

SNCC 28th Anniversary Conference: The Redemptive Community”: The Sit-Ins, the Freedom Rides, and the Birth of SNCC

We Shall Not Be Moved: The Life and Times of SNCC 1960 - 1966 Conference

Date: April 14, 1988

Location: Trinity College - Hartford, CT

Host:

[Jack Chatfield](#), Professor of American History, Trinity College

Performances:

Sparky Rucker

[Hollis Watkins](#)

Moderator:

[Julian Bond](#) (Atlanta Committee for Appeal on Human Rights, 1960-1961;

Director of Communications, SNCC 1962-1966;

Georgia House of Representatives, 1966-1974;

Georgia Senate, 1974-1987)

Panelists:

[Diane Nash](#) (Nashville Student Christian Movement, 1959-1960;

Coordinator, Freedom Rides, 1961;

Director, SNCC, 1961; Field Staff, SCLC, 1961-1965)

[James Forman](#), (Executive Secretary, SNCC, 1960-1966;

Author, The Making of Black Revolutionaries)

[Charles McDew](#) (Chairman, SNCC, 1960-1963)

[Bob Zellner](#) (Field Secretary, SNCC, 1961-1967)

Sparky Rucker: Music has always been a way that people have been able to express the problems that they've been having, and a way to join together. Without music—it's the glue that holds us all together—something that kind of makes us feel not afraid anymore. Many times during the movement, we were able to sing together at the mass meetings and on the line.

But you know, that wasn't the first time we started singing these songs. Some of these songs started way back. Let's go back a couple hundred years. Let's talk about people heading north to freedom by way of the Underground Railroad. One thing about these songs, they were meant to be sung together. This ain't TV, this is real life, living color.

[singing]

*Won't you get on board children,
Children, children, get on board little children, get on board children, children,
There's room for many-a-more ...*

Sparky Rucker: You know, I can do that verse forever till you learn it. We pretend I'm a broken record.

[singing]

*Won't you get on board children,
Get on board little children,
There's room for many-a-more...*

Sparky Rucker: A lot of us learned our musical trade during those times, and I know a lot of my experiences came from being on the picket lines down in my hometown of Knoxville, Tennessee, and spending some time down in Atlanta [GA] and over in Nashville [TN] during the freedom movement, working with groups like SCEF [[Southern Conference Educational Fund](#)] and SNCC and the—what is it?

Audience Member: Southern Folk Cultural Revival Project.

Sparky Rucker: Thank you. Southern Folk Cultural Revival Project. Boy ain't that a mouthful. But there were some of the people that would come South from the North to sing some of the songs, and some of the people from the South to sing the Southern songs to Southern people. Let them know you didn't have to go get Pete Seeger. You could just get old Reverend Brother Brown from down in Americus, Georgia. He's the man that taught me how to play this old bottleneck guitar.

A lot of those songs that we sang were songs that were the old slave songs, but we had to change them around a little bit. Songs like “Paul and Silas.” The old song used to say, “Keep your hands on the plow and hold on.” We said, “Shucks, man, they been trying to keep us down in the fields all this time. You know, maybe we better keep our eyes on the prize.”

[singing]

*Paul and Silas bound in jail,
Had no money for to go their bail.
Keep your eyes on that prize
Hold on, hold on...*

Sparky Rucker: Thank you. A couple of years ago, I had the privilege of doing a TV special for a strange network. The network now seems to be having trouble keeping priests from being defrocked—but it was for a show called *Catch the Spirit*. And you know, I got nothing wrong with catching the spirit as long as the right person out there pitching it—if you get what I'm saying.

There's a friend of mine named Bill Dale who wrote this song using as the chorus a very familiar song. We recorded this thing on Martin Luther King's birthday.

[singing]

*He preached about love and read from the Bible,
His words rang out like an old time revival.
He said, you will need courage,
But you do not need a gun.
We shall overcome...*

Jack Chatfield: Sparky Rucker. Is Diane Nash here? We all here? Julian? Where's Julian. I'm trying to find out who's in the room and whether we are ready to go or not.

I'd like to welcome everyone to the second event of our retrospective conference on the history of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee of the 1960s. For those of you who may not have been here this afternoon, I would like to make a couple of technical announcements about the lay of the land and what you can find in the lobby and things of this kind.

First thing I'd like to say—actually, something I forgot to say this afternoon—the conference brochures are, of course, spread through the area in the adjoining lobby, and we have plenty of them. There are some minor changes in the program—or one or two significant changes, actually. One of them was the scheduling of Sparky Rucker. Otherwise, the program is pretty much intact, but there is a revised schedule, which is available in Xeroxed form in the lobby.

Something I forgot to say this afternoon, the SNCC conference brochure is illustrated by some exceptionally fine photographs, which were taken by two photographers who are here today: Doug Harris, wearing the Grateful Dead sweatshirt.

Doug Harris: There's a lady in Brooklyn who swears that this is Africa.

Jack Chatfield:...tells me it's an African sweater. Doug Harris took the photograph of [Stokely Carmichael](#) during the voter registration drive in Lowndes County, Alabama in 1965. And it's appropriate to say at this time that news arrived last night via Martha Norman of Detroit, Michigan, that Mr. Carmichael—now Kwame Ture—is back in the United States. He was called back on business, and he'll be coming up on Friday evening, and he'll be on the Black Power panel on Saturday afternoon.

The couple of the other photographs we used in the brochure were taken by [Danny Lyon](#), who is a very well-known name, as is Doug Harris. Danny—this is Danny. Some of us wear ties now, Danny, but you're not required to do that. I thought that would get a laugh, but I'll move on to something else. There are some things you can't make jokes about.

In any event, a couple of technical announcements for Friends of SNCC who have come, in some cases, from very long distances, and for whom we have arranged free housing. After the panel is over, those who are hosting the Friends of SNCC and who are here will meet them in the lobby or in the adjoining lounge across the hall—so-called Alumni Lounge—and we will arrange to get people to the places where they're staying, either immediately after the program or eventually, after the program of socializing should occur.

There are a couple of other announcements. Tomorrow morning in this room at 9:15 a.m., Tom Hayden—who has decided to come long ago to come to this conference—will be conducting something of an informal discussion with students and interested people. And this will be in the Washington Room—everything is taking place here. Mr. Hayden's lecture-discussion will occupy the time, the hour or so before the first panel begins at—I hope I haven't forgotten the schedule here—10:30 in the morning. Just checking. Mr. Hayden will be in this room

At 12:15, in this room during the lunch break between the morning panel and the afternoon panel. Many of the former SNCC people would like to meet with interested Black students from this campus and from other campuses. That meeting will take place here, beginning at 12:15 and ending sometime before the mid-afternoon panel.

For those of you who plan to return to the conference tomorrow, I am informed that the Hartford Police Department—they did not speak to me directly—but I am informed that the Hartford Police Department may be towing cars—not ticketing cars, but towing cars—that are parked on the street. Not in the lots, but on the street. So I would avoid parking there if at all possible.

For those of you who do return tomorrow, there is a distant parking lot—but a large one—on that end of the campus, the corner of Vernon Street and Broad Street, and you may have to park there. Trinity has an ongoing parking crisis—not the major crisis it faces—but one, nonetheless.

Audience Member: Are they towing tonight?

Jack Chatfield: Are they towing tonight? Sounds like the title of a song. I don't know whether they're towing tonight. If I know anything about the Hartford Police Department, they stop towing at four o'clock in the afternoon.

On the table directly in the back of the room, there is a rich and lavish display put on by the people from the Institute for Southern Studies in Durham, North Carolina. *Southern Exposure* magazine—the magazine published by the Institute for Southern Studies—is going to produce an issue which will, which will be devoted—I guess much of it, 12 pages, I believe—will be devoted to this, to this conference. The people from *Southern Exposure* have brought other copies of their magazine, which are on sale in the back of the room. And we urge you to look at them.

I believe that concludes my announcements. Rather than infringe upon the panel which is about to follow, I would simply like to introduce, very briefly, a person who needs no introduction: Julian Bond, formerly of the Atlanta Committee for Appeal on Human Rights. Much has happened since those days. Julian.

Julian Bond: Thank you, Jack. This is the panel which will attempt to answer the essential SNCC question: Who authorized this meeting? Or actually, how did it all begin?

As [Howard Zinn](#) noted earlier this afternoon, there is an interconnectedness in the movement—not just from the period of beginning of SNCC until its end, but from the period shortly after the first slaves came to this country until today.

And it's interesting—a book published four years ago called *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement* details this connectedness, and surprisingly to me, at any rate, shows the essential role of the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] and NAACP youth chapters in helping to organize essential early sit-ins in several cities in North Carolina before the Greensboro sit-in in February of 1960.

It talks about the Baton Rouge bus boycott, the connectedness between the developer and leader of that boycott, Reverend T.J. Jemison—whose father was head of the National Baptist Convention. How Reverend Jemison was able to go to the Baptist Convention and tell the Reverend C.K. Steele of Tallahassee [FL] and another minister from New Orleans about what he had done in Baton Rouge, and how later he was able to share his experiences in Baton Rouge with Martin Luther King and Ralph Abernathy.

And so there is a long string of connected relationships in what the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee was able to do from its beginnings until its demise. And we hope that this evening we will be able to discuss these connections.

I'm going to follow the procedure established at the earlier program. We will have the presenters appear in order. Let me say that one of them, James Forman, called Jack a short while ago and said he was at the George Washington Bridge. We expect him sometime before the evening is over. So let us just begin in place, and I will introduce them, one at a time.

