

②      *see p 31*  
*H 2*

*P. 12*  
*17 WA C*  
*P. 28*

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee  
8 1/2 Raymond Street, N. W.  
Atlanta, Georgia, 30314

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SNCC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, December 27-31, 1963

I. Context of the Meeting: The executive committee of SNCC met in Atlanta during the four days at the end of 1963. The meeting was attended by the following members of the executive committee, whole or part time: John Lewis, James Forman, Courtland Cox, Gloria Richardson, Lester McKinnie, Marion Berry, Joan Trumpauer, Ella Baker, Howard Zinn, Willie Paul Berrien; by Project heads Bob Moses, Charles Sherrod, Reginald Robinson, William Hansen, Sam Shirah, and numerous other staff and ex-staff who were in Atlanta for this meeting, or for other reasons. The pattern followed was that of open discussion of whatever matter was before us for the first few days, followed by a closed executive committee in which final decisions and implementation was decided upon, based on the consensus of the larger meeting.

The meeting took place in Atlanta at the time of a developing protest of Dobbs House, Inc., restaurants, as a result of refusal of service at a Toddle House restaurant in Atlanta just before Christmas. During the time of the meeting demonstrations were being carried on at the restaurants in Atlanta, led by Dick Gregory and assisted by members of SNCC (since the local Committee on Appeal for Human Rights was away from School) and at times the entire group was present in Atlanta. The context of action provided a useful tension between action and thought and was the subject of much discussion during the course of the meeting.

Another part of the context of the meeting was the development of a community-oriented project in the section of Atlanta known as *Buttermilk Bottom*, being carried out by SNCC field secretaries. At times, the group participated in action in *Buttermilk Bottom* as well.

II. FIRST SESSION: Afternoon, December 27: *Buttermilk Bottom*, Agenda, Washington Project

The meeting began with a report by Reginald Robinson on what action was taking place in *Buttermilk Bottom*, relating it to the lunch counter demonstrations and calling for the active participation of the Executive Committee. Discussions followed in which the following points were made:

1. "Buttermilk Bottoms" (hard core slum areas) exist everywhere in the USA. If we are going to address ourselves to such areas, it must be comprehensively and not sporadically as we stumble into them. The root problem is unemployment, a national issue (Cox).
2. It is particularly bad for SNCC not to attempt anything here since this is the SNCC headquarters (Thelwell).
3. We need to handle a great many other problems first: the internal life of SNCC, e.g. money, staff, loss of old spirit, etc., before trying to undertake a national attack on the problem. This is why we are here (Sherrod).
4. Our perspective on these problems has to be: a) SNCC can't solve unemployment problems; b) solution lies with federal government; c) we cannot offer a comprehensive program, but unless we take action to disrupt the political scene to force action, nothing will happen (Cox).
5. The issue is not simply the Federal Government but the power structure of the society, which has to be approached at all levels. This full scale attack at all levels can be begun with the present SNCC structure, and not too drastic a re-examination of SNCC would be necessary (Thelwell).

Perhaps our Coordinating Committee structure is obsolete. Do we need a small policy making group, a legal advisory board to plan long range strategy? How do we handle education, both within and beyond SNCC--new staff? conferences? Perhaps we should begin making specific national demands such as a national economic planning commission.

What we must do is to use the specific happenings as a focal point of discussion of the broad questions at the base of the problem.

*Ella Baker* agreed with *Dr. Zinn*, feeling that we place too much value on action and not enough on planning, and suggested that we spend a good deal of our time discussing two or three aspects of what *Dr. Zinn* raised.

Other comments on this were made by several people, in general agreement. It was expressed that we ought to examine the assumptions behind SNCC's going into the rural areas to see whether they were still valid. Others felt we should discuss what is the root of the problem: not hatred, but power; and where we place the person-to-person relation, nonviolence, and religion in our work.

*John Lewis*, chairman of this session, asked for suggestions for the agenda. All suggestions were turned over to a committee composed of *Bob Moses*, *Courtland Cox*, *Charles Sherrod*, *Howard Zinn*, and *Doris Derby* for organization for the rest of the meeting.

