy government bonds and then present them to the Treasury, which issues new fiat cash against them. The official cost of living escalated 4.4 percent during 1968. During the first quarter of 1969, the government reported a 1.5 percent increase in the cost of living — the sharpest rise of any three-month period since May-July 1956. In March, the consumer price index rose eight-tenths of one percent, the biggest monthly gain in eighteen years. This rise, at the rate of 9.6 percent annually, shows

that inflation has not been slowed but is actually *gaining* momentum. Commenting on this inflation in the *World Currency Report*, Franz Pick writes:

*If we accept this fact [a 1.5 percent rise in the cost of living during the first quarter of 1969] and apply it to the purchasing power of total public and private debt, conservatively estimated at 3 trillion Minidollars, we have to conclude that not less than \$45 billion of purchasing power of this debt has been wiped out during the first 90 days of 1969.*

As of April seventh, the cost of day-to-day loans soared to 9.5 percent, the highest since 1929. If a Nixon tight money policy leads to a decline in the stock market (as it did in 1929), a slow-down in demand for goods, and rising un-employment, the President and the Federal Reserve will likely turn on the printing presses full blast under the resulting political and social pressures. Retired persons, widows, and others on fixed income may be decimated by inflation, but *they* suffer in relative silence while unemployed urban minorities are being agitated in their displeasure to hurl Molotov cocktails. If it comes to a choice between these voting blocs, the aged or the urban minorities (as it probably will), it is obvious which one will win. The elderly will, however, be consoled with an insufficient rise in Social Security "payments" which will only add to inflation and further weaken the bankrupt agency.

It is not just the aged and minorities who are victims of inflation. Articles are already appearing in newspapers and the finance journals suggesting that home ownership may in the future be the perquisite of the rich only. (Two years ago we were being told that within a decade most American families would own two homes.) A recent Associated Press release states:

*Higher interest charges on mortgages, higher taxes and insurance and rising costs of lumber and other materials have sent house prices skyrocketing. More increases are in prospect . . .*

Bernard Janis, president of Janis Corp., of Miami, Fla., estimated the cost of a \$30,000 home has risen 20 per cent in the past year and will rise 10 per cent more to about \$39,500 in the next six months.

*U.S. News & World Report* says that while labor's wages rose 6.2 percent last year, "Rising living costs and the federal tax boost designed to hold down consumer spending have more than offset the extra pay."<sup>\*</sup>

Understandably, all this inflation is destroying America's ability to compete in world trade. In 1964, says *U.S. News & World Report*, the United States sold \$3.6 billion more than it bought abroad. By 1968, the U.S. was *buying* \$2.5 billion more abroad than it was selling (not counting foreign aid giveaways). The stimulation of imports caused by inflation, defense spending overseas, and foreign aid have combined to create a simply horrendous American imbalance of payments.

Our government has claimed that America did not last year have a balance of payments deficit; but, it is a case of where figures don't lie, liars figure. As *Barron's*, the influential financial weekly, notes:

<sup>\*</sup>The following letter is reported to have been recently received by the Federal Reserve Board: "I understand that there is a move to replace the image of George Washington on the quarter with that of General Eisenhower. Since we already have Kennedy on the phony half dollar and F.D.R. on the phony dime, may I suggest we go along and put Ike on the phony quarter, Martin Luther King on a phony nickel, Earl Warren on a phony penny, and Walter Jenkins and L.B.J. on opposite sides of a three dollar bill. This entire move now seems to present another problem. There is an apparent overwhelming shortage of phony money on which to immortalize all the phonies."

*Last year's so-called payments surplus largely reflected a series of bookkeeping devices designed to put the national accounts in a more flattering light; without such cosmetic treatment (which the new Administration vows to shun), an ugly deficit upwards of \$2 billion would have surfaced.*

Proof of the pudding came when the *Wall Street Journal* announced that, during the first quarter of 1969, the U.S. ran its only first-quarter trade deficit since 1950, causing the worst three-months imbalance in nineteen years. Canadian financial analyst C.V. Myers observes:

*The U.S. suffered a B.O.P. deficit of \$1.8 billion in the first quarter — highest since 1950. At the same time Europeans invested \$1.3 billion [in the stock market]. Except for this good luck the deficit would have been \$3.1 billion in a single quarter. What happens when foreign D.J. in-*

*vestors decide not only to quit buying, but decide to sell?*

It was the \$3.5 billion deficit for all of 1967 which prompted the Johnson Administration to institute panicked controls. The 1969 first-quarter deficit amounted to a staggering \$6.8 billion on an annualized basis, and the Nixon Administration is openly admitting we are in for a bad year. This means more strains on the faltering dollar and potentially disastrous claims against our seriously diminished gold supply.

Most conservative analysts did not think the dollar would survive 1968 intact, or that the world's currencies could avoid severe devaluations. Although nothing has changed, and none of the problems have been solved, the international monetary structure still staggers along as it was. Predicting the date when the monetary mess will hit the air conditioning is very difficult because of unknown political considerations. That it will do so is now simply a matter of time.

