

overthrowing our form of government, does indeed exist is sufficient cause to question American decisions that have selected the course along which this country is being led.

If the commission was sincere in its efforts to get to the root of the trouble, why—one might ask—did it overlook the sinister activities characterizing the Third Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars held on September 9-10, 1967, at the New York Hilton Hotel? For it was there that plans were hatched for the riots we witnessed last spring, and for the campus revolts that coincided with the communist uprisings in Germany, France, and Italy. For the alert citizens it was there, also, that the glittering curtain of cultured myth which has camouflaged the true nature of socialism was swept aside to reveal the unembellished structure in all its frightening aspects.

There were 2,000 registrants at this fall conference of socialist scholars, including communist anarchists, black power advocates, two guests from the Soviet Union, and a guest of honor, Owen Lattimore—late of the Institute of Pacific Relations. Dr. Lattimore was described by the U.S. Senate Security Subcommittee as a "conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy." This finding was made by the subcommittee after an exhaustive study of Dr. Lattimore's PPR activities.

Michael Harrington, board chairman of the Socialist League for Industrial Democracy, Hyman Lunnar, national education secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and Stanley Aronowitz argued for radicalism in the path toward U.S. revolution.

It is interesting to note that Harrington, who poses as the classic "soft socialist"—the one who believes in revolution by legal means—should have capitulated when Lunnar and Aronowitz attacked his self-position paper. Aronowitz said only a revolutionary action group such as his could attain socialist objectives in America. He called for the radical destruction of existing authority, rather than reformism.

"O.K.," Harrington conceded finally, "if you think it will work, I am all for it."

Other speakers at the Third Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars were a black power panel whose participants talked about burning twenty American cities and organizing a military struggle

in the streets in the spring.

James Boggs of Detroit, speaking from the Socialist Scholars Conference platform, declared: "Black power is a scientific concept—it must bring the struggle to the streets and force America to increase militia and police beyond its capacity by bringing the struggle not to a few cities but to twenty cities next year," meaning 1968.

Speaking directly to the Socialist Scholars, Boggs declared: "There is no in-between. You are either with the revolution or you are not. The U.S. as a nation is a counterrevolution." He said further: "All revolutions start with a minority . . . I don't think over three per cent of the Russians were ready for a revolution."

The Third Annual Socialist Scholars Conference at New York's Hilton Hotel came to an end, but not before an invitation was issued to militants in the audience to participate in another meeting in the New York Hilton's Morgan Room. James Boggs said the meeting was to begin immediately, to plan how to do things "now and next year." Also, militants were urged by a panelist to enroll in a 14-session course in techniques for future street action. Among the subjects to be offered were: Coordinated Tactics, Crowd Control, Techniques to be Used Against Police, etc.

On that fateful weekend in September our television and radio networks and the national printed news media remained silent on the socialist meeting and the personalities who planned the insurrection. While they reported (and condemned not) the planned violence that followed, they feigned ignorance of its causes.

But the bi-weekly *U.S.A.*, published by Alice Widener, did cover and report in detail on the activities of the Third Annual Socialist Scholars Conference. Mrs. Widener is one of the few responsible writers on the national scene who is an authority on the new and the old left, having personally covered and reported in depth on more leftist meetings than the average individual socialist or communist has attended. When Mrs. Widener's reports are published, the left howls, but when that which she says will happen does happen, on schedule, you know she is right.

*Being that American freedom will always control totalitarian politics is just as dangerous as planting a cancer cell in a healthy human body.*

# Life Line FREEDOM TALK

A DAILY RADIO COMMENTARY BY

LIFE LINE

DALLAS, TEXAS 7 5206

11  
November 2, 1968  
No. 7

This is LIFE LINE, Melvin Munn from Dallas.

## 1. TOTALITARIAN PARTIES 2. THREE FLAGS OVER ANARCHY

Neither the Communist Party, U.S.A., nor any sham political party intent on overthrowing our present government should be allowed to function in a free society. The very nature of freedom rejects the notion of totalitarian political parties.

Dr. Benjamin E. Lippincott in his book, *Democracy's Dilemma: The Totalitarian Party in a Free Society*, wrote:

"If few things were more unexpected in the first half of this century than the advances made by totalitarian dictatorship, few were more striking than the intellectual response made to democracy's dilemma. In countries where one might have expected a wealth of inquiry to result from so basic a challenge, the opposite was true. In Britain and the United States, the leading democracies of the world, only a small number of writers came forward to make a basic analysis of the relation of a totalitarian party to democratic government."

We do not give a blanket en-

dorsement of Dr. Lippincott's book, but must credit him with at least being one of the few writers to devote an extended study to the subject. We are inclined to agree with Sherwood J.B. Sugden, of the *Quarterly University Bookman*, when he wrote that Dr. Lippincott has raised all the standard objections to any curbs on totalitarian organizations and satisfactorily disposed of them.

