

## **Yankee Steve's Column**

### **for the Week of May 7, 2009**

#### **Part one, Section two: Communism/Socialism in Black America**

How is it that when a Socialist like Barack Obama wanted to find a black church in Chicago, or when he wanted to call on blacks to serve with him in government, he did not have to look very far? Anyone can answer that question. Socialism is entrenched in the black churches, which just happens to be a church-based community. A number of black ministers like Jesse Jackson would never question Socialism from the pulpit, not if they wanted to remain on good terms with their followers.

According to J. B. Matthews [1894-1966], former Methodist churchman and an expert on Communism, **Protestant ministers “are the single largest group supporting” Communism in America.** That was a color blind statement. However, when it comes to Socialism it would have been easier for Obama to find a black church in agreement with his Socialism. Marxist welfare ideology is more entrenched in the black churches than it is in the white churches. It would have been easy for Obama to find a church that leaned to the left. As a matter of fact he chose one that wore its Marxism with pride.

The pastor, the Rev. Jeremiah Wright, preached in Obama's hearing for 20 years what is called Black Liberation Theology, which is a type of Marxism that came up from Central America.

This past week it was announced that Obama was looking for a church. If the above quote of J.B. Matthews is correct than the president will be able to find a black or for that matter a white church which will be able to shroud its Marxism and anti-authoritarian spirit behind a lot of gospel verbiage. I would imagine that Obama will hook up with the United Church of Christ which has been preaching Socialism since the days of Reinhold Niebuhr, its most prominent theologian.

#### **Race**

Communists realized a long time ago that they could exploit racial tensions. This explains why so many of the agitators calling for equal rights, especially for blacks, have been Communists. On the surface it looks as if the Communist really cares for the black man. A black Communist, Leonard Patterson, realized however that this was not the case. Patterson testified in 1950 that he ought to leave the Communist party because he had come to the realization that Communists are exploitive, and that they only intend to use the black man in America. He is a means to an end. Through him the Communists can bring about a revolution. Patterson said,

I left the Communist Party because I became convinced . . . that the Communist Party was only interested in promoting among the Negro people a national liberation movement that would aid the Communist Party in its efforts to create a proletarian revolution in the United States that would overthrow the government by force and violence through bloody

full-time revolution, and substitute it with a Soviet form of government with a dictatorship of the proletariat.

## **Slander**

A leading expert on political happenings was asked a short while ago, “Do you know any black Republicans?” He answered, “I know all of them!”

Communists knew that they had to discredit the Republican Party because it was not amenable to their plans. They succeeded. There are very few blacks who vote Republican.

Some time ago Communists were faced with a daunting challenge because they knew that northern blacks customarily voted Republican. To solve their problem they resorted to slander.

Communists gambled on the idea that blacks living in the south would someday be granted suffrage and that when they did receive the right to vote that it would be in their interests to influence blacks to believe that the Democrats, whose policies were and are in line with Socialism, would better serve them than the supposedly uncaring Republican conservatives.

Researcher and economist John T. Flynn states that between the years 1937 and 1949 at least 87 Communist front organizations were begun with one purpose in mind, to make it look as if the Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, was a disinterested onlooker when it came to civil rights. In that way they could move blacks out of the Republican Party and into the Democrat Party, the Party that had begun to listen to liberal social planners that were in league with the Communists.

Note: There is an irony here. Conservatives have always more in favor of improved race relations than liberals. History professor Jonathon Bean at Southern Illinois University in Edwardsville, wrote,

“ . . . **when Franklin Roosevelt refused to have pictures taken with blacks**, the Republican Party called for desegregation of the military, anti-lynching laws, and the right to vote. Furthermore, while FDR sent Japanese Americans to internment camps, a conservative newspaper chain denounced this violation of civil rights, as did the influential black conservative George Schuyler.