First is Diane Nash—member of the Nashville Student Christian Movement, 1959 to 1960, a coordinator of the Freedom Rides in [19]61, SNCC director in [19]61, a field staff member of SCLC [Southern Christian Leadership Conference] from [19]61 to [19]65, and Diane was many, many things to people in the movement. Diane Nash.

Diane Nash: I think history's most important function is to help us better cope with the present and the future. So in trying to think about what I could say to you about the redemptive community, the sit-ins, Freedom Rides, and the birth of SNCC in such a short period of time, I decided that I'd like to talk to you briefly about the philosophy behind the movement that drove the Civil Rights Movement in its very early stages.

Let me just mention several definitions for the word *redeem* that come right out of the Random House Dictionary: to redeem—to recover, as in a pawned watch; to discharge or fulfill a pledge or promise; to obtain release or restoration, as from captivity, by paying a ransom.

So we aspired in the [19]60s to the redeemed community—or, we frequently called it the Beloved Community—a community recovered or fulfilled in terms of a community that could become more of what its potential was. We frequently defined the beloved community as a community that gave to its citizens all that it could give, and allowed its members to then give back to the community all that it could.

Our goal was to reconcile, to really heal and to rehabilitate, to solve problems rather than to simply gain power over the opposition. And it really comes to the question of: Do you believe that human beings can be healed, can be rehabilitated?

It's very interesting to me that so many of the struggles for liberation in the world seek to create a beloved society—a society where human beings get along, where democracy is practiced, and where people better regard each other—that those struggling for liberation try to achieve these kinds of ends by killing people.

And in spite of the fact that efforts toward liberation struggle have been going on, really, for thousands of years, and each generation, many, many people across the world are involved in efforts toward liberation struggle. It's surprising to note, with all that effort and energy having

been expended for so long, that there are still relatively few places on Earth where the level of social, economic, and political liberation is very high.

So it pays, I think, to go back and look at our methods and see if it isn't possible to become more efficient in terms of how we struggle for liberation. I think that the philosophy behind the movement of the [19]60s was very special, very unique.

In terms of my own life, in the late [19]60s—whereas in the early [19]60s I had been very much dedicated to what we called nonviolence—in the late [19]60s, I decided that it was an impotent, probably ineffective, way to struggle for liberation. And I guess I felt that way for a few years, until I noticed that I hadn't killed anybody. I hadn't been to the rifle range. I hadn't blown up anything. And truly, I had done very little during that period of time where I had decided that violence was the way to go.

And I also noticed that the movement had not attracted large, large numbers of people in the kind of meaningful social action that it had attracted while we were using the philosophy of nonviolence.

Now, not only is there a connectedness as far as the historical periods of time, but also a connectedness worldwide. We really used the philosophy that Mohandas Gandhi developed in India. He called it *Satyagraha*, which is the Hindi word for “holding on to truth.”

And a young minister by the name of [James Lawson](#) had been to India, had spent some time in prison in this country because he was a conscientious objector—refused to go into the Korean War—but he had studied Gandhi's philosophy in India and brought that philosophy to Nashville [TN], where many of us who were students at the time attended workshops regularly and became very educated in the philosophy and the techniques that Gandhi used toward the independence of India from Great Britain.

I would just like to mention a few of the basic tenets underlying the philosophy. First, we took truth and love very seriously. We felt that in order to create a community where there was more love and more humaneness, it was necessary to use humaneness and love in terms of trying to get to that point—that ends do not justify means; that, as Gandhi said, everything is really a series of means.

We took truth very seriously. In fact, I guess this has been very important to me in living my whole life. I'm sure I've lived an entirely different kind of life as a result of having been exposed to the philosophy in those early years. Truth now, for me, has very little to do with being good or doing what's right. It's more relevant to me in terms of providing oneself and people around us with accurate information upon which to base our behavior and base our decisions.

That principle has been very well understood, I think, in the natural sciences. It's quite clear that when scientists are calculating their mathematical problems or conducting experiments, that they try to be as accurate and as truthful, if you will, as possible. I think that that might be one reason why, in the natural sciences, we're in the space age, and in the social sciences, we're in primitive stages.

Lying is institutionalized in our social relations. Countries lie to countries. The whole purpose of the CIA is to spy and to lie. And the FBI also. Governments of countries lie to the citizens. Male-female relationships—boyfriends lie to girlfriends, girlfriends to boyfriends, husbands and wives to each other. In our personal relationships, our governmental, economic, business relationships, we come to expect a great deal of untruth.

I think it's interesting to note also that lying is really an attempt to keep someone out of touch with reality. And that we also frequently use that same phrase to describe insanity. We say he or she who is insane is out of touch with reality.

I think another fundamental quality of the movement is that we used nonviolence as an expression of love and respect of the opposition, while noting that the person is never the enemy. The enemy is always attitudes such as racism or sexism, political systems that are unjust, economic systems that are unjust—some kind of system or attitude that oppresses, not the person himself or herself.

We had some illustrations of that, in that one of the managers in particular of a lunch counter in Nashville, who was the opposition the first year that we had sit-ins, became an ally the second year and was talking to managers of the restaurants that we were trying to desegregate the second year and kind of saying, “Well, I know how it is, you know. It sounds really difficult, but it's not so bad,” and was actually encouraging the managers to desegregate.

Another important tenet, I think, of the philosophy was recognizing that oppression always requires the participation of the oppressed. So then, rather than doing harm to the oppressor, another way to go is to identify your part in your own oppression and then withdraw your cooperation from the system of oppression. And guaranteed, if the oppressed withdraw their cooperation from their own oppression, the system of oppression cannot work.

An example of that would be the Montgomery Bus Boycott. For many years, Montgomery Blacks assumed that Alabama whites were segregating them on buses. But in order to have segregated buses, it was necessary for the Blacks to get on the bus, pay their fare, and then walk to the back of the bus.

When Montgomery Blacks decided that there weren't going to be segregated buses anymore, there were segregated buses no more. Didn't take any change on the parts of whites. When the Blacks decided, then there was no longer segregated buses.

So then you have to ask yourself the question: well, who was segregating the buses all of this time?

Now, I think there's a thin line between what's known as blaming the victim and identifying appropriate responsibility. And I think that when you do identify your own responsibility in an oppressive situation, then it puts you in a position of power. Because then you are able to withdraw your participation, and therefore end the system.

There is so much about the philosophy that people as a whole never knew, because it was just reported in newspapers—the fact that the demonstrators were not hitting back or not creating violence. But there were five steps in a process that we took a community through.

The first step was investigation, where we really did all the necessary research and analysis to totally understand the problem.

The second phase was education, where we educated our own constituency to what we had found out in our research.

The third stage was negotiation, where you really approach the opposition, let them know your position, and try to come to a solution.

The fourth stage was demonstration—where the purpose of demonstrations was to focus the attention of the community on the issue and on the injustice.

And then the last stage was resistance, where you really withdraw your support from the oppressive system. And during this stage would take place, things like boycotts, work stoppages, and non-support of the system.

I think I just about used up my time. But I think that the philosophy that started in Nashville, that was borrowed from India, that was the philosophy of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in its early days, has a great deal of merit.

Everything considered, there was a considerable amount of social change achieved. There were some deaths, a number of injuries. But in looking at the efficiency of that struggle and comparing the number of casualties, I think that the philosophy that Gandhi developed works. Appears to me to be more efficient than many violent struggles. And I would really urge you to do some studying of the history of nonviolence and some reading, perhaps, of how it works.

I think it's got great potential for today, and I think that we need to really get past, in this country today, the idea that going to the polls and voting is enough. I think we better take this country and its economics and politics into our own hands—we, the people. If we don't, we're going to lose more and more control of it, and therefore more and more control of our lives. And I think that nonviolence is certainly an approach that we should look into further.

Julian Bond: Thank you, Diane. Next is Charles McDew, who was the first chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee from 1960–1963, a native of Massillon, Ohio, described by Bob Moses as “a Black by birth, a Jew by choice, and a revolutionary by necessity”—Charles McDew.

Charles McDew: As Diane was speaking, just—as I’ve seen so many of you—there were so many memories that came flooding back. And one of the memories I had when Diane was speaking was when we—from Orangeburg, South Carolina—I was the chairman of the Orangeburg Movement for Civic Improvement—went to Raleigh for the first meeting that was to become the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

The meeting was called by SCLC. [Ella Baker](#) was the coordinator, and the one who called us all together. Because we really, in rural South Carolina, we didn’t know what this SCLC was about, but everybody we knew trusted Ella Baker. And so it gave the okay to go.

We went to Raleigh and there were these very elegant people from Nashville who understood the philosophy, who understood the reason behind it, [and] could talk about a redemptive community. And we knew, in Orangeburg, that we had been doing this nonviolent direct action strictly as a tactic, and we learned so much.

The Nashville people were very well versed. Jim Lawson, who was from my hometown, who knew about—from Massillon—and his activities, spent hours talking with us. But we still didn’t have a grasp of the concept as well as the people from Nashville did. And I have to say that that was a continuing sort of struggle within the organization—nonviolence as tactic versus nonviolence as a way of life.

I remember when we left Shaw—Raleigh—in that initial conference, and going back to South Carolina State in Orangeburg, and talking to people about rehabilitating white folks. And I remember an old man said to me, “It’s like rehabilitating housing. How are you gonna rehabilitate what ain’t never been [reha]bilitated?”

