

Asr American

"News for you"

Student Nonviolent

Coordinating Committee

360 Nelson Street, S. W.

Atlanta, Georgia, 30313

November 12, 1966

Vol. II

Published Monthly:

Editor & Staff Fay D. Bellamy

EDITOR'S NOTE.....	A-0
THE BLACK NARATOR poem by le Graham.....	A-2
STATEMENT BY SENATOR J.W. FULBRIGHT (from Arkansas).....	1
TO THE NEGROES OF DALLAS COUNTY (Speech).....	2
NEW SCHOOL OF AFRO-AMERICAN THOUGHT.....	3
BUILDING UP IN THAILAND..... (from Cong. Record/Oct. 3, 1966)	6
JUST ABOUT EQUAL Fiction by Fay D. Bellamy.....	14
JUSTICE IN THE COURTS.....	20
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966 (from Cong. Record/Sept. 29, 1966.....	21
CAMBODIA ASSAILS U.S. IN ASSEMBLY.....	37
WHITE POWER BY Ethel Minor of SNCC Communications.....	37
NEWS OF THE WEEK.....	40
YOU KNOW poem by Ray Duren.....	42
MADAM CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S STATUS IN U.S. QUESTIONED..... (from Cong. Record/Oct. 3, 1966)	42
NEW LEFT/from Cong. Record/Oct. 7, 1966.....	44
NASHVILLE FIELD REPORT by Porter Stewart.....	52
INNER CITY ORGANIZING COMMITTEE.....	53
A MODERN TOM SPEAKS OR Roy Wilkins at his best.....	54
TO SAMMY YOUNGE by Fay Bellamy (poem).....	55
COCA-COLA REPORT by Jack Minnis/SNCC Research	56
THE UNTOUCHED BLACKS/poem by Joyce Kilmer.....	60

EDITOR'S NOTE

We should all be aware that this country is making a last ditch stand to protect his "inhumanity to man". He (white men) has reached the point where he is showing a real fear of the Black Renaissance and its influence on both black and white organizations, the length and breadth of this land.

At this time, the dirtiest word that can be attached to a civil rights or peace group is the word "Communist" or "Anarchist". We are blamed for many things. It does not matter if we took part or not in those issues we are blamed for, but certain persons are attempting to make scapegoats out of us. We should all take note of the various things being said about the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Students for a Democratic Society and other groups. We should analyze why they're being said.

This country can no longer tolerate us. As usual in the United States, when black people become too strong, there is always an attempt to exile, jail or kill him.

Every black leader who became a leader of the black masses with an international perspective, has either been physically destroyed, exiled or harrassed throughout his lifetime.

Remember:

Marcus Garvey: He was first put in jail and later deported.

W.E.B. DuBois: Found he could not have freedom of movement or thought within the U.S. and decided to go to Ghana.

Malcolm X: Murdered

Paul Robeson: forced into "voluntary exile". Robeson was not permitted, by the racists of this country" to sing. Because of his blackness and obvious pride in being proud of it, life became unbearable for him. Throughout the world, he was exalted for his fantastic voice, but not in the United States

Robert Williams: Framed and went into forced exile.

Black Soldiers: After World War II when black troops returned to this country, many of them were lynched or murdered in other ways. These were black people who had

Editors Note: - 2

broken out of the racist confines of the U.S. They had traveled to many countries, lived with and been accepted as men by the peoples there. They could no longer be satisfied with life as it existed then and now in the United States.

We should take note that the ever increasing pressure now being applied to the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee began after our statement against the War in Vietnam.

Adam Clayton Powell: Even though his committee on Education and Labor was the best and most active committee in Congress and the strongest, the government thought he had too much power. Therefore, the Committee was torn asunder to break his power.

Notwithstanding the fact that many of us in the movement may have serious doubts about Powell, it would still be acknowledged that the committee was attacked not because Powell was too strong; but that he was a black strong man.

I feel it is important that we in the movement should never fall into the pattern of looking at situations as all-black or all-white, except when it is just that.

The Black Narrator/by le graham
(At a Symposium for Afro-Americans)

1

White poems

are daggers guns. cops.

piercing hearts in weird design. Ofays
beating niggers to their knees. Coloured
girls with wigs passing & cutting Afro's
mind. Or black poems judged by whitey's
standards. 11:45 & still no ring (eastern
standard time. owned by grey cats on mainline U.S.A.)

These poems are such things. pointed. like twist drills
parting tools. I know

the creator

(in classroom faces. human relationship meetings.
morning greetings as a habit. a state of mind after a workshop on
blackism)

2

Black poems are beautiful

egyptian princesses. afro-americans. john o. killens. ossie
davis. leroi jones. mal
colm x shabazz. robert
williams. lumumba. A

poem for woolly-haired brothers. natural-haired sisters. Bimbos.
boots & woogies. Or nappy-headed youngsters

Cause they want what i
want: blood from revolutions. A
fast boat to Africa, ghana
the cameroons uganda &
nigeria...

Here in america i want black thoughts. informs of con

crete skies

tumbling down

on dingy ofays. on negro

middleclass heads (konked-haired hipsters. wig-wearing whores.
sophisticated teachers. inspiring professors
...schooled in propaganda)

Crush their minds & lives thoughts. Talk to them in chinese
vietnamese

or

black language

Fuck their minds up. cross-cut & rip-saw

their ideas. in

ugly design. improper

balance. Yeah.

using black primitive standards.

WE ARE APPARENTLY TRYING, SINGLE HANDEDLY, BY EXECUTIVE FIAT, TO CHANGE THE FACE OF ASIA. WE ARE TAKING ON THE ROLE NOT ONLY OF POLICEMAN BUT ALSO OF PROVIDER FOR ALL THE NON-COMMUNIST COUNTRIES THERE. EVEN IF WE COULD AFFORD TO ASSUME THIS BURDEN--AND I QUESTION WHETHER WE CAN--IS OUR OBJECTIVE REALISTIC?

WE--A WHITE WESTERN COUNTRY--ARE TRYING TO REFORM AN ORIENTAL CULTURE IN OUR IMAGE, IGNORING THE WARNING OF THE POET LAUREATE OF AN OLDER IMPERIALISM, Rudyard Kipling, WHO WROTE:

The end of the fight is a tombstone white
with the name of the late deceased,
And the epitaph drear: "A fool lies
here who tried to hustle the East."

IN A CELEBRATED COMMENTARY IN 1899 ON THE UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES, KIPLING ALSO WROTE:

Take up the White Man's burden--
And reap his old reward:
The blame of those ye better,
The hate of those ye guard--

STRONG AND VIABLE SOCIETIES MUST BE HOMEGROWN PRODUCTS. THEY CANNOT BE TRANSPLANTED. WE CAN HELP PREPARE THE SOIL, WE CAN HELP PROTECT THE SEEDS FROM BEING TRAMPLED UNDERFOOT, BUT WHAT GROWS MUST BE SUITED TO THE LAND AND CULTIVATED BY THOSE WHO TEND IT.

by Senator J.W.FULRIGHT
FROM Arkansas

Editors Note: I would suggest that you read the article on Thailand. It should prove to be very interesting.

TO THE NEGROES OF DALLAS COUNTY

Here are a few facts:

THERE WAS A MEETING SUNDAY NIGHT OCTOBER 16, 1966 AT BROWN'S CHAPEL WHICH AS WE ALL KNOW IS HEADQUARTERS FOR THE MOVEMENT IN DALLAS COUNTY. THE WORD 'Movement'!! I'M BEGINNING TO WONDER IF OUR PEOPLE HAVE FORGOTTEN WHAT THE WORD REALLY MEANS. I WAS LISTENING TO THE REV. F. D. REESE AND REV. P. L. LEWIS AT THIS MEETING. REV. REESE SAID HOW MUCH PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE SINCE THE MOVEMENT BEGAN.

IN HIS STATEMENT HE SAID THAT HE DID NOT WANT A BLACK GOVERNMENT OR AN ALL WHITE GOVERNMENT, BUT HE WANTED TO SEE A BLACK AND WHITE GOVERNMENT IN OFFICE. THIS WAS IN REFERENCE TO HIS SAYING HE HAD NOT SOLD OUT TO THE POWER STRUCTURE AS IT IS.

NOW I WANT YOU NEGRO PEOPLE TO STOP AND THINK FOR JUST A MINUTE OR TWO. IF THIS IS TRUE, THEN WHY IS THE DALLAS COUNTY VOTERS LEAGUE, DCVL, ASKING PEOPLE TO VOTE STRAIGHT DEMOCRATIC TICKET ON NOVEMBER 8th, A TICKET WHICH HAS ALL WHITE PEOPLE RUNNING ON IT.

BLACK PEOPLE OF DALLAS COUNTY, I SHOULD LIKE YOU TO TAKE A REAL GOOD LOOK AT THE REV. P. L. LEWIS. HE MADE A STATEMENT IN AN ATTEMPT TO MAKE BLACK PEOPLE LAUGH AT ONE ANOTHER. IN HIS STATEMENT HE SAID THAT YOUR SKIN IS BLACK, YOUR NOSE IS WIDE, AND YOUR LIPS ARE THICK AND YOUR HAIR IS KINKY. HE WENT ON TO SAY THAT YOU DON'T HAVE THE SENSE TO BE IN POLITICS BECAUSE YOU ARE DUMB AND "I'M SMART BECAUSE I DEAL WITH THE PEOPLE DOWNTOWN", meaning hisself. HE ALSO NEEDS A FEW FACTS ABOUT NEGRO HISTORY. MAYBE HE DIDN'T LEARN THAT IN SCHOOL, BUT THE FACT IS THAT THE BLACK MAN HAS MADE HIS MARK IN HISTORY SINCE THE BEGINNING OF RECORDED HISTORY.

REV. LEWIS WENT ON TO SAY, "WE ARE RIGHT AT THE POINT IN HISTORY WHEN ABE LINCOLN WAS ALIVE AND WHEN NEGROES WENT INTO POLITICAL OFFICES AND THE WHITE FOLKS FOUND OUT THEY DIDN'T HAVE ENOUGH SENSE TO BE IN POLITICS; AND THEY PUT THEM OUT.

PEOPLE, THE HISTORY I LEARNED ABOUT NEGRO POLITICIANS DIDN'T READ LIKE THAT. I MAKE REFERENCE TO NEGROES LIKE HENRY H. GORNET WHO WAS RECORDER OF DEEDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND P.B.S. PINCHBACK WHO SERVED AS STATE SENATOR AND LATER LT. GOVERNOR OF LOUISIANA. THERE WERE MANY OTHERS LIKE HIRAM REVELS, ROBERT SMALLS, EDWARD BROOKE AND WILLIAM HOOTIE.

I THINK REV. LEWIS NEEDS SOMEONE TO TEACH HIM THE TRUE FACTS OF HISTORY. I DON'T BELIEVE THE MAN IS THAT DUMB, BUT IS TRYING TO LEAD OUR PEOPLE BACK INTO SLAVERY FROM WHICH THEY CAME. THIS MAN WILL BE WEARING NICE CLOTHES AND DRIVING A FINE CAR AND EATING STEAK ON NOVEMBER 9th.

BROTHERS AND SISTERS, WHAT WILL YOU HAVE? WHAT WILL YOU TELL YOUR CHILDREN AND GRANDCHILDREN? WILL YOU TELL THEM THAT YOU VOTED THEM BACK INTO SLAVERY OR YOU GAVE THEM A CHANCE FOR FREEDOM?

WHAT SHALL IT BE.....THE WHITE ROOSTER OR FREEDOM, THE INDEPENDENT CANDIDATES.

(Speech made at a meeting in Dallas County, Alabama by a SNCC worker).

THE NEW SCHOOL OF AFRO-AMERICAN THOUGHT

Identity is the subject of creation. Only a black man who knows his blackness and is proud of his blackness can create for himself and others.....

One believes or has been taught to believe that the black man has no culture--no art, no sensitive or soulful oasis in his history of which he can be proud. Today, too many people believe that their black brothers and sisters have no culture, and that Africa is still all jungle and it's people savages.

To help disspell this myth, in September 1965, the Cardozo Area Arts Committee, Inc. -- a broadly based community organization--was formed to bridge the gap between the artist and community.

The Cardozo Area Arts Committee, Inc. has now a base of operation, The New School For Afro-American Thought. The purpose of this school, which was founded by the committee is to create an awareness and identity in black people through the Arts and Humanities. It desires to implant in the community respect, knowledge and love in ourselves as people. And it is imperative that our creative energies be recognized and appreciated if we are ever to grow to love and understand ourselves and others.

Along with creating awareness, the New School For Afro-American Thought will instruct and educate the community--especially the youth--in art, dance, drama, history, literature and music. The school will encourage people in the community who have talent and/or interest in these areas, to share them with

his brothers and sisters. The New School For Afro-American Thought desires to make the community more aware of the artist of the past and present, and to create and stimulate towards creation, those of the future.

The school will provide the people of the community with a home base of operation. A place where the artist and sculpture can work; where musicians, dramatists and all people can hold meetings, workshops, lectures, etc. It will be a place for all people can hold meetings, workshops, lectures, etc. It will be a place for all people in the community to gather and express ideas, opinions and our growing consciousness of our community and the world we are involved in today.

It's most "souful" purpose will be accomplished if it can bring all black people it touches to the point of realizing--"Yes, you are black and beautiful; you are beautiful because you are black!"

For further information, write to Cardozo Area Arts Committee
2208 14th St. N.W.
Washington, D. C.