Meanwhile, the monetary time-bomb



A year in which armed Black revolutionaries captured colleges — and "Liberals" begged their pardon.

which was handed by President Johnson to President Nixon ticks away. Nobody knows the exact time of the explosion, because nobody knows the length of the fuse. But Calvin Coolidge, who chose not to run, may have had better foresight than Richard Milhous Nixon.

A sure sign of a decaying civilization is a rising crime rate. And, we are rapidly learning that the wages of "Liberalism" is anarchy. The latest crime statistics divulge a twenty-one percent overall increase in crime during the first six months of 1968, as compared to the same period in 1967. The figure becomes even more meaningful when one realizes that it is piled on top of a sixteen percent increase for the same period of the previous year, and an eleven percent increase for the year before that. These statistics represent an increase in crime amounting to 109 percent in just eight years.

The new statistics reveal that seventy-six police officers were killed in the line of duty during 1967 — bringing the total killed since 1960 to 411. A startling aspect of these figures is that, of the 539 offenders in the slaying of policemen, seventy-seven percent had prior arrest records; two-thirds had been granted leniency in the form of parole or probation, and *thirty percent* were actually on *parole* when they murdered a police officer.

Are America's professional "Liberals" upset by the hideous permissiveness these statistics represent? A typical attitude was displayed by the late *Saturday Evening Post*, which this year decried the "American obsession" with increasing crime. The *Post* editors exclaimed:

*According to a Louis Harris survey, 8 out of 10 Americans agree that law and order have broken down in this country. Politicians have exploited this fear. . . .*

*We are now in the midst of several momentous revolutions that are exerting majestic forces on us*

*but creating little bloodshed. American Negroes are breaking out of thralldom that ranges from prejudice to near slavery, our young people are breaking away from the Establishment. . . . This has been a fierce struggle, but most of the violence has been committed against property, and it is really extraordinary that these convulsive efforts could be as peaceful as they are. . . .*

Young people, absorbing the "Liberal" attitude that mere property need not be respected, are now annually doing \$200 million in damage to America's school buildings alone. "Liberals" might properly concern themselves over how many ditches must be dug, nails pounded, or bricks stacked by honest working people to earn the extra \$200 million in taxes required to replace such senselessly destroyed property.

Coming in on the same swell as the rising tide of crime statistics, though less susceptible to physical measurement, is the Leftist promotion of perversion among the young. With the Leftist mass media glamorizing the drug cults, for example, a *two thousand* percent increase in juvenile drug arrests in the last eight years has been reported by California Attorney General Thomas Lynch. Mr. Lynch disclosed that juvenile drug arrests so far this year have jumped 165 percent above the first half of 1967. The figures, alas, are typical.

Robert Betts of the Copley News Service researched the effect on young people of the growing degeneracy in the mass media. He concluded:

*Beneath the flood of revolutionary propaganda and exhortations to violence aimed at today's youth is an undercurrent of filth which goes far deeper than most Americans realize.*

*For parents to be shocked at*

*youthful pranks is nothing new. What is sinister, however, about the present student preoccupation with sex, drugs and perversion is that it is largely the result of planning and organization. It is the most sinister aspect of the Red youth subversion program . . .*

*The coupling with political propaganda of blasphemous, sacrilegious and vulgar sexual terms used with regard to religious themes and family relationships is a deadly weapon, blatantly used to demoralize and destroy.*

Some might assume that the liberation of the young radicals from conventional morality would give them a tremendous feeling of freedom and happiness. That's what *they* would have you believe; but, having interviewed hundreds of them, my experience has been that hippies and New Left activists are as a group enormously unhappy people. This has been confirmed in a less subjective way by a number of studies concluding that the promotion of free love and revolution among the young has contributed to a rapidly ascending suicide rate. Harvard psychiatrist Dr. Matthew Ross, for example, has reported to the American College of Physicians that currently, "Adolescents of college age are the highest potential suicide risk within the population." The professor noted that the suicide rate for college students is now fifty percent higher than for Americans in general of a comparable age. Among all youths in the fifteen to twenty-four age group, suicide is the fourth-ranking cause of death. During 1966, nearly a hundred thousand of our ever more radicalized college students threatened suicide, one in ten of these actually tried it, and a thousand succeeded.

Even though statistics show rising drug usage, vandalism, venereal disease, and suicide among America's radicalized youth, the "Liberals" are pointing proudly to the fact that this is the most

politically committed generation ever. They are especially happy because that commitment has been directed Leftward.

The January 1969 issue of *Fortune* magazine revealed the results of a survey of youths conducted for the magazine by Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., an attitude-research concern. *Fortune* reported that what would have been "fairly characterized as a lunatic fringe on the campuses" a few years ago has grown into an "important and militant minority." It estimated that about 750,000 American college students now "identify with the New Left." *Fortune* did not note that F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover has revealed: "the objective of both New Left and old-time Communists and their adherents in our society is to completely destroy our form of government."

Young persons between eighteen and twenty-four were divided up in the *Fortune* survey into three groups: those who had not been to college; those who go to college for pragmatic reasons (fifty-eight percent of college students), and a group with less tangible goals (forty-two percent). *Fortune* calls the latter group the "forerunners," because it "foresees their number and influence growing in the years ahead." According to *Fortune*, these student critics of America "represent the principal intellectual thrust of the oncoming generation." In every category surveyed, the "forerunners" were far to the Left of the "pragmatics," who were in turn to the Left of those who did not attend college.