**WASHINGTON DEMONSTRATION:** *Bill Mahoney* presented a proposal for a demonstration in Washington on February 1 around the issue of youth unemployment. The purposes were to be twofold: to bring the issue before the public, and to demand broad and effective legislation to change the situation. It was seen as a demonstration carried out by the Washington SNCC office, drawing upon Washington people, but with participation invited from other places. (A written proposal is available in the office.) Points in the discussion were:

1. ought to keep in mind the civil rights bill, and try to relate timing of the demonstration to the bill which has aspects relating to unemployment. (*Anna Hedgeman*) Perhaps should make it larger, more national, and later.
2. should consider some form of direct action in relation to it. Anniversary demonstrations per se don't mean very much--direct action in other places in conjunction with it might be a good idea (*Ivanhoe Donaldson*).
3. should see this as a broad demonstration, local but supported by demonstrations in other places, on the theme of "civil rights and employment" or "jobs and civil rights" and relate it also to the bill (*Jim Worman*). It is not our role to give final solutions to the unemployment problem, but to demand through noise and social dislocation. Arrests are not necessary in connection with that demand, more important to get many demonstrations.
4. demonstrations for middle class demands do nothing for the lower class. Must make sure not to become part of the black power structure and relate to lower class. Demonstrations in Raleigh have not expressed lower class demands (*Doug Harris*).

The matter of Washington demonstration was referred to the Executive Committee for action.

*Anna Hedgeman* of the National Council of Churches' Commission on Religion and Race, expressed thanks from the NCC for the SNCC workers who participated in travel for the Commission in five states in the Midwest. She said the church is beginning to move, thanks to the programs such as that Midwest travel. At the last General Assembly of the NCC they voted to support the discharge petition and are now working on plans for opposition to the expect-

The agenda was presented and approved. (Attached)

The discussion on economics was begun with a look at the local areas where we are working.

1. *Albany and Southwest Georgia: Charles Sherrod.* We work with people with out money- mostly on plantations or maids. There are no unions. Negroes are employed in small numbers in the factories. This affects our work directly, for without economic guarantees people are limited in participation in direct action. In more rural areas the problem is the small farmer. We believe that the solution may be cooperatives and have been working in that direction, but find problems similar to those of applying government programs. The problem of bypassing the local power structure. You need to have money to borrow money. At Koinonia there is a pecan factory which we might be able to take over and run next year, thereby protecting the jobs involved there. Additional comments by Phil Davis and Bob Cover: At present we are planning on setting up a development corporation rather than a cooperative for technical reasons, and are working on applying other governmental programs not automatically available to Negroes. The car pool that was set up after the bus line went out of business has been falling down and has been taken over by SNCC. It is hoped that eventually this may become a means to do union-type organizing among the maids, but this is just a hope at present. The boycott downtown can perhaps be measured by the fact that four stores have gone out of business. It seems that the stores are ready to discuss change but the city's commission is opposed.
2. *Mississippi: Bob Moses.* Throughout the south the small farmer is on the way out. The government estimates that a \$50,000 capital investment is needed today to realise \$3-4,000 net in farming, and seems to feel that the only hope for the small farmer is to salvage some of the small white farmers, abandoning the Negroes. And these people leaving the farms are not only unemployed, but largely unemployable. What can be done ?

At present in Mississippi we have a few experimental programs. In Ruleville there is a self-help project making quilts where women earn up to 30¢ an hour. In Amite County there is a possibility of a syrup-making project. We are trying to get government programs into the area, but there is opposition. Even though the local Negro citizens in Greenwood are prepared to put up their share of capital under the ARA program, it looks like the money probably will go to Mound Bayou. This is only one factory, employing up to 100 people, to be completed 5 years from now. So there is no help in that direction.

The programs of food and clothing are very important to the holding we are presently conducting. If we can guarantee food and clothing to people, they won't move north in search of support and we can organize them to act politically to force the kind of changes that must come. It is a question whether enough can be done soon enough to accomplish this.

We need to work further on specific things such as simple homes that people can build and national boycotts used effectively. The real question is whether we are going to organize to get out share of existing



jobs or whether we will go for something much more basic, the change to get enough jobs for all. To do this we do not have a clear idea yet of what it will take--simple estimates of how much is needed for retraining and education, e.g. farmers' \$15 billion, do not seem to be sufficiently worked out.

*Jim Forman* commented that we must make use of all these existing programs, at least try to expose the inadequacy of them. People are leaving the rural areas for the city not just in Mississippi but all over. We must use this to sharpen the issue of unemployment as a whole. This means we are going to have to get into the white community.