Because these myths concerning the right of totalitarian parties to operate in democracies have enjoyed general acceptance, particularly in the judicial and administrative areas of the United States government, and because these myths of totalitarian organization rights in a republic have a disarming simplicity, light must be thrown on the dark confusion in the foundation of current theory—or poetry of theory—a confusion that may again bring democracy down, as it often has in the past.

Here are a few questions for a start. You may wish to supply your own answers:

What are the basic understandings essential to the operation and survival of democracy? What is the nature of a totalitarian organization? Can it be viewed as a political party? Most importantly, do rights entail duties? If so, what duties do totalitarians undertake which correspond to the rights they demand?

The National Socialists in Germany, the Soviet Socialists in Russia, and their counterparts in China have denied all freedom of speech, thought, association, and action. Their call, gray totalitarian societies reduce the individual to a frightened, faceless blob.

The domestic disciples of these totalitarian governments have openly advocated the destruction of the host republic and its democratic institutions. Yet when they demand greater freedoms for their totalitarian organizations on the campus, and when they successfully seek protection for their subversive activities before the Supreme Court, they argue: "If truth is to prevail, all opinions must be allowed to compete freely in the marketplace of ideas."

This is the perfect argument for restricting those who would permanently close the marketplace of ideas. The myth that some important truths may fail to gain currency if the communist organizations or other totalitarian enemies of democracy are outlawed is preposterous. The Soviet Socialists' dictatorship, and other totalitarian

groups and their domestic disciples, have a peculiar conception of truth.

Domestic communists and their quasi-respectable apologists argue: "To outlaw organizations on account of the ideas they advocate is to become like the totalitarians. It is to become the thing we hate."

Well—there is a world of difference between the democracy that says: "Everything is discussable except one idea," (the idea that would suspend all discussion), and the communist who says: "Nothing is discussable but one idea—the totalist vision of the Soviet Socialist Dictatorship."

Another argument offered by those who would protect totalitarian organizations which would use the institutions of a free society to destroy that society is the following: "To outlaw a totalitarian organization would be to drive it underground, where it would be more dangerous because invisible." This is a fatuous line of reasoning. Some members of totalitarian organizations always are underground, whether the party is lawful or not.

To abolish a party's public organization and respectability is to deprive it of great opportunities for recruiting, fund raising, and generally spreading the party line. Communist and other subversive organizations howl at any hint of restriction. Apparently, they feel they must have above-ground respectability to accomplish their goal of destroying democracy.

Spongy thinking is most apparent when men say, on behalf of totalitarian organizations: "Conceivably, a true majority of the people may, at some time, prefer dictatorship to a democracy (republic)." They must, it is claimed, "have the right to make that choice."

The one freedom that must ever be denied the free man is that of selling himself and his posterity into slavery. This point is central to the philosophy of freedom and to the democratic theory that depends upon it.

Dr. Lippincott deserves much credit for his scholarly attention to the arguments of the totalitarians and their apologists. After judicious weighing of contrary arguments, Dr. Lippincott observes: "It is our contention that a totalitarian party does not present democracy with a dilemma at all, so

far as theory is concerned, if we disengage ourselves from the illusions of traditional liberalism. It is not a dilemma if we look at the purpose, character, and behavior of such a party and take account of its relationship to an outside power, and of the decisive role of its submerged operations. It is a dilemma only if we emphasize form at the expense of substance. It is not a dilemma if we give up the myth that a totalitarian party is a bonafide one."

Lippincott concludes that, "A Nazi or Communist Party has no moral right to exist within a democratic state." He further states that democracy need not stand forever naked before its enemies, but warns that should any democracy fail to gird up its loins with sound doctrine, it shall not stand for long.

Order typed copies of FREEDOM TALKS at the rate of 3 for 25¢. For distribution, order 100 or more FREEDOM TALKS, same date, sent to one address, at 3¢ per copy. Specify the program number announced by commentator. Subscribe to FREEDOM TALKS, mailing each week of 7 commentaries of the week, plus extra pieces. 1 year—\$5.00. LIFE LINE, Dallas, Texas 75206.

Many Americans find it hard to believe that such a thing as a conspiracy aimed at overthrow of this country could have been allowed to develop and to foment the strife, the destruction, and the loss of life that accompany frequent uprisings. Even the President-appointed fact-finding commission, which supposedly investigated

### THREE FLAGS OVER ANARCHY

the cause of the uprisings, chose to ignore any indication of a conspiracy and blamed the trouble, instead, on the "failures" of law-abiding Americans. The very fact that the presidential commission did ignore clear-cut evidence that a Communist-Socialist-Anarchist conspiracy, dedicated to