#

BUILDING UP IN THAILAND

Mr. FULERIGHT, J.W. from Arkansas.
Mr. President, since the officials of our Government who are responsible for our policies in Asia, and more specifically Thailand, decline to testify in public session before the Committee on Foreign Relations, I believe it is my duty as Chairman of that committee to make a brief statement on the subject. When I say "decline," I speak from personal knowledge, because I personally invited members of the Department of State--specifically, the Secretary of State--to come and testify in public session, and my cordial invitation was declined.

I believe it is my duty simply because it seems to me that the people of my country are entitled to know to what extent their sons and their fortunes are being committed in Thailand.

I believe this enormous expenditure of our resources in Thailand should, at the very least, be the subject of discussion and serious consideration by the Congress, especially by the Senate, before the commitment is final and complete. It seems to me that members of the Senate, who share in the responsibility for Government policies, should at least know what those policies involve. It is not solely because I disapprove of our policy of enlargement of the war in Southeast Asia that I believe it is my duty to present publicly in one statement the information which has come to my attention about Thailand.

Regardless of my views, I believe the expenditure of billions of public funds, and the exposure of American lives to destruction 12,000 miles away in Asia, is a matter of sufficient

importance to warrant congressional consideration and approval. On Jan. 1, 1965, there were 23,000 American military men in South Viet Nam. On June 1, 1966, there were 25,000 in Thailand, and I gather that there are now more than 30,000 there. We are building up in Thailand--building barracks, air bases, ports and supply depots.

What are the reasons for this new military involvement in Southeast Asia? What is the legal basis and the political justification? Are we trying to apply the lessons learned in Vietnam; are we falling into the same errors; or are the two situations not analogous? We are building up in Thailand, but do we know what is building up in Thailand?

For answers, Americans must turn, paradoxically, to the press, for a curtain of official secrecy surrounds our activities in Thailand. We have been told from time to time, by officials, to be skeptical of press reports from Vietnam but now we are given no alternative but to rely on the press for our information about Thailand, because the officials are reluctant to speak.

From the press we learn that most of the 30,000 men we have in Thailand are in the Air Force. They fly a majority--some reports say as much as 80 per cent--of the bombing and reconnaissance missions that are flown over North Vietnam and northern Laos from a half dozen American-built air bases in Thailand--which are legally Thai bases and fly the Thai flag. We are building a giant sea and air base complex at Sattahip which will have runways long enough to accommodate B-52 bombers and which

is costing hundreds of millions of dollars--either one hundred million or more than five hundred million, depending on which paper one reads. We are also training and equipping the Thai Armed Forces to fight Communist insurgents in the Northeast, although we are, reportedly, not participating directly in the fighting. On this point, there is a conflict in the stories reported by the press.

Officially, as I say, we have been told nothing about all this--unless, that is, we happen to see Mr. William Bundy, the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, on television early in September. It is rather curious that he went on "Meet the Press" in September, but has declined to appear in open session before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In the first official statement that some of the thousands of young Americans on the streets of Thai villages are not soldiers on leave from Vietnam or tourist, Mr. Bundy told us that there were "about 25,000" American servicemen in Thailand. He also told us that there was a real threat of insurgency, particularly in the northeast area of Thailand" but that it was "on a very limited scale--a scale on the Vietnamese benchmark would be perhaps on the level of 1959 or 1960 rather than any of the later periods--in numbers involved it is probably only in the hundreds." He added that--

The Thai are absolutely determined to deal with this themselves...our role is to supply them with equipment and to assist them in training as they may desire.

When asked about the exact nature of "our commitment" to Thailand, Mr. Bundy replied:

Well, we have a treaty relationship with Thailand, of course, in that they are a member of SEATO treaty, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, so that we have a fully complete treaty relationship there. Now that applies to action in accordance with our constitutional processes in the event of external aggression and for consultation in the event of subversion. What you have now is some kind of--well, a real threat of insurgency, particularly in the northeast area of Thailand.

Obviously, we have not sent 25,000 or 30,000 men and hundreds of planes to Thailand, and obviously we are not building multi-million-dollar bases capable of handling the largest strategic bombers we have, in order to meet a threat arising from "hundreds" of insurgents. The Thais themselves should be able to handle a military threat of such dimensions. Thailand's Armed Forces total 130,000 men--an Army of about 85,000, a Navy of 25,000, and an Air Force of 20,000 and their defense budget for 1965-66 was over 90 million dollars.

It is quite clear that we are using Thailand as a base from which to launch air attacks against North Vietnam. To justify what we are doing by referring to the insurgency in the northeast and tying this threat of insurgency to paragraph 2 of article IV in the SEATO treaty, the paragraph relating to the threat of subversion, is specious at best.

Mr. Bundy could have said that we were acting in Thailand under Paragraph 1 of article IV which refers to "aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area." But in that case, he would have had to address himself to the requirements that action taken under this paragraph be in accord with the "constitutional processes" of the party acting and that the measures taken "be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations." I will return to this subject of "constitutional processes" in a few moments.

Hence, directly from the press and inferentially from what Mr. Bundy has said on television, one is lead inevitably to the conclusion that we are building up in Thailand primarily a complex of air bases for use in the war in Vietnam--and apparently secondarily a supporting, or if necessary alternative, military supply and logistics base. We are also helping the Thai with equipment and training to control their insurgent problem, but it is not because of the insurgency that we have 30,000 troops there. We are, I gather, again from the press, precluded from saying all this because the Thai government has asked us to remain silent, and we have agreed.

Why is the Thai government so insistent on this point? After all, in 1962, we sent 5,000 troops to Thailand when a Laotian Communist army neared the Thai border. At that time, statements were issued by Pres. Kennedy and by the Thai government, and the United Nations Secretary General was informed of the action in writing. In fact, the Thai government apparently felt it important to inform the Thai people, for the Thai statement, issued on May 15, 1962, included the following

sentence:

It (the stationing of United States forces in Thailand) is hereby announced to the people of Thailand with the request that they cooperate fully with the government in the firm determination to protect and maintain the freedom, integrity, independence and sovereignty of the Thai nation.

If it was judicious to make such an official statement then, why is it undesirable to do so now? I wish that I knew the answer to this question. Perhaps a part of the explanation lies in the Thai Foreign Minister's reported statement at the United Nations a few days ago that Thailand had not asked for American forces to be stationed there and could, if necessary, do without them. The Thais, the Foreign Minister said graphically, "are not hanging onto your G.I's by their shirt-tails."

Another element that may explain-- Thai reluctance to discuss the subject of U. S. military activities in Thailand is the fact that the Thai government may feel that the Thai people would react adversely and that Thailand's political stability would be affected. For Thailand is not the politically progressive country so many say it is, in fact, it never has been. Until the early 1930's, Thailand--then known as Siam--had been for centuries a relatively benign monarchy. In 1932, a group of young military officers and civil servants seized power and induced the King to promulgate the first Thai constitution. A legislature was established, whose members were appointed not elected, but it gained little of the power that had been lost by the King.

Thailand-4

Power was instead generally exercised by a shifting oligarchy in the Council of Ministers or Cabinet, composed primarily of leaders of cliques in the Army, the police and the civil service.

In the 26 years after the coup of 1932, there were 26 separate coups and the constitution of 1932—a modest constitution at best, was inoperative for much of this time, including the years of World War II when Siam, a reluctant if not unwilling ally of Japan, was under a dictatorship.

In 1958, Field Marshal Sarit Thanarat, commander of the Thai Armed Forces, seized power. He abrogated the Constitution, dissolved the National Assembly and the Council of Ministers, banned all political parties except his own "Revolutionary Party", and proclaimed martial law. In early 1959 an interim constitution was promulgated and a Constituent Assembly appointed more than three-quarters of its members from the military profession, to draft a new constitution and to serve as a interim legislature. The Constituent Assembly has yet to recommend a constitution and no parliamentary elections have taken place since 1957. The present prime minister of Thailand, General Thanom Kittikachorn became premier in 1963 following the death of Sarit, who died an astonishingly wealthy man. The popular and dedicated King of Thailand, exerts a beneficial—though apparently limited—influence on policy.

In sum, as one expert on Thailand has written:

The Thai political system has fallen between absolutism and democracy.

There is, therefore, cause for concluding that the Thai government has largely itself—and not external forces—to

blame for the disaffection that exists in the country and particularly in the northeast area. The northeast region has long been a problem for Thai authorities. Geographically remote from Bangkok, it has been ignored by the capital. Economically backward its inhabitants have a lower standard of living than their fellow Thais. A large number of the inhabitants of the region are culturally Laotian, and some 50,000 Vietnamese refugees of the French-Indo-Chinese war also live there. Terrorism began in 1964 and has increased since then. Six persons were killed in 1964, thirty in 1965, and there have been over 70 political murders this year.

Estimates of the number of guerrillas range from the hundreds to more than 3,000. The formation of a Thai patriotic front to lead a war of liberation in Thailand was announced in Peking last year. Southern Thailand has also been plagued by increased Communist-led terrorism involving some experienced guerrillas from the Malayan insurgency, although this seems to be a less difficult problem mainly because there is no contiguous territory under the Communist control.

Is the insurgency in the northwest similar to that in Vietnam in the early stages? The few public statements issued by our government officials indicate that they believe it is. Some reporters also see a parallel. Others, however, do not. They suggest that the threat is being exaggerated and misrepresented by Thai officials in the hope of obtaining more American aid and better American weapons.

Those who are skeptical that an analogy can be drawn point out that the guerrillas cannot appeal to rural villagers in the name of anticolonialism or reunification, but can capitalize only on the resentment of the people in the northeast toward the Thai

Government--resentment arising from the Government's neglect and abuse of the region. As former Ambassador to Thailand, Kenneth T. Young, now president of the Asia Society, wrote recently of the situation in the north-east:

The key to Thailand's lasting safety lies in a better revolution to fill the rural vacuum. This means creating a whole new national identity in two directions. Only a self-restrained civilian and military officialdom knowing how to gain the respect and trust of the rural people can win them over. And only a self-propelled rural people feeling their own stake and welcoming outside aid in developing and protecting their homes, temples, rice fields, schools and villages can repel Communist agents and insurgents.

Testifying before Congress in 1951 on President Truman's decision to deploy four Army divisions to Europe, the then Secretary of Defense, Gen. Geo. C. Marshall said:

My opinion in the matter is that Congress is certainly entitled to know what we are planning and as Senator Smith (of New Jersey) very plainly pointed out, what we do has to have the support of the people.

How times have changed. Apparently, we no longer believe that "what we do has to have the support of the people."

The people obviously cannot support a course of action of which they are kept in ignorance or confusion. I deplore our decision not to discuss what we are doing in Thailand, because

the Thais do not wish us to do so. We are weakening our democratic processes, either because our troops are in Thailand on shaky legal and political grounds or because of the Thai government's political vulnerability or perhaps because of both reasons.

As for the role of Congress with respect to the build-up in Thailand, E. S. Corwin, in his distinguished book, on the Presidency, asked this question on the relationship between the Executive and Legislative branches:

Shall it be the relationship of cooperation between constitutionally equal partners, or shall it be the relationship of principal and instrument; a relationship resting on jointly held convictions as to what the interests of the U. S. require, or on the calculation that when Congress is presented with a sufficiently imperative fait accompli it can be counted on to come to heel?

Our involvement in Thailand may prove to be just such an "imperative fait accompli." At a time when the U. S. is building a vast sea and air complex in Thailand, when more than 25,000 of our forces are stationed there, and when these bases are being used by our forces in an undeclared war in which we are principal combatant, the Senate is asked only to give its advice and consent to a double taxation treaty with Thailand and to another treaty concerning commerce and navigation. This is hardly a "relationship of cooperation between constitutionally equal partners." It is quite the reverse. Congress is in danger of becoming the "instrument" of the President and is becoming so easily and compliantly-if not enthusiastically. We are building up in Thailand.

We are moving in men and planes and steel and cement. We are moving in American dollars--over 433 million in economic aid in fiscal years 1946 through 1965 and somewhat over 60 million in fiscal year 1966; 415 million in military aid through 1963 when the figures began to be classified and I suppose about 40 million more a year since then; hundreds of millions in construction costs in the past few years--certainly well over a billion in all. And the end is apparently not in sight. In the joint communique issued on February 15, 1966, at the conclusion of talks between Vice-President Humphrey and the Prime Minister of Thailand, the Vice President emphasized the determination of the United States to provide all necessary assistance to enable Thailand and the other countries of Southeast Asia, threatened by Communist aggression to defend themselves and to achieve in peace their just economic and social aims.

We are apparently trying, single-handedly, by executive fiat, to change the face of Asia. We are taking on the role not only of policeman, but also of provider for all the non-Communist countries there. Even if we could afford to assume this burden--and I question whether we can--is our objective realistic? We--a white, Western country--are trying to reform an Oriental culture in our image, ignoring the warning of the poet laureate of an older imperialism, Rudyard Kipling, who wrote:

"The end of the fight is a tombstone white
with the name of the late deceased,
And the epitaph drear: "A fool lies
here who tried to hustle the East."