*Bill Mahoney* commented that the fact we have not mentioned unions is significant. Labor has never organized in the South, and most new industry heading South is anti-labor, escaping unions in the North. They are now beginning to carry out Southern organizing drives--the Teamsters, PWA, etc., are moving South. After the Washington Conference we talked with parts of the IUD but we must watch the unions we work with to make sure their whole program is progressive, and should work just with the progressive ones. He has been studying government programs for SNCC. They are a drop in the bucket, but whites are taking advantage of them and we ought to also: e.g. they are building a new space center in Mississippi, we should be part of the construction crews and staff.

*Jim Forman* expressed a desire for us to have some conferences on government programs, recognizing their limitations. We need to begin, especially on those which apply to our project areas.

*Chairman Courtland Cox* summarised the discussion as follows;

1. *Bob Moses* is describing a holding action doomed to failure.
2. *Charles Sherrrod* is talking about a pecan factory to employ a few hundred.
3. In the meantime there are 77 million people in poverty. Two questions follow: a) is there any realistic short range program for SNCC to work on? and b) if not, what kind of long range program will lead to full employment?

Reaction by *Frank Smith*: America experienced one possibility for an economic revolution in the 30s, but programs were developed to prevent the revolution. Today no stopgap or holding measures can keep people from leaving the farms, being unemployed, getting hot. The civil rights bill came about because people in northern cities demanded it. Not sure we want to operate a holding action in Mississippi, or for stopgap measures which buy off revolution. Let the people come together: perhaps we should take all the Negroes from the rural areas into the cities and force the revolution. Hungry people need to be massed to turn over the government. We need to get more hungry people. Don't fight automation or other measures which hasten the crisis.

*Bob Moses* responded that we don't have the answers: we don't know what terms such as "revolution" and "revamp the economy" mean. We need to take time out from action and study with some up-to-date people. The alternatives are not Russia and the USA. It may be that no one knows the answers to the technological revolution in which we are caught. Our political institutions are not geared to handle the pace of the present change.

*Dr. Howard Zinn* summarised the discussion as follows:

We know that we are not capable to cover the whole range of what we need. We need to enlist some of the best minds around in thought on reorganisation of society. SNCC is unique in that while we are in touch with the grass roots of society in a way in which most of these minds in academic pursuits are not, we know that working on the immediate problems will not accomplish the necessary change.

Special interest groups, e.g. farm and labor, will not do it. They stop working for the broad need once they meet their special needs. SNCC has no specific interest group which can be satisfied without solving the problems of the country as a whole. We are in the unique position of combining the vision of the long range need with roots in the local communities. America is rich and lucky--fantastic wealth, and the most wasteful economy in the world. We need:

- a) national economic planning for a full and rational allocation of the nation's resources. Many groups see this but are afraid to say it directly,
- b) an attack on the notion of the profit motive as a great god. It is that is ruining society, forcing all sorts of things on us because they are profitable. The "race" problem, where SNCC got its start, has emerged into a different and bigger issue;
- c) to work with people in short-range projects but at the same time to develop in them a long range revolutionary perspective.

Following this there was general discussion about a lack of knowledge of what an economic program might look like and where to begin to work. During the discussion the following points were made:

1. We definitely need the stopgap things to give us time to work out the long range programs (Marion Berry).
2. Part of the problem is that while there are cushions for whites caught in economic change, there are none for Negroes. The total economy can supply these. We need to make the demand strong enough to meet the need: redistribution today, jobs tomorrow. (Mike Thelwell)
3. We cannot just ask for revolution: must channel demand in meaningful ways. Need to see the difference between social work and social change. What we want is the latter and need to keep a perspective of working ourselves out of a job eventually (Stokely Carmichael).
4. Must be careful of falling into the system: e.g. with foundations, as happened with foundation control of voter registration. The government's most reactionary responses in recent years have been in regard to economic matters: e.g. anti-strike actions. Perhaps what we need on Feb. 1 is not a demonstration but a general strike (Frank Smith).
5. We need to tell people, as we conduct that holding operation, that the system needs to go. This means that the holding operation may eventually become almost physical: e.g. marching on grain storage bins. We do not yet though know how to get to the system we want (Ivanhoe Donaldson).
6. The only way to make the unemployed aware is to organise the unemployed and sit on their doorsteps. We need to work on several different levels: need to work at education of staff on economic organization on the one hand; on the other, continue with programs of mass action, organising people, development of leadership. But what will change is the nature of the demand, what people are organising for. Food and clothing is an organising technique--given to those involved. But also a real test of whether social change can also be humanitarian (Bob Moses).
7. Be careful how we use such terms as "revolution" and "overturn government"--they are loaded in the mind of people. Can work at what you want to do without calling it this. Strongly affects public image. Be concrete, specific (Jim Monson).
8. We really must be careful of terminology. Slogans not needed to be militant. We delude ourselves when we use them because it clouds our inability to face concrete reality of what is needed (Cox and Forman).
9. In line with this need for education, plans have been worked out for four persons from Mississippi to do a work study program at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington next semester (Stokely Carmichael).