There were arguments. There were arguments that were constant about, how can you make a moral appeal in the midst of an amoral society? Not *immoral*, mind you—*amoral*—a society that had never accepted us as full citizens. And that was a constant. We had a small office down in Atlanta, and the arguments would go on forever. SNCC meetings went on for days and days and nights and nights.

I remember at one point we even talked about splitting the office. We had two rooms—on one side we were going to say “Student Nonviolent,” and there’d be a dove with an olive branch in its beak. And on the other door we’d have “Coordinating Committee,” and there’d be a male fist.

And we seriously talked about those things. As Diane mentioned, there was nothing under the sun that we did not consider as worthy of talking about. And if you came to consensus on something, then you would do it.

Many of us bear the scars today of meetings when somebody, after four nights of discussion, said, “We ought to go down and make a citizen’s arrest of the chief of police.” And we’d do it—and be whipped and put in jail.

But through it all—through all of the arguments, philosophical differences—we were, we called ourselves a Beloved Community, a band of brothers and sisters, a circle of trust. And we trusted that what we ultimately would do would be for the best of us and best for the movement.

A lot of people don’t realize when we finally sort of made SNCC a working organization—we were in the beginning really just coordinating by collecting information—we decided that in order to keep it going, some of us, some people, would have to drop out of school and work full time. I remember [\[Charles\] Sherrod](#), [Charlie Jones](#) and several others. And we decided one of the first things that we had to do was make ourselves knowledgeable about the system we were going to deal with.

We raised money. The first time we raised money was to educate ourselves. We held a seminar in Nashville. We brought in labor leaders, historians, psychiatrists, psychologists, people from the entertainment world. We brought in everybody who would talk to us about different aspects of the system that we were about to attack.

I think that’s important to understand that once we decided we were going to make our move, we felt we were making it with the widest possible knowledge and information.

And as I said, we talked about all sorts of things as being possible and desirable programs. We talked about taking over the NAACP. We said the NAACP was already organized. They had youth chapters. They had money. Let’s take them over. I remember we went to the NAACP convention that year—1961, in Minneapolis [MN]. We were going to try and get the votes to rule the NAACP.

We talked about taking over the [Southern Christian Leadership Conference](#). We said, “Sherrod can speak as well as the Lord.” These were serious considerations. In years afterwards, I used to sit down, we’d sit down, laugh, like with [\[Lawrence\] Guyot](#), and Julian, and say, “Wow. We were really bold.”

SNCC was bad. You said you were going to do something—we would do it. Just wild things. Because we really didn’t know exactly what we were going to do, but we knew we were going to change the face of America.

Another thing people don't realize—generally, we said we were going to do this in five years. Back then, Chairman Mao [Zedong] had his five-year plan for growth for China, and we talked in terms of five years. It was for a couple of reasons—several reasons. One, we felt that you only had five years to do it, and we should then disband the organization.

We talked about that. We said because if we go more than five years, or if we go without an understanding or feeling that the organization would be disbanded, we will run the risk of becoming institutionalized and spending more time trying to perpetuate the institution than having the freedom to act and to do. So we talked about, “In five years, that's it.”

And another thing was—we talked about, what are we going to tell our parents? That you're about to drop out of school? You could sort of placate them, if any, by saying, “You know, this is going to end at a specific time. Five years. Then I'll fall back to school.”

And the other thing we said was that we'd have to do it in five years because by the end of that term, you'd either be dead or crazy—that you could not bare your chest to that sword constantly without it taking its toll.

We were very serious and gave great thought to that. We knew—we'd seen people burn out, and it hadn't been five years, and we were seeing it already in a very brief time, that it was getting to you. It was getting to us all. So we set a time, and then we set about to put together a plan on how we were going to act.

It's important to understand what was said before about—we weren't always agreed on a nonviolent direct movement. [The Highlander \[Folk School\]](#) meeting was a highlight of that, where there was a split and very heated discussions about whether or not we were going to continue direct action—i.e., sit-ins and boycotts and the like—or also involve ourselves in voter registration.

We ultimately, after four days up in those mountains where the Beloved Community nearly fell apart—because everybody was arguing so passionately for what direction they felt SNCC should go in—we finally agreed that we would do both direct action and voter registration. Because we concluded that voter registration in Mississippi and Lowndes County, Alabama, was direct action.

We decided we would have a program—we called it, it was Diane's project. *Project MOM*. You do remember that—“Move on Mississippi?” We were going to move on Mississippi, both in direct action and political education and voter registration. And with those thoughts, we headed to McComb [MS].

I remember when we first went to Mississippi. Sherrod was in the car, Charlie Jones, and we stopped at the border, and there was a big sign that said, “The Knights of the Ku Klux Klan

Welcome You to Mississippi.” And we grew silent. And we were all very afraid. And we sort of knew that we were about to walk into the heart of the beast.

The memory of Emmett Till’s bloated body was still as fresh in our minds. We all remembered. Everybody at that time knew where they were when they saw the pictures of Emmett Till’s body. We knew what it was like in Greenwood [MS].

And to further sort of underscore what we were walking into—we stopped for gas, and Sherrod foolishly went to the bathroom, and as I recall, the owner escorted him out with a pistol. And we sort of felt—we are here. We are in Mississippi. We are in the heart of the beast.

When we made a move on Mississippi—one of the things, I know I was talking to [Tim Jenkins](#) about this later—was that one of the things you had to do was come to grips with your own mortality, with your own sense of mortality. There was a clear understanding—this ain’t fun and games. This is not going to be big demonstrations with lots of television cameras, with people around watching.

When we went to McComb, and when we went to [Amite \[County\]](#), and you out on those highways in the middle of the night, and it was dark, and you were frightened, you had to think that you would never live to see your home again. And once you dealt with that, it was a very freeing sort of situation.

I remember I dealt with it in McComb [the day they beat Bob \[Zellner\]](#). A quick aside: we had a demonstration—we were down in Mississippi educating people to vote. Hollis Watkins, Hollis and Curtis, high school students. Brenda Travis were asking us, “Do we have the right to go to the train station?”

We said, “Sure.” So they went—and they were arrested. Kicked out of school. The other kids said that they had to support them. Went on a march. We went along with them. And we were arrested.

And I remember—they were beating Bob Zellner and [Bob]Moses, and I tried to cover him. And later they took us down to a cell in the basement, and we didn’t know what was happening. That was one of the first times I thought Bob was dead—out of several other specific times I thought, “Well, they killed him.”

But they would come and take you out of the cells one by one, take you upstairs, and we’d all say goodbye to each other. And I remember—they’d taken me out of the cell in McComb and taken me upstairs, and I’m sitting on this bench thinking, *What am I doing here? I want to die. Is this really going to make the difference? Maybe I did the wrong thing. I hope I can be courageous when they do this.*

And as I was sitting there—and there was like 200 white men in the hall, letting them come—I suddenly was sort of snapped out of my thoughts, because there was somebody hitting me with a rope, slapping me across the face and saying, “Son of a bitch. You son of a bitch. You never marry my daughter. You never marry my daughter.”

And I thought, aw man. I don’t even know y’all little ass daughter. I realized that these people are really serious. This man is prepared to hit me with the rope, is prepared to kill me about somebody I’ll never know, who probably isn’t my type. And yet, they would kill me. And at that moment, I thought, this system, these people, have been so corrupted by their own beliefs that they are sick. And I too—we all—have an obligation to make them well, or to help make them well, as well as ourselves.

And at that point, I was really never afraid to face dying in the South again. And it happened that night in McComb. So it freed me up.

Because at the same time, that very, very next day, they arrested most of our people, most of the SNCC people, since we were all down on this big Move On Mississippi project. And we decided we had to leave McComb. But we had to leave a symbolic presence. We had to leave a symbolic presence.

We worked by consensus. Consensus was: you’re the chairman, it would be best that we leave the head of the organization. Well, I stayed. Everybody else left. And I remember going to the SNCC office the next morning. There’s a big sign that said, “SNCC done snuck.”

I took the sign down and sat in front of that little grocery store in Burglund where we had the office, and said we were open for business, and we were registering voters. It was always very important to us that we not give people the sense that we had deserted.

The night the kids were killed—[when \[Andrew\] Goodman, \[Michael\] Schwerner, and \[James\] Chaney were killed](#)—the first thing we did was send field workers back to Mississippi. And I can remember driving with Dorie Ladner and George Greene back to Natchez [MS] and how that felt.

One of the things I hope you get out of this conference—I know the rest of you, I mean the old SNCC people will—and when you see each other is a remembrance of how it felt, and how good it felt, that you left something behind. That we left something behind. For years, I felt that we failed. But now I really believe that we overcame a lot of things. Thank you.

Julian Bond: Thank you, Chuck. Next is John Robert Zellner—SNCC field secretary from 1961–1967, native of East Brewton, Alabama, the author of the soon-to-be-published *The Wrong Side of Murder Creek*. Bob Zellner.

Bob Zellner: Chuck has sort of gotten us into McComb. I had thought about starting a little earlier, but it's hard to follow McComb, so I'll have to get there quickly. That was one of my first introductions to Southern justice—the raw end of it—at least in McComb.

But I just want to read—since Julian gave me a little commercial plug on the book—if there are any publishers here, I'll meet with you afterwards. I'd like to just read just a little snippet of what I have about my first day in SNCC. I'll tell you later about how I got to SNCC, being a white Southerner, but most of you know the story anyway.

I just want to tell you how SNCC was the first day I got there. Because first of all, I thought that when I joined SNCC, I was joining a real going concern. It says in the book here:

I thought SNCC was the most exciting thing around. I'd been meeting them in passing here and there for a while, and now I was about to start working with them. I assumed that they were a going concern.