In a celebrated commentary in 1899 on the United States and the Philippines, Kipling also wrote:

Take up the White Man's burden--
And reap his old reward:
The blame of those ye better,
The hate of those ye guard--

The resentment of client states toward those on whom they have become dependent is as insidious and inevitable in the 20th century as it was in the 19th. Never colonized, traditionally suspicious of foreigners, the Thais surely do not rejoice in being militarily dependent on the United States, as the Thai Foreign Minister's statement at the United Nations shows. Because of the resentment and xenophobia that even benign foreign intervention brings, massive infusions of men and money may well hinder the Thais from developing, rather than help them to develop a sound political environment in which insurgency cannot flourish. The strong and viable society must be home grown products. They cannot be transplanted. We can help prepare the soil, we can help protect the seeds from being trampled underfoot, but what grows must be suited to the land and cultivated by those who tend it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article entitled "FULRIGHT CHIDED BY THAI OFFICIAL," written by Seth S. King and published in the New York Times on September 24, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the record, as follows:

FULBRIGHT CHIDED BY THAI OFFICIAL--THANAT
Says People Resent Challenge to U.S.
Policy

(by Seth S. King)

United Nations, N.Y., September 23.--Thanat Khoman, Thailand's Foreign Minister, said today that his country bitterly resented Senator J. W. Fulbright's effort to challenge the Johnson Administration on its policy in Thailand.

"We resent being used as a club for striking at the President over his policies in Vietnam," Mr. Thanat declared.

Senator Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said Tuesday that he would press for a public hearing on American activities in Thailand.

He said he was "very dubious," about the long-range objectives there and wanted to pursue the question of whether the United States was getting involved "in another Vietnam."

In an interview at the United Nations where he is attending the General Assembly, Mr. Thanat said Thailand had not appealed for the stationing of American forces there and could, if necessary, do without them.

"If Senator Fulbright does not want them there, let him start a move to bring them home. We are not hanging on to your G. I.'s by their shirttails," Mr. Thanat declared.

Earlier this week, Senator Fulbright's committee held closed hearings on Thailand and subjected William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, to a four-hour questioning.

"We would rather go down fighting Communism by ourselves than be a pawn for Senator Fulbright," the usually placid Thai Foreign Minister asserted. "We are not the 51st state."

Thailand is a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. In the last five years a number of large American bases have been built in that Country.

For nearly two years, the major effort of the Air Force against targets in North Vietnam has been mounted from Thailand. However, neither the United States nor Thailand has publicly acknowledged this. Planes from American bases in Thailand have also been used constantly against the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos and against pro-Communist Pathet Lao forces there.

Thirty-Five Thousand Americans In Thailand

After Tuesday's hearings committee members disclosed that American military forces based in Thailand now totaled nearly 35,000 men. This was three times their strength in December, 1965.

The Democratic Senator from Arkansas said he was not disturbed by the Administration's "short-range policies" in using Thai bases but by the "Administration's long-range objectives in Thailand and the rest of Southeast Asia."

"The Thai people are getting fed up with reading the criticisms and insinuations about all this," Mr. Thanat said. "They say let the Americans take their soldiers home if this is the way they feel."

The Thai Foreign Minister said Communist efforts to subvert Northeast Thailand were at a lower scale now than earlier this year.

"But this is something they turn on and off like a thermostat," he said. "We are moving against this and can handle it. It is not something that will get out of hand without American help."

(From the Congressional Record/October 3, 1966)

"JUST ABOUT EQUAL"

BY Fay D. Bellamy

"Look Vic, the times comes for us to move. We either get the show on the road or call it quits."

"Man, I'm ready. You know I stay read. Let's get Randy and Chuck together so we can finish mapping out our plans."

Vic settled his back against the wall and from his position on the floor, watched Ted pick up the phone. He was nervous and a little excited, but there was no fear. He and the others had been working on their plan for the past ten months and the time had come to execute those plans.

Ted finished his calls and smiled at Vic; "They'll be over in about 15 minutes."

Neither of them was much for wasting words. They settled back to listen to the mystical and exciting sounds of John Coltrane and Archie Shepp.

"That Coltrane and Shepp by themselves is a gas, but the two of them together, wow," Ted stated.

"You laid the shit on the line man."

"Those are some together cats."

They continued talking in low voices until there was a knock at the door. Chuck was the first one to arrive. He walked into the room and squatted on his heels. His only greeting was a nod of the head. There was no need for questions or small talk; he knew what was up. The months before were nervous one, secret meetings, plans and many angry thoughts.

Tonight...he was calm.

Randy never knocked, but walked into Vic's apartment as if it were his own personal property.

"Hey Baby."

"What's happening Randy."

There was general greetings and each one knew this was not a bullshit night. In each ones mind was the clear winter night.

of last January 23rd. It was a night neither of them would ever forget, not in this lifetime nor the next, if there was such a thing.

That was the night they went to a party at Jennifer's house. That was one groovy party. That chick had more booze than five alcoholics could drink in five weeks. Talk about a hell-raising night, that was it.

Then it ended as all good things usually do. Vic wondered why it was always the good things in life that ended so suddenly while the painful things stay in your mind and eat into the brain. It was as if pain was a parasite and needed the human brain to exist on.

"Hell, that life I guess," Vic thought to himself.

His mind went back to that night in '66. Randy had his father's car and Chuck had his old man's station wagon. Benny was with them that night. First their dates had been dropped off and they now were on their way home. Benny was the thinker of the group. He liked to take long walks and do stupid things like sitting under a tree and watching the clouds take different shapes or some simple shit like that. This night he wanted to get out a few blocks from his house and walk the short distance home. The two cars pulled over to the side of the highway and Ben got out of the station wagon.

"I'll see you cats late tomorrow. Be damned if my mother thinks I'm going to get up early and go to church in the morning. I'm sleeping late."

They pulled off in a great farewell of comradeship; blowing horns, shouting and waving.

"Try not to run into no crackers baby. You know how they like to fuck with a cat when they catch one of us alone," Randy yelled out of the window.

Benny waved and began his trek home, past the little stores and on up the street to the restaurant on the corner where he made his turn. His house was only six blocks from the corner.

"I've got to go to the john", he said out loud, talking to himself. "This is just as good a place as any", and he walked into the restaurant, into a nightmare he would never awaken from.

Chuck got the news first. A black cat who worked in the filling station down the street from the restaurant knew most of the young guys in the area.

He went to Chuck's house and saw only one light on. He went around to the side window and knocked. Chuck raised the window and stuck his head out.

"What's up baby?" thinking it was one of his friends. The man identified himself.

"Man they done shot Benny."

Chucks' knees began to shake and for a moment he felt he was going to faint. That time had ceased to exist.

"They shot him for nothing. He wanted to use the john and they killed him. In the head man. He was trying to run away, but they shot him in the head." He went on, talking as if he were delirious. Chuck wouldn't, couldn't speak. Something had happened to his voice. Why couldn't he talk!

"He's dead.....Blood...Everywhere you look, nothing but blood."

Chuck climbed out of the window so he wouldn't wake his folks. He had finally gotten hold of himself.

"Calm down man." I never could remember this cats name, he thought to himself. "Come on and go with me. I have to get the guys together."

They got in the station wagon and drove off. Chuck's mind was in a whirl. "I have to be calm. Have to find out what happened."

He went to each house and finally they were all together a ain. The cat from the filling station began to explain what had happened.

"It was like this man. You know that restaurant on the corner of Tulsa and Euclid St, well Benny went in there. He came out running and this cracker that owns the joint was behind him. He had a his hand and was aiming it at Benny. Man, there wasn't no place to run to. Ain't nothing on that street 'cepting that little alley and the Greyhound Bus Station."

"Get to the point man," Ted shouted.

"Okay baby. Okay."

"Well Benny ran a little ways and stopped. He and this cracker was arguing about his wanting to use the john. Then Benny ran into a Greyhound bus parked at the station. It was full of people and they could see som bad was happening. Well, that bus

made driver made him get off and the bus drove off. Now he couldn't even hide behind the bus. That cracker raised his gun and took aim. Benny turned to run again and was shot in the back of the head."

Chuck turned the ignition on and headed for Tulsa and Euclid. They let the man from the gasoline station off on the side of the road. Then he burned rubber taking off again. They arrived at the same time the police got there. There was no sign of Benny.

Could that man have lied? No! Nobody could lie about a thing like that.

Where's Benny?

Ted walked up to the sheriff. "Where's Benny?"

"I don't know what you're talking about. Who the hell is Benny?"

"You'll know soon enough man. Just wait."

If any fear had ever existed in Ted, about white folks, it had now disappeared. When he was told a brother was laying dead, shot in the head for want of a piss in the john; for wanting to piss the way civilized folk say you're supposed to piss, no, there was no longer any fear.

Randy had walked across the street to a little alleyway where the man said Benny was shot. It was dark in the alley, with only the reflection of the street lights on Euclid and the ones shining from the restaurant which was situated almost directly across the street. He walked on a little ways.

"Benny." "I've found him. Oh dear God! I've found him."

"Benny, Benny.....it's me baby."

Vic and the others ran across the street and stopped. A puddle of blood had formed next to Benny's head and was overflowing; running in a dark trickle into the street, making its way to the gutter.

" B E N N Y"

No! Hell no! It was a night none of them would ever forget. The next weeks were nonexistent. The only thing that was real was the pain they felt. They had been children together. Their mothers were best friends. They had fought each other and passed

"RULEVILLE JOURNAL"

Circulation: 2000

April 25, 1967

Orville Wilks, 8, was found with a broken neck in the woods, about half a mile from his home. He is the brother of David, 5 who drowned last November 20th. His mother said she had given him some rope with which to make a swing out of.

Sheriff Rodman says, "it appears David caught his foot in the rope and while attempting to untangle his foot, he became more entangled and fell from the tree.

Mr. and Mrs. Wilks were taken to the hospital under sedation. Mr. Wilks was mumbling incoherently about someone murdering his sons. When our reporter asked the sheriff about this he stated, "Mr. Wilks is understandably overwrought with grief, but there were no signs of foul play near either child at the time of their unfortunate deaths. I can fully comprehend Mr. Wilks sorrow and my heart goes out to him.

Mr. and Mrs. John Wilks are the only surviving relatives, of little Orville.

"RULEVILLE JOURNAL"

Circulation: 2000

May 3, 1967

We wish to express our sympathy to Mrs. John Wilks whose sons were lost to her in tragic accidents at the tender ages of 5 and 8, and whose husband has had a nervous breakdown.

Your friends and neighbors are in sympathy with you Mrs. Wilks and hope and pray Mr. Wilks gets well soon.

All those wishing to send get well cards to Mr. Wilks may mail them to the:

State Mental Clinic
Rt. 3 Box 99
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

"Hey Randy, how's life treating you?"

"Man, here today, gone tomorrow, that's what I always say. I was just thinking Randy; three to one makes it 'just about equal' don't it.

"Yeah man, just about equal."

JUSTICE IN THE COURTS

by Anonymous/Attorney-At-Law

An honest appraisal of Black People's efforts to achieve equality by court order or legal decision forecloses a continued effort in that direction.

Historically, American Law is based upon the law of England at the time of the revolution. At that time, the rights of English citizens were extensive and the concept of personal dignity was well developed, albeit limited in practice to a certain class. It was because the American Colonials were denied these rights that they revolted. With the success of the revolution, the rights of the Englishmen were incorporated into American Law. Thereafter, the American courts were quite ready to preserve and protect those rights for the benefits of citizens. (Actually, the rights of Englishmen were for the benefit of the propertied class. The expenses and delays of the system made them seldom available to the poor.) The American system tended to expand the availability of legal remedies to the working class; though this was a long slow process attended by some violence.

These developments were, of course, just between white people. When the Black Man became a paper citizen by reason of the constitutional amendments, a new problem was encountered. As Black Men became skilled in the law, they demanded the ancient rights of English men for Black People. To accord Black People the same historical rights of white people would place an impossible burden on a social system completely racist in character. Therefore, the law developed its Black-side whose doctrine may be summarized as, "Any nigger getting out of hand is guilty...."

This is still the prevailing doctrine in American Law. In addition, the tendency of American Law to recognize class actions and interests was reversed. This effectively blunted mass movements of undesirable character.

In this era, the annual expenditure of organizations seeking legal remedies exceeds two million dollars. The results of this expenditure have been of no effect in extending the rights of whites to the mass of Blacks. Their situation has not changed since 1900. Perhaps, an equal effort in the direction of politics or economics may have produced some long term benefit.

In summary, we must recognize that the law will always reflect the society in which it exists. A racist society must use the law, among their tools to perpetuate itself. They are intertwined in a Gordian Knot.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - HOUSE

September 29, 1966

(Discussion around House Resolution 15111.)

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Note from Editor: (There were 80 pages of discussion around various amendments on the poverty program. I have abridged those 80 pages in an effort to make it more interesting to you.)

MR. QUIE of _____: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"(2) The Director shall not approve a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board on which representatives of the poor do not comprise at least one-third of the membership.

"(3) The representatives of the poor shall be selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty, provision shall be made for selection of representatives of such poor through a process, such as neighborhood meetings, in which the poor participate to the greatest possible degree."

(Mr. Quie asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, we have now moved into title II, community action. If there is any amendment the community action title needs it is this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this provides that every community action board must have representatives of the poor.

This shocks many people, when one says that representatives of the poor should be on a community action board, because, as said by many, if the poor were able to govern a community action board they would not be poor.

In the hearings we have held and the visitations we have had to communities and center cities. I have talked with many poor people who are articulate and able and could effectively serve on a board.

But what this amendment says is "representatives" of the poor. If the poor decide they want to be represented by someone who is not poor, that would be their judgment, but let us make certain they can make the judgment and that at least one-third of the people on the community action board have been selected by the poor to speak for them.

They must have a voice if they are to effectively bring themselves out of poverty. As I have said many times before, we have seen this type of initiative work in Federal programs. The cooperative extension program is one. The ASCS in the agricultural area is another, in which the people themselves who are to be benefited serve on the board.