In 1964, Lyndon Johnson passed the landmark Civil Rights Act only after Republicans introduced their own bill and overcame a Democratic filibuster. 89% of Republicans voted for the Civil Rights Act—a far greater percentage than the Democrats, who mustered a bare majority. Almost immediately, however, the Democratic Party returned to its tradition of racial discrimination by instituting racial preferences that judged people by the color of their skin.” In other words the blacks were duped. Here is an inconvenient truth for Al Gore. His father voted [1964] against the civil rights act. **The civil rights act was passed by conservatives not by liberals.**

## Blacks and Front Organizations

Flynn explains the nature of a front organization,

A front organization, of course, is one which presents a more or less respectable and non-suspect façade behind which the revolutionary objective is carried on . . . The publicly advertised objective is always to raise the standard of some Negro group - the standard of living or education or social justice. But the real purpose is to line up the Negroes on the side of Communists, or their brothers the social planners.

**The most important black organization which acted as a front organization, at least for a time, is the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People).** If this can be disproved, then it would not follow that the NAACP has not promoted Socialism which is nothing more than Communism using the slower lane, a little less violent, but wanting the same result, a government that is all powerful, a government that is willing to take from one in order to give to another, a redistribution of wealth.

The NAACP began in 1909 or eight years before the Russian revolution, and 61 years after Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels published the *Communist Manifesto* which called on the workers of the world to unite because all they had to lose was their chains. That kind of rhetoric has an appeal to poor people, like the many blacks who were forced into poverty by no choice of their own. They were brought from another country and enslaved. After being freed from slavery, they were denied the rights of free-born citizens, rights that if granted them would have allowed them to prosper even more rapidly than they have already.

How could they extricate themselves from their unpleasant situation? How could they be given the dignity they deserved? Some blacks began to think that Booker T. Washington [1856-1915] was all wrong. The secret to their betterment was not, as he said, through education. The future they said lay in protest. Booker T., a man possessing incredible dignity, and boundless eloquence, knew that certain blacks would use the race issue to further their own personal goals and that this would impede progress.

This is not to say that he did not rely in some ways on the judicial system, but it does mean that he felt he should place an emphasis on personal improvement. Washington, who founded Tuskegee Institute, believed that if the black man was to rise in America he would have to place the emphasis on education. Protest would call attention to his situation but without an education the black man would be unable to become the equal of the white man. In most respects he was right. He knew that the future of the black man lay in the hands of judicious whites who would be reticent to grant blacks their rights if they had not been elevated by education to the level of whites.

The NAACP met for the first time beyond the border in Canada. As a result it became known as the Niagara Group. The African-American Communist W. E. B. Du Bois [1868-1963], a favorite with radicals, and a close associate of another Communist, American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) secretary Roger Baldwin, became the most visible representative, or if you like

the front man for the organization. Does his Communism mean that the NAACP is a Communist organization?

That is not the most important question. The real question to be asked is whether Du Bois tried to present racial inequality as a result of an inherent weakness present in and inextricable from capitalism, which seems to be the case. Is capitalism inherently racist? Any organization that believes that, whatever the racial disposition of its members, must be thought of as a front organization for Communism unless it is already openly Communist.

Prominent figures in the Jewish community with Socialist leanings backed Du Bois and the NAACP. They would have known that Du Bois was a Communist.

The organization was incorporated in 1911, but it would not have a black president until 1920. Du Bois continued to play a pivotal role in the movement but the decision making-really belonged to Jewish liberals and social planners among whom were financier Jacob Schiff, historian Howard Sachar, professor Joel Springarm, Rabbi Stephen Wise, Rabbi Emil G Hirsch, and others like that of Julius Rosenthal, Jacob Billikoph, and Lillian Wald among others.

Note: Jews like Julius Rosenwald [1862-1962] the head of Sears, Roebuck and Company, must have been shocked when they saw all that liberal/Marxist money being devoted to the NAACP. They would have known that this could only lead to national disunity. Jews know an agitator when they see one. Rosenwald helped Booker T. Washington and the Urban League because he believed that the future of blacks in America would be better served by education than by Communist agitation. Rosenwald was a capitalist who believed in *laissez-faire* economics. His generosity toward blacks brought along other Jewish financiers whose giving was very impressive.

Since the birth of the NAACP a number of black organizations have served as fronts for Communism. Martin Luther King, Jr. was a member of some of these organizations. The question is always asked was MLK was a Communist? One thing is certain; King was not a practicing Christian. His moral life is never spoken about when his name comes up on television or on radio. If you criticize King, blacks will consider you a racist.