Since *Fortune* sees the "forerunner" group growing in "numbers and influence" in the coming years, their attitudes are most significant. They "identify themselves as 'doves' who are anti-Vietnam and anti-war in general, who believe the U.S. is a 'sick society.'" Obviously, the "forerunners" listen attentively in class. Eugene McCarthy is the most admired man within this group — followed by Teddy Kennedy, John Kenneth Galbraith, Allen Ginsberg, Commu-

nist "Che" Guevara, and Communist Stokely Carmichael. The man most despised by the "forerunners" (and, by a country mile) is George Wallace (seventy-eight percent).

Only nine percent feel strongly against the late Communist murderer "Che" Guevara, and only six percent deeply oppose Marxist Professor Herbert Marcuse. Only eight percent of the "forerunner" group intend to enter business, while fifty-three percent want to enter teaching at some level.

Not everyone is quite as impressed with the "forerunners" as is *Fortune*. Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, a University of Chicago psychologist, told a Congressional Committee recently that the campus revolutionaries are "truants from life . . . fixated at the age of the temper tantrum." Dr. Bettelheim compares the schoolboy Lenins to the Hitler youth. The ideology of the revolutionary German students who helped in the rise of Hitler, he said, "pitted the sons against the fathers," insisted that "the generations cannot understand each other" and are, in fact, enemies; and, in short, "said exactly the same as our rebellious students who insist that nobody over thirty is trustworthy."

Not surprisingly, these "forerunners" have a strong tendency to react in any situation like so many Pavlovian dogs. Recently at Fresno State College a leadership class decided to determine how far the misleaders can lead. This class formed a group named the Malaperts — which means nothing — and then the Malaperts called a campus rally and demanded the most absurd things they could conjure up. They demanded trolleys to transfer students from dorms to classrooms; flood control for the high and dry campus; free beer in the student union; and, that students be allowed to choose their own roommates in the dorms, male or female. Two hundred and fifty students showed up for the rally and 150 signed up with the Malaperts. Campus leaders of the

Marxist Students for a Democratic Society announced: "We're with you all the way." When one student shouted, "I stay in touch with campus activities and I've never heard of any outfit called the Malaperts," he was booed off the stage.

The whole situation would be hilarious if the hardcore activists weren't growing more psychotic, and therefore increasingly dangerous, day by day. The militant young Marxists really don't understand that the real Communist revolution is taking place *within* the Establishment, using their street-bunder activities as an excuse to pull the strings of dictatorship tighter and tighter. The young Leninist types can't understand why the revolution didn't start yesterday, and they are growing more frustrated and organizing for sabotage and other forms of violence. (See *AMERICAN OPINION* for May 1969.)

Providing what the Communists call the *agit-prop* for this revolutionary effort is the so-called "underground press," which now publishes five hundred youth-oriented Marxist papers across the country. Another way of spreading the virus of revolution is through classes such as those given by the "Free University" using a building of the University of California at Santa Barbara. One class there is called "The Tactics and Practice of Guerrilla Warfare at U.C.S.B. and in the Santa Barbara Community." A mimeographed sheet announcing the program states that it "will cover strategies and will hold drills" — providing instruction in "how to hold a building against police attack; to conduct hit and run missions; to defend against police harassment; to sabotage military-industrial-police functions; and, to get the community involved through terrorism."

At the first meeting of the above training center an outline was distributed which stated that "it is the purpose of this class to give the people who are already convinced that the government needs to be overthrown a method of overthrowing it . . . The method of

teaching this class will be to take abstract strategies of guerrilla warfare and to apply them, in the classroom and in the field, to the environment of Santa Barbara and the UCSB campus specifically."

Never to be outdone, the University of California at Berkeley is offering a course in urban revolution, with the opportunity to receive academic credit. Professors for this effort are S.D.S. founder Tom Hayden, and Dr. Herbert Marcuse, an avowed Marxist popular with European student Leftists who coined the chant "Marx, Marcuse and Mao." The course is sponsored by the Center for Participant Education, which last fall sponsored lectures by Communist Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver.

Robert Betts recently prepared a six-part series on how the Communists organize and manipulate campus disorder. In that nationally syndicated series, appearing in the *San Francisco Examiner* and a number of other major newspapers, Mr. Betts noted:

*Americans don't have to look for Reds under the bed. They can be seen almost any night on television — leading a college riot or mingling in the melee like extras in a movie crowd scene. They're not all card-carrying members of the Communist Party. They are defined not by whether they pay party dues, but by their actions, their vocabulary, and the way they always manage to be where the trouble is.*

*Those who keep close watch on the unfolding pattern of subversion [law enforcement Intelligence personnel] in this country can pick them out easily.*

*The average American sees only turmoil and shakes his head over the "impetuosity of youth."*

The primary organization of the New Left is the Students for a Democratic



**Communist James Forman asks \$500 million.** Society, about which F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover has stated:

*Unfortunately, much of this unrest and violence was instigated and precipitated by a subversive force which is growing in numbers and militancy. It is called the New Left, and at its core is the organization known as the Students for a Democratic Society.*

*The concept of violence as an instrument to destroy the existing social order is as inherent in the philosophy of the New Left movement as it is in the philosophy of the old-line Communists who have worked for years to undermine this nation from within.*

*This was particularly evident at the national convention of the Students for a Democratic Society.*

Associated Press recently quoted S.D.S. National Secretary Mike Klonsky as reporting that S.D.S. membership now stands at 100,000.