There are a number of cities in the country where this does not occur, but there are other places where it does. We can see successful ventures where the poor are involved.

Many people in OEO believe in this philosophy, but what has happened is that many of them do not, and the political power of some mayors in some cities prevents the effective involvement of the poor from occurring.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman, and I want to say that I contemplated offering an amendment similar to the one which was just offered. As Chairman of the Republican Task Force on Economic Opportunity, I might add we did look into the question of what is good about community action programs and why certain ones have gone wrong. In every case I think there has been an indication as to where there have been problems, such as in Philadelphia and Chicago, that there has not been sufficient involvement of the poor. This amendment would certainly be a step in the right direction to secure that involvement.

Because the committee did not do so the Republican Task Force on Economic Opportunity, of which I am chairman, did hold a series of meetings in some of our cities. Specifically, we visited Philadelphia, Chicago, San Diego, and Bakersfield, California. Because our time and funds were limited we directed our attention primarily to the effectiveness of the community action program in these communities. We did so for a number of reasons, but primarily because the community action program and its requirement for "maximum feasible participation" of the poor is the only really novel aspect of the poverty program.

I would like to share with you some of our findings. In Philadelphia and in Chicago, we found that genuine participation by the poor in the community action programs was nonexistent. Although the structure of the programs in these two cities is vastly different, the end result is the same, the poverty program has been subverted to the political ends of the city political machine. One witness in Phila., an elected representative of the poor, said: "We were elected as stooges. The program is controlled from city hall." To make sure that the elected representatives of the poor in Phila. did not get any ideas about their role, the poverty program placed 118 of the 144 elected representatives, plus 142 of their relatives, on the poverty payroll or in other city government jobs. One witness declared that those running the Philadelphia poverty program to build a "third force" for Mayor Tate's reelection campaign.

In Chicago, where, of course, the Daley machine is much more sophisticated than its counterpart in Philadelphia, no effort has been made to create even the facade of maximum participation of the poor. The city administration is in firm control. As one witness pointed out, "Neighborhood council members are appointed from the top and are eventually removed at the whim of administrators. Majority decisions of the council have been overruled by the Center's director."

In both Phila. and Chicago great care has been taken to see to it that the neighborhood councils have no funds. The decision has been made, as another witness put it, to control rather than to liberate the people in the poverty areas.

In Bakersfield, while there is maximum participation of the poor, there is virtually no participation by the rest of the community. As a result, community acceptance of the program has become an issue on the fall ballot.

A universal complaint at all of our hearings was the inefficiency of OEO machinery in approving programs. One witness in Philadelphia declared that OEO "sits on proposals for an agonizingly long time -- it's like dropping a rose petal into the Grand Canyon and waiting for the echo." Reports of waiting as long as 18 months for approval of programs were common in Philadelphia, Chicago, San Diego, and Bakersfield. One witness in San Diego pointed out that projects must be approved at local, regional, and national levels but because of the turnover of personnel evaluating the project it is difficult to learn the status of a project application. A witness in Bakersfield put it more strongly when he said it was impossible to learn the disposition made of an application on the regional and national level.

There were complaints, too, about the application forms -- their length and complexity. As a witness pointed out, on the one hand we insist that the poor must participate in the programs but, on the other hand, we force them to find some Ph.D. to write up their programs in the appropriate jargon. The end result is that originators of the program do not recognize their offspring and, indeed, after it has gone through the bureaucratic mill the offspring has become a changeling.

Complaints were also registered that OEO sets up too many controls and minute criteria that make it difficult at best to carry out the program on a local level. This is particularly true of the prepackaged programs such as Upward Bound and Headstart. Many witnesses called for greater flexibility so that such programs can be tailored to local needs.

Generally speaking, witnesses had faith in the community action concept and want to see the program continued as it is without restricting funds for programs in specific categories. The categorical approach that is in such disrepute in our public assistance programs should not now be imposed on the poverty program as seems to be the plan under the bill we are now considering.

These are some of our findings. I hope that next year the committee will abandon the notion that all wisdom resides in Washing-

ton and will hold hearings in the field. As the gentleman from New York indicated emphatically yesterday such hearings are necessary, particularly in his own city of New York. I am sorry Republicans have not been there yet and I hope Democrats will join us in these efforts after the election. The Committee has a real responsibility. If they face up to that responsibility they will learn first hand, as the Republican Task Force on Economic Opportunity did, of the hopes people have for the poverty program and their genuine desire to make this program work. They will learn that the people on the frontline of the war have a large contribution to make in the success or failure of this venture."

MR. POWELL. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I want first to pay tribute to the gentleman from Minnesota's labors in this field. He has been, since the inception of this act, struggling to try to make the Office of Economic Opportunity live up to the intent of Congress. On December 23, 1964, I first criticized the poverty program for its absence of poor people on antipoverty committees. Nothing happened. On April 11, 1965, I again made a public criticism of the lack of representation of the poor in the anti-poverty programs. Finally I was able to sit down with Mr. Shriver and he sent me a letter, which I hold in my hand, dated May 12, 1965, in which he said that the poor shall not participate where there are "other compelling reasons for their not participating."

Mr. Chairman, I sent that letter back to him.

And finally, on May 12, I received from Mr. Shriver word to the effect that they were going to see that the intent of Congress was carried out.

Mr. Chairman, while it is not incorporated in any written memorandum, Mr. Shriver, over a year ago, in the presence of witnesses in my office, said he believed that the percentage should be one-third. I said, "Fine."

Mr. Chairman, that commitment is not being carried out.

We stand today on the verge of a very bad situation in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn.

Mr. Chairman, Representative CAREY, our colleague who serves on this committee, from the great State of New York -- talked to the Members of this body yesterday about the fact that there were 55 people on the board in the poverty area of Bedford-Stuyvesant in Brooklyn, but that only 2 were representatives of the poor.

Mr. Chairman, that represents a violation of the act, it represents a violation of the intent of Congress, and I believe that this is the strongest point which we are going to be able to make in the entire restructuring of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see a unanimous vote in favor of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Minnesota."

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe it has been made perfectly clear, not only during the past year, but before, that there is a need for this kind of directive to the Office of Economic Opportunity, so that there will be a more meaningful involvement of the poor in the development and administration of local community action programs and on the community action boards.

Mr. Chairman, if poor people are going to be able to help shape their own destiny, then it is essential that there be true representation and the maximum feasible use of elections to select such representatives to serve on policymaking boards or other bodies.

The community action program offers an opportunity for people to work together to identify common interests and to articulate their needs. If the poverty of power is to be overcome, indigenous leadership must be encouraged to emerge. That is why we wrote into the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, when we first passed it, that a community action program is one "which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."

MR. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to get into this debate, but sometimes my pragmatism causes me to get involved in some of these idealistic ideas.

I have no objection to the poor being involved in this. But, on a practical basis, an amendment of this kind, it seems to me, would be just as logical as passing a law saying that one-third of all the defeated candidates for Congress ought to be seated in the House. Or every time a business starts up there ought to be at least one-third of the board of directors people who have gone bankrupt.

Now, a lot of these people that you are going to involve in this have been failures all their lives and they do not know how to make anything run right. If your idea is to put them on here to get them involved and teach them something, that is one thing; but just coming in with an amendment saying you have to have a certain percentage of those who have never been successful in anything to run this program really does not make much sense. You might find you will have more headaches when you get through than you had when you got started."

MR. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who preceded me stated rather forcefully a viewpoint that I think is largely held by a great many people who do not fully understand the concept of involving the poor in helping themselves. This is not a concept that the poor will run a program themselves or that they know more than the welfare people do or the sociologists or other administrators. That is the key to success in this program.

It offers the poor influence over the type of program that will be put into effect supposedly to benefit them. It gives them some voice in setting priorities. If the planners decide that they

want to move into a certain slum area and do something about a recreational park and the people there feel that they would much rather have the money spent on getting rid of rats or the garbage or whatever else it is, they will speak up and they will have some influence. They will have votes. They are not just an advisory committee somewhere that is ignored.

- Unfortunately, on our committee when we adopted the original poverty program, we had some discussion about this general language requiring maximum participation of the residents of an area to be served and did nothing to clarify it.

Some of us raised the question that this was ambiguous and would cause problems. It has caused problems all over this country. In the community action boards there has been almost continuous controversy. How many do you have to have? What is maximum feasible participation? In Chicago they said that the maximum feasible participation of the poor means that we will hire as many of the poor as we can as community representatives, and they do not have a single representative of the poor on the Chicago Community Action Board, selected by the poor. Mayor Daley takes the view of participation of the poor that he can select some people who are poor who will speak supposedly for the poor residents. Of course, they are accountable not to the poor residents of the area, but to Mayor Daley, or the other individual who has appointed him. As a result, you have none of this ferment. You have none of this involvement in the Chicago program. We have had such uneven administration in this program by Mr. Shriver that we have some areas that have been denied funds because they do not have enough involvement of the poor, while Chicago goes right on without a single true representative of the poor. This is just intolerable. We should have set this standard originally. We have the same kind of lack of fuller involvement in Los Angeles, Cleveland, Memphis, San Antonio, St. Louis, Atlanta, Albany, Mobile, Oakland, Chicago, as I have mentioned. Baltimore, Newark, and I could go on, as I am sure the chairman would agree with me.

It is time that we laid out clearly in the statute what we mean. I am very frank to say that a good proportion of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are on our committee have opposed this concept. They have been afraid of the concept. They have said "Let us not have poor people involved here on community action boards." I am delighted that we have reached the stage now where we can have an agreement and insist that they have at least one-third representation of the poor."

MR. SISK. I would like to ask the gentleman a few questions about this business of the poor. Lord knows, no politician is crazy enough to oppose the poor. We all talk about the poor. Frankly, some of us still claim to be poor. I would like to have from the gentleman his interpretation of what the poor are. We have had some problems on the community action program with reference to the representatives of the poor. What does the gentleman define a representative of the poor to be?"

MR. QUIE. The gentleman has put his finger on one of the most difficult problems we have, and that is understanding who is poor. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, when the debate began, so far we see the economic figure of \$3,000 or therabouts used for a family of four, but my amendment does not require anybody to take a pauper's oath or come in and declare he is poor to serve on a community action board.

What my amendment does, on number three, if there is a concentration of poverty in the city -- everybody recognizes that all large cities have such areas -- everyone in such an area would be able to take part in an election process or a neighborhood meeting, if they wanted to use that method, because practically everybody in such a community is poor. The amendment would require, however, an emphasis on participation by the people who are poor. In determining who the poor are in a rural area, people pretty well know who they are, and they would be invited into a neighborhood meeting."

MR. SISK. If I could cite the gentleman an illustration, we have a couple of areas in my district where we have had fights develop over who was going to be on the commission and so on. What brought about some of this was the fact that certain representatives of OEO claim that to qualify as poor the representative had to have an income below \$3,000 in order to serve. Does the gentleman interpret this to mean anything like that?"

MR. QUIE. No. What I am talking about in my amendment -- and I hope everyone will understand that -- there are representatives of the poor in a city. If in a certain area, there might be an attorney living, and the people who are poor wanted him to be a representative, he, himself, would not be poor, but he could be a representative of the poor, if they selected him."

MR. SISK. All right. I am inclined to go along with the interpretation of the gentleman. Unfortunately, we have had some people out running around and setting up regulations and trying to tell people how to organize these boards who do not agree with the interpretation of the gentleman. I want to see representatives of the people from areas that have these problems serve on these boards. I think this is excellent. When we go into a community and they have a problem and they select people, I do not wish to see some arbitrary figure set, and say that the representative himself, must have earned less than a stipulated amount.

I should merely like to make it clear that we are not here setting up some specific line -- whether it be \$3,000 or \$2,000 or \$4,000 -- to say that an individual, to serve on a commission, shall have an income level below that if he is going to represent the poor."

"I believe the gentleman said that was not his intent." 27

Mr. Powell of New York: Mr. Chairman, let us consider the District of Columbia antipoverty program. The District of Columbia United Planning Organization has 96 people in the poverty program that earn more than a million dollars involved, because some of them earn more than \$10,000.

This program is one of the worst in the country. Its supergrades total more than a million dollars.

I do not know why we should have to wait for the Appropriations Committee. We did not wait for the Appropriations Committee or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service when we just adopted the Green-Erlenborn amendment, which was adopted by a vote of 2 to 1.

I believe this is not retribution, at least not on my part, because I have been in the forefront of this fight from the very beginning. The 45 amendments to this act are constructive, from our side of the aisle, to make it a better act. One of them was the limitation on salaries. I believe this is a step forward.

Even if this is defeated--and I hope it will not be--at least I believe it will serve notice that steps should be taken to see that the money is not squandered on supergrade salaries. This is a program for the poor, and 1 out of 45 is getting a supergrade salary.

Mr. Broyhill of Virginia: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Broyhill of Virginia:

"Title XII--General Provisions"

"Sec. 1201. No part of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall be used to provide payments, assistance or services, in any form, with respect to any individual who--

"(1) incites, promotes, encourages, or carries on, or facilitates the incitement, promotion, encouragement, or carrying on of, a riot or other civil disturbance in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to preserve the peace of the community concerned or to protect the persons or property of residents of such community; or

"(2) assists, encourages, or instructs any person to commit or perform any act specified in paragraph (1)."

Mr. Broyhill of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to prohibit the payment of Federal funds under this act to any individual who incites, promotes, encourages, or carries on, or facilitates the incitement, promotion, encouragement, or carrying

on, of a riot or other civil disturbance in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to preserve the peace of the community or to protect the persons or property of residents therein. Such prohibition would also extend to persons who assist, encourage, instruct any other person to commit or perform such acts.

