

# MARTIN LUTHER



United States  
of America

## Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 113

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1967

No. 158

## REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING: MAN OF PEACE OR APOSTLE OF VIOLENCE?

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most incredible cases of American naivety can be found in the strange story of Rev. Martin Luther King. While alert Americans generally seem intent on discovering the facts, discussing the issues, and developing a dialog in scores of social, economic, political, and religious areas and debating the pros and cons of the Bishop Pike, the Rap Brown, and the George Lincoln Rockwells, there is a strange silence and lack of debate when it comes to Martin Luther King.

It is almost as if he is being consciously protected by the press which normally accepts accolades for presenting both sides of a story and piercing with rays of informative reportorial light all proper facets of national life. King is a national figure, this cannot be denied. He is one of the only men who can go from tall cell to a conference with the President of the United States. His name is known; his cause is said to be civil rights. For one reason or another, however, very little is known about the real Martin Luther King. I believe that if his true character were known, he would not be able to command a corporal's guard to follow him.

While preaching nonviolence, I believe the record clearly shows him to be an apostle of violence. While gaining major support from clergymen, I believe he has preached an expedient, totally materialistic line which is the antithesis of religious teachings. He has openly associated with the most radical elements in our society. I believe he has done more for the Communist Party than any other person of this decade.

These may sound like strong words, Mr. Speaker, but the facts are even harsher. I have heard Reverend King speak. On one occasion he may have a soulful melancholy that is, without doubt, most impressive. On another, he can rant with the best of the demagogues, and while more sophisticated than Stokely Carmichael or Rap Brown, he says, in effect, the same thing. He makes no pretense of keeping his skirts clean or his house in order. He does not have to because the past 18 years have demonstrated that the liberal community and the news media of our country will either not note or meekly forgive his indiscretions.

Take the year 1967 alone. At a time when Detroit and Newark had just witnessed a virtual guerrilla war and a chaotic lawlessness without equal in modern times, King was urging a massive dislocation of northern cities. Instead of intervening as a moderating influence he took up the cause of the rabble-rousers and threatened these dislocations which, he averred, would force the Congress to provide financial assistance for slum Negroes. Yes, he would force us. Force us in this free society. Force is a word he understands well. He added:

This is something like a last plea to the nation to respond to nonviolence. There is a great deal of bitterness (in the slums). If there is not provided a channel of constructive action, this bitterness will lead to desperation riots and social disruption.

At a time when the incendiary statements of Brown and Carmichael were sparking the riot-prone tensions, did King emerge as a national leader seeking to soothe these passions? No, he attended as keynote speaker the most radical assembly of anti-Americans ever put together, and as the Communist Daily Worker approvingly and glowingly reported:

He described vividly the racism that can praise in its history books a white Patrick Henry who sounded the call against the

British redcoats while it condemns E. Rap Brown who insists that black victims of oppression in America should fight for their freedom.

Imagine that—comparing the rabble-rousers, the looters, the social misfits in America to patriots like Patrick Henry. He was further quoted as saying "Maybe the bluecoats in the ghetto are our redcoats."

The convention, the National Conference for New Politics—NCNP—heard chantings of "Kill Whitey, Kill Whitey" and the most revolutionary anti-American doctrine that could be imagined and yet the August 29-September 4, 1967, confab had the supposed "man of peace" Mr. King as their keynote. It represented a major breakthrough for the Communist Party and King helped. For years, the Communists have chafed at the doctrine of separation which tended to keep them out of respectable liberal gatherings. In the 1930's, the liberals worked hand in hand with the Reds but the growth of anticommunism in the Nation has brought about a change in the 1960's and 1960's. Except for the more radical groups, liberals in general have tried to keep Communists from participating in their causes and at their conventions. King has consistently worked with Communists and has helped give them a respectability they do not deserve. The NCNP in Chicago represented such a breakthrough in the Red goal of "non-exclusion" that they editorialized gleefully in their organ, the Daily Worker, on August 22, 1967.

Reverend King is the hero of many militant Negro leaders although denounced by others in the black power structure. He has allied with Cassius Clay. When you study his speeches closely you are struck by the obvious fact that while ostensibly condemning racism, he himself preaches a black racism. One of the leading black racists in the country is Rev. Albert C. Cleage, Jr., who just after the terrible riot told his Central United Church of Christ in Detroit:

There is no escape for you and what white people try to tell that good niggers can get through this golden door of integration, don't believe it. We don't even want that door because that's destroying us.

Cleage went on to say:

We are dealing with an enemy who is not going to accept us into American life.

In extolling King, he noted:

Dr. King led black people to understand that integration could never come to pass. He helped black men understand that "the man" is an enemy.

In his flagrant disregard for law and order, Reverend King has given credibility to one of the most dangerous dogmas that can be promoted in an orderly society. He simply arrogates to his own inspiration the whim to disobey any law which is loosely termed unjust. Court orders, State, and Federal laws, municipal ordinances—they must all fall in front of his supposition that he has a divine right to break the law. His conduct is clearly criminal in this regard and certainly has helped develop the idea among rioters and looters that they can obey their own concepts of good and bad laws and act accordingly.

Like most power-hungry tyrants, he has gone one step too far. In disobeying a court order, he was sentenced to jail. On appeal to the Supreme Court, he was surprised to find that a usually supine and hopelessly liberal Court rose up in indignation and slapped his wrists in a strong indictment of his illegal activity. Said the Court in affirming his jail sentence on June 12, 1967:

This Court cannot hold that the petitioners were constitutionally free to ignore all the provisions of the law and carry their battle to the streets. One may sympathize with the petitioners' impatient commitment to their cause. But respect for judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of

law, which alone can give abiding meaning to constitutional freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this succinct statement should be burned into the consciousness of all of those who have at one time or another fallen for the pious pronouncements of Martin Luther King. Carrying the battles to the streets, as the Court phrases it, is not a constitutional right. It is, in reality, criminal conduct and should not be condoned by any thinking American. I repeat again the Court's most emphatic statement:

But respect for judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, which alone can give abiding meaning to constitutional freedom.

At the height of the rioting fury which was sweeping the country, King joined three other civil rights leaders in issuing a cautious call for an end to violence because, among other things, it is self-destructive to the Negroes' interest. This was on July 24, 1967. Two days later King was visiting Cleveland, Ohio, on an inspection tour. He tersely expanded on his theme of violence being self-destructive when he said:

I don't recommend burning down Cleveland. We end up getting killed more than anyone else and our businesses get burned.