In addition to its normal routine of driving spineless deans to distraction, Students for a Democratic Society has three stated projects. One is to abolish R.O.T.C. on the nation's college campuses. It has already forced many schools to deny academic credit for the military training courses. What is it all about? Simple: The Army gets half its new officers from R.O.T.C., the Air Force forty percent, and the Navy thirty percent. Columnist John Chamberlin explains:

*If they had their way, the S.D.S. authoritarians would render a nation of 200 million prey to the blackmail of Soviet Russia on its eastern flanks, Maoist China in the Pacific, and Fidel Castro anywhere south of the Caribbean.*

Project Two of the S.D.S. is to bring the revolution down from the universities into the high schools. Much of the propaganda for this movement comes from the so-called "underground" newspapers now published by many high school revolutionaries. The number of such Marxist papers is confirmed at *five hundred* by Dr. B. Frank Brown, director of the Institute for Development of Education Activities, Inc.

The third major S.D.S. project is to infiltrate factories for the purpose of "achieving solidarity with the working class" and to propagate sabotage. Labor columnist Victor Riesel writes of the S.D.S. plan:

*There are regional and group "coordinators." Last year they sent 130 students into the shops, stores and mills in New York, Rochester, Boston, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, Baltimore and Newark. Now the coordinators, operating on the theory that there can be no American revolution without the working class, and war material*

*shipments cannot be halted without this same proletariat, are escalating their infiltration.*

Still it is the college campus which absorbs the overwhelming effort of the New Left. Thus, when the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame, said that rioters there would be expelled, one could hear a collective gasp from the halls of ivy to the shores of 'Frisco Bay. It is said that the mass inhalation caused vacuous low pressure areas resulting in windstorms from high above Cayuga's waters to Cal's symbolic Campanile.

The *Wall Street Journal* cites a "typical reaction" to Hesburgh's position from an administrator at California's San Fernando Valley State College: "If we had taken Father Hesburgh's stand, the place would probably have burned down." As it was, Black Militants only did \$100,000 in damages, held a Dean overnight at knife point, and forced a written promise of no reprisals. The President of a "prominent liberal arts college in the East," who refused to allow the *Journal* to use his name, stated in impeccable Liberalesque: "He has taken a simplistic approach to a complicated problem. It isn't fair to mislead so many people — including the President of the United States — into thinking that this hard line will result in restoration of peace on the campus. I haven't talked to a single college or university president who feels this is a good solution." That gives you a pretty good idea where the administrations of our schools stand, and why the student revolutionaries dare be so bold.

Dozens of universities during the current year have been besieged by arson, bombings, beatings, kidnappings of administrators, and the capturing of school buildings by renegade students. Yet the Neville Chamberlains in the halls of ivy only purse their lips and wring their hands. It is obvious that many of the student revolutionaries know that

they either have a soft touch or a secret ally in the administration and push accordingly.

Dr. Charles B. Huggins, Nobel laureate in physiology and medicine at the University of Chicago, has made these perceptive comments on the handling of student demonstrators:

*Liberals are famously capable of handling demands that originate from their right. Their defenses are well organized, their responses are facile yet firm, their knowledge of what is negotiable and what is non-negotiable is unmistakably clear. In contrast, liberals are almost completely incapable of handling demands that issue from their left. Complaints from the left confuse the liberal. Complaints from the left automatically weaken him by implication that he is not liberal enough. Demands from the left make him feel illegit. And the liberal feels this way regardless of the actual, substantive character of the demands.*

*Facing left, the liberal frankly cannot distinguish a good demand from a bad one, for voices from the left remove his bearing. . . . The liberal faces right with a forthrightness and honesty. He faces left with hypocrisy.\**

Time and again the campus Leninists have instituted revolutionary activities only to go unpunished. Columbia University, for example, arranged to have those students arrested during last spring's siege

\*When dissidents took over the administration building at the University of Chicago, Dr. Huggins called a press conference and denounced the invaders as "adolescent ugly ducklings." He called the takeover a "criminal act" and said: "This was a hijacking and we are on our way to Cuba." The "hardcore," Dr. Huggins told newsmen, is part of the International Communist Conspiracy which seeks "to bring America to its knees."

turned over to the school for "punishment." Despite the fact that the students proudly admitted violating both civil law and University regulations, Columbia's disciplinary tribunal imposed no penalties whatsoever on the young revolutionaries. This incredible decision was taken in order "to re-establish student relationship to the University." The campus Reds won complete amnesty for actions that, when they occurred, had been deemed worthy of criminal prosecution by civil authorities. Do you think any of those students quit S.D.S. because of Columbia's leniency? Or, is it more likely to have augmented their contempt for the poltroons who run the school?

