NOTES OF A DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE AGENDA FOR COFO MEETING

PRESENT: J.M. Collier, Mat Suarez, Mike Sayer, MacArthur Cotton, Jesse Harris, Oscar Chase, Mendy Samstein

1. Meeting should begin at 11:00 a.m.

2. a. Program
   a. Opening Remarks- Aaron Henry- Nature of COFO and purpose of this meeting (15 min.)
   b. Report on Freedom Vote Campaign- Bob Moses (15 min.)
   c. Report on state-wide staff meeting- Dave Dennis (10 min.)
   d. Organization of COFO (90 min.)

1. Following suggested structuring agreed on at Greenville with the supplements or amendments made at Jackson meetings (read point by point)

2. Permit amendments of these recommendations from the floor.

e. Finances - tabled till Bob M. and Dave D. return (15 min)

f. Programs

1. Wasserman (National Sharecroppers Fund)-- This should be a brief and simple outline of the various federal programs which are available. (Greater detail should be reserved for smaller meetings either on a district or county level. Mr. Wasserman can inform people when he will be available to attend such meetings.

2. Jesse Morris-- (Discussion of community centers and program for getting jobs from federally contracted companies with special emphasis on the NSA project.

3. Action Projects

1. Freedom Registration

2. Action around Johnson's inaugural

(Also discussed were plans for sending delegates to the National Conventions of the Dem. and Rep. parties and the running of candidates in the 1964 congressional election. It was agreed that these programs should be discussed at the next COFO meeting.)
was discussion of staging mass voter registration marches. It was generally agreed that no concentrated effort should be made at this time to hold such demonstrations, that if any take place they should arise out of locally planned decisions. Discussion centered on whether we are organizationally prepared at this time to make any strong push involving demonstrations. The opinion was expressed that more preparatory work had to be done to develop organization strength and to arouse the national conscience. It was agreed that a Selma-like demonstration at this time would not be effective enough and would at the same time seriously exhaust our resources (jailing of leaders and excessive bail). The creation of a crisis which would accomplish our objective, it was argued, had to be seen as a long-term proposition.

Finally, it was agreed to postpone discussion of a summer program involving Northern students to a future staff meeting. It was held that this involving the expansion of staff and at least initially was properly staff business.

**Future Program**—(This would involving very briefly outlining** political plans for this summer and fall: the election of delegates to national conventions and the running of congressional candidates.)

**Discussion of Organizational Structure**

1. There was considerable discussion of what the basis for membership in COFO should be. It was argued that COFO should develop as a membership organization rather than as a federation of local affiliates. Since the staff had officially voted to favor the latter, it was agreed that the whole issue should be brought up again and rehearsed at a future staff meeting.

2. It was agreed that we postpone discussion of the question of whether COFO should create an independent party, whether it ought to attempt to work within the existing parties through a political action arm, or whether COFO itself should be conceived as a political party for a future staff meeting. It was held that the staff should properly develop its own position before the question should be raised at a COFO meeting. Also it was agreed that more preparatory discussion on a local level of the question was needed.

3. It was felt that there should be two state committees, a state executive committee which would consist of five or so people
who would be the real decision-making body and a state committee which would be a larger body, made up of representatives from the districts, which would be essentially an advisory body. The executive committee would be comprised of full-time workers and would have the power to appoint standing committees to fulfill certain functions. These committees would be responsible in turn to the executive committee—and not to the state committee. Essentially, the state committee would be confined to passing resolution which, however, would not be binding on the executive committee.

Question: how would the executive committee be chosen and to whom would it be responsible: COFO or the staff?