

-THE POOR IN AMERICA-

and other means. In other words, it was not set up to create new jobs, but rather to match unemployed workers with jobs that were already available. To be in this program, a person had to be: one of the following:

- unemployed, and a member of a family whose income was less than \$1200 a year
- working at a job below their skill level
- working much less than full time
- working in a job that would soon be taken over by a machine
- between the ages of 16 and 22 and in need of training and more education

The main things wrong with this program, like the ARA, is that it is too small. In 1963, the MDTA had 1,622 projects, with 59,595 men being trained. In the four states of the Deep South (Ala., Ga., La., and Miss.) there were 51 projects, with 2,099 men being trained. The breakdown by states was:

	<u>Projects</u>	<u>Trainees</u>
Alabama	30	1,569
Mississippi	5	125
Louisiana	--	---
Georgia	16	405
Total	<u>51</u>	<u>2,099</u>

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 -- Johnson's "War" on Poverty.

There are five key programs set up by this Act:

- 1) The Job Corps will offer work, training and new surroundings for 10,000 boys and girls in 1965 and 100,000 by 1966, with most of them coming from the slums, and being high-school drop-outs. The young people will be paid \$50 a month. One staff person will work with every 5 young people in the program. Training will take place in national parks, forest facilities, veterans hospitals and other areas far away from the slums.
- 2) Youth Work-Training program for about 200,000 young people. This will try to keep potential school drop-outs in school. The students will earn enough money in various jobs in federal, state, and private agencies, to allow them to stay in school - or to return to school if they have already dropped out and wish to return.
- 3) Work-study programs will give 140,000 college students part-time jobs and vacation work in labs, libraries, and so forth, with costs shared by the U.S. Government and the University. This is to help students get enough money to stay in school.
- 4) Community Action Program will give funds to communities to help them fight poverty in their community. Plans will be made by the people in the community. These will probably be things like community centers, playgrounds, adult-education facilities and health clinics.
- 5) Adult Work-Training programs will try to retrain and find jobs for people on relief. There is a literacy program for adults included.

Again, the problem with this program is that it is too small. A mere \$784 million has been set aside for it. To see how small this amount is, we can compare it with the other 2 agencies and

-THE POOR IN AMERICA-

programs of the federal government which deal in some way or another with poverty; their total budget was \$15 BILLION in 1964. So Johnson's "War" is not really a "War" at all. It is more like a minor skirmish.

There are two other things wrong with this program. First, everybody who is to receive anything through the program must first sign a loyalty oath. Secondly, every program proposed by the people of a community is subject to a veto by the Governor of the State.

(Information from the Research Dept. of the United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers, and from the Act.)

UNIONS, BOSSES, AND NEGROES

One way that working people have been able to get higher wages, shorter working hours, and better working conditions is by forming a union. A union is simply a group of people who join together and tell their 'boss' that they will not work for less than a certain amount of money, for more than a certain number of hours, and only under certain conditions. If the boss refuses to agree to their demands, and to sign a written contract, then the workers strike; that is, they refuse to work until the boss agrees to their demands. Some people say that we should organize ourselves into unions and strike against our 'bosses' -- the plantation, farm, and factory owners. Can we do this? What are some of the problems we would face? What are the risks we would take? What could we gain? If we do organize, should we form independent unions, or should we join up with one of the big unions that already exists? What would be the advantages and disadvantages of this?

There is one big problem that working people face when they join unions and strike, especially in the southern states. If they have jobs which are not very skilled jobs (that is, jobs which somebody else would learn to do quickly without much training), then they can be replaced very easily when they go on strike. And when there are many, many people who don't have any jobs at all (as there are in the South), then these people who don't have jobs can be hired to take the place of the people who go on strike. What happens then is that the people who go on strike sooner or later lose their jobs completely (one year after their contract runs out, if they were in a union before.) But the boss doesn't lose any money because he has been able to hire new workers to take the place of the strikers.

The only way to prevent this from happening (short of violence), is to organize EVERYBODY in the whole town -- to organize all of the workers and all of the people without jobs, so that they won't take the jobs of the people on strike. This is very hard to do, because the people who don't have jobs usually want jobs so much that they will take the jobs of the people who are on strike no matter what the people on strike say to them. It is hard for these people to see that it would be better in the long run, if nobody agreed to work for a boss unless he paid them enough and met their other demands as well. So this is one big problem we would face. We would have to organize nearly everybody in order to win a strike.

There is another problem with unions in the South. That is that if we organize on the plantations and the farms, and demand higher wages, then the farm or plantation owner might decide that it would be cheaper and less trouble for him in the long run if he brought in machines to do the work which we do now. And there are machines which can do most of the work we do; so the farmer could bring these machines in tomorrow if he wanted to. He would then have to hire only a very few people to run the machines, and the rest of us would all be out of work.

Finally, there is one more thing we should think about, one more problem we might run into if we organize. If we organize all of the maids in a town, and they demand higher wages and shorter hours, some of the white ladies who now hire maids wouldn't be able to afford them any more. They would fire the maids and do the work themselves. Some of the white ladies who now have jobs (because their maids do all their housework and cooking, and take care of their children for them), might have to quit these jobs. But most of them would probably find a way to do this work themselves and still keep their jobs. (They might, for example, share the baby-sitting job with their neighbors). So, if we organize ourselves we might find that some of us would keep our jobs and get higher wages, but many others of us might find ourselves out of work.

But let's suppose that we think about all of these problems, and we decide that the circumstances where we work are such that we think we can better our lot if we organize into unions, and, possibly, strike. The next question we need to think about is whether we should form independent unions, or whether we should join ourselves up with one of the big unions that has branches (called 'locals') all around the country. To answer this question we need to know something about these big unions -- about how they treat Negro workers.

Most of the big unions have written, formal policies against discrimination; but many of them don't pay much attention to these formal policies, and they do discriminate against Negroes. Some of the most important ways they discriminate are:

- 1) excluding Negroes from membership
- 2) having segregated 'locals'
- 3) controlling whether any Negroes are hired in the plant, and if so, how many
- 4) controlling what kinds of jobs Negroes get, and whether or not Negroes get promoted as fast and as far as whites

Membership and Segregated Locals

Very few unions still exclude Negroes completely from their membership; in fact, only 3 still do. By the Civil Rights Act of 1964, such exclusion is now outlawed.

In the past, unions which didn't keep Negroes out altogether often formed segregated locals. Often, Negroes wanted to keep the locals segregated as much as whites did. This was because in the segregated locals Negroes could hold offices in the Negro union, and have some say over their own affairs. They knew that if they joined up with the white local, they would have little chance of

holding office and little say about anything that went on in the union. This is still the case in some places, particularly in the South, where segregated locals still exist.

Hiring

Sometimes unions set up a 'hiring hall'; the bosses agree to hire nobody except people the unions send to him through the hiring hall. By excluding Negroes from membership in the union, the union can keep Negroes from getting any jobs in a particular plant at all. Or they can carefully control the number of Negroes who do get hired and what kinds of jobs they get.

Job Opportunities

In addition to the hiring halls, unions sometimes set up referral systems. In this case, Negroes must go to the union first to be referred to a job opening. Unions which discriminate refer Negroes only to the worst, lowest-paying jobs; often, whites don't even have to use the referral system but are informed of job openings by the union by telephone.

Another way unions keep Negroes from getting good jobs is by keeping them out of training and apprenticeship programs. If the Negro never gets a chance to get trained for a skilled job, he is 'not qualified' when an opening occurs in that job category.

But the main way that unions control the jobs that Negroes get is by putting pressure on the employers. They tell the employers that if Negroes are hired, or hired for good, high-paying positions, then the white employees will strike. (Often this is a bluff; and a firm statement by the employer (the boss) is enough to put down any resistance white workers have to Negroes being hires.)

Unions in the South

Unions in the South discriminate more than do unions in the North, as we might expect. Some of them have set up separate lines of promotion for whites and Negroes. Negroes can be promoted up the job line just so far, and then no farther. Thus, there is a top limit to the kinds of jobs Negroes can get and how much they can earn. Usually, Negroes' jobs are limited to unskilled, menial laboring and service jobs. Sometimes Negroes are allowed to transfer into better, higher-paying jobs, but only by losing all of the years of seniority they have accumulated since they began working in a plant.

One cannot criticize all unions in the South, because there are some where Negroes are organized and protected and promoted as fairly as whites. One finds this to be true in the fertilizer, food-processing, logging, lumber, and meat-packing unions. These unions are exceptions to the general rule, however. Overall, unions in the South have hurt rather than helped Negroes.

-THE POOR IN AMERICA-Discrimination by Bosses

Bosses, men who run the plants, discriminate against Negroes just as do some unions. The most important ways they discriminate are:

- 1) In recruiting workers
- 2) In hiring
- 3) In making work assignments
- 4) In promotions
- 5) In training of workers

Recruiting

This is sometimes hard to see, because discrimination in recruiting goes on 'behind closed doors.' Sometimes there are special unwritten agreements or 'understandings' between public or private employment agencies and the bosses, whereby the agency will not refer Negroes to the bosses for hiring. (The Civil Rights Act of 1964 makes this illegal.)

Another way bosses discriminate in recruiting workers is by recruiting them from all-white high schools or colleges, or from all-white neighborhoods.

A third way is for employers, bosses, to recruit workers only from among friends and relatives of people (mostly whites) already working in the plants.

Finally, discrimination occurs in the hiring halls, as we mentioned above.

Hiring

Discrimination in hiring is much easier to see than discrimination in recruiting. Most bosses will now hire some Negroes, but usually only for semi-skilled or unskilled jobs. (54% of all domestic workers are non-whites; many service workers, like janitors, are non-whites. Few, only 4.7%, of all profession and technical people are non-whites.)

Since the civil rights movement began to demand more and better jobs for Negroes, some of these better jobs have been opening up. But many times Negroes do not have the skills that are needed to fill these jobs. The question of what should be done about this -- whether special training programs should be set up, night classes for high school drop-outs, or what -- is one we should talk about.

Promotion

There are many different ways Negroes are discriminated against in promotions. Sometimes Negroes are simply overlooked, when a position opens up at a higher level in the plant. Sometimes these new positions demand special skills which can be learned only through training, and Negroes are excluded from the training programs. And sometimes Negroes are allowed to transfer to these better, higher-paying positions only by losing all seniority privileges.

-THE POOR IN AMERICA-Why employers practice racial discrimination

In addition to prejudice on the part of some employers, there are other reasons why they discriminate against Negroes:

- 1) They are afraid that white customers, employees, labor unions, or the general white public will object, and that their business will suffer.
- 2) They do not think that qualified Negroes can be found for many of the higher-level positions.
- 3) They don't feel like changing old practices unless someone pushes them to do so.

Discrimination by Employment Agencies: Public and Private

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 now outlaws discrimination by these agencies. But it will be a long time before such discrimination ends, especially in states where there is already a Fair Employment Practices Commission. The federal government will not step in in such cases until it is clear that the state commission isn't doing anything about discrimination. This takes time to prove.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act makes some of the discriminatory practices we just talked about illegal. The Act says that:

- 1) No employer may fire you or refuse to hire you or discriminate against you in your wages and conditions of employment, or segregate or classify you in any way that might deprive you of job opportunities or of your rights as an employee, because of your race, color, religion, sex or national origin.
- 2) No employment agency may refuse to refer you for employment, or classify you, or discriminate against you in any other way, because of your race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.
- 3) No labor union may exclude you from membership, or discriminate against you, or segregate or classify its membership or refuse to refer you for employment or limit your employment opportunities in any way, or try to get an employer to discriminate against you, because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

These rules, if they are enforced, should do a great deal to end blatant discrimination. (They might be less effective in ending the more informal, difficult to prove types of discrimination -- like unwritten agreements by employers to hire only whites, or few Negroes; or the use of personal influence to get jobs for whites).

To enforce the Act, a federal commission of 5 members is to be set up. This commission may cooperate with state, local, or other private or public agencies to make sure that Negroes get equal job opportunities. If there is already a state Fair Employment Practices Commission in operation, the federal commission may agree not to interfere with the work that this Commission is doing unless it feels it is necessary, in order to enforce the Civil Rights Act. The commission also has powers to make studies and recommendations, to mediate disputes, to conduct hearings, and to examine witnesses.

-THE POOR IN AMERICA-

This part of the Civil Rights Act goes into effect this July. It applies, during the first year, to employers or unions that have at least 100 members; in the second year, to those which have 75 or more; in the third year to those with 50 or more; and in the fourth year, to those with 25 or more.

MEMO TO:

*File
S.F.
POS*

ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS INTERESTED IN:

STUDENT NONVIOLENT COORDINATING COMMITTEE
MISSISSIPPI FREEDOM DEMOCRATIC PARTY
COUNCIL OF FEDERATED ORGANIZATIONS
GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE SOUTHERN FREEDOM "MOVEMENT"

RE: INADEQUACY OF MASS MEDIA COVERAGE OF THE ABOVE

FROM: MIKE MILLER, BAY AREA REPRESENTATIVE, STUDENT NONVIOLENT COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Despite the fact that the above organizations have all issued and continue to issue press releases, analyses, program reports and other materials on the Southern freedom movement, it is almost impossible to find out in the mass media what is going on in the South.

Enclosed is a sample of what comes into our office regularly. We believe you will be interested in this material and in the continuous flow of important information that comes into our office. To make this material available on a regular basis to you, we would like to establish a KEY LIST MAILING - a list of people who would receive a bi-weekly mailing including releases from MFDP, COFO, SNCC, and material of general interest and reprints of articles from such magazines as The New Republic, The Nation, Commonweal, and so forth. Because of our limited resources, we are asking people who are interested in being on the KEY LIST to send us \$10 earmarked for the purpose of receiving the KEY LIST MAILING. If there is sufficient demand for the KEY LIST MAILING, we will start sending you mailings within two weeks. If there is not such a demand, we will return your \$10.

Following is a list of some of the topics and areas of interest that will be covered in the KEY LIST MAILING if there is demand for it:

- MFDP Congressional Challenge
- MFDP Summer Project in Mississippi
- Administration attempts to weaken MFDP
- COFO Freedom Schools
- COFO Community Centers
- COFO Federal programs
- COFO and the "War on Poverty"
- FBI inaction in the South
- Justice Department inaction and action in the South
- Southern Community power structure reports and studies
- Mississippi Student Union reports and conventions
- SNCC "Black Belt" organizing
- SNCC field reports about organizing in the Black Belt
- SNCC and other civil rights organizations
(CORE, NAACP, SCLC, etc.)

Our idea is to send the material with an accompanying one-page summary of contents. The one-page summaries could serve as an index to topics covered and issues discussed in the KEY LIST MAILING.

We look forward to hearing from you - and to any remarks you might have regarding this proposal.

Estimated cost per year of the KEY LIST MAILING:

20 pages per issue 26 times per year @ \$10 per year

Per mailing, per year, based on 200 subscribers:

Paper	\$1.10
Stencils, ink, repairs25
Envelopes25
Stamps	2.60
Miscellaneous materials10
Labor (based on 1/4 typist @ \$25/week)	6.50

\$10.70

We hope that there are 200 of you out there who are interested in receiving the KEY LIST MAILING.

DEADLINE FOR SUBSCRIPTIONS TO THE KEY LIST MAILING IS MAY 1, 1965.

Enclosed is a business reply envelope for your convenience.

June 13, 1965

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

KEY LINE HEADINGS

of the Bay Area

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee
887 Park Ave., San Francisco, Cal. 94110

CONTENTS:

KIM 12 Behind the Selma March, by Martin Luther King, Jr.

King discusses his session in Selma...points out problems he faces in planning nonviolent action.

KIM 13 Life With Lyndon in the Great Society, Vol. 1, Ch. 10, by Jack Nimble, WFOC research

How can Lyndon use surplus food for international business deals and not feed the hungry Negroes in Selma? Is the U.S. a country or an empire?

KIM 14 Latest Development in A.S.C. Elections in National Agency, WFOC

Correspondence between WFOC staff and a representative from the Department of Agriculture... Meeting of Farmers discussed A.S.C. elections.

KIM 15 Tension, Not Split, in the Negro Banks, From The Christian Century

More on Selma...Can SNCC and SCLC work together?

KIM 16 Reorganization in the Campaign, by Nicholas von Hoffman

Are there "disorganized communities"? Organizing is actually reorganizing...the politics of change...

KIM 17 Freedom Campaign to Washington, D.C.

The Washington Lobby in support of the WFOC Challenge...

KIM 18 The Voting Record of the Challenged Members of the Mississippi WFOC, WFOC research paper

Background of the four Congressmen who have been in the House...Partial voting records from 1945.

BEHIND THE SELMA MARCH by Martin Luther King, Jr.

In his address to the joint session of Congress, President Johnson made one of the most eloquent, unequivocal, and passionate pleas for human rights ever made by a President of the United States. He revealed a great understanding of the depth and dimension of the problem of racial justice. His tone and his delivery were disarmingly sincere. His power of persuasion has been nowhere more forcefully seen. We are happy to know that our struggle in Selma has gone far beyond the issue of the right to vote and has focused the attention of the nation on the vital issue of equality in human rights.

During the course of our struggle to achieve voting rights for Negroes in Selma, Alabama, it was reported that a "delicate understanding" or "agreement" had existed between myself, Alabama state officials, and the federal government to avoid the scheduled march to Montgomery on Tuesday, March 9.

It was interpreted in some quarters, on the basis of news reports of my testimony in support of our petition to the Federal District Court in Montgomery for an injunction against state officials, that I worked with the federal government to throttle the indignation of white clergymen and Negroes and their courageous determination to take a stand, so that Selma could present a superficially calm face to the millions of Americans whose eyes and minds were trained on it at that particular moment.

I am concerned about this perversion of the facts and for the record would like to sketch in the background of the events leading to the confrontation of marchers and Alabama State Troopers at Pettus Bridge in Selma, and our subsequent peaceful turning back.

The goal of the demonstrations in Selma, as elsewhere, is to dramatize the existence of injustice and to bring about the presence of justice by methods of nonviolence. Long years of experience indicate to us that Negroes can achieve this goal when four things occur:

1. Nonviolent demonstrators go into the streets to exercise their constitutional rights.
2. Racists resist by unleashing violence against them.
3. Americans of conscience in the name of decency demand federal intervention and legislation.
4. The Administration, under mass pressure, initiates measures of immediate intervention and remedial legislation.

The working out of this process has never been simple or tranquil. When nonviolent protests were countered by local authorities with harassment, intimidation, and brutality, the federal government has always first asked the Negro to desist and leave the streets, rather than bring pressure to bear on those who commit the criminal acts. We have always been compelled to reject vigorously such federal requests and have rather relied on our allies, the millions of Americans across the nation, to bring pressure on the federal government for protective action in our behalf. Our position has always been that there is a wrong and right side to the question of full freedom and equality for millions of Negro Americans and that the federal government does not belong in the middle on this issue.

During our nonviolent direct-action campaigns we always have been advised, and again were so advised in Selma, that violence may ensue. Herein lies a dilemma: Of course there always exists the

-BEHIND THE SELMA MARCH-

likelihood that, because of the hostility to our demonstrations, acts of lawlessness may be precipitated. We realize that we must exercise extreme caution so that our direct-action program is not conducted in a manner that might be considered provocative or an invitation to violence. Accordingly, each situation must be studied in detail; the strength and temper of our adversaries must be estimated and any change in any of these factors will affect the details of our strategy. Nevertheless, we often must begin a march without knowing when or where it will actually terminate.

How were these considerations applied to our plans for the march from Selma to Montgomery?

My associates and friends are constantly concerned about my personal safety, and in the light of recent threats of death, many of them urged me not to march Sunday for fear that my presence in the line would lead to assassination attempts. However, as a matter of conscience, I cannot always respond to the wishes of my staff and associates; in this case, I had made the decision to lead the march on Sunday and was prepared to do so in spite of any possible danger to my person.

In working out a time schedule, I had to consider my church responsibilities. Because I am so frequently out of my pulpit and because my life is so full of emergencies, I am always on the horns of a dilemma. I had been away for two straight Sundays and therefore felt that I owed it to my parishioners to be there. It was arranged that I take a chartered plane to Montgomery after the morning service and lead the march out of Selma, walking with a group for three or four hours, and take the chartered flight back in order to be on hand for the Communion Service at 7:30 p.m.