Stanford recently suspended a number of students for an academic quarter. The crime was invading the Stanford Research Institute and occupying it for over a week; but, again, the punishment was mere tokenism to calm alumni and public opinion. Suspended students were not even restricted from campus. Now, the suspended revolutionaries can devote full time to agitation at the school. The fact that it will take them an extra quarter to graduate undoubtedly leaves them less than heartbroken.

Then there is *Hahvaad*, sometimes mispronounced "Harvard" by middle brows, home of the *crème de la crème* of the Liberal Establishment. National F. Review Jr., the Establishment's favorite conservative and a Yale man, lampooned Harvard's President Nathan Pusey and his fellow administrators for the spinelessness they displayed during the April unpleasantness at that institution. Even a Yale graduate could see that as an Administrator Dr. Pusey has a limp wrist. He tried to get his deah, deah revolutionaries released, but a local judge refused to grant a University request to drop charges against 169 ersatz Lenins. Those found guilty were fined (hold your breath) the grand sum of twenty dollars. One hundred thirty-nine are appealing the "sentence." Certainly the Pusey-cats are smiling. But,

not everyone at Harvard is smiling. As J.C. Helms, a Harvard graduate student, wrote to the *Wall Street Journal*:

*The problem at Harvard is not SDS. The problem is not the use of police, nor is it the student strike. The problem is the Harvard faculty: Its lenience, its blindness and its cowardice.*

*On April 9 several hundred students seized University Hall by force. They came armed with crow-bars for smashing windows and chains to secure the doors once they were inside. They evicted nine deans, dragging some of them through the halls: One was even carried out, slung over a student's shoulder. They physically beat an undergraduate in University Hall who was not in sympathy with their action: He was alone, and five of them held his arms and his hands while two others beat him... the next morning one of their leaders urged a mob of many hundreds to pelt President Pusey's house with rocks.*

*... How can it surprise us that such an incident occurs, when last year a mob of students held an interviewer from Dow Chemical Co. prisoner for seven hours, and the university did next to nothing...?*

*Can our faculty not see the damage that will surely come to this university if it is not made crystal clear that lawless force can never be permitted here? Or is the faculty always blinded by the argument that these militant moralists are fighting in a good cause?*

*I think it's time somebody called nonsense nonsense. I think it's time somebody called nuts nuts. Isn't this the generation that wants to tell it like it is? Why, then, is everyone mincing words? The students who occupied University Hall*

*are violent people; they do not belong here. Their wrongdoing is not just youthful restlessness; it is not just misdirected idealism. It is a crime, and those who committed this crime should be expelled immediately and never allowed to return.*

If students faced expulsion for participating in such violent demonstrations, the chaos would dry up faster than water in the Sahara. Yet, the National Student Association has reported that of 39,000 students who were involved in rioting during the first half of 1968, only thirty-nine were permanently suspended. The Fire and Police Research Association reveals that, in more than twenty-five years, no student has ever been expelled from the University of California — the focal point of the national student revolution.

Many are wondering why the alumni of our harassed colleges don't temper their benevolence until such time as college administrators move and move hard against the campus revolutionaries. Harvard went so far in provoking its alumni over the student strikes there this spring that the issue of *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* for April 28, 1969, was bound in a cover displaying a red, clenched fist — the international symbol of Communist revolution.

The truth of the matter is that most universities, including many private ones, are now getting so much money in federal grants that they are no longer dependent upon the benevolence of old grads. Mr. C.L. Dickinson of the Institute of Humane Studies, and a former employee of the Stanford University business office, relates that Stanford now receives nearly \$50 million a year — seventy percent of its total income — in government research grants. Like so many other prestigious schools, Stanford is no longer a private institution, but for all practical purposes a federal university.

Stanford's situation is not atypical.



**Communist Black Panthers, trained for guerrilla warfare in our cities, are now assassinating police.**

"Liberal" columnist Joseph Alsop writes that the federal government paid Harvard just under \$64 million last year — of which \$20 million went to the faculty of arts and sciences. "As to the U.S. academic world as a whole," Alsop says, "the overall federal subvention to the universities has now reached \$4.4 billion a year, even after subtracting all funds for defense contracts. Of this huge sum (far, far bigger than the federal subsidies to education of poor children) \$3.3 billion takes the form of student aid and other straight subventions that have nothing to do with any kind of research."

Congressman Paul Rogers of Florida has demanded that Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert Finch stop financing those arrested in demonstrations. Rogers ascertained that "of the 549 students arrested this school year for participating in campus disorders at San Francisco State College, 122 were receiving federal financial assistance . . . Yet there has been no indication that this assistance has been terminated."

Who is financing the revolution against

the U.S. Government? Why, the U.S. Government, of course.

Revolutionary Black Nationalism spread during the year from the inner cities onto the campus as the most militant of ghetto youth were provided with government scholarships. Once on campus, these Black thugs, far from appreciating the opportunity provided them, formed coalitions with white thugs to disrupt the schools. If university administrations were loathe to enforce discipline against white radicals, they were positively appalled at the thought that Blacks should have to obey the rules. This year the Blacks brandished weapons — including guns, spears, and clubs. Next year, you may assume, they will probably use those weapons as the radical movement requires constant escalation to maintain its momentum.