I had been told to get a room at the Atlanta YMCA [Young Men's Christian Association], which was right around the corner from the SNCC office on Auburn Avenue. I think it cost \$1.50 [\$16.06 in 2025] a night.

My father and some of his preacher friends had driven me over from Alabama on their way to a conference at Lake Junaluska in North Carolina.

I got my room with a little cot, put my things away, and went looking for the SNCC office. I finally found it. It was just one room—a tiny room, too. I knocked on the door, which was open, as a matter of fact.

There was one desk, and a light-skinned Black man was sitting there. I asked if this was the SNCC office, and he said, 'Why do you want to know?'

I said, 'I'm Bob Zellner, and I'm trying to find the SNCC office.'

He said, "Oh, okay. I've been expecting you. Come in."

It was Ed King, a young Black Kentucky State student who, at that time, was SNCC executive secretary, I think. He told me he was glad to see me.

Then I put a briefcase on the table and said, 'Here's the briefcase.'

I thought, 'Oh good, the briefcase.'

He said, 'You take this. It's got everything in it.'

I asked him what I should do with it, and he said, "Don't do anything. Just keep it."

He told me to be at the office at 7:30 every morning, to not leave before 5:00 p.m.

Then I asked him what time he would be there, and he said, “I’m not going to be here.”

I asked him where he was going to be, and he said, “I’m leaving.”

I asked when he was coming back, and he said, “I’m not coming back. I finished my job here, and I’m going back to school.”

I was beginning to wonder what was going on, so I asked him what I should do and if someone else would be coming in.

He said, “I’ve got no idea. Just be here in the morning, answer the phone, take messages. If you have any trouble, SCLC office is across the street. Someone will come eventually.”

That was it. He gave me the key, showed me how to lock up, and he was gone. I never saw him again. I don’t think to this day I’ve ever seen Ed again.

A few days later—maybe as much as a week—I was still alone in the office. People were calling from all over the place, and most of them wanted to know about Bob Moses. I later realized they were probably concerned about my accent—it was very Southern at that time.

I was filling up a padd—you say, how could it be worse—I was filling up a pad with messages and still carrying the briefcase with me to the YMCA every night and back to the office every morning. I kept wondering about the briefcase—and about Bob Moses.

One afternoon, I was sitting there, and suddenly, without a sound, a Black man was standing at the door.

He said, “Who are you?”

I thought, oh good—finally, a little action. I said, “I’m Bob Zellner. Who are you?”

He said, “I’m [James Forman](#).”

He came in, and I got up from behind the desk and offered him the chair. We always had that position in SNCC—no matter what they tell you about the whites taking over.

Well, the first thing I said was, “Here’s the briefcase.”

And he said, “Oh, the briefcase. What’s in it?”

I said, “I don’t know. I thought you would know.”

He said, “How would I know?”

So we opened up the briefcase, and there was every issue of SNCC's newspaper, *The Student Voice*, copies of leaflets, and the contact list. All of SNCC was in that briefcase.

Oh my God. In a little bit, Forman went out into the hall, brought back a suitcase and a great big tape recorder. He put it up on the table, put a mic in my face, and said, "I want to know everything about you from the time you were born till now."

I was very flattered, but I realized later that was Forman's little intimate way of practicing security.

But anyway, I could go on in that vein, but it was amazing, the way we were in those days in SNCC. You just—it was time to do something, you just did it.

McDew said that at one time, around that time, we spent a lot of time trying to figure out what we were going to do. Well, one thing that we were always doing—anytime we were trying to figure out what we were going to do—we were doing what we were doing. We were still doing those things.

So anyway, I still was very puzzled about Bob Moses, and I asked Forman, I said, "Who's Bob Moses?"

He said, "He's in Mississippi."

I said, "I didn't say where he was—I said, who is he?"

He said, "Don't worry. You'll meet him soon."

So that was September the 11th, 1961—my first day in the SNCC office. My first week in the SNCC office. And by October the 4th, the following month, I was in McComb, Mississippi. I was beaten and thrown in jail—the first time I was ever put in jail.

And thereafter, when constructing this book, it was fairly easy for the first five or six months of my SNCC tour, because one month I was beaten and arrested. I got out, rested up, and didn't go to jail the following month. But the month after that, I was in jail somewhere else. I remember McDew and I did some time in McComb—and not in McComb, but after McComb, in Baton Rouge. So that'll be a good chapter.

But I have to tell you a little bit about McComb, because everything in life has circles. But it didn't take us long to get to McComb, because it wasn't long after Forman got there that people filtered in, and then I began to learn what the ropes were.

My job, by the way—I was supposed to go and visit white campuses. I had been hired to be a campus traveler. And so I thought, well, you know, I need to keep up, more or less, with what's

going on. But I can't really get involved that much, because how am I going to go to Southern campuses?

So I asked Forman. I said, "What should I do? I need to know what's going on."

He said, "Well, why don't you come to the meeting in McComb?"

I thought that was reasonable enough, but I had no idea what it would mean. Because when I went to McComb for the meeting—lo and behold—we were meeting up in the top story there. And late in the afternoon, we heard a strange sound from far away.

We heard the sounds of "We Shall Overcome." It got closer and closer to the office. And then, in a little bit, the students were all streaming up the hall and got placards and everything. They were writing up placards, and they were going to march to Magnolia—actually, not even to McComb. They were going to march to the county courthouse in Magnolia.

And so everybody was getting ready, and the question was, well, who's going to go? And I said to myself, well, of course, I can't go. I've got to go to white Southern campuses. I don't want to get arrested, because then how can I ever get on campus?

And I said, plus, my parents are going to get in trouble. My mother is a schoolteacher—she'll lose her job. My father won't get to have a church anymore—he was a Methodist preacher. He's going to lose his job. And I said, plus, if I go, you know, I'm going to be the only white person. It might be more violence. So I'm glad I know that I can't go.

So, you know, nobody said anything—"You should go," "You shouldn't go," and so forth. But there was that feeling that came over me when somebody said, "Well, it's getting dark. We're going to go to Magnolia. We gotta go."

So down the stairs they went.

And all of a sudden, I said to myself, "What are you doing?"

I said, "Here are these kids in Mississippi. They are going to go and march—the first march ever like that in Mississippi." They were going to march with placards on October 4, 1961.

So I said to myself, "What's going to happen to them? What's going to happen to their parents?"

And everything paled into insignificance. And I said, "If I'm going to be a SNCCer, I gotta be a SNCCer."

I just fell in line, and away we went.

I think there was criticism later on, but I don't think I ever would have been a SNCCer if I hadn't done that. Because what SNCC was—when it was time to do it, you had to do it. And what had gotten me into SNCC in the first place was Diane Nash. And I had never met Diane Nash, but I had watched her on television.

And [John Lewis](#)—I hadn't met him, because he came to Montgomery on the Freedom Ride. And I visited him, and William Barbee, and Jim [James] Zwerg, and so forth in the hospital in Montgomery.

I was a civilian then. And I couldn't believe the level of fury that was coming from my people and what was happening. Also—I couldn't not get involved. I remember another thing that brought me to SNCC. There were the Freedom Rides, and there were the sit-ins.

But I remember that when the Freedom Rides came to Montgomery, I went down with some students from my college. And the thing that sticks vividly in my mind now about the Freedom Ride was—when, after everybody was beaten severely, some beaten nearly to death—the crowd gaily swept up the clothes and the books and burned them in the streets.

And I remember—like a movie—that was right near the bus station in Montgomery. There was a construction site, and there was three-quarter inch plywood as a fence there. And in that plywood was embedded...bricks. Bricks were stuck in the plywood. They had been thrown with such fury and such force—like a tornado.

So what happened to me was that I saw this happening. And I either had to completely give up, or I had to join. So the first very timid thing I did was, I went to an integrated meeting in Montgomery where some SNCC people were there.

And as a result of going to that meeting, the Klan burned crosses around my dormitory. I was called into the office of the Attorney General of the State of Alabama. And he said, "You've fallen under the Communist influence."

And I remember saying, "You mean there's Communists in Alabama?"

This was MacDonald Gallion—he wasn't too smart. But he said that, "Well, they don't live here, but they come through here."

And I think I remember several of them coming through there, right?

So he said—he gave me a list of names. And he said, "If any of these people contact you, you let me know immediately."

And he gave me a list of names. Diane and Carl Braden were at the top of the list. Clifford and Virginia Durr. Other people. And when I found out they actually lived in Alabama. He lied. Also,

it's very funny too, because a little while after I was put in the paper and asked to leave school for going to this integrated meeting, I got a call from [Anne Braden](#).

And I said, "Oh, here's the Communist."

And I got an invitation to come to dinner at Virginia and Clifford Durr's house in Montgomery. So the first time I'm meeting people that are on the right side, I said, "Well, if the Attorney General is against these people, they must be all right."

But anyway, that's what brought me to SNCC. And it's what brought us all to SNCC. It was a necessity, need, and you did what you had to do—when it had to be done.

Julian Bond: Thank you, Bob. Before we take questions from the audience here, let me go back through the panel and ask you each to respond very quickly, if you can, to one question. And let me start with you, Diane.

Diane, can you remember any single moment, as opposed to a series of influences, or a single moment or thing that changed you from just being a student at Fisk University to being an active participant in the movement that was going on—that triggered your movement from being a bystander to being a participant?

