



Postmaster:
Form 3547 requested.

SCOTTISH RITE NEWS BULLETIN

1735 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington 9, D. C.

NOTICE

There is no charge for the SCOTTISH RITE NEWS BULLETIN, which is sent without any obligation whatever upon the part of the recipient. It is the property of the Supreme Council, 33° (Mother Council of the World), Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, and is under the direct supervision of Sovereign Grand Commander Thomas J. Harkins, 33°, with Grand Secretary General Claud F. Young, 33°, Business Manager.

This Bulletin is published as a contribution to the welfare and happiness of the nation by diffusing information concerning education and civics, and it is hoped the widest use may be made of the data contained therein. Any of the material may be used at any time, with or without credit to the SCOTTISH RITE NEWS BULLETIN, but where it is noted that excerpts have been made from other publications, proper credit should be given. A marked copy would be appreciated when our material is used.

Freemasonry has ever been the friend and supporter of constitutional government. Fourteen of the Presidents of the United States have been Masons, and the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States were largely formulated by Masons. Freemasonry seeks to inculcate and deepen a sense of duty and responsibility in a patriotic citizenry and, as a primary consideration, the Supreme Council desires to stimulate an earnest and intelligent interest in public education as fundamental to patriotism.

SUPREME COURT RULES ON SEGREGATION

ON MAY 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled unanimously that the segregation of white and colored pupils in the nation's public schools is in violation of the provisions of the Constitution and "has no place" in the field of public education. This ruling completely discarded the doctrine of "separate but equal" facilities for the races that has held since 1896, and is generally hailed as a landmark in American history.

The opinion of the Court as applying to the several states of the country, exclusive of the District of Columbia, was based on the wording of the Fourteenth Amendment, which is interpreted as prohibiting the maintenance of racially segregated public schools. The Court said, however, that a similar ruling for the District of Columbia was applicable only under the Fifth Amendment, because the seat of the Federal Government cannot be classed as a state, and because "the concepts of equal protection and due process, both stemming from our American ideal of fairness, are not mutually exclusive." This did not imply that the clauses providing for "equal protection of the laws" and "due process of law" are interchangeable, but only that they are not mutually exclusive. Segregation is described as a restriction of liberty, unconstitutional "except for a proper governmental objective." Segregation is not properly classifiable as such an objective and hence constitutes "an arbitrary deprivation" of the liberty of Negro children.

The decision covered only elementary and high school children, but it was

interested persons recognized the complex nature of the many problems involved, both social and economic, and fully understood the reason for the Court having deferred a statement regarding the implementation of its ruling. It asked that arguments be presented this coming autumn as to a time for the completion of the change-over and also as to the agency which should describe and enforce the terms under which segregation shall be abolished.

Reaction to the ruling was varied, although nearly all state authorities agreed that it was to be expected. Most of them felt that little trouble would be experienced in making the shift, although in some places it would take considerable more time than in others to be accomplished successfully. Some of the governors expressed their intention to call conferences of both state and local school authorities to work out a plan of operation acceptable to both the people and the court. Many newspapers and individuals who have long been interested in the problem have expressed the opinion that the matter was not one to be settled by any branch of the Federal Government, but should have been left to the states to handle in their own way and in their own time. They pointed to the gradual disappearance of segregation in many places and expressed the opinion that such procedure would have been much less likely to cause dissension and trouble. Many church groups appeared to be elated, and by some it was believed that the ruling would deprive Communism of its most forceful talking

to honor the decisions of our courts and to defend the dignity and prestige of our judicial system. With respect to this most important decision, which is obviously of a revolutionary nature and which could be productive of serious repercussions in many places, the time-honored doctrine of "separate but equal" facilities, heretofore optional in many states, would seem to have been the most logical, sensible, and least troublesome solution to the problem, and the substantial claim of an invasion of state rights would have been avoided.

N. S. M.

"FREEDOM TO READ" IS SUBJECT OF FILM

Columbia University in New York City has produced a film in connection with its bicentennial celebration, entitled "Freedom to Read." Running for fourteen minutes, its subject matter fits into the bicentennial theme: "Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof."

The theme is dramatized by showing a hypothetical conflict between an experienced librarian and an irate citizen over the advisability of banning certain books from the library shelves. In a meeting of the library board of trustees, a spirited debate takes place in which both sides are represented.