No government can survive, Mr. Chairman, if it finances its own destruction.

Lawful protest, Mr. Chairman, strengthens us; lawlessness destroys us.

If we aid those seeking to riot, finance those intent on destroying law and order, by providing them with funds from the very government which they are bent on destroying, we are fueling the fires of that destruction.

Lawful conduct is the cornerstone of our Constitutional privileges.

Officials of most duly established governing bodies, in their oaths of office, swear to protect and defend the Constitution of the U. S. and the local governments they serve.

Unlawful conduct, the denying of the use of public property whether it is a street or a place of business, a home or a church is a direct violation of constitutional rights and a stepping stone to anarchy.

We cannot tolerate this and remain free, and for this reason I urge the speedy adoption of this amendment.

Federal employees, and those paid by Federal funds, should not only obey the law, they should set an example for others to follow in obeying them. Unfortunately our streets are all too often filled these days and nights with individuals who are paid by Federal funds in one form or another.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, will relieve them of the burden of rioting or the burden of violating their sworn obligations to uphold the law. Either all of us must obey the law or none of us.

Mr. Chairman, as most of my colleagues know, a so-called action group based in Montgomery County, Maryland, known as ACCESS--Action Coordinating Committee To End Segregation in the Suburbs--has gained wide publicity in recent weeks by walking the circumferential highway protesting alleged discrimination in housing in Maryland and Virginia and has just announced its intention to spend 3 days over a weekend walking some 14 miles through my congressional district. All of us pray, Mr. Chairman, that no difficulty will erupt during this 3-day and 2-night march, but experience in Chicago and elsewhere has shown that the danger does exist.

For the past few weeks, ACCESS has chosen to protest against the Buckingham Apt. Development in Arlington, Va. But the Buckingham Apartment development has certainly not been the only victim of the actions of this group. Owners of almost every business establishment located within close proximity of the Buckingham Apartments have suffered severe business losses because the protesters, not restricting themselves to picketing the actual Buckingham rental office, have consistently refused to walk in areas where they will not prevent persons from entering other shops and businesses in the area.

Arlington police, responding to appeals from businessmen in the vicinity, asked the leaders of ACCESS to discuss what the problem was with them.

I am told that in response to a request to the cochairman of ACCESS, on Mr. Wm. N. Hobbs, that they refrain from interfering with the businesses having no connection with the controversy, Mr. Hobbs pointed his finger at a high ranking police officer and I quote:

*We intend to disrupt the Arlington businesses and the community as much as we can *** and the police department will protect us.

Mr. Wm. N. Hobbs is an administrative assistant, working in the Public Information Office of the United Planning Office in Wash., D. C., at a salary of \$7,770. He is also cochairman of ACCESS.

Also at the meeting with Arlington officials at which this threat was made, was Mr. John Robinson, the local project leader who acts as a community organizer for the Arlington division of UPO, at a salary of \$5,582. Also present was Mr. Alan McSurely, whose present title at UPO is that of training officer, but who was formerly director of suburban projects, and Mr. Robinson's supervisor, at a salary of \$12,600.

Mr. Buchanan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Broyhill amendment and congratulate the gentleman for offering it. There is certainly evidence which indicates the need for such a prohibition in the record of the OEO to date.

The Office of Economic Opportunity may, in fact, have some secrets which it would rather not reveal to the white light of public inspection. There are, indeed, some strange soldiers in the ranks of the battalions charged with the banishment of poverty.

There is mounting evidence of involvement of extremists and subversive elements in the antipoverty program, using tax money granted by the OEO for the eradication of poverty to achieve their own ends and advance their own philosophy.

It is no secret, however, that the Communist Party plans to infiltrate the poverty program's administrative groups. Listen to Henry Winston, a Communist spokesman, who outlined such strategy in a recent statement. He said:

Today, the Economic Opportunity Act contains a section (Title II) which calls for "maximum feasible participation" of the poor themselves in the fight against poverty. It has already become the basis for organizing struggles in the slums and ghetto communities, and it offers the point of departure for helping to rally the rank-and-file millions into a powerful mass movement which can in turn serve to strengthen the role of the trade union movement in the country.

The communists, by injecting themselves into the three major disruptive areas of the American scene today--the anti-Vietnam demonstrations, civil rights, and economic welfare struggles--have developed a coalition with which this Congress needs to be vitally concerned. The same Henry Winston who spoke of communistic exploitation of the poor in the previous quote admits:

The merger of the three major currents of struggle--for peace, civil rights, and economic welfare--can develop into a mighty anti-monopoly coalition. The Communist Party, despite all difficulties, has been a part of these struggles. It has contributed much to their advance and can help even more to advance this process of development in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I am not contending that the war on poverty has been captured by Communist or leftwing extremists. But this does appear to be the goal of the extremists in much the same fashion as the Communists tried--unsuccessfully--to take control of the labor union movement a generation ago. Most of the people engaged in the war on poverty are stable and dedicated Americans, I am sure. It is, I believe, their aim to uplift the Nation's poor, not exploit them. But, Nation's Business magazine observes that even though the OEO has now forbidden the hiring of employees suspected of disloyalty to the United States "the order did not require the firing of radicals now on the payroll."

Consider such instances in the San Francisco Bay area alone:

San Francisco: John Ross, a member of an official advisory board in the city poverty program was found to be a member of the Progressive Labor Party which the F. B. I. calls a communist group with allegiance to Red China.

Berkeley: Howard Harowitz, a member of the anti-poverty board, admitted he was a former member of the W.E.B. DuBois Club which has been declared by both the F.B.I. and the Justice Department as subversive. Commenting on the

fact that he resigned from the DuBois Club only because he left college, Harawitz stated, "I don't have any basic disagreement with them" (the DuBois Clubs).

Berkeley: A work study grant for "Turn Toward Peace" subsidizes an array of groups opposing U.S. Vietnam policy. The Executive Committee of TTP includes leaders of the Students for a Democratic Society, a top official of which traveled to Hanoi with left-leaning Yale Professor Staughton Lynd, and Hubert Aptheker, top marxist theoretician in the U.S. TTP brought to the University of California's Berkeley Campus Bayard Rustin, leftist civil rights leader and executive director of the War Registers League, for a program on civil disobedience.

Berkeley: Another work-study grant by the OEO subsidizes students working at a private school run by one Betty Halpern, who refused to tell the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1960 whether she was or had been a communist.

Washington, D. C.: A Nation's Business investigation of the anti-poverty program in our capital disclosed the presence on the payroll of a number of extremists of the political left with backgrounds in highly militant civil rights organizations, in ultra-left labor groups and in movements opposing the Administration's Vietnam policy. Some of the anti-poverty workers openly admitted they were Socialists, and mouthed the familiar repeated talks about shaking the power structure. After some racial unrest in the Burry Farms area, the frenzied crowd shouted, "We're going to blow this town wide open."

This past spring the OEO finally ordered:

Manifestation of disloyalty to the United States, membership in subversive organizations, or a lack of sympathy with the objectives of the OEO (are) inconsistent with employment in a community action program,

But, what about the Neighborhood Youth Corps and work-study grants? Why not apply the same order to these facets of the Economic Opportunity Act? Furthermore, the order is not retroactive and does not cover community action people already hired. That is like saying "if you already have Gus Hall, the head of the Communist Party U.S.A., on the payroll, it is all right. Just do not hire any more like him."

Mike Davidow wrote in the Worker last year as follows:

Stop the escalating war in Vietnam which threatens to put an end to the war on poverty. Compel the Johnson Administration to catch up with its "evangelical rhetoric: by shifting billions from its \$56 billion military budget to fight a real war on poverty.

Discussing the maneuver by Communists to plan and administer local anti-poverty projects, the Worker in a front page editorial stated:

It was because of the protests by the Negro people that Congress was forced to insert provisions in the anti-poverty law that would keep the political machines out and enlist the poverty victims themselves to the "maximum feasible" degree in planning and administering the local anti-poverty projects.

Among these "poverty victims" who would administer local anti-poverty projects, according to the Worker, are the Uptown Community Union of JOIN--Jobs or Income Now--and the Westside W.E.B. DuBois Freedom Center, both of Chicago.

The reputation of both these organizations is well known since the Justice Department has required the W.E.B. DuBois Club of America to register as a Communist-front organization and JOIN is the child of Students for a Democratic Society.

The New York project known as Mobilization for Youth--MFY-- is yet another example of the taxpayer-financed haven for extremists and subversives. The project predates the official war on poverty by some 3 years. It was launched by the late President Kennedy as the "pilot project for the war on poverty." MFY was enthusiastically described as "the most advanced program yet devised to combat juvenile delinquency on a broad scale." The project began with an original sum of more than \$12 million--\$8 million from Washington, \$2.8 million from New York City, and \$2 million from the Ford Foundation.

In July 1964, 1 month before the Economic Opportunity Act was passed, President Johnson gave MFY another Federal Grant of \$1.5 million.

Then in the fall of 1964, the New York Daily News charged that more than 37 MFY employees had subversive or Communist backgrounds. The administrator resigned, having misappropriated \$23,000 worth of agency funds, and it was learned that agency facilities had been used to foment school boycotts, rent strikes, and social disorders.

Later investigations by city, State, and Federal officials-- including the FBI--substantiated the earlier charge that there had been "wholesale penetration" of the MFY by Communists and other subversives.

According to Human Events, the following identified Communists were officially connected with MFY:

Mrs. Esther Gollobin, an identified member of the Communist Party, member of MFY Board of Directors.

Calvin Hicks: Communist Party member, Fair Play for Cuba, and Executive Secretary for the Monroe, N.C., Defense Committee, a cited Communist front.

Marc Schleifer: Editor of Robert F. Williams' book, Negroes With Guns, associated with the pro-Peking Progressive Labor movement.

Leroy McRae: member of the Socialist Workers Party.

Mrs. Constance Bart: a member of the Communist Party's Committee in New York.

By way of further incrimination, one of MFY's consultants proved to be none other than Jesse Gray, an identified Communist agent, who served the agency as a "rent strike expert consultant." Yet, despite the evidence against MFY, in July of 1965 the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee quietly approved a grant of \$6.5 million to MFY and other community action projects."

Ample evidence is also available to prove beyond any reasonable doubt that poverty funds are being used to finance violence and racial agitation, Mr. Speaker.

In 1965 the Office of Economic Opportunity gave Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited Associated Community Teams -- HARYOU-ACT -- \$40,000 to be used by the Harlem Black Arts Repertory Theater School. This tax-supported school is coached by the violence-preaching Negro playwright, Leroi Jones, who says:

I don't see anything wrong with hating white people. Harlem must be taken from the beast and gain its sovereignty as a black nation.

Leroi Jones once wrote:

The force we want is of 20 million spooks (Negroes) storming America with furious cries and unstoppable weapons. We want actual explosions and actual brutality.

Last March, 50 New York policemen raided the headquarters of the Black Arts Repertory Theater, founded as a community action program, at 109 West 130th Street in Harlem and discovered a rifle range, an arsenal of deadly weapons, a pipe bomb, sharpened meathooks, pistols, knives, clubs, and a cache of ammunition.

HARYOU-ACT has also given rise to a group known as the Five Percenters. They get their name from their belief that only 5 percent of the Negro race fully understands and supports their campaign for violent revolutionary change in our society. These Five Percenters, expertly trained in judo and karate, have terrorized large sections of Harlem boasting that they receive funds from HARYOU-ACT by blackmail and threatening to bring riots to the streets of New York unless they are paid off in antipoverty money.

It should be noted that the "Summary Report of the Investigative Task Force of the CEO Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the War on Poverty" makes the following reference to Haryou-ACT:

'The HARYOU-ACT program is a unique operation in that it is autonomous and acts independently of any other program in the area. Since the field visits to HARYOU-ACT by members of the Staff, charges of financial irregularities have been levelled against the agency. These charges are under investigation by the U.S. Department of Justice and the Office of the District Attorney of New York county. Therefore, further investigation by the Task Force have been postponed, pending the outcome of the above-mentioned investigations.'

Even in my own State of Alabama, there is evidence that a \$241,604 Federal OEO grant in Lowndes County was about to go to a division of the Black Panther Party known as the Lowndes County Christian Movement for Human Rights and headed by R.L. Strickland, one of the Black Panther leaders. Stokely Carmichael, that recent familiar riot fomenter, originated the Black Panthers before taking over the top job in the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. The OEO grant is presently under suspension pending an investigation into the charges.

This instance and similar ones could be avoided by more thorough investigation. Hugh Merrill, Birmingham News staff writer, writes that the Washington OEO officials did call the Atlanta office asking that the Lowndes County request for funds be investigated.

However, said Merrill:

'... all Washington wanted to know was whether Lowndes County needed money, how many migrant workers there were in the county, and what the area's population is.'

It is strange that no request was made that the sponsoring organization be checked out as to possible political affiliations, or who functions as its leaders.

The time for thorough investigation to be made into political affiliations and background of leadership is before, not after, the grant has been approved.

Such evidence as that submitted herewith makes it imperative for me to ask a thorough review and vigorous screening of present grantess and all future applicants and organizations to determine their loyalty to the United States of America and their sympathy with the intent of the program to alleviate poverty.

35

Loose administration of the program has apparently permitted outright subversive elements to use tax money to exploit the poor and to achieve their own political, economic, and social ends. Reformation of the war on poverty is long overdue.