When Governor Wallace issued his ban on the march, it was my view and that of most of my associates that the state troopers would deal with the problem by arresting all of the people in the line. We never imagined that they would use the brutal methods to which they actually resorted to repress the march. I therefore concluded that if I were arrested it would be impossible for me to get back to administer the Lord's Supper and Baptism. Because of this situation, my staff urged me to stay in Atlanta and lead a march on Monday morning. This I agreed to do. I was prepared to go to jail on Monday but at the same time I would have met my church responsibilities. If I had had any idea that the state troopers would use the kind of brutality they did, I would have felt compelled to give up my church duties altogether to lead the line. It was one of those developments that none of us anticipated. We felt that the state troopers, who had been severely criticized over their terrible acts two weeks earlier even by conservative Alabama papers, would never again engage in this kind of violence. I shall never forget my agony of conscience for not being there when I heard of the dastardly acts perpetrated against nonviolent demonstrators that Sunday. As a result, I felt that I had to lead a march on the following Tuesday and decided to spend Monday mobilizing for it.

The march on Tuesday illustrated the dilemma we often face. Not to try to march again would have been unthinkable. However, whether we were marching to Montgomery or to a limited point within the city limits of Selma could not be determined in advance; the only

-BEHIND THE SELMA MARCH-

certain thing was that we had to begin so that a confrontation with injustice would take place, in full view of the millions looking on throughout this nation.

The next question was whether the confrontation had to be a violent one; here the responsibility of weighing all factors and estimating the consequences rests heavily on the civil rights leaders. It is easy to decide on either extreme. To go forward recklessly can have terrible consequences in terms of human life and also can cause friends and supporters to lose confidence if they feel a lack of responsibility exists. On the other hand, it is ineffective to guarantee that no violence will occur by the device of not marching or undertaking token marches avoiding direct confrontation.

We determined to seek the middle course. We would march until we faced the troopers. We would not disengage until they made clear that they were going to use force. We would disengage then, having made our point, revealing the continued presence of violence, and showing clearly who are the oppressed and who the oppressors, hoping, finally, that the national Administration in Washington would feel and respond to the shocked reactions with action.

On Tuesday, March 9, Judge Frank M. Johnson of the Federal District Court in Montgomery issued an order enjoining me and the local Selma leadership of the nonviolent voting rights movement from peacefully marching to Montgomery. The issuance of Judge Johnson's order caused disappointment and bitterness to all of us. We had looked to the federal judiciary in Alabama to prevent the unlawful interference with our program to expand elective franchise for Negroes throughout the Black Belt.

I consulted with my lawyers and trusted advisors both in Selma and other parts of the country and discussed what course of action we should take. Information came in that troopers of the Alabama State Police and Sheriff James Clark's possemen would be arrayed in massive force across Highway 80 at the foot of Pettus Bridge in Selma. I reflected upon the role of the federal judiciary as a protector of the rights of Negroes. I also gave thoughtful consideration to the hundreds of clergymen and other persons of good will who had come to Selma to make a witness with me in the cause of justice by participating in our planned march to Montgomery. Taking all of this into consideration, I decided that our plans had to be carried out and that I would lead our march to a confrontation with injustice to make a witness to our countrymen and the world of our determination to vote and be free.

As my associates and I were spiritually preparing ourselves for the task ahead, Governor Leroy Collins, chairman of the newly created Community Relations Service under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and John Doar, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, came to see me to dissuade me from the course of action which we had painfully decided upon.

Governor Collins affirmed and restated the commitment of President Johnson to the achievement of full equality for all persons without regard to race, color, or creed, and his commitment to securing the right to vote for all persons eligible to do so. He very strongly urged us not to march. I stood tentatively with Mr. Doar and Governor Collins. I felt that I had a matter of conscience, I felt it was necessary to stand against the injustice on Highway 80. I asked them to try to understand that I would rather die

-BEHIND THE SELMA MARCH-

on the highway in Alabama than make a butchery of my conscience by compromising with evil. The Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth said to the Governor that instead of urging us not to march, he should urge the state troopers not to be brutal toward us and not attempt to stop our peaceful march. Governor Collins realized at that point that we were determined to march and left the room, saying that he would do what he could to prevent the state troopers from being violent.

It is important to stress once again that no prearranged agreement existed. Whether Governor Collins and other officials from the federal government talked with Mr. Lingo and the officials in Alabama is something that I do not know.

All I do know is that just as we started to march, Governor Collins rushed to me and said that he felt everything would be all right. He gave me a small piece of paper indicating a route that I assume Mr. Baker, Public Safety Director of Selma, wanted us to follow. It was the same route that had been taken on Sunday. The press, reporting this detail, gave the impression that Governor Collins and I had sat down and worked out some compromise. There were no talks or agreements between Governor Collins and me beyond the discussions I have just described. I held on to my decision to march despite the fact that many people in the line were concerned about breaking the court injunction issued by one of the strongest and best judges in the South. I felt that we had to march at least to the point where the troopers brutalized the people on Sunday even if it would mean a recurrence of violence, arrest, or even death. As a nonviolent leader, I could not advocate breaking through a human wall set up by the policemen. While we desperately desired to proceed to Montgomery, we knew before we started our march that this human wall set up on Pettus Bridge would make it impossible for us to go beyond it. It was not that we didn't intend to go on to Montgomery, but that, in consideration of our commitment to nonviolent action, we knew we could not go under the present conditions.

As to our next step:

As soon as we had won legal affirmation of our right to march to Montgomery, the next phase hinged on the successful completion of our mission to petition the Governor to take meaningful measures to abolish voting restrictions, the poll tax, and police brutality.

(Reprinted from The Saturday Review of April 3, 1965)

LIFE WITH LYNDON IN THE GREAT SOCIETY, Vol. 1, No. 16

A few weeks ago Lyndon's Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, was wringing his hands and moaning that he couldn't find any way to get surplus foods into the hands of hungry Negroes in Selma who had been fired from their jobs for civil rights activities. Freeman just couldn't seem to persuade the county authorities in Dallas County that they should distribute the food. The entire night of the U.S. Government was hung up by a few courthouse political hacks in Alabama.

But just the other day, Lyndon and his boys in Agriculture pushed through a deal for trading surplus food to the Tshombe Government in the Congo in return for industrial diamonds produced there. Lyndon explained that if the U.S. didn't take these diamonds in return for the food, the Belgian-owned company which mines the diamonds in the Congo would run into serious financial troubles.

The Republic of South Africa got in on the same deal. Lyndon said he would trade surplus food to South Africa in return for \$55 million worth of uranium.

As nearly as we can make out, here's the way these two deals will work. The U.S. Government (Lyndon) will contract with private business in the U.S. to take the surplus foods, and sell them in the regular commercial markets in the Congo and South Africa. Then the U.S. businessmen will turn the money over to the private businessmen in the Congo who sell the diamonds, and to the private businessmen in South Africa who sell the uranium.

The diamonds and the uranium will then be delivered to the U.S. businessmen, who will sell them commercially or to the U.S. Government. Now at every point in this series of transactions--the food goes from the U.S. Government or the businessmen; the food goes from the U.S. businessmen to the South African and Congo (Belgian) businessmen; the money goes from the South African and Belgian businessmen to the U.S. businessmen; the U.S. businessmen then buy the diamonds from the Belgian company and the South African company; and the diamonds and uranium are shipped to the U.S. and the food is shipped to the Congo and to South Africa--there is a profit for American business.

That profit for American business, we figure, is the reason why Lyndon and his Agriculture Department were able to arrange for this complicated international deal, when they couldn't find any way to get the same surplus food into the hands of hungry Negroes in Dallas County, Alabama. There just isn't any money to be made out of giving free food to hungry Americans, so, naturally, Lyndon and his friends find it very difficult to do so.

No incentive, you see,

During the past two weeks or so we've been taught yet another lesson in American justice. One of the lessons involved the U.S. courts and another involved the Alabama courts.

-LIFE WITH LYNDON-

The U.S. case was the one against Ross Barnett and Paul Johnson for defying a U.S. court order by refusing to admit James Meredith to the University of Mississippi. Four of the judges on the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals decided that Mississippi's "changed circumstances and conditions rendered the further prosecution of criminal proceedings unnecessary." In other words, as we see it, those four judges are telling us the heat is off, so there's no longer any reason to prosecute Ol' Ross and Ol' Paul.

Other than the fact that the heat is off Mississippi, we can't see that things have changed there all that much. We suppose the judges can read the newspapers and therefore are aware of the continued burnings, bombings, beatings, jailings and general brutality in Mississippi. We wonder if anything has changed about the fact that two people died in the riots brought about as a direct result of defiance of the court order by Johnson and Barnett. Are the two still dead, or aren't they? Of course one factor in the eagerness of the judges to whitewash the whole thing might be that the Challenge to the Mississippi Congressmen is coming up soon in the U.S. House and the judges don't want to do anything that'll stir up opinion against Mississippi. Three of the judges on the court thought that Barnett and Johnson should be tried on the contempt charges. Two of the four who thought not were from Alabama.

The other case, of course, involved the trial of Collie Wilkins, Jr., for the murder of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo. Wilkins was not convicted and that is no surprise. But we were a bit surprised at the argument used by the Alabama prosecutor when he tried to convince the jurors they should convict Wilkins. The prosecutor told the jury:

"If we are going to justify a cold-blooded murder, then it is to be done on the grounds that this woman was riding in a car with a Negro man... If those are going to be grounds for justifying cold-blooded murder in Lowndes County today, then tomorrow it may be grounds for a murder if someone of the temperament of the defendant here sees you driving your Negro maid home, or sees your wife driving her cook home."

We would not have thought that a public official of Alabama, in a trial he knew would be so well-publicized, would be so frank in explaining why he thought Negroes and civil rights workers should not be murdered in cold blood. If we understand him correctly, he's saying that the thing that's wrong with this particular killing is that it might at some time in the future be used as justification for killing a human-being--you know, a native white southerner.

However, interpret the prosecutor, on the jury as you will, one thing is very plain: it's not a punishable crime to kill a Negro or a civil rights worker in Alabama.

And, speaking of crimes, we wonder what ever happened to that trigger-happy Alabama trooper who killed Jimmie Lee Jackson. Still enforcing Alabama Law, we suppose. And what about those Alabama troopers Katzenbach said he was going to prosecute for the brutality at the Selma bridge on March 7th? They're still enforcing Alabama Law too, while Katzenbach runs around the country telling people what a great Great Society it is that his leader, Lyndon, has got here.

-LIFE WITH LYNDON-

It's time we all recognized that the United States is not just a country--it's an empire. Lyndon intends to be the emperor for just as long as possible, it seems.

Take, for example, an advertisement which ran in the April 29 issue of Lyndon's Department of Commerce daily bulletin. The advertisement was asking for bids on a U.S. Army research contract. Here's how the ad read:

"Service and material to perform a RESEARCH STUDY ENTITLED 'PAX AMERICANA' consisting of a phased study of the following: (a) elements of National Power; (b) ability of selected nations to apply the elements of power; (c) a variety of world power configurations to be used as a basis for the U.S. to maintain world hegemony in the future. Quotations and applicable specifications will be available upon request at the Army Research Office, 3845 Columbia Pike, Arlington, Va., until May 1, 1965."

We can't see any way to interpret this advertisement but that the U.S. Army is making plans now to enforce the economic domination of the world by U.S. corporations and financiers for just as long as possible.

The next question is: Does the U.S. Army do this kind of thing on its own, as a product of general military idiocy, or is there something more to it? That's a hard question to answer with absolute certainty without access to the inside workings of the Department of the Army. However, there is information available to us from which we can at least do some informed guesswork.

First of all, the head man of all the military services is the President himself, Lyndon. We know from his own statements, his own wealth, from what the businessmen have said, and from what Lyndon has done for them, that Lyndon is in favor of taking over the world for American businessmen--permanently.

The top dog at the Pentagon is Robert S. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense. Before he went to work at the Pentagon, he was the President of the Ford Motor Co. Ford operates in most every country of the world--every "free" country, that is, like Portugal, Spain, South Africa, Dominican Republic, Paraguay, Guatemala, etc.

Lyndon has just appointed a new Under Secretary of the Army. His name is Stanley R. Resor. Before his appointment, Resor was a partner in Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons and Gates, a law firm which represents some of the biggest corporations in the country. Eli Whitney Debevoise, senior partner in the firm, is a director of St. Joseph Lead Co., which has operations in Argentina and Peru; he also is a director of West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., which operates in Brazil.

Francis Plimpton, another partner in the firm, is a director of United States Trust Co., one of the nation's larger banks. Plimpton is also deputy U.S. Representative to the United Nations. Other members of the law firm sit on the boards of equally important corporations and banks.

Resor himself is married to the former Jane Lawler Pillsbury, daughter of John Sargent Pillsbury, honorary chairman of the Pillsbury Co., and a director of Northwest Bancorporation, 3rd largest bank holding company in the U.S. This bank holding company controls 6% of the bank deposits in Iowa, 26% of those in Minnesota, 13% of those in Montana, 9% in Nebraska and 24% in South Dakota.

Mrs. Resor's brother, John Sargent Pillsbury, Jr., is a director of both the Pillsbury Co., and Northwest Bancorporation. The Pillsbury Co. produces Pillsbury food products which are familiar to every American householder. The company operates in the U.S., Canada, Guatemala, Venezuela, Switzerland, France and Australia. Thus Resor's wife is an heiress to a world wide financial and industrial complex.

The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Development is Willis M. Hawkins. We suppose it was in his office that the idea originated for the research project mentioned in the advertisement above. Willis M. Hawkins, Jr., is corporation vice president for engineering of the Lockheed Corporation. Besides being a significant factor in the world-production of airplanes and missiles, and (with Boeing) literally dominating airplane production in the U.S., Lockheed has production plants in Canada, Mexico, Argentina and Italy.

This is only a sketchy and incomplete picture of the connections between the U.S. Army and U.S. business. What we have said here does not even deal with the intimate association between the big defense contractors and the Army. What we wanted to show is that the personal lives and fortunes of top Army officials are intimately involved in the operations carried out by the Army all over the world, protecting the advance of American business.

Lyndon is the man who makes it possible for people like Resor to use their official positions for the benefit of themselves and their friends. And as long as the country is owned and controlled by these kinds of people we suppose there's little that Lyndon, or any other president can do to change things.

But Lyndon could tell people the truth about the way things are, and, with the help of the people, at least try to change them.

If such truth is in him, he sure keeps it well hidden.

The May issue of South African SCOPE, a publication of the Government of South Africa, carries a story about the sixteen U.S. newsmen and publishers whom the South African Government brought to that country for an all-expense paid trip to see the truth about conditions there. The newsmen were wined and dined by officials of the racist government, and were given tours of the industrial plants in the areas of the big cities. We can expect now to see glowing accounts in the major newspapers about how lovely everything is in South Africa.

The newsmen could write the truth about South Africa. But if they did, their publishers wouldn't print it, and they'd probably be out of a

job. Too, they wouldn't get invited on anymore of those pleasure-journeys to Johannesburg.

Meanwhile, after the state legislature elections in South Africa, which were won overwhelmingly by the racist Nationalist Party, the South African Prime Minister said: "It is a glorious victory they (the voters) have given the cause of unity based on principle and that of the survival of White South Africa...." This, of course, is the same government that's involved in Lyndon's swap of surplus food for uranium.

The commerce and industry committee of the Planned Parenthood Federation has just released a report on birth control. One member of the committee is Larriot duPont Copeland, Chairman of the du Pont corporation. In releasing the report Copeland said: "I confess, like many others, I once took for granted the notion that a rapidly growing population almost automatically meant rising profits...." However, he went on, he's come to the conclusion that rising population does not mean rising profits--so now he's against rising population.

The report itself said that American business would gain from the application of birth control methods among the world's poor because this would lead to "safer investments, a brake on spiraling taxes for support of welfare services, more prosperous markets abroad...and greater individual and corporate freedom." The report saw the increase of population as threatening "the very nature of private enterprise as we know it." In short, the committee's report favored the limiting of family size so that we would have "a safer world for business."

The committee members include representatives of duPont, Standard Oil, Browning Arms Co., Chase Manhattan Bank, General Electric, United States Rubber, American Cyanamid, International Harvester, Royal Crown Cola, Rockefeller Bros., Inc., U.S. Trust Co., Continental Can, and other financial and industrial corporations.

The men, rulers of the American empire over which they permit Lyndon to preside, see only the profit issue in the indescribable misery and deprivation that accompanies large families among the poor. There was a time when these same men, as Copeland admits, figured that the poor poor people there were, the cheaper labor would be. When they thought this, they looked upon birth control with religious horror. But now that they see the possibility of the poor folks' gaining some measure of political power, and using that power to secure some of the benefits of the welfare state--suddenly they want birth control. Of course the development of machines that do much of the work human hands used to do is a factor in this too. The hands are no longer needed in such abundance to make profits for the rulers; so now the rulers are thinking twice about the advisability of permitting them to exist.

These are the men in whose name Lyndon seeks to rule the world.

LATEST DEVELOPMENT IN ASC ELECTIONS IN MADISON COUNTY, MISS.

The Department of Agriculture, represented by Mr. Seabron, called the COFO office in Canton, Mississippi on March 28. In that conversation Mr. Seabron said that the farmers' elections of last December 3 would be held over in this county in two or three communities. As soon as time and other business allowed the COFO staff called together farmers from all over the county to discuss this possibility of new elections. The minutes of that meeting (see below) were sent to Mr. Seabron. A phone call from him April 2 made it clear that he was most unhappy with the farmers' discussion. The answer of one COFO staff member to that call is also below. At this mailing we have no knowledge of which communities the USDA will have new elections in, nor have we had a chance to talk to local farmers about the latest phone call and an article in today's paper--both of which made clear that the elections will be redone in one or two communities only, whether Negro farmers go along with them or not. COFO will continue to support Madison County farmers in whatever course they take and will refuse to influence that course in any way.

Canton COFO
George Raymond,
Director

To: Mr. Seabron, United States Department
of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Date: 3/31/65

From: Jo Ann Coiman, Canton COFO
Canton, Mississippi

Re: ASCS elections
in Madison
County, Miss.

Farmers representing each of the eight ASCS communities in Madison County met tonight to consider the request of Mr. Seabron that farmers' elections be held over in 2 or 3 communities here. This meeting ended in a majority vote against having the elections in only 2 or 3 places and with a demand that the vote be redone for the entire county.

This decision was the result of 3 hours of careful deliberation. The farmers talked over the possible motivations of USDA: either the Department is trying to placate them through tokenism, or it is trying to warn the white farmers (without going very far) that the elections must be run fairly next time, or it is wanting a small-scale trial run to test different procedures.

They discussed the possible effects of a re-vote in 2 or 3 communities: either it would be a warning to their white intimidators and good preparation for next December's vote; or it would be unjustified compromise.

Then they considered the effects of demanding new county-wide elections: the demand might give a false impression of black-

-A.S.C. ELECTIONS-

supremacy leanings; it might be damaging to future relations with USDA; it would be in keeping with their original protests, which were against the elections as they were handled throughout the county; with such short notice and during planting season they would have trouble getting their voters out again.

Also they discussed, and rejected, the alternative of accepting a revote in 2 or 3 communities but at the same time stating their reservations to USDA and demanding that nothing smacking of tokenism be offered them again.

Their final decision rested on the majority feeling that injustices were county-wide last December 3 and nothing short of county-wide retribution can be accepted; and that the acceptance of anything less would only encourage the powers--both here and in Washington--to ignore and take away their rights again.

They await a reply from USDA.

838 Lutz
Canton, Mississippi
April 2, 1965

Mr. Seabron
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Seabron:

Here I speak not for farmers nor for COFO but just for Jo Ann Coiman.

You said a moment ago over the phone that we were wrong to bring representative farmers together to discuss the new elections. Their lives are effected by those elections, not ours. If they shouldn't have some say in them no one should. You said we should counsel them on what's best. But we assume no right to speak for them without their knowledge. And since our primary goal is their independence and selfdetermination we cannot even press our counsel too far. Now when they are on the verge of the vote that independence is all the more to be cherished.