Who is to blame? Clearly, the school administrators who waived entrance requirements to bring the academically unqualified militants onto the campus in the first place. Demands made by the Black Student Unions and similar organi-

zations varied only slightly from school to school. Typical demands included: all Black flunk-outs are to be reinstated; abolition of the indignity of grades for Black students; admission of Blacks to the college without meeting *any* entrance requirements; that Blacks be allowed to attend classes when and if they feel like it; and, that after four years all collegiately registered Blacks be awarded a degree. Such requests are deemed quite reasonable by many "Liberals," but some cynics have suggested that it would be infinitely cheaper to issue every Negro child a college diploma at birth.

Of course, those who suffer most from such demands are the qualified Negro students who earned their way into school, most of whom are in the library or laboratory while their dullard brothers are threatening to torch the "racist honky college." The qualified Negro student realizes that if Negroes are given college degrees, without having to earn them, his own diploma becomes worthless.

When the above demands are met, the tribal chiefs among the militants cook up a few more "non-negotiable" demands for Whitey. A standard demand is for the establishment of "Black Studies" departments. White college administrators have been falling all over themselves establishing these little horrors. Black Studies are so ludicrous that even oldtime Negro Leftists like Bayard Rustin have ridiculed them. Rustin actually asked college officials to "stop capitulating to the stupid demands of Negro students . . . and see that they get the remedial training that they need." Bayard claimed the Black militants are looking for "an easy way out of their problems." As he phrased it: "What the hell are soul courses worth in the real world? In the real world, no one gives a damn if you've taken soul courses. They want to know if you can do mathematics and write a correct sentence." Rustin added: some white professors desire a "revolution by proxy" and are using unwitting Negroes to this end.\*

It is possible to have legitimate courses on African history and culture, although the field is somewhat limited by the absence of primary written sources. Nonetheless, most of what is masquerading as Black Studies amounts to no more than courses in Hate Whitey. Even "Liberal" columnist Joseph Alsop is concerned about Black Studies becoming studies in Black Mythology and revolutionary propaganda. "In short," Alsop writes, "the question is whether 'black studies' are going to be historically truthful and therefore intellectually respectable and academically valuable . . . . Unhappily, any practical-minded person can foresee that 'black studies' will too often fail to meet the above mentioned tests

---

\*Typical of the concessions of which Rustin speaks is the recent approval by the Academic Senate of the University of California at Santa Cruz to name the seventh college of the school after Communist Malcolm X as demanded by Black militants and their supporters.

Corroboration of Rustin's thesis of whites promoting "revolution by proxy" came recently from S.I. Hayakawa in testimony before a Senate Subcommittee. Dr. Hayakawa accused rich white radicals of recruiting black militants on American campuses to be "cannon fodder in a revolution." He told the Senators: "To use a phrase I detest, but which in this instance is all too descriptive, white revolutionaries, by their largesse, are making 'house niggers' of their black allies."

"And when the crackdown on revolutionary activities comes," he said, "it will be the black who will go to prison, not the whites who fed them, taught them their Marxism and egged them on." Hayakawa contends "that many of today's black militants are being pushed into revolution by white revolutionaries, including wealthy people from outside the college community."

The acting president of San Francisco State told the committee that black militant rhetoric stems from Communist classics dating back a half century or more: "But whites are doing much more than giving them words to recite and arguments to use . . . . They help blacks with money, food, jobs and transportation. Blacks in trouble with the police at San Francisco State are usually bailed out promptly and given expert legal help. By these means blacks are recruited to be cannon fodder in a revolution planned by whites."

...if they are commonly organized in the way now demanded. Hate-promoting readings in Frantz Fanon are more likely to be emphasized. And so will black-racist bosh like the claim once made by the New York leader of the Revolutionary Action Movement, Herman Ferguson, that there had been 'an Anglo-Semitic plot to conceal the leading role of the universities of Timbuktu' in all of Western progress and science."\*

Earlier this year, two U.C.L.A. students who were members of the Communist Black Panthers were shot to death with .38 magnums in a campus building while participating in a "discussion session" over who would control the U.C.L.A. Black Studies program. The two executioners were members of a rival Black Communist group called US (for Us Slaves) headed by psycho-fanatic Ron Karenga, an officer in the Republic of New Africa.

Ironically, the two dead Panthers were attending U.C.L.A. on government scholarships in a program which, other than being Black, had but two primary qualifications: first, you must *not* have graduated from high school; and second, you must have spent time in prison on a felony charge. Those qualifying, believe it or not, are called "high potential students."

Naturally Cornell, the victim of the most brazen takeover by armed scholarship students, is now in the process of instituting a Black Studies program. Cornell President James A. Perkins, you will recall, caved in to all the Black demands. The *Chicago Tribune* reports that Cornell is considering hiring James Turner, a graduate student in sociology and African studies at Northwestern, to be director for Afro-American studies.