No statement, Mr. Speaker, could more clearly expose the irresponsible, cynical nature of the subject of these remarks. This is typical of the manner in which he advocates "nonviolence." Burning,

looting, and killing are not immoral or wrong, it would seem. Merely destructive to the self-interest of this particular minority group.

Reverend King expresses indignation over Vietnam. In this he is joined by many millions of Americans. Few of us are pleased at what is happening there but we are not disloyal to our Nation. Reverend King showed his true colors in April of this year in a major speech he delivered on Vietnam. I believe that any thinking American who will study his words must conclude as I have that he is disloyal to the United States. He maligned his country with lies and accusations that come straight from the Communist Party line. A strong statement you say. Listen to what he said. He praised Ho Chi Minh as the only true leader of the Vietnamese people. He condemned the United States as the "greatest purveyor of violence in the world today," and likened our Nation to Hitler's Germany. He condemned the late President Diem as "one of the most vicious modern dictators" and threw out wild charges like the United States may have killed 1 million children in Vietnam. He conjured up an American napalm war in Peru so he could denounce it. He said we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam and our minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony. These are but a few of the wild accusations of the Nobel Prize winner many people have been led to believe is a man of peace.

Even the ultraliberal Washington Post could not stomach King's blatant lies and propaganda. In an editorial entitled "A Tragedy," they roundly condemned King by saying:

A TRAGEDY

Dr. Martin Luther King's Vietnam speech was not a sober and responsible comment on the war but a reflection of his disappointment at the slow progress of civil rights and the war on poverty.

It was filled with bitter and damaging allegations and inferences that he did not and could not document. He flatly charged the Government with sending Negroes to fight and die in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. But Negro troops constitute 11 per cent of the enlisted personnel in Vietnam (16.5 per cent of the population was Negro in 1960). Negro casualties are higher than this (23.5 per cent of killed in action) because of higher Negro enlistment for elite corps and higher rate of Negro re-enlistment. No doubt these figures reflect in part the fact that civilian employment opportunities are not as great for the Negro. But they also reflect, in part, the seal and courage of Negro soldiers. And they reflect the fact that in this war the Negro uniform is not limited to work battalions.

Dr. King says the United States may have caused a million civilian casualties in Vietnam—mostly children—but he did not give

### THE ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT

## King Plan: Blame Congress

WASHINGTON—In singing out Congress as their principal scapegoat for the big city riots, militant civil rights leaders are setting their sights on obtaining more than massive federal funds for the Negro ghettos and job-training programs.

The attacks against Congress spearheaded by Dr. Martin Luther King, head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and Bayard Rustin, executive director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute, are part of an over-all campaign to establish a political "third force" by 1968.

Immediate objectives, which will be advanced by demonstrations and mass meetings here this fall, are to drive a deep wedge between Congress and the other two branches of government and to develop a multiparty system.

Long-range goals of King and Rustin are to use the proposed "third force" as a political movement to bring about basic changes.

### Cover-up for Stokely, Brews

In telephone calls around the country, King and Rustin outlined these plans while urging other civil rights, peace, student, and labor groups, and friendly politicians to center the blame for the riots on Congress.

By adopting this strategy, King and Rustin are saying that a "united front" could be built up to attack Congress, especially the House of Representatives. These attacks also would draw public attention and criticism for the riots away from such advocates of violence as Stokely Carmichael and E. Rap Brown, according to King and Rustin.

Both Brown and Carmichael are connected

with the so-called Student Nonviolent Coordinating committee and have been preaching violence and black power thrust the country. Carmichael is now in Cuba.

The King-Rustin plan calls for the "united front" to be operating as soon after Labor Day as possible in order to begin organizing for the coming battle to seat the former Harlem congressman, Adam Clayton Powell.

The second round in this historic constitutional battle should take place in early October, when Powell's petition to regain his House seat reaches the Supreme court. His petition, denied in Federal court here, is on appeal to the United States Circuit court.

By uniting these forces behind Powell, King and Rustin hope to create a national political issue to stir up Negroes in all the large cities and encourage them to become active with peace groups in the new "third force."

### Expect Favorable Ruling

According to information gathered by House Democratic leaders, the King-Rustin strategy is being based on the assumption that the Supreme court will rule in favor of Powell and the House will again refuse to seat the Harlem Democrat.

Should a constitutional deadlock of this magnitude develop, the House leaders admit it could cause one of the gravest internal power struggles in this nation's history.

"Under the explosive racial conditions in this country," one House Democratic leader warned during a recent private discussion on the Powell case, "demonstrations in this country could easily lead to a riot that would set everything afire here."

It was the consensus of the House leaders taking part in the discussions that Powell, who was reelected in a special election this spring, was delaying his return as part of the King-Rustin strategy.



Robert S. Allen  
Paul Scott

# DR. KING EXPOSED

any supporting authority for this statement. He stated flatly that "our officials know" that less than 25 per cent of the members of the National Liberation Front are Communist—but he neglected to say what officials or where they said it.

He contends that Ho Chi Minh knows that the bombing and shelling we are doing is "part of traditional provocation strategy," but gives no credence to our express declaration that no invasion is intended.

He has no doubts that we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam and thinks it will become clear that our "minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony." He feels that men will "not refrain from thinking" that our "maximum hope is to good China into a war so that we may bomb her nuclear installations." It is one thing to reproach a government for what it has done and said; it is quite another to attribute to it policies it has never avowed and purposes it has never entertained and then to rebuke it for these sheer inventions of unsupported fantasy.

He has even conjured up an American napalm war in Peru so that he could denounce it.

Dr. King is right to reproach America for not ending discrimination and poverty. But these are failures for which every Administration in the history of the United States deserves more reproach than this one. It is strange irony indeed that the Government which has labored the hardest to right these ancient wrongs is the object of the most savage denunciation, the most unreserved criticism and the most unfair blame.

Dr. King has done a grave injury to those who are his natural allies in a great struggle to remove ancient abuses from our public life; and he has done an even graver injury to himself. Many who have listened to him with respect will never again accord him the same confidence. He has diminished his usefulness to his cause, to his country and to his people. And that is a great tragedy.

To those liberals and bleeding hearts who have not intelligently discerned what King has been saying and doing during his decade of prominence, this may have come as a tragedy. To those of us who have followed him closely and have been aware, by both public and confidential documentation, of his questionable activity, it comes as no surprise at all. In 1967 the real King surfaced and yet where is the criticism he should be getting?

These are but a few highlights, Mr. Speaker, in the disappointing story of Martin Luther King. I say disappointing because he has had a rare opportunity to align himself with an important cause and work for solutions to social ills through our democratic process. This he has not done. He has had the opportunity to work with men of good will but all too often he has allied himself with the most radical and un-American elements in our country. I now present in detail some of the background of Martin Luther King.