You were angry about their all or nothing attitude. But surely you realize that their decision is not only a demand but also a risk. Furthermore you know the countless times they have reached out for a "token of good faith" and drawn their hands back empty.

You said your investigators didn't find reason enough for a revote in even a few places let alone in all places. I'm not surprised. They didn't come to this county until weeks after the vote was over. And once they came they kept coming back, asking for information we'd

already given them (you yourself had to ask for the Crawford affidavit again, after we'd given it to I don't know how many people already). We had to explain the election procedure to one investigator; we also had to help him with his spelling.

You said that getting any action on the election took much toil and struggle. I don't doubt it. Nor do I doubt that you put more than your share into the struggle. Our people who have met with you have always labeled you "friend." So, while I deplore the state of our democracy which no longer values discussions of the people but relies on "spokesmen," and while I grieve over the federal bureaucracy through which obvious truths cannot travel without being mangled into ambiguous "findings," I am truly sorry for the thankless and angering position in which attempted democracy and obvious truths have put you.

Sincerely yours,

Jo Ann Coiman

Shortly after noon on Tuesday, March 9, John Lewis, short, stocky chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), stood up to address an overflow throng in Browns Chapel A.M.E. Church in Selma, Ala. Never before had the old church seen such an audience. There were hundreds of local Negroes, of course, but crowded into the balcony, in the aisles, all over the floor around the podium were college professors and students, ministers, priests and rabbis, people from all walks of life and all parts of the nation. Thousands more were milling about in the bright sun outside, all waiting for the word—to march or not to march to Montgomery. Two days before, on Sunday, such a march had been brutally turned back by state troopers; it was to protest the tear gas, the billy clubs, the bull whips, the cattle prods used on that occasion that this mass of concerned citizens had assembled in Selma.

Lewis, his head still throbbing from a clubbing by troopers on Sunday, told the crowd that for him there was no choice—he must march, because no one had the right to deny American citizens their constitutional right peacefully to seek redress of grievances. It was one of his best speeches in months; his eyes blazed and his gestures became violent as he moved to his climactic point. Then, suddenly, incongruously, the audience burst into applause and the TV lights poured a blinding white bath over the rostrum. Lewis' shoulders slumped and his lips tightened as he waited for the tumult to subside. He did not need to turn around to know what had happened behind him. The experience had become familiar in the past two months: Martin Luther King, Jr., had just entered the room!

Lewis bravely went on with his talk, but he must surely have known that he might just as well have stopped the moment the Baptist minister who heads the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (S.C.L.C.) entered the room. For it was on King's decision that most of the undecided would act.

As it turned out, that decision was indeed to march. But, unknown to the potential marchers, King had come to the church after agreeing to end the march following a peaceful confrontation with the troopers. Although the decision turned out to be one of relief to many who had come to Selma to make their witness that day, others considered it a shameful retreat. Among those who looked on it that way were James Ferman, executive secretary of SNCC, plus many SNCC workers and many other people who look on the lively organization with philosophical sympathy. A few were already angry: they felt that King had chickened out by remaining in Atlanta when the Sunday march was attempted. Others held simply that King had no business making "deals with the enemy."

The events of that Tuesday brought into the open a resentment that had long bubbled among some of the students. It stemmed from the feeling that King and his S.C.L.C. were johnnies-come-lately in Selma, yet were running the show, getting all the credit at the expense of SNCC.

Such resentment is understandable. SNCC had been hard at work in Selma for over two years. It believes that no organization has a right to enter any community and make the decisions; it holds rather that since local residents will in the long run bear the consequences, they should be the ones to make the decisions, with SNCC's function being merely to help in whatever way it can. Some of the young SNCC workers reportedly felt that King was gaining fame by moving into a town, creating a brief sensation, then leaving with no permanent gain registered for the local Negroes.

I

This resentment had been reported in a rash of newspaper reports and columns. Their number increased a few days after Selma when violence erupted in Montgomery and a mounted sheriff's posse used whips and billy clubs to disperse hundreds of students, including some SCCC workers. That night a mass meeting was held in the North Baptist Church in Montgomery. There was a feeling in the warm night air that the worst might happen. Militant Jim Foreman did nothing to quiet the mood in a fiery speech calling on Pres. Lyndon Johnson to halt police brutality in Alabama. Only the night before, the President had made one of the most dramatic speeches in the history of his office, calling for a strong voting rights bill and the end of police brutality. But Foreman flowered with distrust born of long disappointment. "Did Pres. Johnson mean what he said?" he cried. To "make sure," Foreman called for a massive demonstration in Washington to "tie up every street and bus and commit every act of civil disobedience ever seen — because I'm tired of seeing people hit."

The next speaker was Martin Luther King, Jr., who had rushed to Montgomery that afternoon when he got wind of the volatile feelings developing there. A militant speech was called for, and King delivered. "I'm not satisfied as long as the Negro sees life as a long and empty corridor with a 'no exit' sign. ... The cup of endurance has run over." But his call was not for a "massive demonstration" in Washington; it was for people to march, "nonviolently and peacefully," to the Montgomery county courthouse.

King's strategy worked: everyone went home to bed, and the next day the pent-up tensions were worked off in a six-hour demonstration. However, the conflict of tactics there revealed, with King the winner, lent more fuel to the talk of division in the organizational ranks of the nation's Negroes. And comment in the press proliferated.

Is there a split? No, says John Lewis: "There have been normal disagreements in tactics, but no split." After all, he reasons, how can there be a split between groups that have never pretended to act as one? It is unfortunate that such disagreements, an inevitable part of any revolution, are suddenly getting so much publicity. Lewis points out that he himself is a voting member of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference's board of directors, and that he or someone representing him has been in on every major decision made in the Selma voter drive. Moreover: "As I have said many times to Dr. King, I am not going to engage in a public discussion of organizational problems. S.C.L.C. is not the enemy — George Wallace and segregation are the enemy." Adds Ivanhoe Donaldson, SCCC's influential administrative assistant: "Within the movement we are a family. Arguments take place in any family. They don't mean disunity."

II

One of the charges leveled most frequently at SCCC is that at times when the drive has been making strong headway the group has proved itself too militant, too uncompromising, even irresponsible. In a way, of course, this is something the organization cannot control, since by its credo it welcomes anyone interested in working for freedom. Explains Lewis: "SCCC is not a membership organization, so a lot of people wear SCCC buttons although they are not on the staff. And when they do something inconsistent with the non-violent movement, we get the blame." SCCC's antipathy to anything as bourgeois as an organization chart implies, in sharp contrast to the attitude of S.C.L.C., which freely distributes copies of its very formal organization chart, with all sorts of lines running to and from all sorts of boxes listing names and titles. If SCCC should ever get up an equivalent, the result would resemble a bowl of spaghetti.

Lewis denies the further charge that SCCC demonstrates only for the sake of demonstrating. "I don't condone incidents where people provoke, where they try to antagonize," he says. "Maybe we can get a staff to adhere to that attitude, but there is no way to be certain that all others who join a demonstration will control themselves. I don't know; maybe I'm getting cynical about going to jail." The young man smiles; he has been in jail 37 times. "Maybe I'm getting tired or old or conservative, but I don't think so. I believe we are at a point where we must be militant but at the same time we must be statesmen. Radical, yes, but with a sense of diplomacy."

Jim Foreman is much more militant; for him, diplomacy can go hang. Actually, this is SCCC's problem: it doesn't give a whistle for the niceties. It is concerned only with attacking serious ills. When a battle is won, a law passed or a concession gained, the rules of the game call for a breather, sometimes a Thank You — even from most liberals. Not from SCCC! It knows much is still to be done. Thus Jim Foreman had no time to compliment Lyndon Johnson on his memorable voting rights speech.

Such apparent ingratitude has alienated many people, including quite a few liberals. SCCC is really saying little today different from what it has said since it was founded in 1960. But is its attitude in fact a deficiency? Perhaps its critics find it offensive because it is militant to the point of searing the sensibilities like a branding iron — which is considerably less comfortable than being pricked by a pin.

SCCC has done the dirty work for the past five years. Its small staff (currently 209 in number) has been the catalyst spurring group after group of southern Negroes to work together as a unit in the striving toward freedom. It has seen so many apparent gains melt into no change at all for the local Negro that it has lost patience with all calls to "be reasonable" or to "go a little slower." This means that SCCC is exasperating, infuriating — and brutally realistic. Its realism is so straightforward that it actually becomes complex — too much so for many northern white liberals to abide. The result is that certain columnists fall back on the "communist" charge. That cliché has been resorted to by, for instance, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in their syndicated column. In what is for them a surprising outburst, they have written: "SCCC and its leaders aren't really interested in the right to vote or any attainable goal, but in demanding the unattainable as a means of provoking social turmoil."

Not interested? Yet it was SCCC that came to Selma in 1962, that installed a full-time office there in January 1963. By October of that year, when it sponsored the first Freedom Day in the Black Belt and 500 Negroes turned out to try to register at the Dallas county courthouse, it had ten staff members living and working in Selma. Despite incredible harassment, ever present danger and beatings worse than any the police inflicted in the heavily publicized encounters of the past three months, SCCC persisted. The result: four separate federal voting suits instituted against Dallas county. Evans and Novak could not be more wrong about SCCC's stake in winning voting rights.

As for the "communism" charge, that is too easy to make. In a tactic smacking of the House Un-American Activities Committee, SNCC's detractors level the charge but offer little proof. Because SNCC is so loosely organized it is entirely possible that some communists have climbed aboard. But there is no evidence that they influence policy. And even if they were present, SNCC is so overwhelmed by the job at hand, so lacking in money and time that it finds itself unable to run security checks on all the people who drift in and out of its voter campaigns.

III

SNCC will continue to be militant, to upset liberals as well as conservatives. It knows too well the pitfalls that accompany politeness. Besides why bother? Has not Barry Goldwater been able to say, even after all the evils were again dramatized at Selma, that we already have plenty of voting laws on the books?

The significant question for the entire civil rights movement remains: Is SNCC too militant to live with Martin Luther King's S.C.L.C.? Headlines and columns notwithstanding, the evidence is against a Yes to that question. Philosophically the two groups are almost identical; the differences lie in tactics; and the tactics, while different, are often amazingly complementary. For instance, S.C.L.C. is now working feverishly to launch SCOPE, a huge new program in which thousands of college students will spend the summer in dozens of southern communities, or organizing and educating Negroes to vote and engage in political action. Ironically, this is virtually the same program SNCC has been operating for the past five years.

Furthermore, if all the mulling and tugging in Selma could not shatter cooperation between the two groups, it is not likely that anything can. SNCC worked in Selma for 29 months, then saw Dr. King roar in and get the glory. Yet Ivanhoe Donaldson can acknowledge: "S.C.L.C. was able to do here what we weren't able to do. That did it was King's image - the fact that that he is a minister, that he has the church behind him. The churches mobilized, which was what brought national attention. We switched to the role of supporting the drive. SNCC often has to operate under a blanket provided by other organizations in order to get an air of respectability it doesn't command by itself. S.C.L.C. doesn't need to do that."

Says John Lewis: "I don't think there is any attempt by S.C.L.C. to discredit SNCC. The last three months our whole relationship with S.C.L.C. has been an education to me. We have had a chance to sit down and really talk with each other. When people aren't acquainted they become suspicious of each other. Neither organization has reason to be suspicious of the other and from Ivanhoe Donaldson: "We don't have to worry about our relationship with S.C.L.C. We have to worry about things like what the press is doing lately. It is confusing people who want to support both organizations."

(The Christian Century, May 12, 1968)

REORGANIZATION IN THE CASBAH

By Nicholas von Hoffman

People's thoughts are captives of their vocabularies. When we use the expression "community organization" we are automatically accepting certain shaky assumptions. We are implying that there are communities which are not organized, that every community ought to be "organized", and that community organizing is a profession apart from others, like law or engineering. Personally, I believe that all three propositions are either false or highly misleading.

So far as I know there are no disorganized communities. The two words cancel each other out. The word "community" sums up a host of organized relationships. I don't want to get involved in fine distinctions, or I will be like the sociologists who don't even agree on what society is. When I talk about organized relationships I mean nothing fancier than relations between people that are recognized by all, that are frequent, and that anybody who knows the community can reasonably anticipate as he moves about from person to person. Wherever you have that, you have a community of some kind. And you have that wherever people are making their homes. It's the difference between a hotel and a boardinghouse. The one doesn't have a crisscross of common relationships and practices; the other does, and is a little community.

You may say that I am splitting hairs. You might concede that there may not be disorganized communities but there certainly are disorganized geographic districts, especially in big cities where a lot of people live without community -- that is, without organization. On the surface the statement seems plausible, but a little reflection should make you doubt it. The instances on record of even a small number of people living closely together in a state of semi-anarchy are very rare. I don't know of one.

Skid Row, which is a place where people go because they want to escape social and legal control, turns out to be a kind of "anti-community." An "anti-community" is a community founded on values and interests that are the reverse of the dominant world enclosing it. Even the Bohemian sections of big cities are not peopled by disorganized individuals. They have their own communities too.

According to the ancients the act of creation was bringing order out of chaos. It has been left to men to reorganize from time to time. Organizing of every sort is actually reorganizing. Let's not arrogate to ourselves, even in our thinking, powers and responsibilities that belong to the gods. In saying that organizing is in reality reorganizing, I am not trifling with a petty distinction. Many people who talk about community organization define it as organizing a "disorganized" mass of people who seem to be detached islets in the moving river of society.

Such thinking quickly jumps to the assertion that "such and such a place cannot be organized because people are too disorganized."

We have all heard that remark, and we have seen sensible people nod their heads in agreement. The speaker could be right, but there are no such places, and we are not called to organize anyhow; our work is reorganization.

After having invented the impossible fiction of a "disorganized community" some sociologists have set out to prove it empirically. Of course they were successful, and the myth of the disorganized lower-class Negro, Puerto Rican, or Southern white community became an established fact. The repercussions of having demonstrated the validity of a false proposition have been enormous. Government policies in education, welfare, housing, and law enforcement have been based on it. Since it is a fundamental tenet that disorganized communities cannot be organized, tiny committees of professionals with time to meet for lunch were judged the optimum organizational activity possible. Many men who might have accomplished real good did not try, since it had been demonstrated that results were all but impossible.

Lower Class Negro Community

I want to stick with the lower-class Negro community because the future of its people will largely shape the future of the cities themselves. Also, by looking into these districts we can find out a lot about the organization and re-organization of people in general. For the same difficulties arise in many white areas, but since their problems are less intense the underlying similarities are less in evidence.

Lower-class Negro sections have their share of natural community. Political groups flourish in them. Churches that have not had their incentive sapped by debilitating denominational subsidies develop organization and substance. Throughout, a web of gambling organizations provides a fine communications network. There are such trade associations as the organizations of beauticians, barbers, and saloon keepers. Sometimes the organizations are formal and elaborate; sometimes they are informal and simple. There are clubs, lodges, fraternities, and sororities. Blocks and buildings have their small groups that usually revolve around some outstanding local figure who may be simply a resident but is also frequently a flat janitor, a barber, or a building manager. Among these and more groupings are types of organizations that the outside world recognizes. I speak of churches in the major denominations, PTA's, social agencies, and such miscellaneous associations as the League of Women Voters. They are in the community but aloof from it. Their contacts are almost unbelievably sparse and their penetration is almost nil. The isolation of the "respectable" organizations confirms the disorganized-community hypothesis in the minds of their staff people. From their vantage point, the neighborhood does indeed look like disorganized anarchy.

Usually the groups that suffer from being cut off are what I like to think of as "branch office" organizations. The local PTA or major-denomination church or social agency is a replica of a form and program devised elsewhere under other circumstances. You might call it a standard brand pushed into a specialized market

-REORGANIZATION-

There has no call for what is being offered, but the branch office has no power to change the "line". It must sell what the central warehouse sends it. I have watched this happen even when the people in the branch office knew better. The subordinates in many social agencies will laugh behind their bosses' backs. The underlings are usually less well paid, less part of and interested in the downtown world, where programs and policies are conceived. Being closer to the community they are less prone to let theory wipe out fact.

There are surely political reasons why, for example, a local YMCA in a lowerclass Negro neighborhood will carry out a perfectly pointless program year after year. The people who own the Y's don't want any trouble. But I have also seen churches and social agencies fail to exploit rich opportunities out of dogmatic stubbornness. Mediocre, doctrinaire professionalism has littered the poor sections of our cities with immobile, unadaptable, institutional dinosaurs. These beasts can neither feed themselves nor support their own weight. They violate the law of the survival of the fittest, thanks to a large vested interest in failure. The failure to attract support from the beneficiaries or to get results cannot possibly be disguised. Failure is used to demonstrate how bad things are and how badly the services are needed. Thus, repeated failures supervised by qualified professionals assure the annual subsidy.

An enormous amount of rationalizing is needed to keep such a system going. The mess in the community surrounding the branch offices is too awful to be covered up. So the justification is that, inadequate as they are, the branch office staff are the only hope. For evidence the branch office managers hold up the people's non-existent "disorganization" again. Those who are told about it must believe what they hear. They couldn't know better. Their ignorance has made them terrified of the lower-class Negro community. With heads stuffed full of lurid tales of rape and narcotics, they are gullible setups for swallowing any wild story. The phantasmagorias that are soberly passed on to philanthropic administrators and benefactors as research are the more credible because their tellers are convinced they are true.

A PERSON WITH A FOLLOWING

The interval between the crazy notion of a disorganized community and a leaderless one is short. No comment about lower-class Negro communities finds more utterance than the bromide about lack of leadership.

No people has ever been without leaders. They may not have been smart or good at bringing home the bacon to their followers, but leaders there always are a plenty. Well, what is a leader? This definition may be simple-minded -- namely, that a leader is a person with a following -- but it is useful for understanding. If you will go along with the definition, then you will see that a lower-class Negro area is swarming with leaders.

The leaders are not well-educated white collar types. Some

leaders are on ADC, but the going theory is that a woman on ADC must be a slob. That word is used to describe dependency, aspirational levels are the words used, but are in fact kinds of irrelevant reasons are used to knock people off the leadership lists. None of them have anything to do with whether or not Jones or Smith had a following. The practice of not recognizing popularly chosen leadership is as old as politics, but it can be a dangerous game. The Negro population affords a good example.

The white world has picked out the Negro leaders it cares to recognize. It complains that there are too few of them, not realizing that only a certain number of people will consent to be lackeys, or Uncle Toms and Aunt Tomasitas, as they are called by the millions of Negroes they do not lead. Being a puppet, even at good wages, is a hard job. Since the leaders the whites have chosen for the Negroes are either detected by their supposed followers or unknown to them, they are never able to get Negroes, particularly lower-class ones, to behave. They complain that the Negro leadership is untrained. Massive adult education is prescribed, and the Uncle Toms are marched off to school to learn leadership skills. After being put through the leadership-training spaghetti machine (the product is an extremely thin pasta with a hollow center) the leaders return, as ineffectual as ever.

"Community organization" now intrudes itself into our line of vision. The "community organizers" are also representatives of the repudiated brand names. They run smack into the same insolubilities. In short order the "community organization" develops into a professional luncheon circle. There is talk about indigenous leadership, adult education, urbanization, and acculturation. Recently some effort in the direction of housing has been included. The results are so scanty that a whole rationale has been developed to demonstrate that results aren't important. The thinking is that doing, not getting, counts. The atmosphere changes to the therapeutic climate of the outpatient clinic. Words like "process" and "experience" are loudly spoken.

The profit to the individual and society, we are told, is invisible but even more worth-while than palpable accomplishment. Potential leaders are having experiences that will stand them and us in good stead at an unspecified future date. The naked emperor is walking the streets again while his ravished subjects praise his "experiential" robes. In the meantime truth grows uglier and we begin to cast about for other ideas.

Let's go back to the lower-class Negro area for instructional material. I have already said that it, the prime example of a disorganized community, does not and cannot exist. I should now like to argue that its nonexistent leadership is actually alive and kicking. The leaders are the men and women running the organized groups that the experts have empirically demonstrated don't exist.