Diane Nash: Well, Julian, I was at Fisk University at the time, and after the first three or four weeks, I guess when the novelty of being in a new school wore off, I really started feeling unjustly limited by not being able to go downtown with a girlfriend and have lunch, even in someplace like Woolworth or Walgreens, and not being able to attend the movie theater in town.

I was really interested in—well, I was in college, and I thought this was really a time for me to be expanding and growing as a human being. So I started asking people around the campus, other students, if they knew of any organizations that were trying to do something about this.

Having been from Chicago [IL], which is very segregated, the public accommodations were not segregated, and I was quite outraged when I first encountered a "white" and "colored" sign at the restrooms at the Tennessee State Fair. And so I proceeded to ask students if they knew of anyone trying to do anything about it.

Interestingly enough, after asking many students—and after their not only telling me no, they didn't know of anything, but their response was kind of along—many of them along the line of, "And why are you trying to do anything? It's been this way a long time, and it's probably going to stay."

I really came to the further depressing conclusion that the Fisk students were really apathetic.

And then, of course, I did find out about the workshops that Jim Lawson was holding, and proceeded to go to them.

But frequently today, I hear people say students are apathetic. And I really doubt it, because I do some talking on college campuses, and there's always that one or two students that come up afterwards and say, "You know, I'd really like to do something meaningful with my life. Do you have any ideas?" or "What do you think about the Peace Corps?" or something like that.

And what happened with the students at Fisk that I thought were apathetic was that when there was a framework for them to move into—when you could say, "We're having a sit-in Tuesday morning at 10 o'clock, be at such-and-such a place"—they were there. And by the hundreds and thousands, they were on picket lines and sitting at lunch counters and going to jail. So it turned out that they were not apathetic after all.

And I think that if there is an ingredient that we in my generation have not provided—that I was fortunate enough that there was something provided for me to move into. And that is, that my generation has not provided a framework for youth today to move into and attempt to make necessary changes.

Julian Bond: Chuck, what about you? You're from Massillon, Ohio, down here in Orangeburg, South Carolina. What tipped you over?

Charles McDew: I never quite adjusted. My father had the idea, as many Black parents. One, that you should have the Black experience. You should go to a Black school where you see Black professionals, have a full social life.

And then Massillon—in Massillon, maybe 3,000 Black people in town. So when I was sent to South Carolina State, I had never seen segregated anything. And I just could not adjust. And so before I ever went home—I went down there in September, and by the time I went home for Thanksgiving or for Christmas, I'd been arrested three times.

First time in Sumter, South Carolina. [A] group of guys—we [were] stopped by police. I was driving and the police pulled me over. And I said, "You know, what's the problem, sport?"

[The] cop said—we talked for a while. Then he said, "Where are you from?"

I said, "Ohio. Why?"

He said, "They never taught you how to say yes sir or no sir up there?"

I said something like, "Aw man, you must be jack." And that's when I was tipped, because he broke my jaw. Hit me with his nightstick and broke my jaw.

I tried to fight back and was beaten bloody. One of the things that I kept thinking as I was being beaten was not so much about these two cops that were beating me, but the four other fellows who were standing there watching you being beaten and not helping. And I was saying, “I’m gonna kick your ass—each and every one of you.”

And I could not understand that—why they would do that, why they wouldn’t help. I understood later. But that night, I was beaten, jaw broke, and I was put in jail. When they got me out, bailed me out, I was put on a train to go from Sumter back to South Carolina State. Still with bloody clothes on.

This guy says, “Get on back to the colored car.”

I had never been on a train before. I’d been driven to the South by my parents. I had never been on any public accommodation.

And I said, “You know, I’m not gonna ride back there with caskets and dogs and all that sort of stuff. I paid for a ticket. I’m riding in the regular car.”

And I was back in jail.

And I was calling my parents, saying, “Get me out of here. These people are crazy. I’m not going to stay.”

And we sort of agreed that I’d have to stay through the end of the quarter—end of the semester—which fortunately ended in February.

And before that time, a group of people came and said, “Would you join us in this movement we’re going to start?”

And I said, “It’s your problem. Y’all gonna put up with what these white folks that’s your problem. I’m getting out.”

And as many of you know that have seen the thing—that I was reading the Torah. And there’s a part that says in the Torah:

“If I’m not for myself, who will be for me? If I’m for myself only, what am I? If not now, when?”

I gave that a lot of thought and decided, I cannot only be for myself. I cannot only just fight for my own dignity. If I’m ever going to do it, I’m having to deal with this now—because my father didn’t deal with it back then, and my children will have to deal with it later. So I might as well do it now. And that’s when I made the commitment.

Julian Bond: Now Bob, unlike the other two, you're white and a native Southerner. You grew up in the segregated system. What happened to you?

Bob Zellner: I already talked about that a little bit, so I'll take this opportunity to say what I want to say anyway. I will respond a little bit to that, though, because it's amazing how things change in 25 years.

Because now, it's a pleasure to speak to a group of people who have the knowledge that you have. Go speak to someone who only knows Martin Luther King and possibly Booker T. Washington. Speak to people who don't know anything that happened after 1945.

Now it's very difficult to get across to ordinary people now, especially young people, what it was like to be in the South in the [19]50s and the [19]60s. And some meetings where I go to and I say that I lived under a system of apartheid—of apartheid in the South—some people get mad. They say, "What do you mean? Here in the United States?"

And I said, "Exactly." That's the only way that some people now can understand the system that was in the South just 25 years ago—because they know the system in South Africa. They know what the name of the system is in South Africa. They may even know about the ANC [African National Congress] in South Africa. And when I talk about what happened to me, I can explain it to them a little bit if I say, "What would happen to a young white South African who joined the ANC?"

So it's sort of strange that our dialogue here, about what happened to us only 25 years ago in our own country, has to be explained in terms of what's happening somewhere else. But to me, that's the only way that I can do it.

Now, when I speak to college students—and Julian and I talk about this sometimes too—what do you do? We have flowers on today because we got up this morning. Jack Chatfield got us up bright and early this morning to go speak to a high school. And we must have had a couple thousand students at the high school.

And [June \[Johnson\]](#) and [James \[Lawson\]](#) and Julian and I went out there—I forgot, maybe somebody else—and it wasn't long before we had them on their feet. And we were singing "This Little Light of Mine," and we were talking the talk and walking the walk.

And Julian said at one time, "I think we can march them out of here."

And I said, "Right. Where are we going to go?"

Yeah. So that's really what I want to talk about right now. One of the things that SNCC gave us was a lifelong commitment to political action, to struggle. And each one of us are doing that in our own way.

I was recently—and I talked about this morning at the high school—one way I could relate to the students this morning was that I said, “I’m a businessman in New York now. But what I do is, I do political work.”

So I was able to take off two or three weeks before Super Tuesday and go South and organize for Jesse Jackson with white people. And I got a lot of stories about that, and I could tell you some funny stories about being a white person now and campaigning for Jesse in the South—because it’s totally different.

White people now will walk up to you and say, “You got any more of those Jesse Jackson buttons?” I mean, it’s practically unreal.

There are certain things that we can still march people off to. And I hope we’re all marching people off to things in our own way. I’m trying to participate, and we’re all trying to participate, I suppose, in some way in Jesse’s campaign. It comes from our movement. It *is* our campaign.

Another thing that we used to always do in SNCC meetings and SCEF meetings in the South—we’d want to know what was going on in the local community. What can we do if we get a bunch of people that are ready to march somewhere?

Well, there’s something happening here in Hartford right now that if we did get some people ready to march, there’s a place to march here. Because there’s a trial going on in this city and I’m ashamed to know that I don’t know very much about it. But I know right now there’s a trial going on in Hartford for the Puerto Rican freedom fighters. People who are in trouble because they intend to liberate themselves.¹

You remember how we used to say, “What’d so-and-so get arrested for?” “Well, he was tending to liberate himself.”

So the Puerto Rican freedom fighters are here in Hartford, and they’re being tried by our good friends—the FBI—and the federal government of the United States. So if you get an itch to march somewhere, let’s march over there and find out what’s happening with those brothers and sisters.

Julian Bond: Now, let’s open it up to those of you gathered here. If you have a question, I hope you’ll raise your hand, wait to be recognized, stand up, speak loudly and clearly, identify yourself, and make your question—longer than the explanation I’ve just given—shorter, rather, than the explanation. What about coming to this mic here? I guess you come to this mic. Anybody? Yes?

¹ This refers to the early 1980s trial in Hartford of Puerto Rican nationalists charged with seditious conspiracy, who framed their prosecution as political persecution for their role in the anti-colonial struggle to liberate Puerto Rico from U.S. control.

Audience Question: This is mostly directed to Ms. Nash. Ms. Nash, you were talking about a redemptive society. And in the early years, the redemptive society for SNCC worked. But once they started getting more Northerners and more whites in SNCC, the cultural differences seemed to abolish this redemptive society—this Beloved Community, this band of brothers in the circle of trust. And I was wondering if you thought that a band of brothers—

Diane Nash: And sisters.

Audience Question: And sisters, pardon me.

Diane Nash: What was the last part of your question?

Audience Member: A band of brothers and sisters can resist on a large scale?

Diane Nash: Yes, I certainly do. I would not say that the reason that the redemptive community idea seemed to dissipate as Northerners came in and more people came in—the reason wasn't that new people came in.

I think we did not devote enough time and energy into the education of the people coming in, to the same level as the people in Nashville, who had received really a great deal of education. In Nashville, we started the teaching process before the sit-ins began in Greensboro on February 1, so there was quite a bit of time for people to become well versed. But what happened was that we got involved in going to jail and organizing and what have you, and I think we did not devote enough time and energy into training new people.