We can ill afford the underwriting with our tax dollars of any pro-Communist or racial agitating group which purports to be fighting a war on poverty when all the while it may be fighting in America, exploiting the deserving poor, and misusing the very freedom for which our country stands.

"CAMBODIA ASSAILS U.S. IN ASSEMBLY"

October 18, 1966

Following is an excerpt from a statement by Huot Sambath, Cambodia's chief delegate to the United Nations in a speech attacking the United States' "invasion" of South Vietnam as more ferocious than any colonial conquest of the past century.

"In strongly worded criticism of United States racial attitudes, Mr. Sambath said American Negroes were 'fighting for their dignity and for their fundamental rights which are denied them.'

"He then questioned whether the United States would ever commit against the people of the white race 'atrocities such as those of which it is guilty every day in Vietnam.'

"Mr. Sambath declared that a 'very special' account of the war had been presented by the United States together with a proposed plan for peace. He then said:

"'We, the Cambodians, are better placed than anyone else to denounce before the representatives of the whole world, crimes that are the shame of all civilized countries. The only people responsible for the martyrdom of the Vietnamese people are /those of/ the United States, who will have to answer to history for their actions.'

"Mr. Sambath protested that the United States was talking of peace plans but was demanding the right to maintain a regime of its choice in Saigon. He called the recent elections for a constitution-drafting assembly in Vietnam 'a farce'."

(From the New York Times, 10/18/66, p.13)

Following is a copy of the article which SNCC Communications submitted for a Guest Editorial in RAMPARTS magazine: September 10, 1966, written by Ethel Minor.

WHITE POWER

The White Power Structure of America has finally removed the curtains of deception and hypocrisy which it has used the past 400 years to deceive and exploit black people. White power has shed the masquerade of democracy and freedom in the "land of the free and home of the brave," and made it clear that any real efforts of the black people to control their own destiny and obtain those basic human rights

of freedom, justice, self-preservation, and self-defense will be resisted by the white majority -- with force, if necessary. To tell it like it is, "Mr. Charley, in effect, has come out and said: "Nigger, this is a white country, we own it, control it, and if you try to change it, we will cut you down by any means necessary."

A most blatant example of this unmasking and display of white power can be seen in the reaction of the white establishment and their emissaries to the increasing militancy of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. Organized in 1960, SNCC's philosophy was then one of making the "American Dream" a reality for all through the use of non-violent direct action tactics.

Throughout five years of freedom rides, sit-ins, boycotts, marches, voter registration drives, special educational projects, and grass roots political projects (MFDP, Black Panther Parties, etc.), our staff and field workers were committed to a policy of tactical non-violence, whether or not the individual could accept it philosophically. Although the southern governors, senators and local politicians made no attempt to hide their scorn and hatred for what they termed "an invasion" by "outside agitators," their northern counterparts seemed to have praise for the young students who lived through the hall of countless beatings, jailings, and a constant reign of terror. The so-called white liberals of the North responded by pouring thousands of dollars into "the movement." After every church bombing, after every reported incident of brutality against civil rights workers, after every murder (especially if the victim was white) more liberal white consciences would be stirred and a little more financial support would flow in. Even the federal government posed as a friend of the "Negro Revolution." As long as SNCC operated in the south, where no one could deny there existed a rigid, brutal system of degrading and dehumanizing the black man and woman, and as long as SNCC remained non-violent in the face of brutally violent oppression, the white liberal, northern friend, and black bourgeoisie contributed enough to keep us going. But then something happened.

In the summer of 1964, a revolt of black people exploded in Harlem and other northern city ghettos, followed by the now famous white revolt in the summer of 1965. An analysis of the causes and grievances behind those revolts made it crystal clear that the "racial problem" was not confined to the rural south, that racism was not an isolated phenomenon peculiar to the south; it was, rather, a national policy of the United States -- an integral part of what is known as "the system."

In consideration of the fact that we live in a racist country, that conditions under which black people live (north and south) have not improved, in spite of the past decade of civil rights activity and civil rights bills, SNCC has been forced, during the past few years, to re-shape its thinking about the real nature of the problem facing us, and to develop a philosophy for implementing programs which will deal effectively and realistically with our dilemma. Since we have been powerless, in the past, to control our destiny and make effective changes in American society, we can only conclude that black

people must strive for some power -- or to state it simply -- Black Power -- which means that we black folk would then be able to move from a position of strength and power.

But this simple little phrase seems to have upset an awful lot of our former "white liberal friends" and "supporters," making one question whether or not they were ever our friends and supporters.

It is perfectly clear that throughout its history, this country has developed a thorough understanding (or Mis-understanding of the use of power). Power as accepted is thoroughly white. We can only conclude that the reaction to SNCC, is a reaction to Black -- organized Black Power.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Guatemala: Wiry, blue-eyed Luis Augusto Turcios Lima was not quite 19 years old when he joined a group of fellow officers in the Guatemalan Army in a barracks revolt against a corrupt government in 1960. The coup fizzled, but young Lieutenant Turcios never stopped rebelling. By last week, when he was killed in an auto crash outside Guatemala City, Turcios was the hottest Latin American guerrilla chief since Fidel Castro. From the Guatemalan capital, Newsweek's chief Latin American correspondent Milan J. Kubic cabled this report:

A child of Guatemala's tiny middle class, Luis Turcios first wanted to become a priest, then an army colonel and finally the leader of a civil war to turn his country into another Cuba. After the abortive barracks revolt six years ago, he fled to the mountains and helped another young officer, Lt. Marco Antonio Yon Sosa, found a guerrilla band called M-13. In April 1965, he left the Trotskyite Yon Sosa to set up his own Armed Forces of the Rebellion (FAR), the armed sector of Guatemala's Communist Labor Party. At the same time, a high-ranking party member named Claudio Cesar Montes left his law studies to become Turcios' chief aide.

Kidnapings: Hidden away in the heavily forested Sierra de las Minas of eastern Guatemala, Turcios's small band of twenty rapidly grew to 200 regulars plus an additional 800 "weekend warriors," many of them university students. Led by a cadre of Cuban-trained revolutionaries, FAR at first tested its mettle by ambushing army patrols and raiding small towns. Then beginning last winter FAR shocked the country by

kidnaping a number of prominent people in the streets of Guatemala City. The ransoms netted \$425,000 and FAR picked up thousands more in "protections payments" from terrified businessmen.

Turcios used his ill-gotten gains to smuggle in more weapons and pay his soldiers up to \$5 a day (compared with Guatemalan Army pay of \$10 a month) and to play the role of modern Robin Hood, robbing the rich to help the illiterate Indian campesinos.

To Turcios, the election of a moderate law professor Julio Cesar Mendez Montenegro as President of Guatemala did not change the situation at all. When the well-meaning Mendez offered an amnesty upon his inauguration last July 1, Turcios rejected it. "Our objective is to take power," he declared. The new President then turned to his security forces, only to find them virtually useless. Nearly 400 of the Guatemalan Army's 1,000 officers are chair-bound colonels, some of them illiterate. The result was a military stalemate.

Executions: Meantime, with every day that passed, Turcios grew bolder. He frequented Guatemala City dives and his picture was taken with a girl friend on a capital street. His men collected eighteen new cars from frightened auto dealers as a "contribution to the cause" and also "executed" four members of a right-wing political party.

At that, the coffee growers, bankers and businessmen who run Guatemala decided to fight back. Led by Mario Sandoval Alarcon, a pistol-packing landowner, they organized two terrorist groups supporting Turcios, compiled a list of 880 FAR members and threatened their relatives and friends. "All we are doing is what the Bible suggests--taking

an eye for an eye," Sandoval says.

When Turcios was killed last week, some rebels blamed Sandoval's terrorists, but a lone survivor, identified only as "Tita," insisted that the "auto accident" was just that. Despite a chill rain, some \$1,500 mourners attended Turcios's funeral in Guatemala City. FAR's only reaction to his death was to appoint his second in command, 25-year-old Cesar Montes, as the new guerrilla chief and to announce that the fight will go on."

YOU KNOW. JOE/Ray Durem

You know, Joe, it's a funny thing, Joe!
You worried most of your life about me,
Always afraid I'd get a job with you,
Always scared I might get served with you,
Paralyzed I'd wanna love your sister,
or that she might love me.

Didn't want me to eat with you,
scared I might sit with you,
but with that Atom Bomb, Joe,
looks like I'm gonna die with you!

Don't seem right, does it, Joe?
Ought to have a separate bomb for colored!

What do you think, is it too late
to make that A-bomb segregate?

One little change would suit me fine:
just add a big 'White Only' sign.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD-SENATE - October 3, 1966.....Madam Chiang Kai-Shek's Status in United States Questioned.

MR. FULRIGHT OF ARKANSAS: Mr. President, before I make a few remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an article entitled "Madam Chiang Urges United States to Halt Mao."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

MADAM CHIANG URGES UNITED STATES TO HALT MAO

Lincoln, Nebr.---Madame Chiang Kai-shek Thursday described America's foreign policy as projecting "an image of fear" and called upon the

United States to use its power to overthrow Red China.

The 70-year-old wife of Nationalist China's leader said this is the only way to stop the military expansion of Red China under Premier Mao Tse-tung.

"United States foreign policy conveys to neutrals, skeptics and fence-sitters as well as to the Chinese Communists an image of fear through using what might be described as timidity and techniques of 'push, pull, click, click' in dealing with the Communists," Madame Chiang said in an address at Nebraska Wesleyan University.

"There are two solutions to the problems facing Russia and the United States as well as Southeast Asia and ourselves: Bash in the door with overwhelming force so that all the rottenness will fall out of its own accord, or use the proper key and unlock the door that will be the beginning of the end for the inquisitorial Maoist orgies."

Madame Chiang was here to accept an honorary doctor of humane letters degree at a convocation at Nebraska Wesleyan. She is making a 1-year tour of the United States.

An unexpected protest walkout by a group of Wesleyan professors and students failed to materialize. A spokesman for the Methodist Church-sponsored college explained that attendance at the convocation was not compulsory. (end of article.)

Mr. Fulbright, This is an article reporting upon a speech by Madam Chiang Kai-shek in Lincoln, Nebr., calling upon the United States to use its power to overthrow Red China.

Mr. President, it seems most unusual to me--in fact, I do not know of any precedent--for the wife of a head of state of an important ally of this country to come to this country for a year, as the article indicates, seeking to influence directly a major foreign policy of this country.

I do not know what kind of visa Madam Chiang Kai-shek carries. I do not know under what auspices she comes, or whether the State Department requested her to come to help support its policies. I think it is very interesting. I would like the State Department to inform the public and the Senate the precise status of this very well known woman, who is the wife of the chief of state of one of our allies, and under what auspices she has come to seek to influence our foreign policy.

THE NEW LEFT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a new phenomenon has arisen on the American political scene and it is one which can no longer be ignored. No longer can we say that The New Left is simply a vociferous, activist minority, something to be truly concerned about, something which will fade away if we only pretend it does not exist.

"The New Left" may be a vociferous activist minority. But such minorities often influence events in a manner far out of proportion to their numbers. Revolutions are not made by disorganized majorities, but by tightly organized and committed minorities. We forget this lesson of history at our peril.

"The New Left", has in recent months made a formal entrance on the American political scene. The New Left candidates have challenged the seats held by incumbent Congressmen in many states. Dorothy Healy, a well-known West Coast Communist leader, polled more than 80,000 votes in Los Angeles and Herbert Aptheker, leading Communist theoretician, is running on a "peace and freedom" ticket for a congressional seat in New York City. The "New Left" with which we are faced is many things. In order to place it in a proper perspective it is essential that we understand its real nature. A significant aid in understanding it is an article by Dr. Milorad M. Drachkovitch, entitled "The New Left in the United States": a critical appraisal, which appears in the Spring 1966 issue of Western Politics, published at Stanford University.

One thing the New Left has proved to be is the possessor of a moral double standard. Dr. Drachkovitch states:

...by espousing the cause of Vietcong, they put themselves critically on the side, as Albert Camus used to say, of the "privileged executioners." They were ready to advance to excuse all the excesses of the revolutionary fury ("nuns will be raped and bureaucrats will be disembowled", said Carl Oglesby in his Washington speech, and absolved these atrocities as a "letting loose of outrageous pent up sometimes over centuries"), reserving moral opprobrium exclusively for the American side in the war.

Another important factor about the "New Left" is its willingness to work with Communist and to accept Communists as members of its organizations. The original Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society, for example, opposed communism. It said that--

As democrats we are in basic opposition to the Communist system. The Soviet Union as a system, rests on the total suppression of organized opposition, as well as a vision of the future in the name of which much human life has been sacrificed and numerous small and large denials of

human dignity rationalized.

But the 1965 Annual convention of the Students for a Democratic Society struck this antitotalitarian clause from its constitution. A policy of "non-exclusion" took its place, and full fledged cooperation with Communists became possible.

David McReynolds, himself a radical, has expressed his view of the "New Left" in these terms:

"The New Left" is nihilist, anti-American, courageous, anti-political, anti-ideological, oriented to spontaneity given to substituting moral cliches for political analysis, deeply moral and, yet, capable of profound unconscious dishonesty.

