

WHAT ABOUT TOMORROW?

Top level, strategically planned racial demonstrations are springing up 'spontaneously' all over America. These groups warn of national revolution unless racial demands are met. What was once 'a problem for the South' has become a problem for every state, city and community. It threatens the Negro, just as well as the white man.

These same organized racial agitators, who proclaim and cite their constitutional right of 'peaceful integration' are aiming at destruction of orderly freedom. History of the last 30 years reveals a long list of nations taken over by Communists, through use of racial agitation.

These agitators are not merely asking for 'equal rights' for the Negro; they are demanding 'special rights' in violation of the rights of all people. They are demanding the right to violate city ordinances and state laws.

They are demanding—and getting—immunities and special privileges for Negro citizens which white citizens do not possess.

Demonstrators claim they are fighting for their 'dignity', but is there any 'dignity' shown here in these hysterical demonstrations? Do they not suggest that they are a phony front for something alarmingly different? In other countries racial upheavals have been created to bring about artificial conditions designed to climax a need for military dictatorship. America was born in the hearts of men because of the urgent need for freedom from oppression and dictatorship. Love of God and fellow man was the strong fabric from which it was constructed. Today there are salesmen selling hate of their fellow man and inflaming racial tensions, rather than seeking fair solutions.

Rights and Responsibilities

Private property, such as a restaurant, can not be regulated as though it were a public highway. It is up to each individual to set the standards for his establishment, to which his clientele must conform. Private rights include the right to be left alone, as well as the privilege to make or lose money, according to the way the individual chooses to conduct his business, no matter how wise or how foolish. It is the responsibility of all men to respect the rights of others.

Until now it has been the storekeeper's right (and that means every man's right under the Constitution) to serve the persons of his choice—to cater to whom he chooses. This is a Constitutional Right, incident to the ownership of private property. He has been free to refuse to serve anyone whom

he chooses not to serve. If a storekeeper can be compelled to serve in his store, people he would rather not serve, the institution of private property is endangered. His store has become public property—and your private property rights have become endangered. Yet that is precisely what the present administration is seeking to accomplish by invoking the "interstate commerce" clause of the Constitution.

Under this kind of dictatorship, the doctor, who prefers to select his office location, choose his nurse and be a heart specialist, can be required to be a general practitioner, told whom to employ and where he shall work. If he refuses, he can have his office seized and occupied by the favorites of the bureaucracy. The same would become the case for editors, lawyers, salesmen, etc.

Private Property Rights

If the right of private property is taken away from the citizen in an artificial emergency, created by professionally sponsored racial riots, then Congress might be 'pressured' into passing Federal 'Emergency' measures under the label of saving our nation from internal disorders. This could result in a total dictatorship, and our hard fought-for freedoms will have vanished. This would prove as disastrous for the Negro as for the white man.

There is now substantial agreement that the Negro should have equal voting opportunities and equal opportunity in the use of all public facilities. But to give the Negro his due is one thing. To sacrifice any of our basic liberties in the process is quite another. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and in this day and hour the Negro agitator is asking for more than equality; he is demanding, and getting special rights (in the form of decisions by our courts) which invade the rights of all citizens. The voices of the responsible Negro leaders who are alert to these dangers are drowned out in the mounting hysteria over the attainment of false goals.

Constitution and Congress—Law of the Land

According to the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the land are made by the Congress. The Supreme Court merely renders an opinion, as to the applicability of these laws to a specific case before it. Its opinion becomes the law of that case. As such, it is indicative of how the Court (as currently constituted) may be expected to decide a similar case. However, to declare an opinion of the court to be

'the law of the land' is to declare that the Supreme Court and not the Congress makes the laws. This is unconstitutional. But you may be sure that this is what a dictatorship in control of the court, but not of the Congress, would like to have you believe.

Senator Russell Charges

Of the planned race riots going on all over the United States Senator Richard B. Russell charged on June 12, 1963 that President Kennedy was raising the spectre of mass racial violence to push Civil Rights proposals that were a step in the direction of Socialism or Communism.

"I was . . . shocked" he said "to hear the President justify, if not encourage, the present wave of mass demonstrations, accompanied by the practices of sitting or lying in public streets and blocking traffic; forming human walls before the doors of legal businesses and assaulting with deadly weapons officers of the law, whose only offense was to maintain order and protect private property."