When I first got exposed to the philosophy, I really didn't think it would work. And I had had a lot of training in it. But it was the only thing that was going on in Nashville that was trying to do something to combat the problem. And so I said, "Well, I'll go along with it." I really didn't think it would work.

It was only in the process of using it that I finally became convinced. I always had the feeling that many of the people from throughout the South—including a number of people who were in SNCC—probably did not understand it to the level that many of us did in Nashville. I think that education too...

Audience Question: I'm [indistinct] I've never heard of SNCC until Monday afternoon, when I read about this conference on the front page of the Living section of the *Hartford Courant*. And what I really want to know is, why do you think that so many young people have never heard of SNCC?

Because I've been here all day, and it sounds like you've really got a lot accomplished and everything. But all anybody under 20 or so has ever heard of about the Civil Rights Movement is

Martin Luther King. And I was wondering why you think that he's gotten kind of all the credit, and everybody else seems to have been forgotten.

Charles McDew: Anybody? The movement was always—I mean, Martin—Dr. King was the only person that could be identified. I remember even the people in SCLC that we admired most—like C.T. Vivian and [Fred] Shuttlesworth and those guys in SCLC—you never heard of, or would never hear.

I think that once the movement started to dissipate—and that was, as I said, there was—I know there was a feeling among most of us that this was not going to be a lifelong occupation, nor an organization that was going to continue to live. That it became easier for historians to identify the progress of that period with one person. And that was with Dr. King.

I don't think it was sort of a deliberate attempt to subvert—yes it was. It was a deliberate attempt to subvert history. One of the things that we were always criticized for—we would not turn away YPSL [Young People's Socialist League]. We would not turn away members of the Communist Party. We were a mixed bag of people.

It was said that we were uncontrollable, too demanding, too radical, and ultimately unacceptable. And we were unacceptable in the history of this country. That's why you haven't heard of us.

Diane Nash: I think it's deliberate too, to a certain extent. I think that if young people, especially today, knew that it was kids just like them—when they look around today and see things that need to be changed—instead of saying, “I wish we had a leader today like Martin Luther King was,” or something, they would ask themselves, “What can I do?” or “What can my roommate and I do?” I think it really subverts present and future efforts towards liberation.

I think it's kind of complicated too. For instance, because of our religion—I know this idea of the charismatic leader, starting with Jesus Christ—that somehow you have to go through Jesus to get to God.

You know, people being Christians, the paternalistic family, that children are raised to obey a father or obey a mother or obey an external, rather than to obey their own connection with God's morality and their conscience.

So people tend to be afraid to take on responsibility for their own lives. Many people really seek a father or a leader to tell them what to do. It's kind of a cold feeling when you finally face the fact that there's nobody out there to lead my life but me. And that's a considerable amount of responsibility.

I think that kind of mentality sometimes finds a benevolent figure or positive figure for a leader, like a Martin Luther King. But that same kind of place in the psyche will allow a Hitler to

emerge—a charismatic figure that seems to have the answers and that people tend to follow, instead of being their own leader.

[*INTERRUPTION*]

Bob Zellner: What I’m concerned about when people don’t know about our history. But we have watched the sainting of Martin Luther King. Martin Luther King has been made a saint of the movement, the way that Booker T. Washington was the saint before—the great Black leader.

Now, when they sanctify someone—when they, the power structure, the ruling class, whatever you want to call it—when they choose the leader of the Black people, the leader of the oppressed people, and so forth, and they sanctify that leader, they don’t even sanctify the whole leader.

Did you ever hear them talk about Martin’s economic program? Did you ever hear them talk about Martin taking a position against the war in Vietnam?

Now what we did at that time was—we felt that we were the ox, and we were dragging Martin Luther King along. I mean, people can’t imagine that kids dragged Martin Luther King along. And sometimes we felt we had him by the nape of the neck.

And listen, let’s get history straight. We called him, in private, “De Lawd,” right?

We were very irreverent. We were not reverent with that reverend. We weren’t reverent with any reverends. We were bodacious. We were bodacious to the maximum. We were kids, and we changed this country. We were kids, and we changed America.²

I remember in [19]64 going to the White House to visit “Ears” Johnson—that’s LBJ [Lyndon B. Johnson]—when we had lost three comrades in Mississippi. And I went with Rita Schwerner and Jim Forman and so forth to the White House.

And Mr. Johnson came in from one side of the room and came over and shook hands with everybody. Said, “I’m so glad to meet you, Mrs. Schwerner.”

And she said, “Well, I’m sorry, Mr. President, this is not a social call. We’ve come to talk about three missing people in Mississippi.

“We’ve come to talk about a search that we don’t think is being done seriously. We’ve come to talk about what we think is the shortcomings of the federal government in terms of protecting civil rights workers in Mississippi.”

² This passage captures the audacious spirit of young civil rights activists who saw themselves not as followers of Martin Luther King Jr., but as the driving force of the movement—challenging even revered leaders with irreverence and boldness as they helped transform American society.

And the President of our United States said, “I’m sorry you feel that way, Miss—” and turned on his heels and walked away.

And then we got a lecture from Pierre Salinger about, “You don’t talk to the President of the United States that way.”

And Rita Schwerner said, “We do. It wasn’t a social call. He wanted to make a social call out of it. We were here on something serious.”

So we were bodacious. We dragged Martin Luther King along. We dragged LBJ along. They sanctified LBJ. Look at the pictures. There’s LBJ, there’s Robert—BJ, I mean—Robert Kennedy, and there’s Martin Luther King. And SNCC dragged all of them along, kicking and screaming.

Not Martin so much, because sometimes Martin was willing to do what he had to do. And we don’t take anything away from Martin Luther King. And we don’t take anything away from JFK either. But those people were not saints. We had tremendous problems with those people.

Read the history of the [March on Washington](#) in [19]63. Read [John Lewis having to change his speech](#). You know, we were bodacious. And they were afraid of us because we were making great changes in this country.

But when they sanctify somebody, they leave out all that person. So they don’t even talk about Martin’s economic program. Martin was coming around on the war in Vietnam. He was coming around on the need for economic struggle. We had ended segregation in public places, and now people needed the money to buy the hamburger.

Audience Member [Amherst College]: I’m a student at Amherst College, and the Amherst crowd’s here, I have a question stemming from your comment about visiting Communists.

There’s been a lot—with the Southern governors like [Orval] Faubus and [George] Wallace—they said that it wasn’t really the Southern Blacks that were upset. It was outside agitators that came in and fomented all this anger and everything like that.

I’d like to ask you how you felt about that comment, and also the role that the white Northerners played, and how you felt about them wanting to come in and help out. I understand that there was a little bit of tension—wanting to keep it a Black movement, with Blacks organizing it and running it. So could you comment on the outside agitators and the white Northern influencers?

Charles McDew: He used to be the governor. The first time I ever heard the charge of an outside agitator—“Communitists coming in to foment this dissent”—if I could have turned red, I would have.

I said, “Look, Mr. Holmes, I will not stand here and have you insult my intelligence, and insult our intelligence, to suggest that we are so dumb as that we have to wait for somebody to come 10,000 miles to tell us that you, the government, and every social institution in this state has their foot on our neck.”

It is an insult to our intelligence to say that the Black people of this area do not know that they are being exploited and wronged. It is not an outside group that is agitating—although the agitation gets the wash clean. The thoughts that come are from people from here. And the other thing—except one incident—thought to suggest that.

And two—the whole thing about Northerners. We used to say that it’s a mistake to think that when state troops or the local police start cracking heads, they’ll say, “Show me your license.” And if your license says Connecticut or Illinois, “We’ll sit you over there and we won’t beat you.”

That once you joined yourself to the struggle, it made no difference where you came from. We faced a common enemy and a common problem. It made no difference that if you spoke with an accent that was from New York or Chicago, you faced a common battle.

One of the things we also talked about in the early days—it was necessary to have whites, because we did not want to, one, get into a movement that was going to polarize. And two—the thing that Diane spoke about earlier—is that we were concerned about the type of society we create after this is all over.

And we used to take the position that if you were—one of the only problems we used to have with Northerners, as a quick aside, is they would say, “Well, I have the plan for you. If you do this, you can get over, and all you have to do—Marx says, in *Slavery, Wage Theory of Organization*—if you do thus and so...”

We’d say, “Fine. Here’s what you do, sport. You know, we believe in your moral commitment. We believe in your political analysis. Put your body where your thoughts and passions are. Bring your body down here with us. And if you can, then, in Lowndes County or Augusta or Amite, sit out there and discuss the Manifesto and get these people to organize a rally, fine.”

But the important thing is—if you are prepared to bring your ideas, we’re prepared to let you try them out. But you have to come down here with us. So I don’t think—certainly in the early days—there was any fear or concern about Northerners coming down. We needed all the help we could ever get.

Julian Bond: Bob?

Bob Zellner: What?

Julian Bond: You remember that story I'm talking about. In that courthouse?

Bob Zellner: Yeah, but why don't you tell it?

Julian Bond: I don't remember it as well as you do.

Charles McDew: Both of y'all was members. Tell the story. Tell the story, brother.

Bob Zellner: Is that when, when the Danish writer was down—

Julian Bond: No, when he was in the courthouse, and this guy ran up and said something to him?