Dr. Drachkovitch does not underestimate the morality and virtue of many of the young people who participate in the various "new left" movements. Their rebellion, however, seems to be a rebellion "without a cause." They know that they want to change American society, but they do not know what they want to establish in its place. In this respect, the Communists stand ready with an answer. Dr. Drachkovitch concludes his unusually thoughtful analysis as follows:

A full spectrum of organized left-wing movements--from social democrats to "Maoists" is busy today trying to channel into politically and organizationally much more precise frameworks the energies of the elusive "new left". It would be futile to indulge in political forecasts. Shall we have, "in a year or two, everywhere" a new and powerful Communist Party, heralded by the new draft-program of the CPUSA; shall a revigorated social democratic movement emerge; shall the "Maoists" capture the imagination of the young insurgents; can the current fragmentation of leftist groups continue indefinitely? Only the future will tell.

I wish to share this article with my colleagues and ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

THE NEW LEFT IN THE UNITED STATES: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL

(by Milorad M. Drachkovitch)

"Much of left-wing thought is a kind of playing with fire by people who don't even know that fire is hot."

George Orwell.

"There are unhappy signs of a new populism of the left in which the old Narodnik illusions about the peasants are being applied to students and the poor."

Alasdair MacIntyre.

These last few years we have been witnessing a new phenomenon in American political and intellectual life which is usually termed the "new radicalism" or the emergence of a "New Left," and which, curiously enough, resembles the populist movement among the Russian "alienated" youth in the second part of the last century. In the 1860's and '70's, many among the educated people in Russia, belonging to the socially privileged classes, went to the people with consuming fervor and expectation that by making the peasants conscious of their abject material and moral situation, not only the feudal structure of Russian Tsarist autocracy would break, but a new, qualitatively superior, communalist society would emerge. Today, in America, on a much smaller scale but probably with no less intensity, hundreds of American students belonging by their social background to the privileged strata of society, go "to the people"--the most economically backward Negro regions of the south, or the slum areas elsewhere in the nation. Their idea is to organize the poor and underprivileged, to arouse their social consciousness, to build together with them the rudiments of a counter-society which by its justice and democracy will challenge the established order, ultimately destroy it and replace it by a morally and socially superior community.

Nineteenth century Russian with its prohibition of all public organization and public life and twentieth century America with its freedoms of assemblage, speech, organization, and dissent, are, of course, hardly comparable entities and the parallelism between the two populisms outlined in the preceding paragraphs should not be pushed too far. The critical point, however, is that a sizable part of the politically most engaged American feel today "alienated" from society and are rebelling against the "system" or the "Establishment" in all its basic institutional forms: political, educational, cultural. Moreover, the revolt of young American populists is characteristically spreading: from the "closed society" in Mississippi it engulfed the most open campus in Calif.; from the limited field of civil rights in one part of the country, it passed to assail the basic tenets of the country's foreign policy and then, with a sort of self-righteous fury, ended by attacking, or more correctly indicting the very foundations of American society.

It should be immediately added that the old, the conventional revolutionary force in this country, the organized and disciplined Communist movement, contributed little to the emergence of the "new radicalism" rather becoming in the process a sort of "fellow traveller."

It still tries, as will be seen later, not so much to capture the movement as to channel it in a direction which at a later stage should allow the party to assume leadership. In fact the ideological founding father of the new radicalism, the late C. Wright Mills, professor of Sociology at Columbia University, was a non-communist (though a vigorous anti-anti-communist) as is its most popular anti-establishmentarian today, the crypto-Anarchist writer Paul Goodman. Moreover while the Communists are essentially political revolutionaries and ideological monochordists, the new radicals are, or pretend to be, more versatile and protean: their "revolution" is much broader, for the concept of liberation is both social and individual, their claims for freedom are unlimited (the concept of unrestrained sexual freedom or sexual "rights" being one of the fundamental tenets of their faith), their methods of raising Cain and their cursing of the social status quo particularly shrill. It is little wonder, then, that the new radicals are often more vituperative than the Communists, and than in many instances the Communists appear tactically moderate in comparison with these obstreperous newcomers in left politics. One can say that for many new radicals the Communists are old hat sort of ideological squares, dull, and by their orthodoxy an inverted picture of the bourgeois world.

MULTIPLE ASPECTS OF THE "NEW LEFT"

The very character of the "New Left" is "elusive" as was obvious to any attentive listener at a conference on new radicalism organized recently at Stanford University. For the analytical purposes of this article, the phenomenon of the "New Left" will be illustrated by referring to its two most prominent and militant organizations: the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). The first group has distinguished itself by its struggle for multiple Negro emancipation in the South; the other has been most involved in "community" work in the slums and elsewhere in the country. Both groups, however, share a global interest in all the problems of the day, both nationally and internationally. It should be immediately added that since both of these organizations are not "monolithic" in the Communist sense of the term, and since--particularly in the SDS--there are members and groups with sharply divergent views on many questions, the analysis that follows cannot and does not pretend to cover all these shades of opinion. The attention, therefore, will be centered either on the official pronouncements of the organization, or on the statements and attitudes of its most prominent leaders.

In a similar vein, the purpose of this article is not to probe the motives, personal or social, which have prompted the participants in these organizations to commit themselves to the work they are doing. A high degree of idealism and a strong motivation characterize the new American radicals; without these qualities, they would not have become a noticeable social and political force, and would not have created the new political atmosphere on American campuses which influences many more students than the actual membership of the SNCC or SDS. Strong motives and personal idealism are, however, only one side of the coin. The other side consists of no less typical traits of the movement, which in the last analysis are or may be of greater significance. What we have in mind, and what is analyzed below, are the following three components of the professedly non-ideological activism of new radicals: (1) their negative and quasi-nihilist attitude towards the values and achievements of the American society and even of the Western civilization; (2) the utopianism of their goals and the extreme vagueness of their means; (3) their truly radical contempt for the political experience of the past, on both national and international levels. We will see, then, how the "old" left tends to capitalize on a movement which knows better what it rejects than what it would like to create.

A SOCIAL ORDER TO BE DESTROYED

The first official statement of the SDS, drafted by Thomas Hayden, founder of SDS, and adopted at the founding convention of the movement in Port Huron, Michigan, in June 1962, singled out two elements that had prompted a new generation of American students to pass "from silence to activism." One was "the permeating and victimizing fact of human degradation, symbolized by the Southern struggle against racial bigotry"; the other, the contradiction existing between the official peaceful intentions of the United States and "the economic and military investments in the Cold War status quo." The discovery, then, of the "hypocrisy of American ideals" came as a determinant of political alienation in a society found morally reprehensive.

This critical mood became in subsequent years increasingly morose and the dissatisfaction with the societal order and values more pronounced. The rebellion at Berkeley in the Fall of 1964 was its most spectacular expression. A year later, on November 27, 1965, before tens of thousands of peace marchers in Washington, D. C., Carl Oglesby made an impassioned speech linking casually "our anti-Communist

corporate liberalism" and its guilty prosecution of the war in Vietnam. The speech, which a reporter called "the electric moment of the afternoon" and an American "Maoist" publication chose for special reprinting, epitomized the entire phenomenon of the now head-on, frantic "insurgency" (Tom Hayden's word) of the new radicals against the American "system". The domestic struggle for liberation in the South and the struggle against the American efforts to defend freedom in Vietnam and throughout Southeast Asia, were fused into one whole; the common roots of injustice in the South and "imperialism" in Asia were to be found in the American economic and political establishment; the Cold War villain, not only in the present phase, but even from the outset, was the U. S. military-corporate order.

The war in Vietnam became indeed the catalyst of emotions and militancy of the "New Left." In distinction, however, from the usual critics of the Johnson Administration's policy, who argued for its change from the standpoints of realism, anti-globalism, neo-isolationism, pacifism, international morality, and so on, but who were aware of the ferocity and the Communist-dominated character of Vietcong, and behind them the threat of Maoist China, the new radicals chose to see in the Vietcong the bearers of an authentic revolution. Moreover, by espousing the cause of Vietcong, they put themselves uncritically on the side, as Albert Camus used to say, of the "privileged executioners." They were ready in advance to excuse all the excesses of the revolutionary fury ("nuns will be raped and bureaucrats will be disembowled," said Carl Oglesby in his Washington speech, and absolved these atrocities as a "letting loose of outrageous pent up sometimes over centuries"), reserving moral opprobrium exclusively for the American side in the war. In the same vein, in the statement on Vietnam, made on January 6, 1966, SNCC found no difference in the death of civil rights workers in the South and "the murder of people in Vietnam," and indicted in strongest possible terms the U. S. policy: "...our country's cry of 'preserve freedom in the world' is a hypocritical mask behind which it squashed liberation movements which are not bound and refuse to be bound by the expediency of the United States cold war policy." Likewise, in his Vietnam Day speech on the Berkeley campus, on May 21, 1965, Mario Savio saw in the Vietnam's National Liberation Front a counterpart to the Berkeley "Free Speech Movement, while Yale professor Stanton Lynd chose of all places, Hanoi (where he went illegally, earlier in January of this year, in the company of Thomas Hayden and Herbert Aptheker, chief theoretician of the United States Communist Party) to denounce U. S. barbarous aggression in Vietnam."

AN AMERICAN UTOPIA

The picture that emerges here is not only ideologically and politically confused, but the authoritative speakers of the "movement" are extremely vague and less than sanguine concerning their chances of success.

The Port Huron Statement, to start with one of the earliest declarations, hailed a new concept of "participatory democracy" had pledged for the SDS a struggle to "replace power rooted in possession, privilege, or circumstance, by power and uniqueness rooted in love, reflectiveness, reason, and creativity." One does not have to be a "new radical" to subscribe to the nobility of such a vision. But it is hardly enough to serve as a guide to concrete political, and still less, revolutionary action. Aware of the necessity to give to the Movement a firmer programmatic as well as sociological base and a more effective organizational strategy, the leaders of the SNCC and SDS, have been busy trying to find new concepts and build new vehicles of change. One expression of these preoccupations was the creation of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, which by its challenge to the regular Democratic Party delegation from Mississippi at the 1964 Democratic Convention, acquired national prominence. The election of a SNCC field secretary, Julian Bond, to the Georgia State Legislature in June, 1965 was another example and attempt to build new political bodies and to elect non-conventional political figures in opposition to all the existing channels of power, as well as to the organizations devoted to changing the status quo step by step. These include the older predominantly Negro civil rights movements, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People--NAACP, Congress of Racial Equality--CORE, etc.--indeed all the organizations which started the civil rights movement and have won the only real victories that have been won, gathered the only real mass force, and awakened the conscience of America on the race question.

An article entitled "The New Left" published in the December, 1965 issue of the theoretical journal of the Party, Political Affairs, formulated the preceding points with remarkable clarity and frankness. "America is being set on fire by its younger generation," exults the first sentence of the article. "All over the nation, young people are on the move, in the forefront of the progressive struggles of our time. The militancy and struggle have captured the imagination of the country, and their activities are the catalyst which will help liberate the immense forces for social changes that lie bubbling so very close to the surface."

These Americans are, in every sense of the word, the heroes of today; it is impossible to begin an article about them without a tribute and a salute. Generally speaking, they are called the "New Left." After analyzing the composition and fluidity of the "New Left" the article examines the basic views of the SNCC and SDS, the rejection of compromises and coalitions with mainstream political forces, and the concept of counter-community. Sympathetic to the motives behind these attitudes and ideas, the article frowns on the "New Left's" "distrust of all leaders of any kind, and rejection of any organization that is structured in any way." It obviously disapproves the trend within the "New Left" which it calls "a kind of personal, existentialist, socialism," and is not happy about another "special kind of romantic and emotional black nationalism" prominent in "New Left" thinking. In the classical tradition of Lenin's 1920 arguments against the "Left-wing Communist," those phrasemongers who did not grasp the essence of effective political warfare, the article reproaches the "New Left" for being reluctant to cooperate with the older civil rights groups, for withdrawing from the political life of the country, and for drawing abstractly the conclusion that all leadership is manipulative, and that any organization is in itself a negative thing.

The main theoretical, Marxist, critical point of the article is that the "New Left," being primarily a movement of middle class students and intellectuals, is unable to grasp the question of class, and therefore does not realize that it is the working class, the wage-earners, which is a growing and the most-revolutionary class in the United States.

My only prediction is that the present "rebellion without a cause" of the New Left will necessarily assume, in the near future, much more defined political contours, for better or for worse.

Finally, we at the universities, where the "New Left" was born, professors as well as students, will continue to face the metamorphoses and the challenge of the "alienated" in our midst. The minority of activists who have lost faith in the substance and form of our society and even civilization itself, are forcing the rest of us--to our benefit--to reexamine the values of that society and civilization, values many of us take for granted. It is to be hoped that the challenge of those who aspire to destroy this society will provoke an adequate response: the building of a coalition of people who, despite their variegated philosophical, social, and political beliefs, are ready to stand up and be counted in defense of an order and a civilization which, imperfect and in need of reform as they are, nevertheless represent the highest achievement of free men in history. This article is a modest contribution to this new commitment of the intellectuals.

(Reprint from Congressional Record/ October 7, 1966-by Mr. Dodd of Connecticut)

NASHVILLE REPORT: by

Porter Stewart/Director of Nashville's
SNCC Chapter

We have managed through personal funds to establish the residence of our headquarters at 10th and Herman Street for the month of October. However, to function properly and to carry out the aims of SNCC, we will need certain essentials as:

1. Telephone
2. Lights and heat
3. Transportation

However, we know that some of these essentials can be eliminated by asking for donations throughout the community.

We have established two chapters in Nashville, with coalition of A&I and Fisk's students. On State's campus, we have Bob Butler as Chairman and Fisk's campus, we have Roland Scott as Chairman. Fortunately, we have Mr. John O. Killens and Mr. Samuel Winbush as our advisors.