These undiscovered leaders are inconveniently realistic in their judgements. When you find them, which is very easy, they

point to a system which they see as the cause of most of the community's and the people's woes. The system is summed up by words like "Jim Crow" and "discrimination." The true leadership is remorseless in crying that the great money and power interests maintain, and profit by, the system. The leadership persists in espousing causes and policies that will blow up storms of peppy controversy.

We have come to the heart of the matter. The leadership is calling into question the conduct and arrangement of society. The leaders are demanding great and deep changes.

Business of Politics

To me their demands place the whole discussion in the domain of politics. The arrangement of society and the conduct of the state are, more than anything else, the proper business of politics. Community and politics, as the words are usually used, are things apart --but are they?

"Every state is a community of some kind," says Aristotle, who adds that "he who by nature and not by mere human accident is without a state is either a bad man or above humanity." Obviously, that is a far cry from the narrow partisan cheering that we customarily call politics. Serious political thinkers, beginning with the Greeks, have passed over electioneering as a minor part of man's political activities. They begin their thinking about the family, property, education, and the other aspects of society that some of us pass over as "nonpolitical." The moderns, from Montesquieu through Marx and Ortega y Gasset, do the same.

In democratic societies, particularly, most politics is nonpartisan. Official actions of party and government usually ratify decisions already arrived at in a variety of other ways. That is not a cynical allusion to the "back room boys" but a recognition that the form and substance of popular government is closely determined by the society that erects and maintains it.

The unrecognized leader in a lower-class Negro community is absolutely right when he insists on keeping political considerations paramount. He knows that programs to curtail high school "dropouts" are worthless when high school students are barred by discriminatory hiring practices from employment. He knows that conservation and rehabilitation programs cannot improve housing because the people do not have the income to afford the improvements. He knows the PTA's are laughable objects because they are the creatures of school systems that deliberately fail to educate his children.

Because he knows these things he shrugs his shoulders at what the standard brands offer. The church with its business-as-usual routine offers him little --not even a sympathetic voice. The recreational social agency gives second-rate athletic and social distractions that are not appreciated when present nor missed when absent. The relief worker is an adjunct of an unfriendly government. To the unrecognized actual leaders, these services are barbiturates. They anaesthetize against the pain inflicted by a system of society and government that leaders and

followers loathe and execrate.

It may bother some people to learn that innocent health and education and general welfare programs are looked at this way. That is because they are not thinking politically. The political mind looks broadly, sees interlocking factors as they operate on the totality, and asks: Where is all this going? Do we want to go there? Political understanding quickly arrives at some very uncomplimentary judgments about the standardized programs. To many unrecognized leaders the major objection is not to the programs' inadequacy but results from a belief that their purpose is to keep the leaders and their people in subjection.

Never is such a state of affairs more obvious than in lower-class Negro neighborhoods where the leadership is engaged in active resistance to the reigning policies. The refusal to co-operate, which outsiders term apathy, and the outright resistance which is called unurbanized or antisocial behaviour, are two of the weapons used in a struggle that local leadership views as political. The outside world prefers to talk as though the problem were medical. By that I mean that the lower-class Negro neighborhood is talked about the way doctors talk about pathology. The people are converted into patients who are to be passive while they are operated on and cured. When the "patients" fight back we misread their reactions and declare that their opposition is another symptom of what ails them. I am not exaggerating, as anyone who has heard the experts talk about "social engineering" and "social planning" will verify.

The Ripening of Casbahs

The root of the difficulty is that the true leadership has never been able to force recognition from people outside the leadership's home base. The result is that in an odd way the leaders are winning the battle but not gaining the victory. What I have in mind when I say that is not very pleasant. I mean that in the big-city slum or near-slum districts the dominant society is being driven out. The ultimate was reached last summer when the New York police were assailed by pop bottles hurled from the roof tops by an unfriendly populace. In such sections, law and order, education, social work, the good and bad manifestations of the ruling world, are in full retreat and are very close to being driven out entirely. Heretofore we have had national enclaves, voluntary and involuntary ghettos, in our big cities; now we are menaced by the ripening of casbahs where our writs do not run, where outsiders dare not go, and where a dangerously separate world is coming into existence.

It is in this sense that I mean that unrecognized leadership is winning the battle. The leaders are chasing the non-indigenous world out of the casbahs and assuming local control. I wish I could say this was a sturdy example of self-government, but it is not. Anyone familiar with certain sections of New York and Chicago will quickly agree. The power of the state has been successfully challenged, and what should be a source of support and strength for the state's democratic institutions is changing into the very reverse.

For the local leaders the victory is very unprofitable. They have chased their oppressors' chosen representatives perhaps, but they have not defeated oppression. They have broken up every attempt to impose policies and arrangements on them, but they have not been able to create and put in force their own.

Why not? I answer, because their leadership has not been recognized. And why hasn't it been? I don't think it is either fair or accurate to lay all the blame on the people whom we have picked as our go betweens. It is true that social workers, city planners, clergymen, and other professionals whom we have made our delegates have been astoundingly dense and morbidly taken up with academic will-o'-the-wisps, but their inadequacies do not explain the present mess.

I repeat that all the blame cannot fairly be put on the outside professionals. Some know better and do what they do only because it is a condition of employment. Many of the rest do merit scorn. I have witnessed rice Christianity in our slums that would result in an American missionary abroad being expelled from the country. At a recent church-sponsored meeting I was astonished to hear a discussion of social services as a device for hooking new members. It is a cause of personal rejoicing to me that men here and the world over hurl such "assistance" back in the faces of the spiritual cannibals who offer food in exchange for souls. I say the same to those who use social services to inculcate so-called "middle-class" values in people denied middle-class opportunities and income. I cannot get over our practicing a colonialism on our own fellow citizens we dare not inflict on the Stone Age aborigines of the central Australian desert.

The casbah's leaders can only fight guerilla warfare. Their resistance has been very, in fact spectacularly, effective, but it has been resistance and resistance only. The nature and extent of their power and organization has precluded their forcing recognition and mounting an affirmative drive.

While there is almost a unanimity of opinion on the casbahs --I continue to use this example because it makes things dramatically clear-- the forms of organization have been good for little more than resistance. The leaders of a thousand small groupings are not in touch with one another. No vehicle exists to mass power for activities beyond each small district. No single leader or grouping is by himself or itself strong enough to demand and get recognition.

I cannot imagine a worse situation. The outside forces have been defeated and driven out for all intents and purposes, but the victorious leaders are not organized in a manner that permits them to follow up their essentially defensive or negative triumph with positive action. I wish I could say that we can take this state of affairs to mean that we have reached an impasse. Impasses are static, but humans aren't, or at least they aren't for long. The communities we are speaking of continue their rebellious course, but after the big speaking of establishing the fact that they will either rule themselves or not be ruled at all, more guerilla

warfare is needless. It is destructive and commits the people to a downward devolution to nowhere. It releases more and more personal desperation in destructive spasms that yield no good result. So it has always been in politics when the people who have the power can't or won't assume office. In the instance we are talking about, the leaders with the power can't assume office.

They can't, that is, unless there is a great reorganization. They must pool their power to form an instrument for taking charge in an affirmative sense. By coming together in larger and wider unity they can consecrate leaders of sufficient power and backing to force recognition. Moreover, a larger and wider union permits the leaders to conceive and promulgate specific concrete and affirmative programs.

Unfinished Revolution

We are looking at an unfinished revolution. For practical purposes, the old regime's power has been broken. It sits outside the revolutionary's district's borders with a titular control which it considers still in effect by sending occasional excursions into the casbah. Within, the revolutionaries, who have made almost a clean sweep, do not realize the extent of their accomplishments, nor do they have the faintest idea how to follow up what they have done.

I hope no one will make the mistake of thinking that what I have been describing is novel. It is a political dilemma that has recurred one way or another since history has been recorded. There have been times when the incipient revolutionaries have been stamped out, and the fundamentally unstable situation has been taken care of by a drastic purge. Sometimes the outcome has been brighter. A new and legitimate power has been created by internal reorganization.

How has that come about? For instance why haven't the local, unrecognized leaders in the casbahs pushed on to the next step? For the most part they have never thought of it, they don't know how, and besides no single one of them has the resources to do what needs doing. Nor is their situation new to human experience. New forms and patterns of action have often come about only when an outside element has been added to the political chemistry. Many revolutions, be they violent or nonviolent, are traceable to outsiders.

Moses, whatever his blood pedigree, grew up an Egyptian. Lenin was a worker no more than Clement Attlee, and the Frenchmen who were the schoolmasters of the American Revolution were certainly not provincial colonists. The outsider is often the final and indispensable catalyst for change.

If we explore the many probable reasons for the outsider's

playing this part in politics, we will have to roam too far afield. Suffice it to say that outsiders are customarily less likely to fail to see the forest for the trees. Their fresh viewpoint opens men's eyes to new formations, new tactics, to the road that goes toward the constitution of a new order.

The outsider is the reorganizer. Haven't we all sat at a chessboard looking pessimistically at our pieces when a friend has walked up, glanced at the chessmen, and made a simple move that seemed like revelation? Usually the move is obvious in retrospect. The friend has reorganized our thinking for us. He added nothing more than a new way of looking at old facts. Newton wasn't the only man in Europe who knew about Kepler's spherical orbits; but he was the only man to see a new way of thinking about them. Mao Tse-tung wasn't the only revolutionary in China, but he was the only revolutionary who could reorder the ways of looking at the facts of China to make a revolution. The same can be said of Gandhi.

Reorganizing of the sort I am speaking about can go and has gone under a variety of names, from Calvinism to community organization. The choice of names is pretty much dictated by the propaganda necessities of the moment. What remains constant is the purely political nature of the activity.

Politics of Change

All politics is arduous and difficult, but the politics of change, which is really what we are talking about, is the most difficult of all. The material is the most volatile, the most uncertain, and the most likely to run off in ways the originators never dreamed could happen. Robespierre, officiating at what he knows are the asinities of the Goddess of Reason, is a warning against believing change is easily managed. The best change and the best revolution is orderly because order preserves the best of the old, to which it adds the best of the new. The best revolutions are orderly because there is less likelihood of provoking a counter-revolution. The New Deal set the seal on an orderly revolution and thereby tamed the counter-revolutionary furor to an irreducible minimum, to wit, Taft-Hartley.

But the politics of change, whether seen as orderly revolution or as armed upheaval, is not choosing abrupt change over a more desirable evolutionary change. The unwarranted introduction of the evolutionary idea into social and political thinking has been a deceiving curse. Societies do not evolve. They do not obey unconscious laws of their own nature. They are the deliberate creations of men. They change when men decide to change them. The changes are not always wise, or even understood by the changers, but what happens is the outcome of conscious, purposeful action. That the actors are sometimes wholly mistaken about the end product is no ground for modifying this statement.

Men often speak as though we had a choice between swift action and more gradual evolutionary change. The idea is invoked when debate over putative change gets too fierce. The case made in regard to the American Casbah is resisted with the argument that it is better to await the day of evolutionary

ameliorations of the system. Such talk is nonsense.

People are always looking for the soft way out of making hard decisions. Eyewash about evolution and education is the language they hope will spare them conflict. I hope you will not entertain the false hope of expecting vital change to emerge without angry conflict. Let us look at two great orderly revolutions instituted by the English-speaking peoples. I refer to the great Reform Act of 1832 in England and the Supreme Court decision of 1954 in the United States. The one opened the door to modern representative government; the other permitted us to walk through it. In both cases the previous fifty years had been given over to arguments purporting to demonstrate that the change could come gradually through education and the mystery of unwilling metamorphosis. You may call it progress or evolution. In the end nothing of the sort happened. A decision had to be made, and in both instances it was bitterly resisted in some quarters.

Looking back after the deed is done, chroniclers have pronounced change gradual. They observe that people were not ready and that it took many years to educate and prepare them for the moment of change. In truth, the gap in time between an idea's being proposed and its being carried out is more plausibly explained as the time needed to gather the power to force the decision.

The evolutionary idea is a happy ex post facto rationalization. It allows people to say, "See, we were really going to do it all the time." Inasmuch as the losing side can use it to save face, it helps to heal wounds that are best speedily closed. But, regardless of how convenient the apology may be, we must not confuse it with the real way change occurs.

Quarterly Reorganization

Now I think we can try out a definition for "community organization." For me, it is the age-old political activity of helping to reorganize a society so that it can change to meet the wishes of its people in a manner that is not without conflict but that is orderly. I stuck in the sloppy clause about conflict lest anyone harbor a vestige of hope that he can get off without it. Actually, the qualification is unnecessary, since conflict is the measure of change. Change cannot exist without conflict, and where conflict is disclaimed there has been no change. It must be so because no change can come about by which all profit as individuals. Change creates new winners and new losers in a society. The winners cheer and the losers groan, although all may benefit indirectly if the change is one that enriches the society.

Some people carry on as if to say that no community should be without its "community organization." If you are prone to concur with this analysis, you will agree that such organizational activity is scarcely wanted everywhere.

Our reorganization or orderly revolution is obviously to be saved for special cases. It should be reserved for communities and peoples who find the apparatus available to them inadequate.

Such drastic measures must have urgent cause. Every community has its problems. Some will never be solved, some cannot be in this generation, and some are of the minor sort that can be taken care of with the means at hand if the people affected so desire. In such communities the people are doing well enough taking care of themselves. Our interference would be officious. We would have nothing to offer, and the odds are that our contribution would be a net minus. Our object is to make democratic self-rule work, and where it is working we should leave it alone. Given half a chance, men run their own business best.

Our attention should fasten on the places where the democratic system has never been introduced or has broken down. It takes no research or scholarly beard-pulling to spot them. They are brutally and crudely evident. We belong there, working at the reorganization which men must manufacture to provide themselves with the tools essential to self-government.

Should the Professional Do the Job?

Who should do the kinds of political activity we have been talking about? Is this work that ought to be restricted to the professionals? The Industrial Areas Foundation has sometimes been criticized for using non-professionals as staff members and censured for helping to build powerful organizations totally controlled by nonprofessionals. Do such people have the knowledge and judgement commensurate with the power they exercise?

Democracy is a system of government that abolishes a professional ruling group. It transfers the responsibility for the state to every citizen individually. If for any reason too many citizens cannot or will not do their duty, the system must fall to pieces. Perhaps the least important duty a citizen has in a democracy is voting. The ballot box is the last resort of a citizenry that has not been looking after its affairs closely enough. Electing the good men or throwing out the rascals cannot take the place of a people's careful and thoughtful day-to-day management and supervision of the work of running a society and a state.

Some of our people cannot do their duty as citizens because they are deliberately stopped. Another portion of our people will not because their private lives have obliterated their public selves. Probably both groups deserve our attention, and it may be that by the time the last chapter of American history is completed we shall repent not applying ourselves to the second group. Justice conveys the greater claim to the first, who would enjoy their rights and do their duty if they were allowed. A profession that enjoys others' rights and does others' duties is not a profession in reality, but a paid ruling class. The reasons may seem good and sufficient, but every time we resort to professionals, we are usurping the citizens' indispensable place in a democracy. Democracy is a faith which holds that in the long run people have the judgement and wisdom to exercise power in their own name.

... Exclude those who happen to be paid for their political work. They are professionals as some golfers are pros and some amateurs. What I have in mind is the person who goes to school and graduates into a profession, laying claim to a scientific body of knowledge and a suitcase full of skills and techniques. No such political profession exists. None ever will.

A few courses in leadership training and popularized sociology equips one for nothing. Such credentials can't be taken seriously and are laughed at everywhere except in schools and other sheltered places where the young and tender collect. I won't expatiate on the proper training for politics. That subject is also one that has occupied the best minds, and having nothing worth-while to add, I limit myself to reminding you that the Greeks doubted that anybody but men of years and experience could understand it.

You do not have to be a Greek philosopher to see that academic qualifications won't get you into the ball park. The Industrial Areas Foundation, which operates on the assumptions stated in this paper, is asked by many people and many organizations to come and help. The requests are made because IAF has a reputation for performance. Of course, we aren't always successful --nothing like it-- but our efforts do bear fruit often. The price for remaining in the field of political or social action is relevance. Nothing succeeds like it and nothing substitutes for it.

You may take those observations as the amoral words of power politics. They are no so intended. Politics is a serious business of supreme importance. Listen to Wristotle: "If all communities aim at some good, the state or political community, which is the highest of all, and which embraces the rest, aims at good in a higher degree than any other, and at the highest good." The highest good is not to be managed by failure; the highest good must be attended by success.

(Reprinted from Social Progress,
April, 1962)

FREEDOM CARAVAN to WASHINGTON D.C.

JUNE 10 - 26

JUNE 20 - JULY 7

DATES INCLUDE TRAVEL TIME

UNSEAT THE MISSISSIPPI CONGRESSMEN ~

* SEMINARS LOBBY WITH CONGRESSMEN

* WORKSHOPS WITH SOUTHERN CIVIL RIGHTS
WORKERS

* CHARTER BUSES AND CAR POOLS

SPONSORED BY: STUDENT NONVIOLENT
COORDINATING COMMITTEE

(OVER FOR MORE INFORMATION)

THE CHALLENGE

The challenge of the five Mississippi Congressmen was initiated under Title 2, Sections 201-226 of the U.S. Code, which says that any citizen may challenge the seating of a Congressman. The basis of the challenge is the obvious exclusion of Negroes from the voting process.

On the opening day of Congress, Congressman William Fitz Ryan of NY introduced a "Fairness Resolution," asking that the challenged Congressmen not be seated, and that the contestants be given floor privileges. This resolution led to a revealing and crucial vote, in which 150 Congressmen voted in favor of the MFDP challenge.

Under Title 2 the contestants were given 40 days to collect depositions in support of their case. Over 100 lawyers went to Mississippi and collected thousands of statements describing the repressive actions of the Mississippi government.

The challenge is now supported by CORE, SNCC, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, National Council of Churches, Americans for Democratic Action, California Democratic Clubs, Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, American Civil Liberties Union, and the International Longshoreman's and Warehouseman's Union.

If you go to Washington with the Freedom Caravan you will:

*Lobby with Congressmen in a concerted effort to unseat the Mississippi regular Democrats.

*Attend seminars and workshops led by SNCC Field Secretaries and MFDP leaders on national politics.

*Meet and discuss the challenge with Northern Congressmen.

THE MISSISSIPPI CONGRESSMEN

Prentiss Walker, Republican without previous experience in the House, celebrated his victory by addressing the Americans for the Preservation of the White Race, a Dixie racist-terrorist organization.

The other four, Thomas Abernathy, Jamie Whitten, John Bell Williams, and William Colmer, are all Democrats. Their voting record has consistently been anti-labor, anti-welfare, anti-Negro, and anti-poor.

The four have maintained themselves in Congress since 1946 through an electoral system that uses violence, terror and outright fraud to keep Negroes from the voting rolls. (A typical county, Benton, in late 1964 had 83% of the whites registered, less than 1% of the Negroes.) Mississippi is a one-party state. "A two party system in our state..." said Gov. Paul Johnson in 1963, "would give the balance of power to our minority group. This would be the end of our way of life."

THE MFDP CANDIDATES

Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, 46, from Ruleville in Sunflower Co., site of Sen. Eastland's plantation. In 1963 she was severely beaten in jail. She received 33,009 votes in the Freedom Election in the 2nd District.

Mrs. Victoria Gray, 38, school teacher and business woman. She was one of the first to house SNCC field workers in Hattiesburg, and now directs the COFO voter registration program there.

Mrs. Annie Devine lives in Canton, and has served on the staff of CORE. "It is time," she says, "that the forces of emancipation become as well organized as the forces of oppression."

THE VOTING RECORD OF THE CHALLENGED

CONGRESSMEN FROM MISSISSIPPI

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party is challenging the constitutional validity of the elections which returned the five Mississippi Congressmen to the House of Representatives in 1964. One of these Congressmen, Prentiss Walker, is a Republican without previous experience in the House. Walker defeated long-time Democratic Congressman Arthur Winstead in the November general election. He celebrated his victory for the party of Abraham Lincoln by making his first public appearance after the election before the Americans for the Preservation of the White Race in Brandon, Mississippi, on November 24, 1964. APWR is a white racist-terrorist organization which was organized to suppress by force and violence the civil rights activities of Mississippi Negroes.