Let the "Cause" Be Removed

If the Communists succeed in America it will be because of a constant whittling away of our constitutional rights. To succeed in this, he must have a 'cause' with which to bring about chaos. If the 'cause' is removed, another must be created, and the pattern repeated. Without 'cause' the Communists are soldiers without ammunition. In Brazil their cause was 'inflation'; in China—agrarian reform; in Cuba it was to 'abolish the Batista dictatorship'. After a 7-year struggle in Algeria, Communist-led Moslems, using racial discord, succeeded in gaining control of the government from the French. As in Algeria, the 'cause' they have adopted in America is racial conflict.

There can be no doubt that the Communist is delighted at the opportunity being presented him to adopt this 'cause'. He will render every aid to the 'pressure-demand' tactics which serve his end. For him every assault on one of our basic liberties is a stepping stone towards a Communist America. There are none so blind as those who will not see, and none so dangerously blind today as those who refuse to recognize the blueprint for the Communist takeover of America.

What Savannah Citizens are urged to do:



AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

1. There is a Savannah city ordinance (Section 24—123.1, 2 and 3) which prohibits mass picketing. This was passed to protect each citizen's right to conduct his business. However, this ordinance permits the picket the right of self expression. Recently mass marches have been practiced. In long columns of single file, pickets have interfered with customers' access to business establishments, in violation of this ordinance. Urge the Mayor and all merchants to have this ordinance enforced. Write Mayor Malcolm Maclean, City Hall, Savannah, and tell him you want him to protect your right to own property, and your individual right to carry on your business as you see fit.
2. Urge the City Council to immediately enact new and stronger ordinances to better control and regulate demonstrations and parades.
3. Write your Senators and representative, and urge them to protect your private property rights. (Senator Richard Russell, Senator Herman Talmadge, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Congressman G. Elliott Hagan, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.)
4. Support and encourage by phone or letter, the merchants who are defending property rights. They are the front line soldiers for you! Purchase from them to show your support.
5. Every American should discontinue buying magazines that give untrue reports of the news. Insist on moral standards in everything you do.

What Atlantans are urged to do:

The time has come for every voter to consider future elections and the candidates who will be run. They should evaluate this carefully. It is time both political parties learn that those who were able to get themselves elected on either ticket, could just as well be elected on an independent ticket. To get proper representation, people of principles and integrity must be selected as your Electors and sent to the Conventions unpledged and committed to no candidate, unless the candidate proposed fills the high standards the voter should require in the men selected to run our Nation.

1. The 14th Amendment did not make the Bill of Rights applicable against the States, as proved conclusively by a distinguished and lengthy article, based upon exhaustive research, by Stanford University's former Law Professor Charles Fairman—supplemented by another splendid article by his colleague there, Professor Stanley Morrison—in the Stanford Law Review of December, 1949. Citing the Fairman article, the Supreme Court admitted the truth of this proposition in the 1959 *Bartkus* case (page 124 of opinion), stating:

"We have held from the beginning and uniformly that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment does not apply to the States any of the provisions of the first eight amendments as such. The relevant historical materials have been canvassed by this Court and by legal scholars. These materials demonstrate conclusively that the Congress and the members of the legislatures of the ratifying States did not contemplate that the Fourteenth Amendment was a shorthand incorporation of the first eight amendments making them applicable as explicit restrictions upon the States."

*Citing earlier cases. **Citing the Fairman article (mentioned above). No scholar possessing requisite competence and intellectual integrity would pretend to the contrary. The two articles mentioned above exposed, scorned, Justice Hugo Black's conflicting pretenses as being based upon inexcusably inadequate research.

2. A power granted to the Federal government under the Constitution cannot be misused to accomplish a prohibited end, as the Supreme Court soundly decided in the *Buster* ("AAA") case in 1936—pp. 73-74 of opinion; namely, the power to tax and spend cannot be misused to effect control over agriculture, farmers. This decision, entirely in keeping with the controlling intent with which the Constitution was framed and adopted (and no contrary amendment was ever adopted), continues to be the correct construction of the Constitution; which makes null and void the conflicting decision in 1942 in the *Wickard* case by which the Court committed rank usurpation.

3. Individual Liberty—for instance, that part of Liberty pertaining to the constitutional rights of owners of private property—can never properly be sacrificed in the name of Equality, misconstrued to have a meaning never contemplated by the Framers and Adopters of the original Constitution or of any Amendment. Equality—meaning only in the eyes of God and of Law, according to the Declaration of Independence—is always subject to the duty and responsibility, including the legal and moral duty to respect the limits of the right to Equality stop where the limits of the right to Liberty begin; neither can ever infringe upon the other's area, constitutionally.

4. The foregoing is apropos, for example, of current violations and proposed violations of the constitutional rights of property—such as stores and restaurants; and it is particularly pertinent regarding those who violate Rule by Law, including law and order, to achieve the means: This leads to moral bankruptcy.