**THE VIOLENT NONVIOLENCE OF DR. KING**  
"I have a deep commitment to non-violence"—Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

On May 4, 1963, police dogs and firehoses were used to quell a demonstration by lawbreakers in Birmingham, Ala. There had been violence plain and simple. Martin Luther King and his right-hand man, Rev. Fred L. Shuttlesworth, threatened that these demonstrations would continue until there were not only promises of an end to segregation but "action." There was, they said, "no intention of relaxing pressure without such action. We negotiate from strength" and "will consider" calling off the demonstrations after the action. This was the mood of the well-known nonviolence of Dr. King.

The day following action by police dogs and firehoses, the New York Times reported that residents of Birmingham heard from the lips of King, the man who preached peace in the streets but led the lawless bands:

Today was D-Day. Tomorrow will be double D-Day.

One seldom hears Martin Luther King's name without the "nonviolent" slogans coming in successive breaths. But quite often the nonviolence of King leads to violence of riot proportions. The big lie technique is clearly used. Repeat "nonviolence" over and over so the public will believe it and then practice violence or the encouraging of violence.

Violence accompanied King during his early days in Birmingham. It was present during the death of a fellow pastor at, of all places, a Baptist convention. It was with him in Albany, Ga. It returned with him to Birmingham and Albany. It followed him to St. Augustine, and they were together in Chicago. It is not an exaggeration to say he leaves a trail of violence in his wake.

In addition to the physical presence of Martin Luther King in flammable cities, there is the presence of King's words and ideas in every tension area across the United States. The power of Dr. King to promote violence was recognized early. Arrested for loitering in 1954, King was charged with irresponsibility by a judge who said:

It is regrettable that this case arose . . . there was serious danger of an incident.

On many occasions, like Chicago in

1966, he goes to the scene of violence and instead of trying to settle troubled waters, he adds to the riot-producing tension.

Early statements of King reveal continued use of the phrase "direct action programs." His philosophy and purpose as outlined in his book, "Why We Can't Wait," amount to this. Note his forked tongue, semantics. He admits that there is an effort to create a "crisis packed situation" but he concludes he is not a "creator of tension." He stated:

The purpose of our direct-action program is to create a situation so crisis-packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation. . . . Actually, we who engage in non-violent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with.

In August of this year, at a time of serious racial tension, he said virtually the same thing—again with a certain amount of double talk. King said:

Negroes will be mentally healthier if they do not suppress rage but vent it constructively and its energy peacefully but forcefully to cripple the operations of an oppressive society.

Read that one over several times and try to tie together the words "rage" which somehow is to be "vented" to "cripple" an "oppressive society."

Louis Waldman, a leading Negro labor lawyer in Chicago, answered King's statement this way:

The philosophy and purpose of Dr. King's program . . . is to produce "crisis-packed" situations and "tension." Such a purpose is the very opposite of nonviolence, for the atmosphere-of-crisis policy leads to violence by provoking violence. And the provocation of violence to violence. To describe such provocation as "nonviolent" is to trifle with the plain meaning of words.

The perpetual crisis technique has been used by the Communist movement throughout the world, both Communist governments and parties follow it. . . . It was used by Hitler in Germany, both on his road to power and after power came to him. . . . It is disruptive of democratic society and institutions.

Whether Dr. King knows it or not, or wills it or not, the policy of perpetual crisis, of provoking "tensions" as he calls it, and of civil disobedience, are disastrous to the Negro people themselves, to civil liberties and to constitutional government. Such a policy lies in the teeth of the very purpose of our Constitution, which is clearly stated in the Preamble to be, among other things, "to insure domestic tranquility."

This is a damning indictment from a man who praises nonviolent approaches to problems of civil rights, and it comes not from a racist, but from a Negro who has been a champion of civil rights for decades.

Most Americans call the bloodshed, looting, fire bombing, and vandalism by its true name, violence, and to argue that these results of the King-led, -organized, and -backed marches, demonstrations, sit-ins, lie-ins, and the like are the fault of those who react against them is to argue not only against logic but also the law. The Supreme Court, in Hague against CIO, 1939, said:

The privilege of a citizen to use the streets and parks for the communication of views on national questions must be regulated in the interests of all . . . and must be exercised in subordination to the general comfort and convenience, and in consonance with peace and good order.

This opinion of the Court was reaffirmed as late as 1966. Former Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Whittaker makes the point that it is an "ancient and honored legal maxim that all men are presumed to intend the natural consequences of their acts." From this maxim comes severe condemnation of Dr. King for the broad areas of unrest and lawlessness which he promotes under the title of civil rights. Largely through the connivance of the liberal community, King has generally escaped the responsibility he deserves for the logical consequences of his civil disobedience pronouncements.

**THE UNJUST LAWS**  
King explained his ideas on civil disobedience in terms of just and unjust laws, and how they are to be broken, during an interview on the March 28, 1965, "Meet the Press":

I do feel that there are two types of laws. One is a just law and one is an unjust law. I think we all have moral obligations to disobey unjust laws.

I think that the distinction here is that when one breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, he must do it openly, he must do it cheerfully, he must do it lovingly, he must do it civilly, not uncivilly, and he must do it with a willingness to accept the penalty.

To King the only guide whether or not to violate the law is his own particular whim or caprice. He and he alone will decide. Note that there is no mention of the fact that following one's conscience may violate the conscious obedience to the law by many other citizens. To King it makes no difference, if one accepts the penalty.

In the recent Birmingham decision,



This well-circulated picture places Martin Luther King at a subversive training school. Four well-known leftists are shown and identified by number.

No. 1. Martin Luther King, Jr.

No. 2. Abner W. Berry, long-time Communist Party functionary; as early as 1938 he gave the report of the Negro Commission of the CP at the 10th National Convention of the Communist Party; later was Negro affairs editor of Daily Worker. His column in the Daily Worker of September 18, 1957, page 5, described the seminar which both he and King attended.

No. 3. Aubrey Williams, board member of Southern Conference for Human Welfare—SCHW—a cited Communist front and president of Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.—SCEF—which replaced SCHW. Senate report

found that SCEF had substantially same leadership and purposes of predecessor organization, SCHW. Also affiliated with Highlander Folk School. Identified as a Communist Party member by one witness before Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; another witness identified him as one who accepted the discipline of Communist Party. He denied both charges but admitted that he had been connected with a member of Communist-front organizations.