\*Not all of the Black Studies curricula are academic. Federal City College in Washington, D.C., offers a course in physical development to "strengthen the body and discipline the mind," including aikido, karate, and the African hunt and dance.

Turner is described by Perkins as "militant but responsible." The *Chicago Tribune*, however, seems to know a great deal more about Mr. Turner than does President Perkins. It notes:

[James Turner] *manifested his militancy in May, 1968, by leading more than 120 black students in the occupation of Northwestern's old administration building, housing its costly data processing equipment and financial records, and demonstrated his responsibility by marching them out when Northwestern accepted all their demands, confessed guilt of white racism, apologized, and begged forgiveness.... If he declines the offer, Cornell might try to get [Communists] Robert F. Williams or Eldridge Cleaver....*

In the meantime, other revolutionary savages are raising money by blackmailing the masochist leadership of our "Liberal" churches. Communist James Forman, an officer in the Maoist Black Panther Party and also S.N.C.C.'s Director of International Affairs, has presented demands to the Episcopal Church for \$500 million in "reparations" for Negroes — to come from all white churches and synagogues. The demand is contained in a "black manifesto" adopted in Detroit during May by the National Black Economic Development Conference (N.B.E.D.C.). The Conference was sponsored by the Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization (I.F.C.D.). According to the official Communist newspaper, *The Daily World*, speakers at the affair included Communist Milton Henry of the Republic of New Africa; radical socialist Julian Bond of the Georgia State Legislature; former football star Jim Brown, whose specialty is beating-up women; Fannie Lou Hamer, of the Marxist Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party; and Marxist James Boggs, writer for a Mao-Maoist

Communist sheet called *The Liberator*.

As you might guess, the money collected is not to be distributed on a pro-rata basis to Negroes, but is earmarked for specific N.B.E.D.C. projects like the establishment of Maoist collective farms in the South — a Republic of New Africa project.

Reception of the demands has been mixed. Bishop Stephen Bayne, First Vice President of the Episcopal Executive Council, declared: "I welcome the manifesto because any sinful man, black or white or any other color, needs to be confronted with a demand for justice." California Episcopal Bishop C. Kilmer Myers described the demands by these Communists as reasonable, and added: "I do think the figure is a little low. I think the church is far more wealthy than you imagine. You are so right respecting the miserable response the church has made to this terrible injustice." As would be expected, the Union Theological Seminary is also supporting the reparations demands. The United Presbyterian Church flew Comrade Forman to its convention and applauded his speech, and top leaders of the National Council of Churches also expressed an appreciative tolerance.

"We're not begging," Communist Forman told the N.C.C.'s 250-member board, "we have a right to demand." Forman is candid about what he advocates. The *New York Times* quotes him as stating, "Whether it takes a thousand years, the economic problems of black people — and whites, too, for that matter — are not going to be solved unless there's a revolution that takes money away from the few rich whites who run this country." Since his demands have received such sympathetic backing from church leaders, Forman has upped the ante by an unspecified amount. His goal has been shifted above the \$500 million mark, "to ask for a percentage of the assets from stocks, bonds, capital investment and unrelated business incomes of all the churches."

Comrade Forman's parent I.F.C.O.

group is naturally a tax-exempt organization which, according to the *Chicago Tribune*, has distributed \$885,831 since its founding 2.5 years ago — eighty-three percent of which went to groups involved in militant or disruptive activities.\*

James Forman, you will remember, is the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Black Panthers, a paramilitary Communist organization. Panthers are required to carry their "little Red book," *Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-tung*, with them at all times. Like the New Left, the Panther movement is growing rapidly. Assistant F.B.I. Director William C. Sullivan recently reported that less than a year ago the Panthers claimed 125 members, all in Oakland, California. Today, they are operating in twenty-four cities with more than sixty thousand sympathizers. Their publication, *The Black Panther* (whose specialty is advocating mass assassination of police), has doubled its circulation in just a few months and now boasts forty thousand subscribers from coast to coast.

True, the Panthers are having some trouble. For example, twenty-one Panthers have been indicted on charges of conspiracy to murder, arson, and weapons violations stemming from their plot to set off bombs in the New York department stores of Macy's, Bloomingdale's, E.J. Korvette, Alexander's, and Abercrombie & Fitch. The bombs were to have been detonated at the height of the Easter shopping rush. In addition, the Panthers planned to dynamite the tracks of the New Haven branch of the Penn

\*The *Chicago Tribune* lists the following organizations as financing I.F.C.O., which in turn is presenting the demands of the Black Communists to American churches: American Baptist Home Missions Society; Board of Homeland Ministries of the Church of Christ; Board of Missions of the Methodist Church; Board of National Missions of the United Presbyterian Church; Executive Council of the Episcopal Church; General Board of Social Concerns of the Methodist Church; American Jewish Committee; Catholic Committee for Urban Ministry; National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice; and Foundation for Voluntary Service.

Central Railroad at six points, and to bomb the Morrisania Police Station in the Bronx as a diversionary action. As New York Supreme Court Justice Charles Marks put it: "The crime here, if carried out, could have resulted in the deaths of hundreds, even thousands." It almost was carried out. Police who had infiltrated the Panthers foiled the operation but one day before it was set to be triggered.