King's enduring appeal among blacks is due to the fact that they needed a defender and a hero, and King was all that.

Whether King was a Communist is still being debated. There is a great deal of supporting evidence that he was. But if King was not a Communist, there should be no doubt that he was a favorite with Communists because they discovered how and in what way they could use him. That is what communists do; they use people. Communists surrounded King in a similar way as they did FDR.

I am of the opinion that FDR was none the wiser. On the other hand, King would have known who was trying to use him, and maybe he even thought that he was using them.

Communists rely on agitation. A society thrown into turmoil is easier to capture than one that is at peace with itself. Even if King were not a Communist and if he wanted justice for a downtrodden people which appears to have been his mission, by most estimates he was useful to Communists. The Communists could use him just because he agitated. The irony is that King's ideas were supported then in Congress by the Republicans and not by the Democrats, and now in contrast in the 2008 presidential election Democrats garnered 96% of the black vote.

Was MLK a Communist? Columnist Dr. Don Boys has written that,

“Carl Rowan, a liberal black newspaper columnist attended National Security Council meetings and was permitted to see confidential FBI files on King. Rowan said that King was known to be a communist since May of 1962, when King's name was “placed in Section A . . . tabbed Communist” in the FBI's files.”

. . . Karl Prussion, an FBI counterspy revealed in an affidavit placed into the Congressional Record that King was a member of over 60 Communist front organizations. He swore that King “had either been a member of, or wittingly supported and took support from over 60 communist fronts, individuals, and/or organizations, which give aid to or espouse communist causes.” He added, “I further swear and attest to the fact that at each and every one of the aforementioned meetings, one Reverend Martin Luther King [Jr.] was always set forth as the individual to whom communists should look and rally around in the communist struggle on the many racial issues.”

A study in the history of Chile will prove to be an eye-opener as it relates to Obama. That history reads as if it were going to be repeated in America.

Here is what happened.

The Socialists came to power by using national elections. However, when they assumed power they showed their true colors. Almost immediately they placed in motion what was called “the Santiago model.” Bryan Crozier tells us that the Santiago model “was aimed at driving the private sector out of business, mainly by reviving a dormant 1933 law that provided for the appointment of an official administrator - styled an *interventor* - to oversee businesses shown to be running at a loss.”

Does this sound familiar?

Syndicalism became the order of the day. “Workers were encouraged to seize factories after locking the management out. Any such business was declared to be “in recess,” where upon an *interventor* would be appointed.” This was accompanied by large scale seizures of land.

Crozier also says that the finance ministry granted instant wage increases that were “the equivalent of the previous years rise in the cost of living index.” Finally, when the Socialist government of Salvador Allende was deposed in 1973, the inflationary rate stood at 1,000 percent. **Interestingly the new administration followed the model of the Chicago school made famous by Milton Friedman, and the inflation rate was then reduced to 5 to 6 percent.**

Socialists are ideologues who hate the private sector. As far as they are concerned there should be no private sector. Consequently, General Motors and Chrysler are beginning to understand what it means to have to deal with a Socialist because Obama is at the helm of government. He is a black man, but he is red. Something along the lines of the Santiago model, or what should be called Marxism is taking shape.

## **Conclusion**

Is the president a Communist? If by “Communist” you mean someone who is a stranger to transparency and truth-telling; if you mean someone whose approach toward religious ethics is more secular and Humanistic than it is Christian; if you mean by Communist someone who wants to centrally plan the economy; if you mean someone who would like to throw open our borders; if you mean by Communist someone who has taken the real steps toward doing away with our national sovereignty; if you mean someone who believes in the redistribution of wealth, then there is at least one black person in America who is a Communist, and his name is Barack Obama, the 44<sup>th</sup> President of the United States of America!

If it is not unthinkable that Martin Luther King, Jr., a Baptist minister and a man that we grew to like, was a Communist, then we can easily believe that Obama is a Communist, just like the black poet Frank Marshall Davis who mentored Obama when he was growing up without a father on the islands of Hawaii.

Ever yours,

Steve Cakouros  
oldlineconservative.com