Bob Zellner: Oh yeah, in Talladega. This is the Talladega story. I don't ever have time to tell you the Talladega story. Real quick, real quick. But there was one time in the SNCC office that Talladega, Alabama—it was a Black college—had kept calling the SNCC office. "We need somebody over here. We need workshops. We're going to go sit in."

And so one day Forman said, "Zellner, go to Talladega."

And I said, "What am I going to do?"

He said, "Stay there until somebody gets there." He knew I had experience doing that.

So I went to Talladega, and nobody ever came. And so when I went to Talladega, I was SNCC man in Talladega.

So they said they were going to go ahead and start without anybody else. And so we started workshops and everything. And so sure enough, they started going down to the city square to integrate the lunch counters and everything.

So one day—I think this is the story that Julian's done—one day Big Jim Folsom, who you may not know who he is, but he was a great big, tall Alabama guy who had been governor a couple of times.

He was a moderate on the racial questions—that is, remained a white moderate. You know what a white moderate is. A white moderate, Southern moderate, is a white guy that'll hang you from a low tree. I mean, actually, Jim Folsom wasn't that bad. He was a pretty good guy.

One time he had Adam Clayton Powell—he came down to Montgomery to visit him—and he had Mr. Powell come over to the governor's mansion. And the word got out that he had been in the governor's mansion drinking scotch with Adam Clayton Powell.

And Jim Folsom went on television—that was when they first had television—and he said a lot had gotten out on him in Alabama, that he had gone to the mansion and drank scotch with Adam Clayton Powell. And he said, “Anybody knows me knows that’s not true. I can’t even drink scotch. I drink bourbon.”

So anyway, I was in Talladega. We were about to have a demonstration there, and Big Jim Folsom was going to have a rally right there in the city square at the courthouse.

And we said, “Well, should we go, or shouldn’t we go? You know, he’s not a bad guy and everything.”

But we said, “No, if we don’t go, we’ll be supporting him. And we can’t support him because he hasn’t really done anything for us, so we better go anyway and just pretend we didn’t know.”

So we went, and of course, the fire trucks were there and the dogs and everything. And it was a terrible mess. And Big Jim and all his people got chased into the courthouse.

And we had a reporter there named Pierre Lauzon—actually, he was in jail with us in Albany—and he went up under cover of the press to find out what Big Jim Folsom thought about this whole thing.

And he says, “Well,” he says, “As near as I can tell, it’s not really against me, but I think it’s all on account of that guy, Ralph Zellner”

Julian Bond: He said you’re with the Christian Communist Integrationists.

Bob Zellner: Oh yeah. With the Christian Nonviolent Communist Integration Organization,” which is almost like what my father called SNCC. My father was a Southern preacher and everything, and he said he thought we were the Non-Student Violating Uncoordinating Committee.

Audience Question: I have a question about the present. As a former college student and a former Black student leader, I would have to say that I agree that there is a general sense of apathy on college campuses, amongst students in general.

Beyond the absence of charismatic leadership, I would have to say there’s a general absence of a sense of urgency that I think that you would experience during your time.

Maybe I’m assuming, but I think—I can’t assume that much. I think there’s—well, I know there’s an absence of that sense. I would like one of you, or how many of you, to comment on the importance of that sense and the origins of its absence, perhaps.

Charles McDew: I think that you create a sense of urgency that grows out of an understanding of what's happening around you. I'm distressed—and have a sense of awareness—that you see people starving in the streets now. You didn't see that 25 years ago. You didn't see people sleeping on the ground. You didn't know that the infant mortality rate of Black youngsters is rising.

You gain a sense of urgency by understanding the systems that we have to deal with—that we all have to deal with. The misallocation of funds to armaments and war, and healthcare suffering as a result of it. The tremendous cost of education and how many people are going to suffer as a result of it. The muzzling of academic freedom. And what you can see—you create a sense of urgency. And what you can say about me—you create a sense of urgency out of an analysis of what is going on around you.

Audience Question: I'm from the [indistinct] rights project in New York City. And first, I want to say that you all are role models. And I've always really looked to SNCC—and just really, SNCC has a lot to do with the work I do.

I was born in 1961, so I was too young to be part of it. I wanted to say that part of what Bob said about apartheid—I want, in the work that I do with Black and Latin women who are homeless women—that there is apartheid.

And in New York City, there's bantustans called welfare hotels where people are living.³ And that for us, there really is a sense of emergency, because—and I know Alfredo Gonzalez just spoke earlier and talked about abandoned military camps—that the fact that there are people in the streets. And it is sort of a matter of trying to find who you get to come and who organizes and stuff like that.

One of the reasons I wanted to say that—all of us at the [indistinct] rights project would really appreciate your insight and your, you know, talent for organizing, for what we're doing. And somehow that we can talk to you about it—that would be really helpful.

And I also want to say that one of our organizers works with the Puerto Rican community against repression, and he called up and we're going to bring some literature tomorrow—so that people can find out more about what's going on with the Hartford 15 and the case there.

Diane Nash: With regard to the sense of urgency, I sometimes think that there is kind of a mass masochism that we're all suffering from right here. Just extreme things such as the fact that our water is poisoned, our air is being poisoned, the soil with toxic wastes.

³ The term "bantustans" in this context draws a powerful analogy between New York City's welfare hotels and the segregated homelands established under South Africa's apartheid regime.

We're eating foods with cancer-causing chemicals—all kinds of gross kind of things that are going on. And we read about them in the newspapers and maybe make a comment or two to each other—"Isn't that awful that they're doing this to us?"—and then we turn the page of the newspaper and go on off to work the next morning or to school the next morning. Tra-la—as though our life isn't being threatened.

You know, if you were about to eat, and I told you that the cook who was about to bring your food was in the next room poisoning your food, and you just proceeded to go on and eat it would be real clear that you were crazy.

And you know, all the social problems that we have right now—it's real clear to me that we're not acting in a psychologically healthy manner. I think one thing that we need to do—speaking of lying and the truth before—is stop lying to ourselves and really realize that our life is being threatened.

And that, like Chuck said a few minutes ago, if we don't take care of these problems, it means our children will have to, or our grandchildren will have to, or that we as Homo sapiens will be wiped off the face of this planet.

I've found that one of the most—well, that the only really effective approach to getting something done, the times that I have succeeded—when I've been the person that got a ball rolling—is to decide within myself that if nobody helps, if nobody else is going to do this project, I'm going to do it.

And if it takes 20 years or 50 years, I'm going to do that. I am going to accomplish this. And have the faith that the other people on the planet who are in the same position as I am will join me. And not expect that everyone will—and just decide what needs to be done, as best possible.

Maybe it means you need to go door to door, talk to people in your block, or people in your dormitory, or wherever you are, and people will join you. But taking that position of, "I'm going to do this. Will you do it with me?" is very different from coming to somebody and saying, "Such and such needs to be done. Let's do it," or "Somebody needs to do it."

I think the first thing is a decision within yourself to act. And then to go on and proceed, and people will join you.

[INTERRUPTION]

Julian Bond: We're almost at the end of our time. Yes, tell us who you are and—

Audience Comment: There'll be several things that have been said here, and to me, they all tie together. You know, this idea about what happened as community ended, how come Martin Luther King is only seen as a leader, etc., etc.

And I think a lot of that reflects the same thing, which is that in this country, you know, people don't look beyond the surface. And the surface, to a large extent, is what is portrayed to you over the mass media. And the mass media, most importantly, you know, [indistinct] people is television.

So what you hear about is Martin Luther King, and you don't hear about, all the people along the way who made those things possible. All the people in those, you know, caucuses in Mississippi, who made the Democratic Party—who changed meetings night after night, week after week, and made that movement strong.

And cumulatively, we end up with a feeling in the end from the media, because they keep saying what happened in the end: this movement died. You know, there's apathy on campus, etc., etc.

Meanwhile, there's all these other things happening in this country that were not happening 25 years ago. There's an environmental movement happening. You're having protest movements over every issue you can think about. People will pick up a placard and go out and demonstrate. And that is the result of the movement.

It doesn't have to be that SNCC went on ad infinitum. The fact that SNCC no longer existed after a certain point does not matter—the organization itself as an organization—it didn't matter if that continued. What mattered was that protest and opposition became a way of life and a way of thinking in this country.

And everybody who opposes—whether it's the water, whether it's nuclear power plants, whether it's a highway coming through your land, whether it's farm closings, plant closings, unemployment, housing, etc.—every one of those things are people who are continuing the struggle.

It's not true that this country has been—all of a sudden there was this big movement, because all the media went in on it—and now, all of a sudden, it's not there. All of a sudden, one day, they're going to say, “Oh, it happened again.” And everybody's supposed to turn around and say, “Where did it come from?” It's always been there.

You know, those people have been—just like I said earlier—there have been people all through the [19]20s and the [19]30s. We grew up hearing about the HUAC [House Un-American Activities Committee] movements and muzzling of all those people.

We didn't hear about the people who didn't hide, you know, who refused to answer those questions—the [Carl and Anne Braden](#) who kept their books and put them in their front hallway, so the first thing you saw when you walked in their door was those books.

We all grew up—I know I did in the [19]50s—thinking all these people went underneath their bed. So that wasn't true. And it isn't true that SNCC just died and all those feelings died. All the

things that have to do with dissent are related to what has happened in the past and are what's happening now.

Audience Question: Did you have any conflicts within the Black Negro community—specifically with somebody like George Schuyler, who was William [indistinct] favorite Negro.