The Republic of New Africa is another organization very similar to the Black Panthers. The principle object of R.N.A. is the establishment of a Negro Soviet Republic in the South — a Communist Party project which dates back to at least 1928.\* The demands of R.N.A. are simple. All it wants is the states of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina, plus \$400 billion in reparations. Remember that R.N.A. founder Milton Henry is part of Forman's group seeking reparations from the churches.

The R.N.A. is only a little over a year old and its membership is limited, but the Communist line behind it has many adherents. Robert M. Hutchins, Director of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, says ghettologists estimate that about thirty percent of the Negro slum-dwellers are now advocates of such black separatism. According to Robert Sherrill, writing on R.N.A. in *Esquire* for January 1969, this "comes to a million or so Negroes eager to make the break and who are — according to the timetable of New Africa's politicians-in-exile — ready right now to get things started with guns."

---

\*And, the line is still a part of the official Communist program. The November 1968 issue of *Political Affairs*, official theoretical journal of the Communist Party, U.S.A., carried an article credited to top Comrade Claude Lightfoot entitled "The Right of Black America to Create a Nation," identified as material discussed at the Special Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., held in July of 1968. As the title implies, the article supports the establishment of a Negro Soviet Republic in the American South.

According to Sherrill, Comrade Milton Henry's strategy seeks to establish the Republic of New Africa in these steps:

*(1) Arm the black communities of the North and West, and if whitey tries anything rough, blast hell out of him . . . (2) Ship about a million well-armed blacks into Mississippi, take over all of the sheriffs' jobs through the ballot box, seize the government, and then move on to Alabama and repeat the process; the next three Southern states would be seized in no special order, but it would be done in the same way, by shipping in armed blacks who would first try to grab the government by voting and, if that didn't work, by guerilla warfare.*

According to Milton Henry, the shift of black Comrades to Mississippi has already begun. He states:

*We have bought a hundred acres in Mississippi. That isn't much land but it is sufficient for a base headquarters. Like the Jews moving into Israel we will start to organize along the lines of cooperative and collective farms. You have to be able to feed your people. But the collective farm does more than just provide food. It's a center where people can get together, can politic themselves and can protect themselves.*

You will recall that \$200 million of the money Communist James Forman hopes to blackmail from the churches is earmarked for buying property for collective farms in the South. You will also recall that Communist Milton Henry is a charter member of Forman's extortion gang. In fact, he may really be the head of it. Are the pieces starting to fit?

They *should* be!

According to Henry:

*The reason we are setting up a Black Legion [R.N.A.'s army] is so we will get our votes counted. If you bring in enough voters to take over a county, that gives you a sheriff. If you are wise in selecting your county — particularly in the Mississippi delta — you will have a large number of blacks to build with. Then we will have a legitimate military force, legitimate under U.S. law, made up of people who can be deputized and armed. The influence we will then exercise over the whole area of Mississippi will immediately be disproportionate to the numbers under our command. If we had only four sheriffs down there, with all that can be done with deputizing, we could change the state of Mississippi.*

The R.N.A. is convinced that with the U.S. Army tied down in Vietnam or elsewhere, and the threat of major guerrilla warfare in all major cities, the government will negotiate. Says Henry:

*We've got second-strike power now in our guerrillas within the metropolitan areas — black men, armed. Say we started taking over Mississippi — which we are capable of doing right now — and the United States started to interfere. Well, our guerrillas all over the country would strike. Our second-strike capability would be to prevent the United States Armed Forces from working us over, not the local forces. The local forces couldn't compete with our forces . . . . They [the U.S. government] can't win in Vietnam and they can't win in the United States. We can fight from within. How are they going to get us out of here? Where would they make the guns to shoot us — in the United States? Do you think we are just going to let them*

*keep on making guns? How will they transport their guns and soldiers — on railroad trains? The United States can be destroyed [by sabotage and guerrilla warfare]."*

What happens to the industries and farms of the South? Henry replies:

*We keep them. We take them and we keep them. The United States would pay reparations . . .*

Author Robert Sherrill asked a number of white Southerners whether they would stay if R.N.A. took over. A typical reply came from former Mississippi Governor Paul Johnson, who said: "I would stay. I surely would. For one thing, I own a great deal of property here. It's not hard to make a real fine living for your family and loved ones." With all due respect, former Governor Johnson doesn't quite get the picture.

And, alas, that's just the problem. Americans *don't* get the picture. On Easter weekend, revolutionaries marched fifty-thousand strong in the streets of New York City to support the Communist Vietcong; our politicians are already preparing to turn Vietnam over to the Communists; Communist-led riots in our streets and colleges have become commonplace; inflation is eating up the American dollar; the socialist dole has reached an all-time high; judicial permissiveness has tied the hands of our police as crime explodes all over America; smut, revolution, and pornography are pushed at our children from every conceivable source; Communist sabotage and violence are sweeping the country.

What is happening is that the Communists are moving in on America — and doing it fast. It's time we *all* "got the picture." When we do, we will stop them and stop them cold. Until we do, however, the *Scoreboard* figure for the United States is going to continue to be frighteningly high. ■ ■