There is no past legislative record upon which can be based an estimation of what Walker's being accepted by the House of Representatives as a bona fide Congressman might mean for future legislation. However, if his first public appearance means anything, it may very well be that Walker will develop for the Republican Party the same kind of racist image which has disgraced the Southern Democratic Party during the past 100 years.

There is a considerable background of legislative experience on the other four challenged Congressmen, from which can be drawn quite dependable inferences about their future course if they are seated. They are all Democrats, and each occupies committee positions of considerable importance.

Thomas G. Abernathy, 1st District, is from Okolona, Miss. He is 61 years of age and has been in the House since 1942 - 22 years. He is fifth in seniority below the Chairman on the House Agriculture Committee. (This Committee handles matters of agriculture and forestry in general; farm credit and security, crop insurance, soil conservation and rural electrification). Abernathy is third below the chairman on the cotton subcommittee; first below the chairman on the dairy committee; first below the chairman on the poultry subcommittee; fourth below the chairman on the Special Subcommittee on Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations; and chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Research and Extension. Abernathy is also first below the chairman on the Committee on the District of Columbia. (This committee handles all measures relating to municipal affairs of the District of Columbia except its appropriations).

Jamie L. Whitten, 2nd District, is from Charleston, Miss. He is 54 years of age and has been in the House since 1941 - 23 years. He is fourth in seniority below the chairman on the House Committee on Appropriations. He is Chairman of the Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies; third below the chairman on the Subcommittee on the Department of Defense; and last in seniority on the Subcommittee on Public Works. (The House Appropriations Committee originates all appropriations of Government revenues).

COST: \$102 This is the cost of round-trip bus fare; you will also need about \$25 for food and extras. There will also be limited car pools. Housing will be provided in Washington. (YOU MUST BE OVER 18)

For applications write or phone: BAY AREA SNCC, 584 Page St, SF, 626-4577 or EAST BAY SNCC, 5929 Grove St, Oakland, 655-9545, or pick up applications at the SNCC tables on your campus.

John Bell Williams, 3rd District, is from Raymond, Miss. He is 46 years old and he has been in the House since 1946 - 18 years. He is first below the Chairman in seniority on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. (This committee handles regulation of interstate and foreign commerce and communications, regulation of interstate transmission of power, inland waterways, railroad labor, civil aeronautics, Weather Bureau, securities and exchanges, interstate oil compacts, natural gas, and public health). He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics. Williams is also fourth below the chairman on the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

William M. Colmer, 5th District, is from Pascagoula, Miss. He has been in the House since 1932 - 32 years. Colmer is first in seniority below the Chairman of the Committee on Rules. (This committee handles the rules and order of business of the House. It determines how much time any bill will be debated on the floor of the House, how much time each side will have to debate, whether or not the bill can be amended on the floor, etc.). The Rules Committee has no standing subcommittee.

Clearly, then, the position these four Democrats take on a given issue is more than routinely important. Because of their seniority (which, of course, is based on the disfranchisement of Negroes in Mississippi), these men occupy committee posts of considerable power. When they are vitally interested in a piece of legislation, they can bring that power to bear on other representatives who do not have their seniority and who might, otherwise, vote against the positions of the Mississippians.

Six organizations rate the voting performance of Congressmen from the viewpoint of the interests the organizations represent. Three of the organizations are usually thought of as liberal, and three as conservative. The liberal organizations are: The Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), the Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO (COPE), and the National Farmers Union (NFU). The conservative organizations are: The Americans for Constitutional Action (ACA), the National Associated Businessmen (NAB) and the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF).

Here are the ratings each of these organizations give to the four Mississippi Democrats whose right to be seated in the House is being challenged by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party:

	ADA	COPE	NFU	AFBF	NAB	ACA
Abernethy	0	0	13	50	79	70
Colmer	8	0	13	75	75	73
Whitten	12	0	25	63	74	67
Williams	4	0	8	63	80	82

When interpreting these ratings, it is important to remember that Mississippi is, in every respect, the poorest state in the Union. The material needs of the people of Mississippi are being less adequately dealt with than are those of the people of any other state. The per capita income of Mississippi is lower than that of any other state;

the Mississippi education system is the least adequate in the nation; Mississippi's housing needs are greater than those of any other state; wages are lower and jobs scarcer there than in any other state. In other words, Mississippi has a greater need for liberal or welfare legislation than does any other state. The liberal organizations mentioned above back such legislation and rate Congressmen according to the way the Congressmen vote on such legislation.

On the other hand, the conservative organizations are opposed to all welfare legislation even to the point in the case of the Farm Bureau Federation, of backing the repeal of all child labor laws. The conservative organizations represent the interests of the wealthy and powerful people of America - the banks, the utilities companies, the large corporations. It is apparent, then, that the Mississippi congressmen, rated as they are, high by the conservative organizations, and low by the liberal organizations, are simply not representing the people of their state, and that the most deprived half are disfranchised. This is what the constitutional requirement of the vote for everyone is designed to prevent.

This is why all persons and organizations who are interested in constitutional government and in the welfare of their fellowmen, should support the MFDP challenge to the seating of the Mississippi congressmen.

Following is a listing of how the Mississippi Democrats, Colmer, Abernethy, Whitten and Williams have voted on specific issues between 1946 and the present. No listing has been made of their votes on civil rights issues, because it is common knowledge that they vote unanimously and consistently against all measures designed to relieve the plight of Negroes.

1946

(Williams not in office.)

Colmer, Whitten and Abernethy voted for the Case Anti-Labor bill which was designed and written and supported by the National Association of Manufacturers.

The same three voted to remove existing ceilings on rents and thus wreck the whole structure of rent control, leaving tenants to the tender mercies of the landlord's conscience.

Whitten and Abernethy voted for a price control provision which permitted a vast increase in prices.

All three voted in support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

All three voted to draft the railroad workers who were on strike, thus breaking the back of the strike.

Whitten and Abernethy voted to exclude agricultural processing workers from the rights accorded workers under the procedures of the National

Labor Relations Board.

1947

All four voted for a resolution giving the House Labor Committee additional subpoena powers which the committee wanted to use in its red-baiting and witch-hunting of the labor movement.

All four voted for the Gwynne bill, outlawing portal-to-portal pay suits and seriously weakening the Wage-Hour Act.

All four voted for a bill cutting the appropriations of the Labor Department and thus seriously curtailed the services the Department could provide for the nation's workers.

All four voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, which seriously curtailed the ability of workers to organize in labor unions.

All four voted for exempting natural gas production and distribution from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, thus permitting the petroleum industry to increase the price it charges for the gas you use for cooking and heating.

All four voted for the Rees Loyalty Bill, providing that government workers could be investigated for evidence of disloyal thoughts and ideas.

1948

All four voted in support of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Whitten and Abernethy voted to turn tidelands oil over to the states, so that these valuable resources could be exploited by the big oil companies for their own profit.

All four voted for the Mundt-Nixon bill, which seriously abridged the civil liberties of all Americans.

All four voted to exclude outside salesmen, industrial home workers, taxi drivers, loggers, tailors, etc., from coverage under the social security act.

All four voted to eliminate low-cost public housing and slum clearance from the 1948 housing bill.

1949

Whitten, Abernethy and Colmer voted in support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

All four voted to remove rent controls at the discretion of local officials, thus enabling real estate interests to apply their great power locally to increase the cost of rent.

All four voted twice to retain the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act

-4-

severely restricting the ability of workers to organize labor unions.

All four voted to eliminate low-rent public housing from the 1949 housing bill.

All four voted to relieve natural gas producers and distributors of government control over the prices they charge to consumers.

All four voted to remove over a million workers from the protection of the minimum wage laws.

All four voted to weaken the anti-trust laws and legalize unfair price discrimination.

1950

Whitten voted against appropriating funds for a mobile public library service for rural areas.

All four voted to kill loans for cooperative middle-income housing.

All four voted in support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

All four voted to exempt natural gas companies from certain federal regulations, thus permitting the companies to charge increased rates to consumers.

All four voted to cut funds for low-rent public housing by \$3 million.

Abernethy and Whitten voted against the extension of rent controls for an additional six months.

All four voted to provide concentration camps for aliens. The bill later became part of the McCarran Internal Security Act.

Whitten, Colmer and Abernethy voted for the McCarran Internal Security Act.

1951

No recorded votes.

1952

All four voted to cut the number of housing units provided in the 1952 housing bill from 50,000 to 5,000.

Abernethy, Colmer and Whitten voted to give states title to tidelands oil reserves thus opening the way for the exploitation of these valuable public properties by private companies for their own profit.

Colmer, Whitten and Williams voted to amend and rewrite the immigration laws to set up discriminatory restrictions against immigrants and endanger the rights of already naturalized citizens.

-5-

Colmer, Whitten and Williams voted to request the President to invoke the Taft-Hartley injunction provision to break the steel strike.

1953

All four voted to give to the states ownership of the tidelands oil reserves.

Whitten and Abernethy voted to extend for three years the importing of foreign labor to work on farms. Previously the house had rejected by unrecorded votes attempts to guarantee minimum wages, working and living conditions (to prevent depressing American wages and working conditions).

All four voted against authorizing funds for construction of 35,000 low-rent public housing units.

All four voted to sell government-owned rubber-producing facilities to private corporations.

Abernethy, Whitten and Williams voted to permit the use of unemployment compensation funds for political patronage purposes and to reduce the contributions of employers to the funds.

1954

All four voted in support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

All four voted against authorizing 35,000 new housing units.

Abernethy, Whitten and Williams voted to permit the use of wiretap evidence in Federal Courts in certain criminal cases.

All four voted against increasing the amount of unemployment compensation benefits and extending the period of coverage.

All four voted to apply concepts of espionage and sabotage to certain labor union activities and to provide the death penalty for peacetime espionage for the first time in American history.

Abernethy and Colmer voted to prohibit the use of the fifth amendment before congressional red-baiting committees and grand juries.

Abernethy, Whitten and Williams voted to require that labor unions be "cleared" by the Subversive Activities Control Board and to outlaw a political party, the Communist Party, for the first time in American history.

1955

Abernethy and Williams voted to sell 88% of U.S. rubber facilities to four rubber and three oil companies.

All four voted for Universal Military Training of the nation's youth in peacetime.

-6-

All four voted to exempt natural gas producers from federal regulation thus increasing natural gas rates to consumers.

All four voted to eliminate from the omnibus housing bill provisions for public housing and provisions affecting housing for elderly persons, cooperatives, students and farmers.

1956

All four voted to eliminate public housing provisions from the omnibus housing bill.

All four voted against federal aid to education;

All four voted in support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

All four voted to cite playwright Arthur Miller for contempt of Congress because of his refusal to become an informer.

1957

All four voted against the use of federal funds to build public elementary and secondary schools.

All four voted to limit the right of an individual to defend himself against informers.

All four voted to cite radio announcer Louis Earl Hartman for contempt of Congress because he refused to submit to the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

1958

All four voted against providing 16 additional weeks of benefits for workers covered by existing unemployment compensation legislation and against providing 16 weeks of benefits to workers not then covered by the legislation.

Williams and Whitten voted against increasing funds from \$100 million to \$2 billion for construction of public works to relieve unemployment.

Williams and Abernethy voted to permit airlines to retain all capital gains from the sale of equipment so they could use it to modernize their equipment. This was, in effect, an exemption from taxation for the airlines.

All four voted for a bill which instructed the U.S. Government to build two passenger steamships at a cost of \$201 million and then to sell the two ships to private companies for \$81 million. The bill further instructed the U.S. Government to guarantee the companies 10% profit on operating costs before the companies would have to return any of this money.

Abernethy, Williams and Whitten voted to permit police officials to

-7-

arrest and detain indefinitely any person on mere suspicion that the person might have committed some crime.

All four voted to extend the Government screening program to all federal workers, whether or not their jobs had anything to do with national security.

1959

All four voted to cut public housing out of the omnibus housing bill, and to cut the authorization for urban renewal by \$200 million.

All four again voted to give police officers authority to arrest and detain a person for an indefinite period on mere suspicion.

All four voted to permit the President to declare certain areas off-limits for travel by U.S. citizens; they also voted to give the State Department power to deny passports to Communists and others whose presence abroad it thought might endanger U.S. security.

All four voted for the Landrum-Griffin anti-labor bill. The bill curbed secondary boycotts, outlawed organizational picketing.

1960

All four voted against encouraging home buying by low and middle-income families by making it easier to obtain government-guaranteed loans.

All four voted against giving federal aid to chronic unemployment areas.

All four voted against providing federal funds, to be matched by state funds, for school construction.

1961

All four voted in support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Abernethy, Colmer and Whitten voted to give police officers authority to arrest and jail for an indefinite period persons suspected of crimes.

The same three voted to speed up the deportation and exclusion procedures of the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

All four voted against authorizing \$325 million to build schools, \$90 million for student loans and \$201 million to aid schools in areas crowded because of federal activities.

Colmer, Whitten and Williams voted against providing funds for construction of generating facilities to produce electricity from waste steam from a new atomic reactor. The private power companies were against further extension of government-owned generating capacity.

1962

-8-

All four voted to establish an industrial screening program to deny to workers employed on national defense work the right to due process under the law and the right to face their accusers when charged with being a "security risk."

All four voted against a \$262 million, two-year program to aid unemployed workers whose jobs were eliminated or made obsolete by automation, runaway plants, etc.

All four voted against authorizing \$900 million for emergency, short-range public works to provide jobs for unemployed workers.

All four voted to turn over ownership and control of the communications satellite system to American Telephone and Telegraph. The system had been developed by the government at a cost of \$25 billion.

1963

All four voted to support the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

All four voted to discontinue the first of the anti-poverty programs, the Area Redevelopment program.

Abernethy, Colmer and Whitten voted against the first income tax cut granted to working people in many years.

All four voted to discontinue the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which did such able work in preparing the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and the institution of the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow.

1964

All four voted to outlaw any federal action which might relieve the mal-apportionment of state legislatures and give city dwellers a more equitable representation in state law-making bodies.

All four voted against an amendment to the mass transit bill which protected pension rights, working conditions, etc., of transit workers whose jobs will be endangered through installation of automatic equipment, mergers, etc.

Abernethy and Williams voted against the Food-Stamp Act, authorizing \$400 million in a four-year period to expand the program giving aid to poverty-stricken families in the form of supplemental food.

All four voted against the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which provides training programs, work-study groups, etc., for both long-term unemployed workers and youths entering the labor force for the first time.

This research paper is provided by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, 1353 U Street, NW, Washington, DC.

-9-

July 11, 1965

KLM 27-34

KEY LIST MAILING

Published by the Bay Area
Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee
1316 Masonic Avenue, San Francisco, Cal. 94117

CONTENTS:

- KLM 27 Race Rule in Washington, by Andrew Kopkind
The "mayor" of Washington, D.C. is elected in South Carolina. Result: 800,000 people, 60% of them Negro, are disenfranchised in America's capital, where whites rule blacks.
- KLM 28 The New Voting Bill: Rhetoric and Reality,
Special SNCC Report
The 14th and 15th Amendments are "paper tigers." Does the voting rights bill mean what it says? Does it avoid the real issues?
- KLM 29 West Tennessee Voters Project
Hot off the WATS Report from Fayette County, the poorest county in the South. Organizing the sharecroppers.
- KLM 30 Two Statements from Jackson
Eyewitness reports from the MFDP demonstrations. The concentration camp, the brutality.
- KLM 31 The Justice Department and the Philadelphia 17,
SNCC Report
What happened to the men who murdered Chaney, Goodman and Schwerner? How the Justice Department (mis)handled the case.
- KLM 32 Trees Don't Vote, by David E. Pesonen
An excellent analysis of the possible effects of the Dirksen Amendment. The conservationists point of view.
- KLM 33 The Structure of the Mississippi Government
Excerpt from the MFDP "Mississippi Political Handbook." How the state governments work, written for residents of Mississippi.
- KLM 34 The Condition of Farm Workers in 1964, by Fay
Bennett, National Sharecroppers Fund
Rural poverty, foreign workers, union activity, agribusiness, federal programs.

RACE RULE IN WASHINGTON,

Andrew Kopkind

Congress may secure voting rights for Southern Negroes this year, but it will probably overlook the disenfranchisement of 100,000 citizens, of all colors, on the streets where it lives. Home rule for the District of Columbia is as much a civil rights issue as voting in Dallas County, Alabama. It has been denied to the people of Washington for decades, not only for the same reasons political power has been denied to the majority of the people in Dallas County: the fear of black faces in government.

"You don't have the vote down here," James Forman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee recently told a rally of SCLC marchers, "but there are hundreds of thousands of Negroes in the North, in Washington, D. C., who don't have the vote, either, because they're Negroes." The audience was interested, but unbelieving. Most Americans do not generally understand, or care, about local government in the federal capital. Those who do know that Congress acts as the Washington City Council are not aware of the foundation of racism upon which the system rests. Forman is one of the first civil rights leaders to make home rule part of the civil rights platform, and to give it a national constituency. Without support from the vast lobby of the civil rights "frontlash," home rule may never be granted. And even so, it would require the kind of effort that national administrations so far have been unwilling to expend.

Congress gave home rule to the District of Columbia in 1802, and took it away 72 years later, after an inept local government had made a mess of financial affairs. Attempts to reintroduce some form of self-government were blocked by radical Republicans who realized that Washington, then as now, was a Southern city and would be directed in the Southern pattern. Then, of course, it would have been conservative and segregationist. Now, with about 60 percent of the District's population Negro, government would be liberal and integrationist. Such historical irony fails to soften Southern attitudes. The Richmond Times-Dispatch, which is the closest large city south of Washington, looks back in horror: "No situation has ever existed... in which a race contributing a small minority of a nation's people has won control of the national capital," an editorial said, not long ago. Exactly what the Southerners fear is unclear. There are some predictions of financial hardships from extension of public benefits or of demagogic

-RACE RULE-

leadership. But for the most part, the terror is the same that grips Mayor Smitherman of Selma or the city fathers of any Southern town. It is the racist fantasy of blood-mixing, morality undermined and order shattered.

In Washington, the old values are maintained by the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives, which for all practical purposes runs the affairs of the city. Its chairman is John L. McMillan of South Carolina, who has few prerogatives as a congressman and many as the "unofficial mayor" of the national capital. The second- and third-ranking Democratic members of his committee are Thomas G. Abernethy of Mississippi and Howard W. Smith of Virginia. In this amateur reenactment of the Holy Alliance, Judge Smith plays Metternich, not without some relish. McMillan is allowed to get most of the headlines, some of the favors, and all of the criticism. Smith pulls the strings. He is, after all, chairman of the Rules Committee, the most powerful single group in the congressional organization, but above that he is a real politician, and has mastered the mysteries of power.

If the committee served merely as a running veto on progressive government it would be unfortunate enough, but it regularly perpetrates acts of legislative vandalism which are national scandals. The most recent example is the crime bill, a nasty glossary of restrictions on civil liberties with a legal foundation about as sturdy as the Goldwater acceptance speech last July. Part of the bill is just harmless nonsense; it contains a section on illegalities in athletic contests which seems to be a somewhat delayed reaction to the Black Sox scandal of 1919, and can be reasonably assumed to provide some small amount of sports page promotion for its congressional supporters. Otherwise, the bill does dreadful damage to constitutional guarantees. It effectively repeals the "Mallory Rule" which prevents police from unreasonably long detentions and interrogations of suspects. It reverses the "Durham Rule" which was the first important attempt to apply the findings of 20th Century psychiatry to the law of criminal insanity. It proposes to exclude the admissibility of insanity as a defense if a defendant does not announce his intention to use it within 15 days of his first (and often ill-considered) pleading. The bill allows police to "detain" and interrogate anyone if there are "reasonable grounds to suspect" he is about to commit a crime, whatever that means. It authorizes prior censorship and the seizure of printing presses for obscenity law violations.

-RACE RULE-

"It is an expression of contempt for the people of Washington," the Washington Post said angrily of the crime bill. "It is dangerous, despotic nonsense." The House committee's liberal minority, made up of Republicans and Democrats who are consistently out-voted, issued an outraged report against the bill: "It proposes harsh and repressive measures to punish the criminal symptoms of the social and economic misery within the District of Columbia. Its disregard of the basic requirements of the Constitution puts human values at the bottom of the legislative scale and distorts our present duty to legislate for good government in the District of Columbia."