No. 4. Myles Horton takes credit for starting Highlander Folk School. Like Williams, was a board member of SCHW and became a director of SCEF. One former Communist organizer testified before congressional committee that Horton once remarked, "I am doing you just as much good now as I would if I were a member of the Communist Party."

already cited, which upheld fines and jail terms for King and others who defied a court injunction against a civil rights march, the majority of the Supreme Court agreed that:

Civil liberties, as guaranteed by the Constitution, imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of unrestrained abuses. . . . Respect for the judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, which alone can give meaning to constitutional freedom. (Emphasis added.)

As usual, Reverend King tried to equate his own illegal contempt of court to Negro injustice. Appearing on the nationwide June 18, 1967, ABC program "Issues and Answers" he found the prospect of his 5-day jail sentence and the U.S. Supreme Court decision which ordered it upsetting to all Negroes. He warned the decision would "encourage riots and violence in the sense that it all but said that Negroes cannot redress their grievances through peaceful means without facing the kind of decision that we face."

This is directly false. In addition to his usual "invitation" to riots and violence, he tries to evade the real issue. He was not engaging in "peaceful means." He was engaging in illegal means, flouting the judicial process. The court decision was not saying anything to Negroes, it was a statement of the law of the land which was clearly applicable to every American. The true King can be seen in this twisting of the facts, his effort at personal martyrdom and the veiled threat of riots and violence which he uses in virtually every situation.

The value of committing acts of civil disobedience "openly," "lovingly," as it were, is commented on by Attorney Waldman, previously cited:

Apparently, Dr. King thinks that in violating laws "openly" he and his followers are more virtuous than those who violate law secretly. As a matter of fact, the reverse is true. The open violation of law is an open invitation to others to join in such violation. Disobedience to law is bad enough when done secretly, but it is far worse when done openly, especially when accompanied by clothing such acts in the mantle of virtue and organizing well advertised and financed plans to carry out such violations. The secret violator of law recognizes his act for what it is: an antisocial act; he may even be ashamed of what he is doing and seek to avoid disapprobation of his neighbors. But the open violator, the agitating violator, acts shamelessly, in defiance of his neighbor's judgment and his fellow man's disapproval.

Dr. King defines unjust laws as "those in which people are required to obey a code that they had no part in making because they were denied the right to vote."

When pinned down about communities where Negroes have the right to vote, and asked whether there was still the "right" to disobey, King expanded his

code for lawlessness even more:

There may be a community where Negroes have the right to vote, but there are still unjust laws in that community. There may be unjust laws in a community where people in large numbers are voting, and I think wherever unjust laws exist people have a right to disobey these laws.

Here King jumped from Negroes to all people and from people without voting privileges to even those who do have the constitutional methods of change open to them. To him, the majority might always be wrong, the minority always right. Acceptance and promotion of this philosophy can only lead to the disintegration of American society. From it follows the chaotic situation where any one who believes, or even feels, that a law is unjust merely disobeys. The denial of freedom to the majority of Americans who obey the law is proportional to the number of persons who set themselves up as final judge and then disobey. While professing Christianity and humility, King strikes a harder blow at fundamental concepts of justice than any would-be dictator or other demagog in contemporary American history.

On the same "Meet the Press" program referred to earlier, Tom Wicker of the New York Times asked:

How are we to enforce law when a doctrine is preached that one man's conscience may tell him that the law is unjust, when other men's consciences don't tell him that?

King responded:

I think you enforce it, and I think you deal with it by not allowing anarchy to develop. I think the chief norm for guiding the situation is the willingness to accept the penalty, and I don't think any society can call an individual irresponsible who breaks a law and willingly accepts the penalty.

This is more King jibberish and feigned piety. To commit murder, for example, and then willingly go to prison to pay the penalty cannot change the nature of the transgression—it is still wrong.

Willingly or not, the question is still, in Judge Whittaker's words:

Can anyone reasonably believe that a disorderly society can survive? In all recorded history none ever has. . . . History also shows that, in each instance, the first evidence of the society's decay appeared in its toleration of disrespect for, and violation of, its law. There is no good reason to believe that similar toleration will serve us differently.

**WHEN CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE BECOMES NECESSARY**

Inflammatory statements, threats and actual instances of civil disobedience are evident throughout the career of Martin Luther King. In December 1959, King called on southern Negroes to practice civil disobedience. If necessary, and to break openly, any State or local law "not in harmony with Federal law. This," he continued, "is the creative moment for a full scale assault on the system of segregation. We must practice open, civil

disobedience."

In the fall of 1961 King spoke on the role of the Negro student, stated his hollow call for nonviolence and in the next breath called for "disobeying the unjust laws."

Two years later in Birmingham, King warned that city of more massive demonstrations:

I hope civil disobedience will not be necessary but, if something is not done quickly, if Congress filibusters the civil rights bill and does not pass the public accommodation section, Negroes will have to engage in massive civil disobedience.

Ten days later he said he feared violence and warned again that if the civil rights bill did not pass it "may lead to a night of darkness and violence."

I personally heard his threats at Howard University in 1964 during the time when Congress was debating the civil rights program, and I can assure you that he spoke not as a man of peace but as a man of violence.

In February of 1966, King and his men decided to assume "trusteeships" of a six-flat tenement in Chicago as part of a campaign to improve living conditions for the residents. King had no authority; his power was only that which is derived from police-state tactics. He simply took over. His reasoning: "morality" is more important than the law and property rights, the action was "supralegal," above the law.

In early April 1966, a circuit court judge enjoined King and his associates from entering the building, interfering, or collecting rent from the tenants, all of which they had done. There can be no denial of King's influence and the results of his "nonviolent" demonstrations and "direct action" programs.

The New York Times of July 16, 1962, stated that Reverend King "threatened a new drive for Negro rights" in Albany, Ga. Ten days later, leader King, according to the Times, set a day of penance following a night of rioting during which Negroes were arrested as they marched on city hall, hooting, laughing, and throwing bottles, bricks, and rocks at law officials. August 11, the police chief of Albany testified that the situation had been under control until King returned to the city to be tried for an illegal demonstration.

Another example of the "nonviolent direct-action" programs of Dr. King was exposed in July 1966 in the syndicated column by respected columnists, Robert Allen and Paul Scott. Their exposé reported that King and company were contacting, and enlisting, Chicago street gangs and "bringing them into the civil rights movement to fight 'the power structure'."