The citizen, who is also the father of a teen-age son, argues that the works of Voltaire should be banned as he was "an exposed communist," and also the books of John Milton, whom the parent refers to as "a well-known fellow traveler."

It so happens that, in the film, the librarian is also depicted as a parent. She calls book suppression a direct violation of her country's "freedom heritage." Then she quotes from President Eisenhower's message to the

AMERICAN INDIANS AGAIN BEING VICTIMIZED

THE interests and wishes of American Indians appear again to have been ignored by the passage of H.R. 1063 which has now become Public Law 280. President Eisenhower, although he signed "this most un-Christian measure," expressed the hope that the Congress would soon take steps to rectify its action. That was ten months ago, and the Department of Interior has not yet submitted a bill to amend it.

The Association on American Indian Affairs, at its annual meeting on May 5, 1954, in the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, went on record as opposing not only Public Law 280, but six other measures introduced at this session of Congress, three in the Senate and three in the House. These, the Association said, would cancel the trust status of eleven tribes, according to a report of the meeting in *The New York Times* of May 6, 1954.

The Christian Century, in its issue of May 12, 1954, carried a well-prepared article on this subject by John Collier, United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs from 1933 through 1945, who is regarded as the nation's foremost authority on the American Indian.

In the early 1880's, Helen Hunt Jackson wrote a book entitled *A Century of Dishonor*, which continues to hold a high place in the history of United States Indian affairs. Yet, for fifty years or more after her book first appeared, the evils to which she took exception lingered on. It was not until President Hoover's Administration that genuine reform was instituted. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, during his administration, extended the reforms started by President Hoover with the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 and additional enactments.

"But since 1950 a frightening change has come about," says Mr. Collier. "Basically," he continues, "it was the official denial (administrative and legislative) of the right of the many hundreds of Indian communities to exist at all, of the right of Indians to exist as Indians. This denial was made and enforced in contradiction of several hundred Senate-ratified treaties, Congressionally-ratified agreements and Supreme Court decisions."

Mr. Collier observes that "here and in Canada the historical and unextinguished way with Indians was by means of treaties, solemnly ratified by government and the tribes, and subject to modification solely through mutual consent. From the beginning and up

to the present, Canada has lived up to her commitments scrupulously. From 1870 through the 1920's, we violated our commitments unscrupulously and, alas, self-righteously. And such is the course now being resumed." He then supplies what he characterizes as "one historical example among hundreds"—that of the Cherokee tribe. Between 1887 and 1923, through forced land allotment, 90,000,000 acres of the best Indian-owned land passed to whites. Only 51,000,000 acres remained to the Indians, nearly half of this being "semi-desert."

Mr. Collier asks and then answers the question: "How is it that men of unquestioned personal probity can be pressing this new onset against the Indians and the national honor? I answer that down the ages—and not only in Indian ages—social ruin has been pursued and achieved not only by men of evil intent but by men of personal probity.

"Implicitly or explicitly, these men now pursuing Indian ruin believe that cultural diversity—at least in terms of Indian culture—is anachronistic, even un-American. Implicitly, or at least in terms of behavior, where Indians are concerned they are believers in political state absolutism and immunity from moral controls."

Our 450,000 Indians, historically and ethnically, he points out, are a sector of the 40,000,000 Indians of this hemisphere, and that "many Western nations (Canada, Brazil, Mexico, Guatemala and Bolivia are examples) are even today molding and elaborating their Indian policies with a full knowledge of the Hoover and Roosevelt Indian policies and in harmony with them."

Mr. Collier says that his article is written as "a plea for action by citizens while it is not yet too late."

Oliver Lafarge, novelist and president of the Association on American Indian Affairs, told the 200 members assembled at its annual meeting: "We cannot accept the doctrine that the executive branch must unquestionably [unquestioningly] do whatever Congress asks for, no matter how patently wrong." He said the Paiutes of Utah had been added to the bill by the Utah congressional delegation. These Indians, he pointed out, are not ready for self-sufficiency and, because there are oil structures under some of the tribe's "worthless seeming land," removal of the trusteeship "could lay them singularly open to being cheated."

Congress at its last session passed

Concurrent Resolution 108 which had been prepared by Glenn L. Emmons, who was appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs shortly after the adoption of the resolution. Mr. Emmons was present at the meeting of the A.A.I.A. and told the members that he had been under a direct mandate from Congress and had no choice in the matter. He indicated that, in cooperation with the Indians affected, he was trying to induce the legislators to set terminal dates far enough in advance so that the tribes would be able to go on their own. Education, health and economic opportunity for Indians are his main goals, he said.