The bill has been reported favorably, and is now before the House. It will probably be passed, as a similar bill was passed last session. It will not, hopefully, get through the Senate, whose own District of Columbia Committee fortunately avoids that kind of bloody-mindedness. The Senate committee is well outside Southern control. Five times in the last 15 years it has passed home rule legislation, and it can be expected to do so again if the occasion arises. But it is a thankless task, and the Senators may well tire of their futile efforts. Without support in the House, the Senate's action is worth little.

In the Dead of Night

The last serious push for home rule was in 1960, when 212 signatures were collected on a discharge petition to bring a bill out of the House committee. Chairman McMillan did not even bother to hold hearings that year. There were not quite enough names, and in fact, as the petition began filling up (it needed 219, or half the House membership) a few of the signers sneaked up to the Speaker's table in the dead of legislative night to cross themselves off. Some simply do not believe in the principle of discharge petitions, which override committee prerogatives, and can cut against progressive as well as regressive legislation. Others miraculously saw the shade of Judge Smith, like Hamlet's father, standing over their own pet projects in the Rules Committee and commanding, "Remember me." One moderate Democrat who signed the petition wondered why a public works appropriation for his district was taking such an interminably long time in Smith's committee. Off came his name, and voila! the appropriation was approved. Congress, to be sure, is too subtly organized to spell out rules for such dealings, and Smith is not

-RACE RULE-

known to be a vindictive chairman (when pressed, he can be quite helpful to Administration causes). But the fear of retaliation is oil to the congressional machine, and members cross powerful chairmen at their peril.

The House never got around to voting on home rule that year. In the last session, McMillan actually held hearings on the subject, but no bill was reported. This year, there are some indications that after a seemingly delay, the committee may again consider home rule legislation. There is, for the first time, measurable Republican support, under the enlightened leadership of Charles McC. Mathias of Maryland. Mathias garnered 13 other Republican congressmen on short notice and introduced his own bill, which would set up a "territorial" legislature and a Presidentially-appointed governor for the District. Washington would at least have as much self-government as Hawaii or Alaska had before statehood. A complex elections formula would ensure some Republican participation in the local council. Obviously, Republicans cannot be expected to greet with unbounded enthusiasm straight partisan elections in a city which is about 80 percent Democratic. The concern of the 14 Representatives shows a measure of magnanimity usually missing on congressional matters. (There is, however, a long-term Republican interest to be served; Negro and civil rights support.)

The Administration's bill proposes a traditional, unproportional election for city council and mayor, thus assuring Democratic preponderance. Both plans would establish a non-voting congressional seat for a District of Columbia representative. The interests of the Federal government in Washington affairs, which are considerable, would be safeguarded by Presidential veto power over local legislation, and by the residual constitutional responsibilities of Congress, which after all could abolish self-government again if things got out of hand.

But home rule legislation requires determination from the House Democratic leadership, and there is not very much evidence that it will be forthcoming. There are enough "swing votes" on the 25-man District Committee to report out a favorable bill this year, and there are certainly enough votes in the House to pass it. The Senate, again, would do its duty. But neither President Johnson nor Speaker John McCormack is likely to take the trouble to press the bill through. The President is busy with voting rights, which is this year's civil rights effort.

-RACE RULE-

The Speaker is almost irrationally afraid to spend from his hoard of political capital, and any small sum will go toward measures with more national appeal and urgency. Although the Democrats have a vast majority and dozens of new liberal votes in the House, they will need help on a discharge petition, and the old blocks will appear.

Penalizing the Negro Majority

Meanwhile, Chairman McMillan can do what he likes about the federal capital, or at least stop the citizens from doing what they like. His vision of tranquillity may be slightly blurred by his reading of the returns from his last election: it seems that by some peculiarity of South Carolina politics (it went for Goldwater, of course), he owes his victory to Negro votes. But that does not yet materially change his perspective. He, and the Southern colleagues he encourages to serve on the committee, can still score political points at home by penalizing the Negro majority in Washington. They conceive their interest to be the unworkability of the District as an integrated community. They inflate every purse-snatching to prove that the city is an inferno of Negro crime (the rate is as low or lower than in most major cities). They block meaningful urban renewal and neighborhood integration plans and then point to the proliferation of Negro slums. No matter if they pull a white minority down with them; there is opposition enough to home rule among conservative white Washingtonians. The Board of Trade, which represents the most established business interests in the District, has traditionally opposed home rule, and its reasons are by no means restricted to economics.

The white minority in Washington has some very real reasons, as well as the usual fantastic ones, for preferring Southern congressional protection to local Negro and white liberal government. There is a fear of higher property taxes; welfare could be costlier, and Congress might lose interest in keeping up its federal "contribution" to city finances. As it is, the congressional share is inadequate, but even that might shrink. Congress could forget the projected subway system, which the District could never afford by itself. Most pro-home rule Representatives would like to see the transit program through the House before reforms are presented; McMillan has diverted some attention from home rule with hearings on subways. There are white fears

-RACE RULE-

of more determined efforts in education and housing integration from a local government, and dark suspicions that freeways may suddenly push through lily-white neighborhoods. Some moderate congressmen, who are generally sympathetic to home rule, have a sincere concern that national interests in the District would be jeopardized by self-government, in such terms as zoning conflicts with federal master plans, unwarranted pressures on Congress from local sources, and interference with Hatch Act rules against government employee participation in politics.

It may be impossible, as one Republican leader in Washington has suggested, for any city to provide good government these days, but Congress has shown itself less able than even the most bedraggled local administrations around the country. It hardly makes sense for the House to spend two days a month as a whole, and much more time in committee, worrying about a board of podiatry, pre-marital medical examinations, and the irrelevancies of local affairs, as it now must. "It is not the first or greatest object of home rule to procure a better government -- important as that is," the Washington Post said editorially. "The greatest object is to procure better citizens -- participating more actively and thoughtfully in their own government and more energetically and interestedly in all other aspects of life in this community."

Like the Negroes of Selma, the citizens of the District of Columbia cannot be counted on to govern themselves wisely or well. But so far, neither can enjoy the basic right of making one's own mistakes. Congress is still exercising that right itself.

(Reprinted from The New Republic, March 27, 1965)

THE NEW VOTING BILL: RHETORIC AND REALITY

"This was the first nation in the history of the world to be founded with a purpose. The great phrases of that purpose still sound in every American heart, north and south: 'All men are created equal' -- 'Government by consent of the governed' -- 'Give me liberty or give me death.' And those are not just clever words and those are not just empty theories...to deny a man his hopes because of his color or race or his religion or the place of his birth is not only to do injustice, it is to deny America and to dishonor the dead who gave their lives for American freedom....Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right. There is no duty which weighs more heavily on us than the duty we have to insure that right."

* * * * *

These were the words the President spoke on the night of March 15, before both Houses of Congress assembled in joint session. It was beautiful and effective rhetoric, and he was widely applauded for the sentiments he expressed. Newspapers and commentators throughout the country assured all Americans that, at last, the disfranchisement of Negroes (or any other Americans) was at an end. All would be well, for the President had spoken unequivocally; he had committed the U.S. Government without qualification to securing, once for all, the right of every American to vote.

Then on March 17, the President sent to Congress the bill he and his Attorney General and other assistants had drafted. It was to be the bill which embodied, in legislative terms, the rhetoric of the President's March 15 address.

Along with the bill, the President sent a letter describing the bill. In the letter he said: "I now submit to you the legislation I discussed on Monday night. This legislation will help rid the nation of racial discrimination in every aspect of the electoral process and thereby ensure the right of all to vote." The President's attitude in the letter to the Congress seemed considerably less committed to the idea of total enfranchisement than had the rhetoric of his address. In his own words, the bill would only "help" rid the nation of discrimination.

The bill he sent along with the letter was much more attuned to the cautious tone of his letter than it was to his address.

-THE NEW VOTING BILL-

The help he proposed to provide with his bill applied only to 50% of the persons in any state or county of the nation. Under the terms of the bill, the old modes of discrimination could continue unabated and unrestricted in any area in which more than 50% of the voting age population had voted in the November, 1964, election.

Thus the bill, at the outset proposed only to enfranchise one half of the people in any area to which the bill applied. The President had said on March 15: "Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote." But the bill which followed that address said that only 50% of American citizens must have an equal right to vote. In short, the President, after having delivered a ringing declaration of the best principles of American democracy, and after having received nearly universal approval of that declaration from the American people, refused even to ask Congress to implement it with legislation.

Is this an unjustified indictment of the President? Is it based upon a misinterpretation of the President's bill?

The U.S. Attorney General, Nicolas Katzenbach, testified before the Constitutional Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on March 18.

In his prepared statement for the Subcommittee, Katzenbach said time and again that existing voting rights legislation is totally inadequate: "The lesson is plain. The three present statutes have had only minimal effect. They have been too slow...What these Negro voting figures do represent is the inadequacy of the judicial process to deal effectively and expeditiously with a problem so deepseated and so complex....It has become routine to spend as much as 6,000 man-hours alone in analyzing the voting records in a single county..."

"After two and a half years, the first round of litigation against discrimination in Selma ended, substantially in failure...despite our most vigorous efforts in the courts, there has been case after case of slow or ineffective relief...it is now beyond question that recalcitrance and intransigence on the part of state and local officials can defeat the operation of the most unequivocal civil rights legislation... The litigated cases amply demonstrate the inadequacies of present statutes prohibiting voter intimidation."

-THE NEW VOTING BILL-

Then Republican members of the Subcommittee pointed out that the 50% requirement in the bill would not help any Negroes in Southern counties in which there are sufficient whites registered to comprise 50% of the total voting age population. They also pointed out that the bill would have no effect in Southern states such as Arkansas, where no literacy test is in effect. Katzenbach readily agreed that these criticisms were true. He said that the bill would not eliminate all discrimination and that it was not designed to do so.

The bill, said the Attorney General, is designed to deal with "massive discrimination" in "hard-core" areas. Other, less "massive," less "hard-core" discrimination can be handled under existing legislation, the Attorney General told the Subcommittee.

One might wonder just what kind of discrimination the Attorney General thought the existing legislation would be effective against, since he had just described it as "...too slow...only minimal effect...inadequacy of the judicial process...substantially in failure...slow or ineffective relief...inadequacies of present statutes."

Furthermore, the Attorney General frankly admitted that the President's bill would provide no relief to New York's Puerto Ricans who had been disfranchised by the state English-language literacy test. But Katzenbach did think that the New York literacy test does prevent "many intelligent citizens" of Puerto Rican birth from voting.

President Johnson warned Katzenbach, when the later was preparing the new voting bill: "I want this bill completely legal;" which means, of course, that it must be upheld as constitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court. University of Chicago Law Professor Philip Kurland explains that "At the time the Constitution was framed, it provided for only a limited franchise." Time Magazine points out that the "franchise in 1789 went almost exclusively to white males; most Negroes were slaves, with no rights at all, and it was to be 131 years before women would be permitted to vote...the effect of it all was the virtual disfranchisement of Negroes in the Deep South."

Of course, we all know that the existing legislation has not "handled" anything thus far. Injunctions have been piled on injunctions in the South. Still local officials disfranchise Negroes, and the U.S. Government appears powerless to prevent it, existing legislation not-

-THE NEW VOTING BILL-

withstanding.

Furthermore, if anything comes clear in the President's March 15 address, it is that each and every instance of racial discrimination is "massive," and that any area in which even a single person, white or Negro, is denied the right to vote is a "hard-core" area.

The President, as other Presidents before him, has lulled the militancy of the people with the stern commitment of his rhetoric. Now he is proceeding, as other Presidents before him, to press for legislation which is completely fraudulent when compared to those eloquent words.

This one thing arises clear and sure from the President's letter to the Congress, from the contents of his proposed voting law, and from the testimony of the Attorney General before the subcommittee. The President had no intention of implementing the ideas of his address in the legislation he sent to Congress, and the Attorney General has no intention of using his enforcement power to make that rhetoric a reality.

Several leaders of civil rights organizations have expressed publicly their support of the President's legislation, and their confidence in his commitment to give the vote to American Negroes in the South. The kindest thing to be said about them is that they simply have not read the legislation, that they don't know about the President's letter and the Attorney General's testimony, and that they are incredibly naive about the nature of racism in the United States.

These leaders, and everyone, black and white, who is genuinely concerned about civil rights in the United States need to understand and accept one historical fact. Racism is deeply embedded in the United States Constitution, in the decisions of the United States Courts which have interpreted that Constitution, and in the structure of the United States Government which supposedly enforced the terms of the Constitution.

How else can it be explained that the "paper tiger" of the 14th and 15th Amendments have not been made a reality during the past one hundred years? How else explain why the might of the federal government has not, since Reconstruction, been used to protect the lives and property of black men in the South who wanted to vote? How else explain why dozens, black and white, could die in the South

-THE NEW VOTING BILL-

during recent years, trying to secure the vote, and federal troops could never be used to protect them?

How else explain why it suddenly becomes possible to send in troops when large numbers of high-ranking whites from the North, and a few high-ranking Negroes, decide they need to make a fifty-mile hike from Selma to Montgomery. Is the right to walk more sacred than the right to vote? One does not get this from the President's fine words, but one certainly does get it from his actions. The federal troops can be used to force a few black children into two white schools, they can be used to protect some folk who want to walk peacefully and harmlessly along a federal highway. But when it comes to the real power to change things in this country -- to the right to decide who will and who will not govern -- the might of the federal government is nowhere to be found.

The whole history of the disfranchisement of Negroes in this country leads inescapably to one conclusion. The vote for Negroes in the South can only be secured by the Negroes and whites in the North who already have it. And this cannot be done by pressure on the President and the Congress to enact more civil rights legislation, because the whole racist structure of the enormously complex U.S. Government provides those who govern with too many "outs" -- the constitutionalism and legalism which have always been used to explain why the U.S. Government must condone lynching, mass murder, systematic terrorism, and every other horror the South has been able to devise to keep Negroes in subjection.

But the issues are clearly drawn in the Challenge by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party to the 1964 Mississippi Congressional elections. The House of Representatives has clear, unequivocal, and unchallengeable constitutional authority to determine who shall and who shall not have seats in the House. No state can claim any right to decide this matter -- no court, either state or federal, can be appealed to with respect to this.

Therefore, the House of Representatives, by majority vote, can instruct the State of Mississippi, in detail, just how its Congressional elections must be conducted if the State of Mississippi wants its representatives seated in the House. The House can determine who shall and who shall not vote in such elections, under what conditions persons shall be registered to vote in those elections, and when and where the elections are to be conducted.

-THE NEW VOTING BILL-

There is, or can be generated, sufficient northern support for the MFDP Challenge; that a majority of the members of the House, if they wish to retain their seats, will have no choice but to impose upon Mississippi such strictures with respect to Congressional elections, that the state will have to permit the "one man, one vote" principle to prevail if the state wants its representation in the House. And once this principle is established and validated with respect to Mississippi, other Southern states will be on notice that the same principle applies to their Congressional elections. If they do not have their own Congressional seat in the House, they will be on notice that the same treatment in the Congressional elections of 1968.

Once the present Southern control of the important Congressional districts is eliminated, many of the political factors which prevent enforcement of federal law in the South will be eliminated also.

Those factors which remain and will be handled by Southern Congressmen, black and white, who must look to the approval of black constituencies to further their political careers.

Whether it is intended to do so or not, the introduction of voting rights legislation into the U.S. Congress at this time functions to divert attention from the MFDP Challenge, and, if it is passed, it will divide support both in Congress and in the nation from the Challenge. Yet, in realistic political terms, the enfranchisement of Negroes in the South depends much more on the effective pursuit of the Challenge, than it does on the enactment of any new civil rights legislation.

From the Wats Reports:

WEST TENNESSEE VOTERS PROJECT

The WTPV covers three counties in the Delta area of Tennessee--Haywood, Fayette, and Hardeman. The project grew out of civil rights activities in this area dating back to 1959, when many Negroes in Fayette County registered to vote. They were thrown off their land and set up a tent city. Forman was involved in this. The Original Fayette County Civic and Welfare League has been in the forefront of the movement here. John McFerren of Somerville is the President. Last summer, there was a COFO-type project in Fayette County manned by 40 student volunteers from Cornell U. They worked on voter registration during the first part of the summer, later concentrated on political organization and education. They were able to organize to such a degree that they had the county broken down to "road leaders," each of whom conducted meetings with 5 or 6 families. People learned how to poll watch and count ballots. The movement was supporting a local white man for sheriff, and a Negro minister for tax assessor. They lost. Most of the poll watchers and ballot counters weren't allowed into the polling places, but they think that if the election had been fairly conducted, the election would have been very close, although they aren't sure who would have won. In Fayette County, there are about 3600 registered Negroes, about the same number of registered white.

Last May, the Fayette County Student Union called in Holly Springs COFO workers to help with organizing p.a. tests.

Volunteers have now begun to arrive to help with this summer's project. It will consist of political organization and a literacy program which is turning into freedom schools.

Last night Tim went to one of the freedom schools. There were about 120 people attending, of all ages. They broke up into 5 groups, and one group talked about strikes, one group talked about the idea of leadership and then about cooperative farming, and one group talked about the history of sharecropping.

Fayette County is the poorest county in the South, and the fourth poorest county in the U. S. Negroes there are sharecroppers, tenants, renters, and small owners. In one area tractor drivers are paid \$2 a day, and so are cotton choppers. The sharecroppers in this area have had their shares cut down to 6 acres, which means they have to try to support themselves as day laborers for \$2 a day. They know about the MFLU, and are discussing the possibility of a strike.

Address of WTPV is Box 277, Somerville, Tenn., 901-465-3218.

TWO STATEMENTS FROM JACKSON

The following statement was taken verbatim in the Atlanta SNCC office:

My name is Mrs. Annie Mae King and I live in Sunflower County, Mississippi.

We were arrested about 12 noon Monday, and they put us in a paddy wagon. It was so hot in there--there were 20 of us in there and we couldn't get no air. When they carried us out to the barn they let us stay in the paddy wagon about thirty minutes before they let us out. When they taken us out they pushed us into the barn.

When we got inside the barn there were about 100 or more cops and patrolmen and they began to push us from one side to the other. They yelled, "Get back, nigger, get back." They pushed us all into each other. One of them pushed me across the back with one of the blackjacks and said, "Get on up there in the line." And they just beat up children, pushing them and hitting them in the head. (The children were 12 years and older.)

After they registered us in on Monday night, they carried in us in another stock barn. They made us sit down on the concrete floor about five in a row. They wouldn't let us sit against the wall, and we had to sit on the floor the whole time. About 10 that night they gave us some little, old, thin mattress.

At five in the morning they made us stand up and give up the mattress. Every time some white girls would come in they would be dragged out if they would not walk. They knocked one white girl in the head.

It's a long story, but the saddest of all--it was a lady that weighed about 300 pounds (Mrs. Maggie Gordon), and we didn't have no kind of privacy because about 25 or 30 cops would be in there all through the night. And this lady had rinsed out her panties, and she was lying on a pallet. And they asked her to get up. And they snatched the tick out from under. And as she lied on the floor two cops taken her by her feet, and they drug her about 25 feet across the hall, and they kicked her all in her privates and beat her terrible.

And it was two young ladies there pregnant, and they beat one of them so she had a miscarriage.

-TWO STATEMENTS-

-TWO STATEMENTS-

I got out Thursday noon. It's a long story. I can't explain it all; I just say what I saw. During this time when they separated us and taken our name and separated the ladies from the men, they were very, very cruel. The food was very, very poor. We didn't get a shower until Wednesday night.

There's lots more....

The following statement was taken verbatim in the Atlanta SNCC office:

My name is Mrs. Maggie Gordon. I'm from Holmes County, Mississippi. I was arrested on Tuesday and taken to the Fairgrounds. About 6:30 Wednesday morning the officer came over and said "Get up and get over there." I said "OK." So when I attempted to move, he said, "Let's drag her."

So I said, "Please don't. I don't have my underpants on." So it was four of them. They grabbed me, and just pulled my legs apart and they kicked me in the privates. And they pulled me from that side to the other side. And they were steadily kicking me with their feet in the privates. And I caught one of the policemen by the leg, and they had those things called billy clubs, and they were hitting me on my arms and hands and to get me loose from him. He fell over and I reached to get the billy club and it was kicked away from me.