From a report said to be circulating through the U.S. Department of Justice, the columnists quoted these statements: King's lieutenants telling gang leaders that "the real foes are Mayor Daley, policemen, slumlords, bankers, businessmen, and school administrators"; or haranguing that this is an "unjust society"; and that "the gang members are being incited to violence instead of being taught nonviolence"; that "gang leaders have little or no understanding of civil rights, but do know how to use force." King, they said, had personally met several times with gang leaders who have a combined following of 1,000.

During the same month that King was reported to be enlisting the gangs, Chicago police battled some 300 Negroes for 2 straight hours of rioting.

Some time later, August 9, the Chicago Tribune reported that:

The Chicago Lawn area was the scene Friday night of civil rights disorder as the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., led Chicago marchers into the community to promote open housing for Negroes.

The Chicago riots of July 1966 deserve elaboration. Here is a selected sequence of events: The July 12 riot broke out just 2 days after King's mass civil rights rally.

The Baltimore Sun, July 10, 1966, reported:

In an interview... Dr. King acknowledged that his "non-strike" campaign in Chicago is an implementation program for the concept of "black power," but under a more palatable name.

Dr. King acknowledged that his presence in Chicago, the street rallies, sit-ins, marches, and door-to-door campaign to sign up members of protesting [units] have more far-reaching aims than the immediate dramatization of problems of impoverished Negroes.

The next day King and Mayor Daley held a "showdown" meeting in the mayor's office. On July 14 the New York Times reported that the near West Side was tense after a police car was stoned by more than 100 Negro youths. Martin Luther King attributed the disturbance to the Mayor's refusal to make concessions to his civil rights program. This is his typical style. Rarely has Reverend King charmed boters, arsonists, and conspirators for violence. He always justifies their actions and, directly or indirectly, encourages them.

The report continued: Dr. King... spoke at the headquarters of the West Side Organization, where a sign on the wall said: "Burn, baby, burn, boycott, baby, boycott." Roving bands of youths and some adults... broke windows, looted stores, and stoned police cars and small police vans.

During the weekend of the 16th, 17th, and 18th, Governor Kerner called out the National Guard when police could not control rioting that in 3 nights included burning, looting, two deaths, 100 injuries, 300 arrests, and extensive property damage.

A few days before the riot, King stated that disrupting the flow of Chicago's traffic—a tactic of Dr. King's—would be "rough" on city officials "when they have to get 200 people off the Dan Ryan (expressway) but the only thing I can tell them is: Which do you prefer, this or a riot?" Another "nonviolent" pilot project was thus in action.

It is doubtful that the city officials made the final choice.

Chicago's Mayor Daley, as reported in the New York Times, "asserted angrily that the strife was 'planned'." Dr. King's aides were in here for no other reason than to bring disorder to the streets of Chicago," he concluded.

Following contact with the gangs mentioned earlier, it is disturbing to note that press accounts of the riots stated that Negro street gangs fanned the flames in the riot and were given credit for spreading violence to greater limits.

The Chicago Tribune reported that prior to the riots, King had shown films detailing the violence of Watts. Asked by the Tribune about this, King replied:

The films showing the Watts riots were so dramatic to the negative effect of riots.

The films add another dimension to the activities of King that are well known by law enforcement officials. Their general reaction to King is summed up by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in this statement:

Unfortunately, some civil rights leaders in the past have condoned what they describe as civil disobedience in civil rights demonstrations.

Martin Luther King, Jr., for example, after arriving in Chicago, Ill., early in 1966 in connection with the civil rights drive there, commented about the use of so-called civil disobedience in civil rights demonstrations and said:

"It may be necessary to engage in such acts... Often an individual has to break a particular law in order to obey a higher law."

Such a course of action is fraught with danger for if everyone took it upon himself to break any law that he believed was morally unjust, it is readily apparent there would soon be complete chaos in this country.

When the riots broke out on July 12, did Martin Luther King enter the scene as a moderating influence? Absolutely not. On the second day of the riot, July 13, a rally was held at a local church and King appeared with one Chester Robinson, executive director of the West Side Organization, who made highly inflammatory accusations about the Chicago police. King's respectability added to the

occasion. Robinson, incidentally, is an ex-convict with an extensive arrest record dating back to 1949. Such are the men King finds himself with time and time again.

The first amendment guarantees the right to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, but it does not allow any latitude for disobedience. It is absurd to even imagine a situation where a law protects the right to disobey a law. To say this is to say that law is not law.

Throughout, the actions of Dr. King have been termed "civil" disobedience, but Justice Whittaker makes this point:

What we are confronted by, and must deal with, are active, overt, willful mass violations of our criminal laws. That conduct is not "civil disobedience" in any dictionary or acceptable sense of those words. The understandable desire to avoid openly admitting advocacy and commission of crime cannot excuse us from calling that conduct what it is. Active and overt acts willfully committed in violation of our criminal laws are criminal violations and not "civil disobedience."

The final result of disobedience is not only gross violations of law during riots and marches, but in the opinion of Justice Whittaker, encompasses a general furthering of lawlessness throughout the country. "Toleration and appeasement" of the "many misguided preachers and activities of Dr. King are heavily contributing causes of the general disrespect for law and hence of the crime that is now rampant throughout our Nation."

I believe it is fair to conclude that Martin Luther King has been an apostle of violence and lawlessness, not peace and nonviolence. His method has been criminal conduct and conspiracy, not civil disobedience. To call it anything else would be the same perversion of the truth that King has engaged in for years.

A MINISTER BUT OF WHAT?

Although Dr. King asks the world to believe that he is a man of God and appeals to "higher laws" in justifying his acts of law breaking, it is incredible that he should expect the people of the United States to be so gullible as to accept the Biblical and historical precedents he conjures up as valid. They are not.

To use Biblical passages as a pretext for his call to lawlessness, King must first deny the context in which the Apostles lived and preached. They had no system of appeals. There was no guarantee of freedom. There was no free speech. The parallel is invalid.

In the opinion of the dean of Talbot Theological Seminary, Rev. Dr. Charles L. Feinberg:

Those who point to Biblical examples of resistance to authority forget the spiritual principles involved there, and are unmindful that they in that day had no such legal provisions for redress for their grievances such as we have today.

That Dr. King should disregard the total context of the New Testament, and the Book of Acts in particular, can hardly be believed.

It is also incredible that King would attempt to compare the civil disobedience of today with the Boston Tea Party. To make this comparison is, again, to forget that there were no channels of appeal or meaningful democratic remedy available to those American patriots. It is interesting to note that the Boston Tea Party and other acts against authority by the colonists were the beginnings of the overthrowing of a foreign government. We must assume that Dr. King knows this basic historic fact. His views and tactics on this point are hardly American.