S. W.

THE DEMAGOGUE

ROY S. LEVINSON, 33°

Columbus Bank & Trust Bldg., Columbus, Ga.

DEMAGOGUE: "One who acquires influence over the populace by pandering to their prejudices or playing upon their ignorance or fears; an agitator for political or mercenary purposes."—Webster's Unabridged Dictionary.

The Founding Fathers of this nation, in their great wisdom, considered the possibility that our Constitution, in securing broad freedoms to everyone, might open the way to the unscrupulous demagogue who, by catering to the

belief that the people are worthy of being trusted with great freedom, to fall a prey to the crafty demagogue, the cynical opportunist, as some of our leaders feared it might? Is such an individual to sit in the chair occupied by Washington, Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln, and at a time when we have become the most powerful nation on earth and world leadership has devolved upon us, and also when we are facing one of the greatest perils of our existence? Are all our constitutional rights, prerogatives and immunities, won at the cost of so much blood, suffering and sacrifice, to be trusted in the hands of an individual, who even now callously disregards them in his inquisitions? Are a thousand atomic bombs and the new hell-bomb to be placed at the disposal of such a person? God grant that this catastrophe shall not come to pass.

Unquestionably the danger is very great. Millions of our citizens are reacting, in respect to the American brand of demagoguery, with alarming precision in the pattern predicted by some of the keenest minds among the founders of this nation, and these citizens are by no means confined to the illiterates, the ignoramuses, or the lunatic fringe, although these undoubtedly comprise a large percentage of the group.

The *modus operandi* is classic. From the standpoint of the demagogue, the situation is ideal. First, the people are stupid. Second, they fear Communism. Play upon these fears to the utmost; give the people one sensation after another, never allow them too much time to think, keep them off balance. The fact that you are unable to prove your charges is of no consequence; truth is of little importance. The important thing is to keep their fears white hot and to convince them that only you can save them. Never retract; never retreat. Anyone who opposes your methods is automatically a communist or communist sympathizer. Your one and only answer to those who have the courage to protest is the smear. Your congressional immunity protects you from actions for libel or slander. Grab the headlines and never let them go. Remember that today's big news is stale next week. Complete and convincing refutations today of charges emblazoned over last week's front pages are no longer of news value. They are relegated to the back pages or don't appear at all. The people want the new, the sensational, the spec-

tacular, and are not concerned with the old. Create dissensions, sow distrust among individuals, in the group, in the party, and between this nation and its allies; divide and conquer.

Few of our leaders have the temerity to protest; threat of the smear keeps them in line. A few recent news items are highly significant. The Secretary of State, representing the President of the United States, a short time ago announced a vital national policy which was contrary to that advocated by one individual who could have given lessons to Nicolo Machiavelli. His trepidation and deep emotion were so obvious as to cause comment by every newspaperman present. An ex-president of the United States recently spoke of this individual as representing the greatest danger which this country now faces and he said here, that whatever our opinions concerning the ex-president, such a statement from such a source cannot be taken lightly.

Scottish Rite Masonry has always recognized the demagogue, together with the despotic oppressor, the priestly fanatic, and the stupid and senseless mob, as the great evils which beset mankind and against which it must and will forever contend; and Scottish Rite Masonry also recognizes the first of these, the slick, unscrupulous demagogue, as the greatest danger to our democratic form of government, which, because of its very nature, is most susceptible to his evil designs. Masons everywhere, and also all men who have the welfare of their country at heart, should never forget this fact.

A POLICEMAN'S TEN COMMANDMENTS

FRANK H. REEVES, 32°

533 N. Haviland, Whittier, Calif.

1. Ask God to give me the strength to do my duty as it should be done.
2. To improve myself morally, mentally, physically and spiritually.
3. To be obedient and carry out all orders from my supervisor.
4. To protect life and property.
5. To report for duty punctually and to be presentable at all times.
6. To be firm and still be courteous.
7. To be willing, cheerful and respectful at all times.
8. To treat my brother officers as I would like them to treat me.
9. To live my life so as to be a credit to my profession.
10. To remember always that I am a public servant and am obligated to give the best I have in me.

Be a philosopher; but, amidst all your philosophy, be still a man.—David Hume.