When I did manage to get up they had pulled and stretched me and tore my clothes off me. So when I managed to get up the one that had kicked me, I caught him on his shoulder and I hit him with my fist. And about 25 or more ganged up and pulled out their clubs and were standing around me. So excuse this expression--I said to all of them, I said, "I am not afraid of none of you motherfuckers." So then they ganged me and taken me out to the police car, and on the way out there one of these patrolmen hit me on the back end, juked me with the stick as we went to the car.

After we got to the car they handcuffed me and leaned me over and beat me all across the vack end and back. So from there to the City Hall the one that had already kicked me in the privates, he asked me my name, and I refused to

tell him my name. So he said "We assume you don't have no name." The he aays to me "Do you know what you are?" I say what he said: "You are a stupid, nasty, stinking bitch." So I said to him, "You are a stupid, stinking, motherfucking bitch." So I hit him and he hit me back. Then the three of them ganged me then, twisting my wrist and my arm behind me. They said, "Let's put her in solitary."

That's in a dark, small room. And on the way up to the room, they throwed me down, stomped me all in my body and still were kicking me. They dragged me in this dark cell and I was in there for 12 hours without water or food or a place to go to the bathroom. Some of the people at the Fairground told my lawyer where I was and he called up to see about me and he came up, and that's why they got me out of this dark place.

And they also had other police to come in and said, "Maggie, we come to take you to have X-Rays so we're not the ones that hurt you. We're not going to hurt you." So they did. They were nice.

I talked to the FBI and gave them a statement on Thursday morning in jail. The FBI men didn't say too much. They took pictures of my head bruises and I was already naked from tearing my clothes off and they took pictures of my back end where I had been beaten. I signed a statement and then I got out. The FBI didn't say anything to me about what they would do. There were just 2 FBI men.

THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT AND THE PHILADELPHIA 17

The Frankfurter Decision in the Williams Case of 1953 is apparently the basis for civil rights law. In this case, Justice Frankfurter ruled for the Supreme Court that in order to try someone under Section 241 of the U.S. Code (the violation of which is a felony) there had to be a charge that both a federally protected right such as due process--and a federally created right like those put into the constitution, freedom of speech, the right to vote, etc., had been violated.

On December 4, 1964, the Justice Department filed "information affidavits" before the U.S. Commissioner, Esther Carter. It is her job to hear these information affidavits and to set bond. She dismissed the evidence included in these affidavits.

In these charges brought under both Section 241 and Section-242, the Justice Department included the fact that both a federally protected right (that Cheney, Goodman and Schwerner's right to vote and right to encourage others to vote and the right of free speech) had been violated. U.S. Commissioner Carter dismissed the affidavits.

Then the Justice Department attempted to indict the Philadelphia 17 under Sections 241 and 242 before a grand jury called by Judge Harold Cox. The Philadelphia 17 were indicted. However, in the grand jury indictments, the Justice Department did not include the fact that a federally created right--the right to vote and encourage others to vote--had been violated. They left out the fact that these men were deprived of their lives because they were involved in voter registration work.

Defense attorneys made a motion during the trial that both charges (under sections 241 and 242) be dismissed on grounds that no federally created right had been violated--indeed, the charge was never brought during the trial by the Justice Department. Judge Cox dismissed the charges under Section 241, the felony charges, but did not dismiss the charges under Section 242 which is a misdemeanor.

The Justice Department then appealed to the Supreme Court to overturn Judge Cox's decision to throw out the felony charges of Section 241. The Supreme Court can't possibly hear the case until this coming fall and probably will wait until next year. They can either decide to uphold

MISSISSIPPI GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE

State Government

Judge Cox and throw out the felony charges or overturn Justice Frankfurter's decision of 1953 and overrule Cox.

A lawyer for Mrs. Michael Schwerner mentioned this inconsistency to a reporter who questioned Attorney General Katzenbach about the case. Katzenbach, usually cooperative with reporters, would not talk about the case and didn't cooperate. He recommended that the reporter talk to John Doar.

Mr. Doar was also rather uncooperative, but he finally admitted: "You're right. We did not include the federally created right for this reason: we didn't feel we could prove that Cheney, Goodman and Schwerner were involved in voter registration activities."

The Executive Branch

Mississippi state government is divided into the traditional three branches, the executive, the legislative and the judicial, and is constantly increasing its other area of state and governmental activity, that of state boards and commissions. This administrative area might be called the fourth branch of state government. Each of these branches will be considered separately.

The head of the executive branch and the chief executive officer of the state is the Governor. In Mississippi the Governor does not have as firm a control over the executive establishment as he does in many other states. Here the Lieutenant Governor, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the State Auditor, the State Treasurer, and several other less important state-level executive officials are all elected by the people in the general election every 4 years, concurrently with the election of the Governor. These officials are largely independent of the Governor and on occasion openly oppose him. However, the very large number of administrative agencies and boards, such as the Highway Patrol and the Board of Trustees of Institutions of Higher Learning, are wholly or largely subject to the Governor's appointive and removal powers. Therefore, he is quite powerful for this reason and frequently makes very advantageous use of this patronage. The Governor's power of pardoning convicts is not an unimportant one and has frequently been used to his substantial advantage. The Governor also has control of the National Guard, which may be used to enforce the state's law. He, as in most states, has the veto power. If he disapproves a bill passed by both houses of the legislature, he vetoes it, and the bill may then be passed over his veto only by a two-thirds vote of both houses. He also has the power to convene the legislature in special session. This is normally done every two or three years, in addition to the regular session, which convenes in January of every even year. The Governor has many additional powers as a result of the common arrangement in Mississippi of making him chairman of several boards by virtue of his office (ex officio), such as the State Budget Commission and the Agricultural and Industrial Board (A & I Board).

The Lieutenant Governor succeeds the Governor upon his death or absence from the state. He presides over the state Senate and has the very important power of appointing the committees of the Senate. He also is an ex officio member of several boards and commissions.

--MISSISSIPPI GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE--

The Secretary of State supervises the corporation laws, is in charge of election returns and certification, and is responsible for the publication and storage of various types of state documents and reports. The Attorney General has a staff of approximately ten attorneys. His duty is to enforce the laws of the state by advising local law enforcement officers, such as the sheriffs and chiefs of police of municipalities, and, when necessary, to resort to the courts for judicial enforcement of the state laws. His office also assists in drafting legislation and in advising the Governor and other state agencies. He represents the State of Mississippi in all courts and defends all agencies of the state. The State Auditor of Public Accounts and the State Treasurer, respectively, audit the accounts of the various state agencies and pay the warrants issued upon the state treasury. There are various other minor elective state-wide offices, the most important of which is the Superintendent of Education, who exercises general control over the state's segregated system of public schools.

The Legislative Branch

The legislative branch of the state government is composed of the two houses, the House of Representatives and the Senate. The House consists of 122 members; the Senate, 52. House members are normally elected from a particular county, and a few counties elect more than one representative. Senators are elected from senatorial districts which normally comprise two or more counties.

The House of Representatives is presided over by the Speaker of the House, who is elected by the House itself every four years in January after the general election. This official is extremely powerful, as he may (and does) succeed himself. The present speaker is Walter Sillers from Bolivar county, who has been in the House of Representatives since 1916, and has been Speaker of the House since 1944. He appoints all committees of the House, including the all-powerful House Rules Committee (which decides what bills shall be considered by the full House); he decides to which committee a bill should be referred; and he decides whom to recognize from the floor; and he has still many other important powers. Many political observers consider this office in its present form subject to abuse.

In Mississippi there is no majority or minority party as yet. Therefore, in the legislature now the leaders who are considered to represent the viewpoint of the administration (the Governor) are often grouped together and those who are frequently opposed to the administration are grouped

--MISSISSIPPI GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE--

together. All but 1 or 2 of the present members of the legislature are Democrats. The legislature meets every two years, always convening in January of each even-numbered year. Frequently a special session is called by the Governor prior to the regular session in January. Sessions normally last from two to four months, although in 1962 and 1964 they reached to almost 6 months. State representatives receive \$3,000 for each regular session (every even year), plus \$22.50 for each day of a special session, plus \$100 per month except months in session, plus liberal travel allowances.

The state Senate, as mentioned earlier, is presided over by the Lieutenant Governor. This official, Carroll Gartin, has powers similar to the Speaker of the House except for the very important exception that he does not have the power to appoint the Senate Rules Committee. These bodies, like their counterparts in the U. S. House of Representatives, control the flow of legislation to the floor. They may defeat a bill simply by refusing to permit its consideration, and normally a two-thirds vote is required to reverse the rules committee. The State Senate also has some confirmation power over the Governor's appointments, but these are of little consequence.

The Judicial Branch

The judicial system of the state is antiquated in many respects and will be considered at this point for state, county and city levels of government. The state's eighty-two counties are each divided into five supervisor's districts, each district having at least one justice of the peace and at least one constable. The justice has jurisdiction over all civil cases involving fines of up to \$200 and of criminal cases that are only misdemeanors involving less than one year in jail. The justice court does not keep a word-by-word record of its proceedings, and only the final results are recorded. Ordinarily the justice court does not have a jury. The constable is the lowest law enforcement officer of the state and is responsible for enforcing the law in his supervisor's district. He attends the justice court, delivers its papers, and carries out its judgements.

In addition to the justice of the peace courts, in the cities there are often police courts. Any city over 10,000 must have a police court, with a judge who must be an attorney at law and a qualified elector of the city.

--MISSISSIPPI GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE--

Cities under 10,000 may have a police court if they wish, and the mayor may act as judge. The jurisdiction of this court is similar to that of the justice court, although it deals only with enforcing the law within municipal limits, on things like municipal ordinances and traffic violations. The police court, like the justice court, is not a court of record. The attending officer of the police court is the police chief or marshal, or his deputies, and their relation to the police court is much the same as the constable's to the justice court.

Many counties in the state also have county courts. These courts have general jurisdiction over all cases involving up to \$3,000, and all criminal and civil matters on appeal from justice courts and police courts are retried in the county court, where either party (or, in a criminal case, the defendant alone) may have a full twelve-man jury, if he desires.

The state's basic trial courts are the circuit court and the chancery court.

The circuit court is the court of general residual jurisdiction and corresponds to the English Common Law courts in which the judge states the law and the jury applies it to the facts. The circuit court handles all matters in which only damages are involved and many special types of cases such as appeals from the board of supervisors of a county or the municipal board or city council of a municipality. There are nineteen (19) circuit court districts in Mississippi. The circuit court also has jurisdiction over all criminal matters (unless, of course, a misdemeanor is involved, in which case the case goes first to the justice of the peace or police court and may then be retried in its entirety in the circuit court. However, this retrial takes place in the county court if there is one, and the circuit court hears appeals from the re-trial in the county court.) A jury trial may always be had in the circuit court. A circuit court judge is elected for a four-year term and, with one exception, circuit court districts comprise two or more counties.

Of equal standing with the circuit courts are the chancery courts. However, these courts are presided over by chancellors who are elected and serve in a similar manner as circuit judges, but who sit always, except for a minor exception, without a jury and themselves decide not only the law but also the facts of a case. Their juris-

--MISSISSIPPI GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE--

diction extends to special classes of cases, such as those involving land, domestic relations, wills and estates of deceased persons, incompetent persons, and minors, suits for injunctions to prevent people from doing certain things, and suits in general for particular types of relief such as creating a drainage district or extending the city limits. There are 17 chancery court districts in Mississippi.

The state Supreme Court consists of nine judges, who normally sit in groups of five each. Cases are heard from September through June on Monday of each week. The court hands down its opinions at the beginning of that day. The court almost always is up to date in its hearings, and not infrequently a decision is rendered two or three weeks after it is argued. The court is composed for eight-year terms. The senior judge on the court serves as Chief Justice; his immediate junior serves as Presiding Justice. One presides over Division (group) A; the other over Division B. Appeals come to the Supreme Court from the chancery courts or the circuit courts. If all five of the judges in a Division do not agree upon the disposition of a case, then the case is decided by all nine judges (*i.e.*, *en banc*).

The state and its many subdivisions such as the counties, the municipalities, and the various circuit court districts are represented in criminal matters in the several courts by prosecuting attorneys. There may be a city prosecuting attorney, normally appointed by the city council, who handles criminal matters before the city court. If there is a county prosecuting attorney for the county court criminal cases, he is commonly an elected official. There is always a district attorney who handles criminal matters before the circuit court and who is elected by the voters of the circuit court district. The Attorney General handles criminal matters on the state level in the state Supreme Court.

The Administrative Branch

There are many state boards and agencies that perform various public services. The Agricultural and Industrial Board has the responsibility of bringing industry into the state and of helping the state's economy. The Budget Commission is responsible for preparing a state budget every two years. The Board of Institutions of Higher

-MISSISSIPPI GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE-

Learning has jurisdiction over the colleges and universities. The State Employment Security Commission administers through its system of employment offices the program of helping unemployed citizens to find jobs. It also handles unemployment compensation payments and the administration of some of the federal programs in the state. All of the above programs are substantially financed by federal funds.

Another sort of state agency is the State Sovereignty Commission, with Governor Johnson as the chairman. This body has as its function the preservation of the segregated system of society that exists in the state. It employs investigators and keeps files on many citizens of the state who differ with the official state policy of segregation. Up until spring of this year, the Sovereignty Commission had given a total of \$193,000 to the White Citizens Council since 1961.

County Government

The governing body of each of the 82 counties is the board of supervisors. One supervisor is elected from each of the five supervisor's districts of every county. The board has such general powers as hiring a county police force, deciding upon the boundaries of the various voting districts (precincts) in the county, hearing appeals from the county tax assessor, authorizing the submission of various bond issues for the approval of the electors of the county to construct various projects such as county parks and hospitals, and levying county taxes. Each supervisor has jurisdiction over the roads in his district and maintains a road shop for this purpose. This gives him extensive political power in his district, since he decides whose roads will be paved.

Another important county official is the county superintendent of education. He has jurisdiction over the county schools and over the various 16th section lands of the county, which are set aside for the benefit of the schools. He decides who rents the land and for what price.

The sheriff is a third county official. In addition to being chief law enforcement officer of the county he is also the tax collector. He enforces the law in the county and executes all orders of the various courts that apply to people of property in the county. One of his deputies attends sessions of both the county and circuit

-MISSISSIPPI GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE-

courts. He has jurisdiction over the county jail. His compensation is through fees for all services that are performed by his office, varying from the collection of real estate taxes to the holding of a particular person in jail. There are several sheriffs in the state of Mississippi who make over \$100,000 a year legally. In addition to his legal income, through his law enforcement powers he has the discretion of whether or not to raid illegal liquor-selling places in his county. This means that he has a lever whereby he can extort payments from the owners of these illegal businesses. This is considered to be common practice. At present through there is a fight in the state government to change the law which does not allow the sheriffs to succeed themselves. It is easy to see why sheriffs would want to continue in office. The governor supports the sheriffs, but many people oppose the sheriffs and the governor on this issue.

The county tax assessor is another official of importance. It is up to him to assess the value of the various pieces of real estate in the county (subject to appeal to the board of supervisors) and to apply to this assessment the rate of taxation that has been fixed by the board of supervisors. This tax is then, of course, collected by the sheriff's office.

Two more very important county officials are the circuit clerk and the chancery clerk. The circuit clerk handles all papers involving the circuit court. He also has charge of issuing marriage licenses and, most important, of registering voters and keeping the election books. It is with him that all persons running for county or county-district office must qualify. To repeat: It is in his office that all persons must now register to vote. And under the present state law, it is up to him to decide whether or not a person has satisfactorily completed his registration tests. The judgement roll is also kept in his office. It is in this book that all judgements of the circuit court and decrees of the chancery court may be entered so as to tie up the real estate (land) of the particular person who has lost a law suit. His office is open every day of the week except, in some counties, on Saturday; and he or one of his deputies is required by law to register any person who comes into his office during those times and who has the required qualifications. It is against state law as well as federal law for him to delay the registration process in any way.

-MISSISSIPPI GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE-

Municipal Government

The governing body of a municipality in Mississippi may be either a city commission, a city council, a board of selectmen, or a city manager together with a city council. All of these forms except the city manager for generally have a mayor who is the chief executive officer of the municipality. In general, however, the governing body meets frequently enough (usually weekly) so that it can exercise general and final supervision over most activities of the municipality.

There is also the city clerk, who may be appointed or elected, depending on the municipality. This official is responsible for registration of voters in the city. In other words, a voter living in the city must not only register with the circuit clerk of the county but, after registering first with the circuit clerk, must register with the city clerk of the municipality. This official keeps the minutes and the record of the proceedings of the city governing body, and the various election books of the city.

There exists usually a city tax collector and a city tax assessor, all under the absolute jurisdiction of the governing body of the municipality.

There is generally a city police chief, who has jurisdiction over the police department and of arrests for all crimes and misdemeanors that might be committed within the city limits. He may be elected or appointed by the governing body of the city, depending on the particular city.

There is normally a municipal police court presided over by a city judge in which misdemeanors committed inside the city are tried. This court hears not only traffic violations, but also such other matters as charges for the breach of peace. This municipal court is almost exactly like the justice court. It normally does not have a jury and is not a court of record. And if one is convicted here, he has a right to a complete retrial before a full twelve-man jury on appeal to the county court, if that county has one, or to the circuit court, if that county does not have a county court.

Reprinted from "Mississippi Political Handbook", published by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

THE CONDITION OF FARM WORKERS IN 1964

REPORT TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL SHARECROPPERS FUND
By Fay Bennett, Executive Secretary

"Only a fool would be happy in Mississippi down here chopping cotton for 30 cents an hour, just think, ten long hours only \$3 a day."

Bolivar County resident in a letter to the New York Times 8/9/64

"... There is truly a world inside our society in which the American dream is dying, where when it rains at night everyone gets up to move beds away from the leaks. Where there is no electricity but discarded refrigerators are valued to keep food safe from rats. Where regularly in the last week of the month families live on things like berries and bread. Where children in winter sleep on floors in burlap bags and their lung X-rays at age twelve look like old men's. Where students drift hungry and apathetic through school and their parents die ten or twenty years earlier than their countrymen."

Ben H. Bagdikian, In the Midst of Plenty

"If we can overcome poverty in the rural areas of the nation, we will eliminate once and for all the major source and fount of the problem throughout the nation. For the urban poor who are today overwhelming our cities are the rural poor of yesterday... And the rural poor of today, and their children, are the urban poor of tomorrow."

Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture
Testimony on Economic Opportunity Act, 3/20/64

This report is prepared in the aura of hope that the stated national policy of a "war on poverty" will go beyond the city slums to their breeding place -- rural poverty. The record up to now of effective governmental concern is miserable. Here is a part of the record and here is a part of the hope.

Rural Poverty and the National Welfare

Nearly half of the poverty in the United States is in rural America. One out of every three rural families has a cash income less than \$3,000 a year, the accepted poverty level. The families of hired farm workers, migratory farm workers, and sharecroppers, are chronically poor, with incomes often less than \$1,000 a year. Rural people have worse housing, poorer schools, fewer public utilities, less access to medical care and social and cultural facilities. They are poor in community as well as in person.

Disadvantaged groups are disproportionately represented in the rural population. There are more of the old and of the young, not economically viable groups; more Negroes, more Indians, more

Mexican-Americans who have been locked out by discrimination as well as by poverty.

The whole economy suffers from the poverty of the countryside. The poor need everything: food, clothes, schools, houses, roads, hospitals, sewers and water systems. An estimated one-fifth of the national production gap* (\$590 billion in 1963 dollars) during the 12-year period 1953-1964 was due to deficient farm income. It is also estimated that between a third and a half of present unemployment is due to reduction of the farm population since 1953. Raising the standard of living of the rural poor would stimulate the whole economy tremendously.

Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs?