Dr. King uses these methods to push into areas and communities where the residents, from mayor to fellow clergyman, say he is not wanted or needed. Some of the greatest condemnation of Martin Luther King has come from men of the church.

In 1964, delegates to the American Council of Christian Churches passed a resolution, "noting with regret that the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., civil rights leader and Nobel Peace Prize winner, had been represented before the world as a peace-loving Christian minister crusading in the interest of Negro life."

In 1966, Dr. J. H. Jackson, Negro leader of the National Baptist Convention, said that civil disobedience and nonviolence would not carry the civil rights movement any higher and might even lead to disrespect for law and order and to possible violence.

In 1965, a Negro alderman in Chicago, Ralph H. Metcalf, criticized King and his group, said King had "alterior motives" in moving into Chicago with his programs and leveled the blast at King that:

This is no hick town. The leaders can handle the situation. We have adequate leadership here.

Metcalf said that King would not be "objective."

The Chicago Tribune of June 30, 1967 reported:

The Chicago chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, long critical of the civil rights tactics of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., has formally split with Dr. King's group...

The article added that King's group and the NAACP have been at odds over

Martin Luther King E Pluribus Unum

By ROBERT ALLEN & PAUL SCOTT WASHINGTON — Dr. Martin Luther King may be preaching the doctrine of non-violence for he coming "civil rights" disobedience campaign in the big cities but he and his aides appear to be organizing for violence. Federal authorities bringing a close watch on his Southern Christian Leadership Conference...

'New Politics' Controversy

Dr. King Will Be Keynote Speaker



By CHERYL BAILEY... Dr. King will be the keynote speaker at the annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in New York City...

Massive Civil Disobedience In North Urged by Dr. K

By PAUL HENREY... ATLANTA, Ga. — Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. urged massive civil disobedience in a speech in North Carolina...

King's tactics last year in the open housing march.

Episcopal minister, Dr. Robert B. Watts, of La Jolla, Calif., is another clergyman who has scored King's disobedience stand and his apparent belief that the end justifies the means. Dr. Watts declared that no one, "however exalted he may be or regard himself, has the right to say that what was wrong before becomes morally right if the acting party is willing to be punished if caught."

Perhaps one of the strongest statements from a fellow clergyman came in April of this year. The blunt, descriptive attack on King came from the Rev. Henry Mitchell, leader of a group of West Side Chicago ministers. Here is the account as reported by the Chicago Tribune:

The leader of a group of west side Negro ministers declared yesterday that Dr. Martin Luther King should "get the hell out of here" because his civil rights marching in Chicago last summer (1966) "created hate."

"If he wants to march on the west side, let him march with rakes, brooms, and grass seed," said Rev. Henry Mitchell.

He said the ministers represented the sentiments of 60,000 Chicago Negroes who want "peace, love, and harmony," don't approve of civil rights marches, and "just want to live in their communities and upgrade them."

Justin E. Walsh wrote in the monthly magazine, Rally, about those who use the pulpit for their strange social and political pronouncements. It seems to fit Martin Luther King. Walsh said:

Thus the pulpit becomes a political rostrum from whence God Himself directs the defeat of Barry Goldwater, the march on Selma, or a teach-in protesting American involvement in Viet Nam. The sacred and profane become confused, religion is reduced to an adjunct of political agitation, and church attendance falls because Americans do not endorse such schemes, will not listen to preachers who do.

Possibly the answer can be found in I Corinthians 1:27. It quite prophetically says:

But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty.

In his constant preaching that the ends justify the means, King is not speaking in the Judeo-Christian heritage belief. This is crass materialism and Marxism. It is expediency not principle. It is frightening to contemplate the many leading clergymen that consciously join his cause or acquiesce by their silence. Even worse, he is being currently depicted as a modern Christian hero by a Catholic catechism series. The total picture of Martin Luther King brings one fundamental question to mind: He says he is a minister. A minister of what?

SOME OF KING'S ADVISERS AND ASSOCIATES When one considers the backgrounds of some of Martin Luther King's advisers and associates, it is hardly surprising



Martin Luther King is shown above with Aune Braden, Carl Braden and James Dombrowski, identified Communists, at a SCEF meeting.



# Enlists the Gangs FOR Violence

Elements of King are contact-  
ing gangs and bringing them into  
movement to fight "the power"  
organization is studying the  
street gangs in Saigon demon-  
strated by A. B. Simpson in charge  
leaders in SCLC's new militant

youth movement.  
According to an investigative report being  
circulated inside the Justice Department, King  
plans to organize the low-age gangs into pre-  
sent and marching groups in all major U. S. cities  
if an Chicago agreement is a success.  
The report reveals that King personally has  
attended several meetings with gang leaders.

including one early in June at a downtown Chi-  
cago hotel, where 50 groups held their "last  
annual gang convention."  
Attending the gathering were the "Black  
stone Rangers," "The Disciples," "The Vikings,"  
"The Panthers," and "The Lords." They are  
estimated to have a combined membership of  
ALLEN & UNWIN Page 11

**Attention to Open Here**  
The program is described as "an increasing self defense a guidance in  
a necessary manner" to the 2nd East Market Street, 2nd & 3rd  
"The program" of "National Day" plans, involving with  
the assistance of "The News" and learned and non-learned pub-  
licity "The program" is the "The News" program.

**Reader's Digest**  
Martin Luther King's  
Tragic Decision  
By Carl T. Lundy

## U.S. Sees Red Scheme to Seize Rights Parley



Washington, Aug. 28 (NEWS Bureau)—  
Evidence of a Communist Party plan to  
take direction of the National Conference  
for New Politics as a vehicle for a new  
third political party has been uncovered by  
government security agencies, THE NEWS  
found out today.  
The agencies believe the Communists hope to  
use the "New Politics" movement as a political  
front to a movement to the National Progressive  
Labor Party.

Party reports indicated that the communists  
hope to take a third party presidential ticket  
of the King and Dr. Spock in the 1968 election.  
Security agencies have said that the Communist  
Party has recruited a substantial number of  
memberships to the movement in past  
months.  
The second major party movement being  
launched today is the "New Politics" movement  
which has been organized in New York City.  
Security agencies believe that the Communist  
Party has recruited a substantial number of  
memberships to the movement in past  
months.



**Negro Pastor Urges King to Leave Town**  
Chicago (AP)—A Negro pastor in a Chicago church urged Martin Luther King Jr. to leave town today.  
The Rev. Henry Mitchell, pastor of the First Baptist Church, urged the suspension of a new conference of the church. The church is back only today because the apartment King stayed in was not yet ready to be occupied.  
King is in Chicago for a meeting with the Chicago Negro community.  
King, president of the SCLC, is in Chicago for a meeting with the Chicago Negro community.