You're talking about mass media—for those who don't remember him, Schuyler was a Black columnist. And maybe his name is being a former columnist for *The Pittsburgh Courier* 30 years after he was fired from the newspaper, he was going around to Birch Society meetings and to meetings that the Manchester Union Leader and other right-wing organizations were sponsoring. And if he wasn't, his daughter was. But they were extremely critical, specifically of Dr. King—and I think of the whole movement. I wondered if you had come in conflict with any of them—either with him or his disciples?

Charles McDew: [indistinct] One would not spend a lot of time dealing with Black people who were critical of the movement.

Julian Bond: And Schuyler is one of these people—and their number, thankfully, is not tremendously great—who had made the great shift from left to right, and felt it necessary, once on the right, to repudiate and condemn and destroy, if he could, all of his former colleagues on the left.

And sadly, his daughter, who was an accomplished pianist and concert artist, was drawn into this—I think probably a little against her will—but it was her father. What could she do? But as McDewg says, I think people, you know, considered the source. This guy was just, you know, way off the deep right hand, and not to be paid attention to.

Audience Question: Were there others like him?

Julian Bond: It was about their quisling [indistinct]...

Audience Comment: To add one thing to what that sister was saying before—the net effect of focusing on one large media presence and forgetting the mass of work and the continuity from year to year is to disable people and to give them a sense of not being able to act individually and not being able to act in a way that makes any difference.

I want to tell one story about that. Muhammad Kenyatta was very active and started a movement in Chester [PA]. And the way he started was he went downtown with a sign one day and started standing outside one of the stores downtown in Chester.

The sign said, “Don't buy where you can't work.” And he got arrested, knocked around, he got hassled—and went back, and people began to join him. The Chester movement is a very

important seedbed for lots of people—particularly later on in SDS [Students for a Democratic Society].

One of the lessons that I think people who were involved in that drew was the possibility of taking that individual action that really moved people. And that gave people the freedom and the sense of possibility to break out of what people call apathy.

One other thing in that respect—when we trace history back, we tend to do it in terms of these great figures. Martin Luther King got his ideas of nonviolence from Gandhi, who got them from [Henry David] Thoreau, right? Thoreau got his ideas from where? It was a commonplace of evangelical Christianity in the early 19th century to stand against laws that were evil.

Ten years before Thoreau, the women in the Women's Anti-Slavery Society, being attacked by a mob of well-dressed men in Boston [MA], stood up against them in a nonviolent manner. Angelina Grimké, twelve years before Thoreau wrote about the need to break the law if the law is evil.

If we get away from the notion that great ideas are transmitted by great minds through great people, and think about the work that goes on at every level, and the continuity of that work—what the sister Bailey's talking about—that is very liberating for all of us. I think it's extremely important to hold on to.

Audience Question: I'd like to direct this to Ms. Nash. You were talking about the future of the nonviolent movement. And I remember reading about Bobby Kennedy saying that one of the greatest helps to the movement was people like Bull Connor, and reading about [Laurie] Pritchett managing to basically defuse the nonviolent movement by understanding some of its tenets and working to mitigate those.

It seems to me that in recent years there have been many, many nonviolent demonstrations and the only one that most people have heard about is when the idiots on a munition train decided to liberate S. Brian Wilson from his legs.

Do you think that a nonviolent movement can work against a system that knows how to play the game—that understands the nonviolent movement like the system today does?

Diane Nash: Yes, I think that's true. One of the problems that we had was with the term “nonviolence,” because it means absence of violence. And that term does not really describe the process that I talked about before. Absence of violence is really just one aspect of it. But this is a whole very active program—a process that a community is taken through.

I think that the many demonstrations or efforts that are called nonviolent are, in terms of there being an absence of violence, but they are not using the whole spectrum of activities and preparation and withdrawal of support.

You have to really analyze what supports—what financial, what political, what PR, etc.—supports a nuclear industry, and how the people as a whole are participating, and draw in masses of people to withdraw that support.

So I think we haven't really totally been using the entire process of nonviolence. So even if the opposition understands it, and we understand it, I think we can prevail.

Julian Bond: Well, I see the old clock on the wall is telling me that Jack Chatfield probably wants to say something. We have more time? One or two more?

Audience Comment: Yes. My name is Marilyn. I'm a former SNCC worker. I just want to comment on what you said about nonviolence may not be working because you don't see a lot of it on television. In 1968 there was a Democratic Convention in Chicago in which the entire country watched American citizens being beaten bloody.

Well, the government told the networks at that point not to cover those types of events anymore, because it was too distressing for Americans to see that. And if you'll notice—I mean, anybody who's old enough can date from that convention forward—you have not seen things televised.

So just keep that in mind. I mean, there's been—the movement has continued. You just haven't seen it on television.

Diane Nash: [indistinct] understand that we are past the point of protest and attempting to show the government, or show the powers that be, that we don't like X, Y, or Z. I think we have to begin thinking of how we are going to solve it, and make the end of any demonstrations or efforts along that line be: what it is we are going to do.

For instance, if we object to the way the media is covering something, then we know that the media is controlled by the powers that be. It has very limited use to let the media or the government or whoever know that we don't like it. They know we don't like it already. The idea is, what do we need? And do it yourself. Take matters into your own hands and do it yourself.

Audience Member (Hampshire College): I'd like to say that there is a student movement alive on campuses. I'm a college student from Hampshire College of Amherst. On our campus—and at the University of Massachusetts—students. occupied buildings and demanded an end to the institutionalized racism that we see on campus.

And they have won all their demands. And there is much progress being made towards this end, and it's spreading now. It's gone up to Dartmouth and to MIT. So there is a student movement on campuses nationwide.

Julian Bond: I saw that impressive pro-alcohol protest.

Audience Comment: I'd like to thank Bob for what he said [indistinct]. I'd also like to say [indistinct] I'm on the support committee for the Hartford 15—and we desperately need, or urgently need, people to come down to the federal courts.

The last of the 15 is still not out on bail. He's been held for 32 months—longer than any other federal prisoner in history—because of the 1984 [indistinct]. He is now in the hospital as of Monday. Stress is extremely serious. We need people from Hartford, particularly, so that they know that we know what's going on. Thank you.

Hollis Watkins: I just want to respond to the question that was raised in reference to people that ridiculed our movement. As Chuck said, we just simply called them Uncle Toms. But we carried that much further than people that were speaking out against that movement.

We even gave the message to those that were not working with us. Many times when we gave the message, we said it verbally. And as all of you know, many times we gave the message in songs.

One of the songs that we sang—we asked the question:

"Which side are you on? Which side are you on?"

We made some special verses, and it goes like:

[singing]

*Which side are you on, boy?
Which side are you on, my Lordy?
Which side are you on, boy?
Which side are you on?*

Now, in Mississippi, this is what we said to the people:

[singing]

*They tell me in Mississippi,
No neutral have we met
You will either be a freedom fighter
Or a Tom for Ross Barnett*

*Which side are you on, boy?
Which side are you on, my Lordy?
Which side are you on, boy?
Which side are you on?*

Ross Barnett was a governor that vowed that it would be over his dead body all Blacks would enter into white schools in Mississippi.

Now, there was a verse similar for the folks down in Southwest Georgia. There was the chief of police down in Albany, Georgia, that was beating and putting the civil rights workers in jail.

And when we went to Albany, we said this:

[singing]

*They tell me in Albany,
No neutral have we met.
You will either be a freedom fighter
Or a Tom for Chief Pritchett, my Lordy*

*Which side are you on, boy?
Which side are you on, my Lordy?
Which side are you on, boy?
Which side are you on?*

Now, I want to direct this question to you. I'm going to ask you:

"Which side are you on?" And you'll let me know in regard to whether you sing the song along with us or not. And then I'll know which side you're on.

Now let's sing the verse one more time:

[singing]

*Which side are you on, boy?
Which side are you on, my Lordy?
Which side are you on, boy?
Which side are you on?*

*Don't listen to Ron Reagan
Don't listen to his lie,
For he will have those bombs falling
All in your eyes, my Lordy*

*Which side are you on, boy?
Which side are you on, my Lordy?
Which side are you on, boy?*

Which side are you on?

Julian Bond: Jack Chatfield has some announcements to close out the evening. Let me thank Bob Zellner, Diane Nash, Charles McDew, Hollis Watkins—thank you. Jack Chatfield.

Jack Chatfield: The man singing those songs was Hollis Watkins. And of the many memories which I carry from the Civil Rights Movement, one is a suggestive memory.

A group of us had driven from Albany, Georgia, through Chattanooga, as I remember, up to Nashville—driving all day and all night. So when we arrived, we were very bleary-eyed.

And when we came into Nashville to go to the conference at Fisk University, we parked in the parking lot and lined up in a row like military cars, or tanks, or armored vehicles—or a group of cars—all of them with Mississippi license plates. The middle of the beast. Walthall [County], Pike [County], Sunflower [County], Amite [County]. And I can still remember them. It's where I first met Hollis Watkins.

He'll be on the Mississippi panel tomorrow. Let me get the time—In the middle of the iceberg—3 o'clock in the afternoon.

I'd like to remind you that for those Friends of SNCC who are going to be arranging free housing, we're going to have a brief—at least a brief—meeting with the hosts in Alumni Lounge, those who are here.

Also like to remind you that at 9:15 in the morning, Mr. Tom Hayden, who has arrived and is ready to go, will be in this room for about an hour.

At 12:15, a meeting with some of the former SNCC people and Black students from Trinity College and elsewhere. Thank you very much.

Bob Zellner: Oh, Jack, could someone make the announcement that the singing will commence posthaste—right up front, right here.

Jack Chatfield: Singing will commence. Posthaste.