About two million Negroes who live on farms, mostly in the South, are held back by discrimination in application of the federal programs which were intended to benefit all. NSF protests about this injustice through the years have been substantiated in depth by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights appraisal of services rendered by agencies of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The Commission found that State extension services in the South, more than 40 per cent financed by federal funds, are administered through separate structures on a discriminatory basis, Negro agents have inferior office facilities, do not meet with white staff, service Negroes exclusively, have unduly high caseloads, and are denied access to training given to white workers, 4-H Club programs sponsored by the Department of Agriculture for rural youth are denied to thousands of Negro youth: Rural Negro homemakers receive less help than white homemakers, and in counties without Negro staff, no service at all. Thousands of Negro farmers are denied programs and services that would help them improve their farm operations.

In Farmers Home Administration (FHA) programs, Negroes receive consistently smaller loans (in parallel situations) and less technical assistance. The few Negro employees are confined to work with Negroes. Negroes are not appointed as full members of county committees in cases where they are allowed to serve at all. Similarly in the Soil Conservation Service (SCS), Negroes receive less service; Negro professionals are restricted; no Negro has ever been elected to a Board of Supervisors for SCS in the South.

* "National production gap" is the difference between what the economists think we ought to produce each year and what we actually produce. The "gap" manifests itself in poorer food, poorer housing, poorer health services, and no community improvement programs.

Until 1964, with rare exceptions, Negroes did not participate in nominations and elections for Agricultural Conservation and Stabilization Service (ASCS) county committeemen who determine the allotments of acres that may be planted in controlled crops (wheat, cotton, peanuts, tobacco, rice, etc.) and administer locally other federal programs. Of 37,000 community committee members in the South, only 75 Negroes were elected. There were none among the 5,000 county committeemen in eleven Southern states. Negroes are not employed in permanent federal or county ASCS positions, nor in important temporary positions filled by county committees each year. No Negro has ever been appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to a state ASCS committee in the South at the end of 1964.

Such discrimination goes far to explain the disproportionate poverty of Negroes in contrast even to the rest of the rural poor. More than half the income of 92 per cent of Negro commercial farms still comes from cotton, tobacco, and peanuts. With technical and financial assistance, Southern white farmers have diversified their crops, improved income and housing, enlarged their farms, and secured better education. Most Negro farmers live at a subsistence level; 62 per cent of Negro rural families had less than \$2,000 income in 1959 compared with 26 per cent of the whites; their families are one third larger and thus per capita income is even lower. Because they have less resources, and more of them are dependent economically -- croppers, tenants, and farm workers -- they have suffered more displacement from mechanization and its consequences.

Hired Farm Workers

Between 1947 and 1960, the number of hired farm workers increased by 9 per cent but the number of man-days they worked declined by 11 per cent. In 1963, the last year for which figures are available, there were 1,862,000 hired farm workers who were employed 25 days or more; they averaged 138 days of work and earned \$883 at farm work. The 278,000 migrants* who worked at least 25 days averaged 110 days of work and their average farm earnings were \$657.

Child Labor. Children of any age may work in the fields at any occupation and for any number of hours, provided school is not in session in the school district where they work. Even so, during fiscal 1963, 6,926 children were found working during school hours in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act. More than half of

*This figure, taken from a United States Department of Agriculture report, does not include the many migrants who travel on their own. There are no complete figures available on the number of agricultural migrants and their children.

-- FARM WORKERS IN 1964 --

them were 10 to 13 years old and 20 per cent were under 9; 51 per cent were retarded in school grade. Employment of pre-school age children is not a federal violation at all.

A Hazardous Industry. Accident Facts, 1964, issued by the National Safety Council, again reports agriculture as the third most hazardous industry, following only mining and construction in death rate. It has the highest total number of deaths, 3,300 out of the total 14,200 accidental deaths in all kinds of work.

Foreign Workers. The total number of foreign workers contracted or admitted to the United States as temporary farm laborers in 1964 was 200,022. Of these 177,736 were Mexican; 14,361 were British West Indian; 7,900 were Canadian; and 25, Japanese. The figures do not include foreign workers who entered in previous years and were still working in the United States.

Congress allowed Public Law 78, the Mexican importation program, to terminate at the end of 1964 both because of the large amount of unemployment and because of the bad effect the availability of surplus cheap foreign labor has had on wages and working conditions of domestic farm workers. A massive domestic recruitment program was undertaken to supply growers with needed workers. However, growers' reluctance to accept the end of the foreign labor supply has been stubborn particularly in California and Florida. Domestic workers have actually been turned away while threats are made that crops will spoil in the fields. Great pressure is being exerted on Congress to force the Secretary of Labor to authorize continued importation of foreign labor, including Mexican braceros and British West Indian workers, under Public Law 414 (the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952). The Secretary has so far resisted this pressure, asserting that adequate wages and decent living conditions would attract sufficient numbers of qualified domestic workers.

Legislation. Federal registration of crew leaders was finally enacted into law during the last session of Congress. Aid for the construction of low-cost farm worker housing was included in the Housing Act of 1964 but no appropriation was made. Measures to regulate child labor outside of school hours and to establish a National Advisory Council on migrant labor were passed by the Senate in previous years but now must be reintroduced. In addition, bills were introduced to authorize development and maintenance of a voluntary farm employment service; to permit rapid tax amortization on farm-labor housing; to bring agricultural workers within the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; and to amend the National Labor Relations Act to extend collective bargaining rights to agricultural employees. The Senate Subcommittee on

-- FARM WORKERS IN 1964 --

Migratory Labor is studying the question of residence restrictions as they limit voting rights and prevent welfare assistance to migrant workers.

Farm Workers and Farmers under the Antipoverty Act. The Economic Opportunity Act can offer programs to assist rural people and farm families as well as seasonal farm workers including migrants. Community Action programs can concentrate on needs of migrant workers and the rural poor such as literacy, manpower training, recreation, social services, and counseling. III-B programs provide for housing, sanitation facilities, education and day-care projects for seasonal farm workers and their families. The housing and sanitation facilities must meet special needs or circumstances: i.e. rest camps en route; facilities for peak season influxes; experimental facilities. Education is for both children and adults, summer school or regular sessions, basic literacy or special needs (citizenship, health training). Day care centers can include health and recreation programs, lunches educational activities. Either public or private nonprofit, or a combination of both, agencies may apply. VISTA Volunteers work with migrants.

Under the Economic Opportunity Act, FHA can make loans to low-income farm and nonfarm rural families who need small amounts of capital to improve their incomes but are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at reasonable rates. Such loans may not exceed \$2,500. Loans up to \$25,000 are available to cooperatives that serve primarily low-income families. Many other aspects of the anti-poverty program, such as all the youth programs, apply in rural areas just as they do in urban.

All this is possible under the Economic Opportunity Act but it does not come to pass without local knowledge and local action. NSF's field staff work to bring this knowledge and to stimulate local leadership.

Union Activity. Because farm workers are not included in coverage under the National Labor Relations Act, their organization into unions continues to present great difficulties. In California, the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, supported by the AFL-CIO and the California Labor Federation, has 138 contracts with farm-labor contractors and is currently striking in asparagus and onion fields. Other unions have been engaged in organizing agricultural and particularly processing workers. In Louisiana, Agricultural and Allied Workers Union No. 300, a division of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, is a continuation of the National Agricultural Workers Union and has organized fishermen and dairy workers. This union also has organized other processing workers. The United Packinghouse Workers has locals of agricultural processing

workers which in some cases, such as lettuce, overlap with field workers since the packing shed has moved into the field.

Monopoly Growth and Farm Disappearance

Small Farms and Large Farms. Small farms that disappear under economic pressure often but not always, are swallowed up by big farms. (They may also be taken over by the sprawling suburbs of the large cities or for recreation or other non-farm purposes.) From 1959 to 1965 the number of farms decreased 18 per cent but the actual land in farms dropped only 2 per cent. The average farm operator today has a farm unit averaging 341 acres, nearly a fifth larger than six years ago. But the average does not give the full picture: the larger a farm is, the more apt it is to increase in size; the smaller it is, the more apt to disappear. This concentration of farm ownership has now gone so far that the nation's 100,000 largest farms control about one-fourth of all our farmland resources.

Sharecroppers. Between 1954 and 1959, the sharecropping system of farming in Mississippi steadily declined as plantation owners of the Delta mechanized production and reduced cotton acreage. The number of tenant farmers dropped from 83,000 to 33,000 while the number of regular (not seasonal) farm workers rose from 24,000 to 39,000. The total number of sharecroppers in the 16 Southern states dropped by a little more than half during the same period, to 121,000 sharecropper farms. Tenants and croppers farming tobacco have declined least in number, but they will be next to go. Tobacco harvesting machinery and new methods of bulk curing are reducing the need for hand labor, and at the same time increasing the need for both capital and more land. As productivity rises, more acreage is moving into the soil bank.

Subsidies. The last obtainable figures for federal farm subsidies are for 1961. In that year the 70 per cent of all cotton farms whose allotment was 10 acres or less received an average subsidy of about \$60 a year. At the same time, the average subsidy of 322 farmers with allotments of 1,000 acres or more amounted to \$113,657 each. Two great corporations received more than \$2,000,000 each. Small farmers cannot afford to cut their acreage; large farmers profit exorbitantly by doing so. The Department of Agriculture states that there were no direct cotton subsidies in 1964. But there were domestic allotment payments of 3.5 cents a pound which would result in the same inequities.

These corporate farmers have also benefitted, until this year, by having a government-guaranteed labor supply which meant that they did not have to make wages and working conditions attractive enough to compete with other employers for domestic workers. Now they are

protesting Congressional and administrative efforts to end this influx of foreign-contract workers, whom only about 2 per cent of all farm employers use. Small farmers compete in the market with the giants, and their incomes are forced down toward the level of depressed farm wages.

Declining Farm Income. The market basket of representative groceries that cost the housewife \$10 in 1947 had risen in price to \$11.88 by 1964, up 18.3 per cent, while the same groceries returned \$4.33 to the farmer, down 15.6 per cent. The farmer's share of the food dollar fell to a 30-year low of 37 cents in 1963.

This is one visible reflection of a post World War II revolution in marketing featured by a tremendous growth in the chain-store system. Today more than two thirds of all retail sales of foods are handled by 10 per cent of the stores. One of every two consumer dollars is spent in less than 100 corporate chains.

As competitive farm markets are lost or become dominated by only a few buyers on a mass procurement basis for hundreds and thousands of retail outlets, the competitive structure of livestock, produce, and other farm markets is destroyed. Simply by not buying for a week, a chain or processor can destroy farmers who no longer have alternative marketing possibilities. The tenant, small or family commercial farmer is squeezed out because he doesn't have the reserves to stand a temporary -- sometimes a prolonged -- loss. This is an important reason for a 27 per cent increase in the number of foreclosures of farm mortgages this year compared to a year ago; one reason we have a third less farmers than a decade ago.

A Program for Small Farmers

Implementation of the Civil Rights Act to secure equal opportunities for all under existing government programs is only the beginning of a policy to aid small farmers. An expanded antipoverty program should include provisions for grants to aid farmers too poor to secure loans and for family farm development corporations which could buy land for sale to present and prospective small farm owners. Increased funds should be authorized to enable FHA to extend credit to more farmers who cannot secure loans elsewhere, with reduction of the interest rate to a carrying-charge level. Such an investment in helping small farmers to continue and to increase their incomes would be far cheaper in the long run than allowing them to be driven from the land into unemployment and onto welfare or relief rolls. Commodity programs should be reorganized so that a ceiling based on income and volume of production can be placed on eligibility of farmers to receive government subsidies or other direct payments. Anti-trust legislation should be enforced

-- FARM WORKERS IN 1964 --

against chain stores or middleman processor-distributors who monopolize marketing channels in a given area.

Federal Programs

A Rural Development Committee, recently enlarged into the Rural Community Development Service, has been established by the Department of Agriculture to coordinate the efforts of various departments and agencies concerned with rural development and to provide policy guidance. The Department is moving increasingly in the direction of responsibility for the whole rural area and not only for agricultural enterprises.

The new Rural Community Development Service will absorb the functions of the Office of Rural Areas Development. Through the Area Redevelopment Act program, loans and grants can be made to furnish needed public services and attract new industries to rural communities and finance training programs to equip workers for the new job opportunities which are created.

The Food Stamp program was made permanent in 1964. The previous pilot program in 43 areas reached 350,000 people. The expansion now envisaged should raise the number of people served to four million.

At the end of fiscal 1963, Farmers Home Administration was servicing accounts of 250,000 borrowers whose outstanding indebtedness was \$2.1 billion.

More than 55 million acres of land have been withdrawn from production through the Soil Bank and Acreage Diversion programs.

National Sharecroppers Fund

* has its own program to stimulate and develop training projects for hard-core rural poor under contract with the Department of Labor under the Manpower Development and Training Act. The contract, which finances NSF's Southern Rural Training Project, is expected to be renewed for an additional year.

* has field representatives working in Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee to bring knowledge of federal programs to poverty-stricken rural people. Now they are organizing people to take advantage of the Economic Opportunity Act.

* works to end the exclusion of agricultural workers from the protections and benefits of social legislation that other workers enjoy.

* supports the efforts of farm workers to organize unions and of low-

-- FARM WORKERS IN 1964 --

income farmers to organize cooperatives.

* supports the efforts of the Secretary of Labor to give domestic workers preference over foreign contract labor in farm jobs and to raise standards sufficiently to attract domestic workers.

* confers constantly with government officials and agencies to protect farm workers and to aid low-income farmers, particularly in implementation of the Civil Rights Act and in the war against poverty.

* distributes fact sheets on federal programs, pamphlets, reports and releases to press and public on the facts of rural poverty and the needs of the rural poor.

* * *

The Economic Opportunity Act and the Civil Rights Act have provided important new tools with which to work in improving the lot of the small farmers, the sharecroppers, the migrant and other impoverished farm workers. NSF is increasingly devoting its efforts to assisting rural Americans to use these tools effectively. Success in this work will bring an end to the last vestiges of existing feudal patterns in the rural South.

KEY LIST

MAILING

A Service of the San Francisco
Regional Office of the Student
Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Selected documents of current
and lasting interest in the
civil rights movement.

Published bi-weekly
\$10 a year

July 25, 1965

KLM 35-42

CONTENTS:

- KLM 35 A New Alliance Shapes Up in Dixie, Business Week, July 10, 1965.
The Mississippi Freedom Labor Union strike... can civil rights groups and unions join forces? Economic conditions in the Delta.
- KLM 36 Letter From Mississippi - Batesville, by Gene and Nancy Turitz.
Is the FDP tending toward political behavior typical of the Establishment? Is it feasible for "local people" to make decisions which come from the bottom up? Conditions in Jackson jail. Freedom Labor Union in Panola Co.
- KLM 37 Mississippi Action for Community Education.
The Child Development Group of Miss. is running Operation Headstart (part of the poverty program) at 83 day care centers in the state. Can the program be effective? What does a program run by highly trained white northerners and Negro middle class southerners have to do with poor people?
- KLM 38 The Five Faces of the War on Poverty, by Earl Raab.
Is the war on poverty turning into a civil war about poverty? Are the poor being given any power?
- KLM 39 On Capitol Hill, by Rep. Charles Gubser.
Some frequently quoted arguments against the MFDP Challenge...heard especially from Republican Congressmen. See the following article for some answers.
- KLM 40 Report on the Challenge, by MFDP staff.
The printing of the depositions has long been delayed by the Clerk of the House of Rep...Highlights of the MFDP briefs, which were submitted to the Clerk...sit-in and trial of 10 Mississippians.

KLM 41 Amite Co. Newsletter, No. 3.

Federal agricultural agencies, controlling credit, crop allotments and general farm opportunities, have traditionally been operated discriminatorially. Lately whites have been appointing "Uncle Toms" to committee posts. How is it possible to achieve meaningful participation in these programs.

KLM 42 Oakland Direct Action Committee.

Community organizing in the Bay Area... organization and background of ODAC... problems faced.

A NEW ALLIANCE SHAPES UP IN DIXIE

AFL-CIO's Interest in a Strike on a Cotton plantation shows how civil rights groups and unions are getting together on their common goals for the South.

AN ORGANIZING CAMPAIGN and strike by two civil rights groups among Negro field hands in Mississippi's Delta counties point to some important trends for labor and employers in the South.

in part because Northern union members have added their pressure for action to that of civil rights groups and more important, because he believes that AFL-CIO must be in on the ground floor of the changes now sweeping the South.

As civil rights workers begin to grapple with bread-and-butter issues, they find themselves involved with union aims and using union techniques for which they have neither experience nor resources. Inevitably, the established unions are drawn into some degree of cooperation. The resulting alliance could offer a real challenge to the Southern status quo and also accelerate basic changes already under way in the Southern economy.

"I shudder to think what would happen to us if we turned our backs and just let all these things go on around us", he says.

Since opening the Atlanta office early this year, Kehrer has established firm working relationships with such groups as the NAACP, and the Reverend Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. ("We tend now to consult before problems get too far along," Kehrer says.)

All this lies in the future, of course--but perhaps not so far in the future as some people imagine. This week, E. T. Kehrer, director of the AFL-CIO Civil Rights Dept's new office in Atlanta, made plans to go to Washington to discuss with union officials the advisability of helping the striking Delta field hands.

He has joined them in such projects as an investigation of the Georgia Employment Service ("We feel it is not just anti-Negro, but anti-worker"), and is currently handling anti-union complaints that might otherwise be pursued under Title VII of the Civil Rights bill. He is working with NAACP's regional office on a list of allegedly discriminatory companies subject to action under Title VII.

SPADEWORK. A veteran Southern organizer, Kehrer recognizes that the strike poses no immediate threat to the Mississippi plantation system of careless, sometimes benevolent, paternalism that holds Negroes in poverty, ignorance, and economic dependence.

But these are matters of organizational cooperation. Rough-and-tumble situations out in the field, like what is happening now in the Delta offer more serious problems.

Nevertheless, he feels that labor must consider playing a role in the current campaign--

OLD PATTERN. The Mississippi

Delta is a rich, alluvial plain sweeping east 50 miles from the Mississippi River between Memphis and Vicksburg. Its landscape and social structure come as close to "Gone With The Wind" as remains in the South. Its 18 counties are one vast cotton field--almost 1 million acres were planted last year, producing a crop worth \$400 million. The land is divided into small farms and large plantations. A few plantations are corporately owned, but most are individual and family holdings.

As a civil rights target, the Delta has been the province of the Council of Federated Organizations, most militant of the civil rights groups, and--more recently--of the Delta Ministry, a well financed project of The National Council of Churches. The Delta's major city, Greenville, is moderate for Mississippi (it houses new industry and hungers for more), but rights workers have run into violence around Greenwood and Indianola.

WORKING CONDITIONS. Thousands of Delta Negroes live in planter-owned houses and buy at planter-owned stores. Some of the men drive tractors. Their wives and children and the old people work seasonally in the fields. Growing mechanization and their own discontent have pushed thousands of others into Delta towns, into Memphis, and beyond to the slums of the North.

Those remaining in the Delta towns form a pool of "day haul" workers. They are piled into trucks before dawn by contractors who sell their

labor to the planters. During a peak week in June, 32,300 people worked in the Delta fields. Their average wage was \$3 per day.

Tractor drivers, who also do simple mechanical repairs, earn \$6 a day plus rent-free homes. Moreover, a conscientious planter often looks after his tenant families--sees that they have food and medical care.

Civil rights activists who began working on voter registration among these people found it didn't mean much to them, according to COFO man Vince Ferrar, a former Columbia University student.

"They were mostly concerned with their working conditions," Ferrar says.

Out of this discovery came the Mississippi Freedom Labor Union, first organized at Shaw, with groups now at Greenville, Cleveland, Indianola and Tribbett.

II. APPEAL TO UNION.

The strike itself started in Tribbett in May--more by accident than design, according to one version. A dozen tractor drivers on the 1,300 acre farm of A.L. Andrews refused to work when he turned down their request for a raise to \$1.25 an hour. Andrews promptly evicted them and their families--about 90 individuals. Later he obtained an injunction limiting picketing.

No other drivers have,



Tenant shacks, from which striking Negroes and their families were evicted, are planter-owned--as are the stores at which they buy.



Tractor drivers, thrown off the Delta farm after they had demanded a raise to \$1.25 an hour, sleep in a tent at nearby Tribbett.



Wives of strikers, who are housed in a Negro college dormitory in Greenville, arrive at Tribbett to visit their husbands during the day.