You might ask where do I come in. My primary aim was to organize the 10th and Herman Street Community. However, students from both campuses became interested in the work or organization that I am a part of. So, therefore, we established a SNCC chapter on both campuses and as a whole, the 10th and Herman Street community is the central location.

Henceforth, we will state our plans. The plans are to work with the deprived areas of Nashville. Some of the areas are in bad condition and we hope to be able to secure better living conditions for people living there. We would also like to mention that these homes aren't equipped with inside bathrooms or drinking water. So, therefore, this makes the living condition unsafe, unsanitary and against the law as stated under the Board of Health Code.

Since we have been working in the community, we have found that some people are contented and some discontented. Therefore, we have taken the position of trying to get the backing from the discontented people and then move forward to the contented ones.

Nashville-2

We have also been able to interest some fellows from the deprived community to do volunteer work with us.

As for now, we have given you all the information that we have at the present time. We are in dire need of transportation. In our next report, we intend to have more information about Nashville, Tennessee.

If you have any suggestions as to how we may further cooperate and carry out the objectives of our organization in its present state, please don't hesitate to offer them.

#

REPORT FROM "INNER CITY ORGANIZING COMMITTEE":

Dear Brothers:

The following is a copy of a wire that we sent to Floyd McKissick and Stokely Carmichael. We urge you to take a similar position and to encourage others in your community to do so and to let us know what actions you and other organizations in your community take. It is important that black militants keep in close contact with one another during this crisis.

Floyd McKissick
CCRE
38 Park Row
New York, New York

Stokely Carmichael
SNCC
360 Nelson St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

Roy Wilkins' nationally-syndicated column which appeared in the Detroit News of October 8 is in fact the definitive statement of the anti-Negro position which is now being hammered out by the bourgeois Negro leadership coalition to undermine the solidarity of black people and to repudiate the philosophy of Black Power. Wilkins' characterization of Negro rioters as "ignorant children" and "little monsters", his support of the organized society which has oppressed us for 400 years, and his reference to 400 years of oppression and discrimination as "tired defensiveness" invite and encourage the white backlash which is just white folks acting naturally. These Negro leaders are now leaning over so far backwards that they are making statements more anti-Negro than those spewing out of the mouths of Southern Congressmen. This kind of leadership is more dangerous to black people than lone Negroes striking out for freedom on ghetto streets.

Inner City Report-2

We are 100% in support of Black Power as defined by Stokely Carmichael and SNCC and Floyd McKissick and CORE, and the action taken by these other national organizations in no wise influences our continuing support of the philosophy of Black Power.

Inner City Organizing Committee
Albert B. Cleage Jr., Chairman
Van Cockrel, Vice-Chairman
7625 Linwood Ave.,
Detroit, Michigan 48206

(Below is a copy of the article which appeared in Roy Wilkin's recent nationally-syndicated column. Editor.)

ROY WILKINS SAYS (or "A Modern Tom Speaks")

NEGRO RIOTERS ARE
'IGNORANT CHILDREN'

Very soon the Negro must come to the moment of truth on the riots that have disgraced him in the summer of 1966. The great inarticulate body of Negro life that does not believe in riots has got to speak out because it is being hurt badly.

The rampaging kids have had their days and nights. They have thrown bricks, tossed their Molotov fire-bombs and posed for TV cameras with the loot they have stolen from stores they or their roving companions have wrecked. They have no shame. They have no knowledge of their race and its history, or of organized society and its processes of government.

They are ignorant children operating in grown-up land in the only way children can operate---loudly, obscenely and destructively. They think

as do children, that if they stamp their feet and scream long enough, the world will change.

Monsters and Saviors

Well, the world will change, just as it changes for all little monsters: it will cease to baby them and will allow the inexorable forces that are called into being by such conduct to function against the youngsters and their ethnic kind.

The curbstone saviors have had their day. The namecallers with the pat answers and the sweeping invective have strutted and spouted. The black pseudo-intellectuals have advanced their tortured theses.

The rabble-rousing speakers and the inciters to conflict and destruction have fired up and sent their gangs forth to bring back nothing except the mounting contempt and the firming anti-Negro determination of the majority.

COCA-COLA REPORT: BY Jack Minnis
SNCC Research Department

FIRST THE FACTS:

The Coca-Cola Company is an Atlanta based corporation which manufactures the syrup which is then sold, to various Coca-Cola bottling companies around the country. The bottling companies are usually owned locally and operate under various kinds of franchise agreements with the company for the bottling and sale of Coca-Cola, Fanta, Sprite and Tab. The company sells to jobbers who in turn sell it to soda fountains, cup machine operators, etc.

The company owns as subsidiaries, bottling companies in various places, but it does not own the Coca-Cola Bottling Company of New York. (More on that below)

The Coca-Cola Company also produces and sells Minute-Maid Frozen Citrus Juices, Snow Crop, Tip Top and Hi-C juices; Maryland Club, Butter-Nut, Fleetwood and Admiration Coffees; and Durcan Tea.

Sales of the juices and coffees are made through brokers to independent wholesale distributors, chain stores, and other direct-buying customers.

The Woodruff family (G. W. and Robert W.) of Atlanta are principal stockholders in the Coca Cola Company. They also own one of the largest plantations in Baker County, Georgia. In 1963, a Justice Department lawyer came down here to try to reason with the sheriff and registrars of Baker County about registering Negroes. The lawyer said that one of the first stops he made when he hit Georgia was the office of Robert W. Woodruff. He asked Woodruff to use his influence as one of Baker County's principal land-owners to secure some kind of agreement about Negro registration with the Baker County authorities. Woodruff, according to the lawyer, flatly refused to intervene in any way.

The Coca-Cola Company is the operating company which produces the items described above. Coca-Cola International Corporation is a holding company which owns, (at March 1, 1965):

6,529,680 shares of stock in the Coca-Cola Company.

This was 22.89% of the voting stock of the Coca-Cola Company and thus, apparent voting control.

Robert W. Woodruff is the son of Emily and Ernest Woodruff. The Emily and Earnest Woodruff Foundation (which is exempt from Federal Income Tax) owned, in 1960:

21,811 shares in Coca-Cola International Corp. This was 15.21% of the voting shares and doubtless constitutes voting control of the holding company which, of course, as above, controls the

operating company. Dividends paid by the Coca-Cola International Corp. on the stock owned by the Woodruff Foundation are, of course, exempt from Federal Income Tax. These dividends amount to between one and two million per year. Present market value of the stock is nearly \$45 million.

Coca-Cola Company has "plants and other important units" in Durban, Johannesburg and Pretoria, South Africa. It is very likely that the bottling and distribution of the beverages in South Africa are done by South African firms, though I have no proof of this at this time.

Robert W. Woodruff is a member of the Directors Advisory Council of Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York. This is the principal Morgan Commercial Bank. According to K. Nkrumah in "Neo-Colonialism" the Morgan interests are closely associated with Anglo-American Corp., Newmont Mining Corp., Engelhard Industries and other financial mining groups exploiting South African mineral resources.

I'm inclined to think a successful effort to inhibit the sales of Coca-Cola beverages would require a communications program of considerable magnitude; If it were undertaken with the general consuming public as the target. There might be more subtle ways of getting at the matter. It is doubtful that consumers are as attached to the coffees and the citrus juices as they are to the beverage, thus a campaign to inhibit the sales of the juices and the coffees might be easier, particularly since they are handled by independent wholesalers, who also handle many other products.

Too, a general campaign against soda fountains, drug stores, etc. which dispense Coca-Cola at the fountain might be given some thought. If people like those at Mt. Sinai, who control whether or not machines can be put on premises could be gotten to in sufficient numbers, the results would be serious -- dividend wise.

The Coca-Cola Bottling Company of New York, Inc. distributes and sells bottled Coca-Cola under exclusive franchise with Coca-Cola Company, in New York City, Buffalo, Trenton, Newark, Jersey City, Newburgh, Poughkeepsie and Bridgeport. It also bottles and distributes, Hires Root Beer in Metropolitan New York and in New Jersey except Asbury Park and Trenton areas. Also, they produce Veep soft drink, "Tab" low calorie soft drink and orange soda.

Stock of Coca-Cola Bottling Company of New York, Inc. is sold on the New York Stock Exchange, of course, so is the stock of Coca-Cola Company: Apparently stock of Coca-Cola International Corp. is not sold on the Exchange. Action against the Exchange and against the Bottling Company might be productive--more so than similar action against the Coca-Cola Company.

The annual stockholders meeting of the Bottling Company is usually held at 425 E. 34th Street, New York City.

The Directors of Coca-Cola Bottling Company of New York are:

James T. Murray - Chairman of the Board and President of the Company. Murray is a member of the law firm of Hayward, Jones, Nutt and Company. His office is listed as the same address as the Bottling Company. Murray is President and Treasurer of the Murray-MacDonald Foundation, Inc., which is located at 425 E. 34th Street, New York. It has assets of \$1,230,110. It lists its purpose as "Grants, primarily for Religion (Roman Catholic), especially for Welfare Programs, Home Missions and Programs Abroad."

Murray is also Chairman of the Charles E. Culpepper Foundation, Inc. of the same address as above. It lists its purpose as "Grants to Hospitals, Educational Institutions and for Scholarships."

Its assets are \$1,799,645. Murray himself is listed as the donor to the Murray-MacDonald Foundation and Charles E. Culpepper (Deceased) is listed as the donor to the Culpepper Foundation.

Burkett Miller whose address is 627 W. Brown Road, Lookout Mt., Tennessee is a member of the Chattanooga law firm of Miller, Martin, Hitching, Tipton and Lenihan. The firm is counsel for a number of large corporations including General Electric, Container Corporation of America, The Equitable Life Assurance Society, etc. The firm is also counsel for the Krystal restaurant chain which permitted the Klan to hold off would-be sitters at its Marietta Street location in Atlanta in 1963. Miller sits on the boards of Directors of Volunteer State Life Insurance Co., American National Bank and Trust Co. (assets: \$126,957,400) in which he owns 5,250 shares of stock (3% of shares outstanding); Miller is head of Tonya Memorial Foundation to which he is also principal donor. It has assets of \$325,103. It lists its purpose as "primarily local giving."

Thomas G. Anderson who lives at 6 Glendale Road, Harrison, New York, is a Vice-President of Chemical Bank & New York Trust Co., 1 E. 42nd St., New York

Frank M. Folsom lives at 480 Park Avenue, New York. Folsom is Chairman of the Executive Committee of Radio Corporation of America. He is also a Director of the following Corporation:

John P. Maguire Company	National Broadcasting Corp.
Whirlpool Corporation	Crown Cork & Seal Company
S. H. Kress Company	Schenley Industries, Inc.
General Cable Corp.	

Folsom is a trustee of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation which in 1960 owned 41.9% of the outstanding shares of S. H. Kress and Co. In 1963, Genesco Inc. bought up 94% of the outstanding shares of S. H. Kress and Co., in a share-purchase deal involving \$27 per share of Kress stock.

Therefore, presumably, now the Samuel H. Kress Foundation owns somewhere around \$25,000,000 of Genesco stock. Genesco is one of the largest retail and manufacturing operations in the world. It deals in shoes, apparel, notions, etc., and operates several hundred retail stores in this country and abroad. It recently acquired a carpet mill in Greenville, Mississippi. The Kress Foundation listed assets of \$28,000,000 in 1962. Its purpose is listed as "To promote the Moral, Physical and Mental Well-Being and Progress of the Human Race." Recent grants have been chiefly in the fields of the fine arts, education and health, particularly Medical Education and Hospitals.

Folsom is a trustee of the National Jewish Hospital (Denver), The Catholic Charities of New York, The National Catholic Community Service, St. Mary of the Woods College, Rosemont College and a member of the Advisory Council on Science and Engineering of the University of Notre Dame.

He was the Pope's permanent representative to the International Agency for Atomic Energy in 1957.

John Francis Power resides at 580 Park Avenue, New York. He is a partner in Eastman Dillion, Union Securities & Co., The Investment Banking House which handles financing for the Bottling Co.

Power is a Director of the Mission Development Company. That is a holding company through which J. Paul Getty (reputedly the world's richest man) controls the Tidewater Oil Company. Power is also a Director of the Consolidated Cigar Corp. which includes Dutch Masters, El Producto, Lovera, Headline, La Palina, Harvester, and Muriel Cigars; and the North Penn Gas Co. which distributes natural gas at retail in 52 communities in Northwestern Pennsylvania.

George L. Morrison of New Port, Rhode Island is also a Director of the General Coal Storage Co. and the Baltimore and Eastern Railroad, a subsidiary of the Pennsylvania RR. Morrison is a trustee of the Drexel Institute of Technology.

Other directors on whom we have no information at this time are:

E. P. Lewis

J. T. Leftwich and

B. V. Underwood.

THE UNTOUCHED BLACKS

The untouched blacks are those black brothers and sisters who feel they have made it into the "Great Society" or the "Accepted".

They have a house, cars, money to waste and talks about the other people (poor blacks).

They are the lost sheep.

They are not a part of this or that.

There objective is to please the white man
become white
talk white.

They are the first to sit at a newly integrated lunch counter.

They are the first to take the newly integrated jobs.

They are the first to go to the newly integrated school.

They are the first to run the newly integrated White House Conference

To talk about "Freedom".

Stop!

What have you done to drink from the Freedom Cup, my brother.

You are a disgrace to the black people. -- Samuel Young, Chaney, Goodman, Schwerner, etc.

You don't even know them.

Come out of there. You cannot represent me either.
Black man.

7-3-66

J. Brown