## King To Serve Jail Sentence

Atlanta (AP)—Martin Luther King Jr. is expected to serve a jail sentence for a violation of a city ordinance, according to a report by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution.  
The report says that King was arrested on Monday for violating a city ordinance that prohibits the use of public places for religious or political purposes.  
King is expected to serve a jail sentence of 30 days.

## Denies Rights Split

Atlanta (AP)—Martin Luther King Jr. has denied a charge that he is splitting the civil rights movement.  
King said that he is not splitting the movement and that he is working for the unity of the movement.  
King said that he is not splitting the movement and that he is working for the unity of the movement.

## U.S. Sees Red Scheme to Seize Rights Parley

Washington, Aug. 28 (NEWS Bureau)—  
Evidence of a Communist Party plan to  
take direction of the National Conference  
for New Politics as a vehicle for a new  
third political party has been uncovered by  
government security agencies, THE NEWS  
found out today.  
The agencies believe the Communists hope to  
use the "New Politics" movement as a political  
front to a movement to the National Progressive  
Labor Party.

## King To Serve Jail Sentence

Atlanta (AP)—Martin Luther King Jr. is expected to serve a jail sentence for a violation of a city ordinance, according to a report by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution.  
The report says that King was arrested on Monday for violating a city ordinance that prohibits the use of public places for religious or political purposes.  
King is expected to serve a jail sentence of 30 days.

## U.S. Sees Red Scheme to Seize Rights Parley

Washington, Aug. 28 (NEWS Bureau)—  
Evidence of a Communist Party plan to  
take direction of the National Conference  
for New Politics as a vehicle for a new  
third political party has been uncovered by  
government security agencies, THE NEWS  
found out today.  
The agencies believe the Communists hope to  
use the "New Politics" movement as a political  
front to a movement to the National Progressive  
Labor Party.

## King To Serve Jail Sentence

Atlanta (AP)—Martin Luther King Jr. is expected to serve a jail sentence for a violation of a city ordinance, according to a report by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution.  
The report says that King was arrested on Monday for violating a city ordinance that prohibits the use of public places for religious or political purposes.  
King is expected to serve a jail sentence of 30 days.

## U.S. Sees Red Scheme to Seize Rights Parley

Washington, Aug. 28 (NEWS Bureau)—  
Evidence of a Communist Party plan to  
take direction of the National Conference  
for New Politics as a vehicle for a new  
third political party has been uncovered by  
government security agencies, THE NEWS  
found out today.  
The agencies believe the Communists hope to  
use the "New Politics" movement as a political  
front to a movement to the National Progressive  
Labor Party.

## King To Serve Jail Sentence

Atlanta (AP)—Martin Luther King Jr. is expected to serve a jail sentence for a violation of a city ordinance, according to a report by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution.  
The report says that King was arrested on Monday for violating a city ordinance that prohibits the use of public places for religious or political purposes.  
King is expected to serve a jail sentence of 30 days.

## U.S. Sees Red Scheme to Seize Rights Parley

Washington, Aug. 28 (NEWS Bureau)—  
Evidence of a Communist Party plan to  
take direction of the National Conference  
for New Politics as a vehicle for a new  
third political party has been uncovered by  
government security agencies, THE NEWS  
found out today.  
The agencies believe the Communists hope to  
use the "New Politics" movement as a political  
front to a movement to the National Progressive  
Labor Party.

## King To Serve Jail Sentence

Atlanta (AP)—Martin Luther King Jr. is expected to serve a jail sentence for a violation of a city ordinance, according to a report by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution.  
The report says that King was arrested on Monday for violating a city ordinance that prohibits the use of public places for religious or political purposes.  
King is expected to serve a jail sentence of 30 days.

## U.S. Sees Red Scheme to Seize Rights Parley

Washington, Aug. 28 (NEWS Bureau)—  
Evidence of a Communist Party plan to  
take direction of the National Conference  
for New Politics as a vehicle for a new  
third political party has been uncovered by  
government security agencies, THE NEWS  
found out today.  
The agencies believe the Communists hope to  
use the "New Politics" movement as a political  
front to a movement to the National Progressive  
Labor Party.

## King To Serve Jail Sentence

Atlanta (AP)—Martin Luther King Jr. is expected to serve a jail sentence for a violation of a city ordinance, according to a report by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution.  
The report says that King was arrested on Monday for violating a city ordinance that prohibits the use of public places for religious or political purposes.  
King is expected to serve a jail sentence of 30 days.

We were convinced that he had renounced  
them and had become committed to the  
Christian philosophy of nonviolence in deal-  
ing with America's social injustices.

King said O'Dell left the movement on  
June 26 by "mutual agreement" because  
of concern that his affiliation with the  
integration movement would be used by  
"segregationists and race-baiters."

The surest indication of O'Dell's break  
with the Communist Party would be, of  
course, his willingness to appear before a  
congressional committee and give the  
U.S. Government the benefit of his party  
experience. Indications are that O'Dell  
could be of immense help in disclosing the  
identities of 30th-century Benedict  
Arnolds hiding their time for the down-  
fall of the United States.

In 1954 O'Dell testified before the Sen-  
ate Internal Security Subcommittee. He  
invoked the fifth amendment and re-  
fused to say if he was a southern district  
organizer for the Communist Party. Robert  
Morris, counsel for the subcommittee,  
said information had been received  
that O'Dell was, in fact, a district organ-  
izer for the Communist Party in New  
Orleans, and that O'Dell gave "directives  
to the professional group" in that city  
and that he operated under three dif-  
ferent names—the other two being John  
Vesey and Ben Jones.

## RIGHT DOWN THE COMMON LINE

April 4, 1967, Rev. Martin Luther  
King, Jr., rose to the speaker's platform  
in New York City's Riverside Church and  
delivered what must surely be the great-  
est condemnation of American policy  
and involvement in Vietnam ever to  
come from a well-known citizen. His at-  
tack was ruthless, packed with mislead-  
ing innuendoes and distortions. A Pres-  
idential aid was later quoted: "a speech  
on Vietnam that goes right down the  
Commie line."

More and more, King has been  
branching out from civil rights into the  
field of foreign affairs. More and more  
he parrots the far left, pro-Communist  
line.

If there were any doubt, the April 4  
speech washed it away. In this speech,  
King lashed out at the United States,  
called our Nation "the greatest purveyor  
of violence in the world today," charged  
the Nation with "cruel manipulation of  
the poor" and, as if written by the Daily  
Worker, said that U.S. troops "may have  
killed a million South Vietnamese civil-  
ians—mostly children." Keep in mind  
that these are only selections from the  
speech.

This speech and his involvement with  
the Vietnam War protests brought down  
on King's head an abundance of de-  
nunciations. From anti-rights leaders,  
legislators, military men, businessmen and  
many Negroes who believe King has gone  
way, way too far.

King's Riverside speech is a hideous  
perversion of fact, a perversion of  
without limits. He said that Americans  
"poison the water" of the South Viet-  
namese. He stated that "we kill a million  
acres of their crops" and that American  
bulldozers "destroy their precious trees"  
and that "they wander into the hospi-  
tals with at least 20 casualties from  
American firepower for each Vietcong-  
inflicted injury." These are King's words.  
To this array of absurdities he added:

We test out our latest weapons on them,  
just as the Germans tested out new medicine  
and new tortures in the concentration camps  
of Europe.

These are a few of the Communist-  
line invectives which King delivered on  
April 4. Since they were spoken, various  
"transcripts" of the speech have ap-  
peared, "cleansed" versions brought for-  
ward in an apparent attempt to soothe  
the irate response of the great majority  
of Americans.

For all his vocal attempts to keep his  
anti-Vietnam stand and civil rights  
separate, and on a "personal" basis, these  
attempts have not worked. There is a  
joining of the two and King has helped  
direct it.

At the 1966 annual meeting of the  
Southern Christian Leadership Confer-  
ence, the group condemned the war,  
called it mass murder and authorized  
King to "throw the resources" of the  
organization behind efforts to end the  
war. It was at this time that King said  
he would write to the leaders of the  
governments involved. Doubtless, he  
dropped the idea when someone told  
him that the Logan Act, which he would  
have violated, forbids an individual from  
dealing in this way with a foreign gov-  
ernment.

King maintains that he has never  
advocated a "mechanical merger" of the  
civil rights and peace organizations—  
which at other times he says are inex-  
tricably bound together—but, mechan-  
ical or not, he did release the Reverend  
James Bevel from the SCLC to head the  
Spring Mobilization Committee To End

the War in Vietnam. Incidentally, Rev-  
erend's wife, Diana, not long ago got back  
from a Hindi pilgrimage, so that helps  
understand the Bevels.

In November 1964, FBI Director J.  
Edgar Hoover called Reverend King  
"the most notorious liar in the country."  
Mr. Hoover spoke with no small amount  
of authority or knowledge. King has  
avoided a direct encounter with the  
famed public servant because the record  
is clearly unfavorable to the civil rights  
leader. Mr. Hoover is privy to many  
confidential reports on Mr. King's ac-  
tivities just as I am, and while their na-  
ture cannot be disclosed, I can say with-  
out equivocation that Martin Luther  
King does not want nor can he stand a  
public airing of his record. I can rest my  
case against King with the public uter-  
ances and actions of this man and any  
revelation of confidential matters is en-  
tirely unnecessary.

Why has he been immune for so many  
years and in the parlance of the day,  
"allowed to get by with murder?" There  
is a peculiar double standard which the  
liberal community consistently applies.  
If any prominent person, particularly a  
conservative, were to identify with or  
share a speakers' platform with a mem-  
ber of the John Birch Society or some  
group the liberals might currently be at-  
tacking, he would be maligned forever.  
Let Martin Luther King openly identify  
with Communists and radicals, have a  
Communist as an adviser, engage in  
criminal activity, appear at the most  
way-out meetings in the Nation and ad-  
vocate racism, revolution or civil dis-  
obedience and these same people look  
the other way.

In the long run, Mr. Speaker, I am  
sure that we don't have to worry that  
much about the Martin Luther Kings.  
Our society is open enough, free enough,  
and resilient enough that it can with-  
stand demagoguery. What is frightening,  
however, is to see the usual guardians of  
the public interest, ranging from the  
press to the Justice Department, look the  
other way and virtually assure such  
people a green light in their operations.

The press has repeatedly referred to  
Reverend King as a moderate. He is not.  
While he is not telling Negroes to arm  
themselves with guns or to "burn, baby,  
burn" like the Rap Browns and Stokely  
Carmichael, he is, in a sophisticated  
way, agitating for the same thing. He is  
going to have a massive dislocation of  
northern cities but no violence. He says  
that upsetting a city without destroying  
it can be more effective than a riot,  
whatever that means. This is the enigma  
of Martin Luther King. He preaches  
nonviolence but somehow this can end  
up in illegal or violent actions. Then he  
says he is not responsible, although he  
himself has often participated in illegal  
acts.

He has thrust himself into community  
after community where even the Negro  
leaders have asked him to stay away.  
Only this year, King again foisted him-  
self into the Chicago turmoil and an-  
nounced his own brand of solutions to  
their ills. Rev. Henry Mitchell, a leader  
in the area King chose as a "target"  
asked him to leave and charged that  
King "created hate." King has thrust  
himself onto the Cleveland, Ohio, scene  
and promoted a boycott of a local dairy.  
In that particular case, he cited as some  
demands on that firm actions which  
could be a violation of the civil rights  
law. He also said the firm must advertise  
in Negro newspapers and put money in  
Negro savings and loan associations to  
avoid a Negro boycott. All in all, this is  
the blackmail tactic of a would-be dicta-  
tor and power-hungry demagog, not a  
responsible leader.

By word and deed, he has been a potent  
force for lawlessness in our country. He  
has been a scoundrel. He has arrogated to  
himself the right to pick and choose the  
laws he will obey. He has set a poor ex-  
ample for others to emulate. He has  
countenanced draft evasion. He has been  
disloyal to his own country.

In an age when our country needs  
statesmen and builders, he has been a  
demagog and wrecker. Many of his  
ideas are alien to our way of life. In  
America, he can constitutionally say  
virtually anything he wants and com-  
mand any following that he can muster  
for legitimate pursuits. It is important,  
however, that he be understood in his  
true perspective so honest and well-  
meaning Americans will not be duped  
because they did not fully understand  
the man, his mission, and his tactics.

NOTE: This reprint contains about  
one-half of the original speech  
which appears in the Congres-  
sional Record of October 4, 1967 on  
pages H13005 through H13017.

EXTRA COPIES of this Broadside may be  
had upon request at 12 copies for \$1.00, 6  
copies, 50c, 3 copies, 25c, 1 copy, 10c.  
Address requests to: Christian Nationalist  
Crusade, P. O. Box 27895, Los Angeles,  
California 90027.