Ella Baker expressed the consensus of the group, that SNCC develop a formal program of economic education for its staff.



IV. THIRD SESSION: Morning, December 28- Political Program-  
Stokely Carmichael presiding.

The discussion began by discussion of voter registration in various local areas. Selma was presented by Worth Long.

We have had an intensive campaign in Selma aimed entirely at voter registration. We found ways to mobilise in the Negro community and have sent as many as 40 persons a day down, but they are not getting registered because the board has been using the registration form as an examination and is not passing Negroes even though under federal injunction not to do this. Selma is in the 4th Congressional District, and there are enough people in this district to elect a Negro state senator, though they are not registered. The federal government has filed a suit in Wilcox County, and if the Justice Department were really to help, there could be a political breakthrough. We need further discussion of possibilities such as that.

Jim Forman also commented on Selma: It is a followup to Greenwood, where the legal principle was established of the right to assemble, picket, etc. for voter registration specifically, under the Civil Rights Act. Selma was an aggressive *One Man-One Vote!* campaign, aimed at exposing to the nation the inadequacy of the 1957-60 Civil Rights Acts, and also to publicise the situation itself. It was discovered that a procedure with potential is to get local officials to violate federal laws thereby forcing a confrontation: e.g. by arrests for voter registration picketing on federal property. In this respect Selma is a pilot project exploring the possibility of direct action within the context of the Civil Rights Acts. If we establish that we can force the federal government to be involved only when voter registration is involved, then this will be applicable in Mississippi and Georgia. It opens the way for legally protected direct action.

Stokely Carmichael presented the picture of Washington. For the first time, in 1964 residents of the District of Columbia can vote for President. They still will not have home rule and the requirements for registration are not clear. The plans for NAG are to conduct a very aggressive voter registration campaign, arguing voting as a right regardless of qualifications, putting the government on the defensive. It will be difficult since they will be alone in such a political campaign. Other organisations are planning to work at registering people, aiming primarily at numbers so as to have strength to ask for home rule. The Washington situation has national implications. The Home Rule Committee is headed by Southerners. Whites in Washington say there is no home rule because 54% of the District is Negro. What is needed is a move to get the 46% whites to understand they they are also disfranchised.

Courtland Cox commented on Washington that our task is not to organise that white minority but to get into the Negro ghettos and give them hope if nothing else. The other organisations will work in white and Negro middleclass areas because it is in their interest to do so. Washington is much like Atlanta or Buttermilk Bottom; no national sympathy because no dramatic events will happen there as in the hard core areas. The role of the federal government is the same as it is in the South.

Jim Forman argued that it is a contradiction to work on voter registration in Mississippi and not in Washington. We need to develop for Washington a plan of action using TV, radio, and other mass media if possible to get the whole community. When and as necessary we can get someone to introduce a bill to congress.

Bob Moses said that since the head of the Committee is from South Carolina and Jamie Whitten of Mississippi is second on the Committee, it would be a

shame not to make a national issue of this especially since the South uses Washington of the failure of integration, it does not want Washington to solve its problems. We should get into the campaign some people from the congressmen's home districts.

There was general discussion of the strategy toward the white community, some feeling that we ought to work there too in keeping with the basic principles of the organisation. Others felt that other whites and other groups could work there better. There was no consensus.

After agreement that strategy would have to be worked out to make this in some way a national campaign, the Washington discussion led to a discussion of the whole philosophy and purpose of voter registration. Comments were:

1. We do not know yet how to make a *One Man-One Vote!* campaign national, e.g. how to use the press and magazines in a consistent push on publicity. (Casey Hayden)
2. The key question facing us may be what is our purpose in voter registration if we cannot register enough voters to change things. This leads directly to the question of a legal arm of SNCC, since we need the federal government in some way to break open the closed society. We need to tie together voter registration, direct action, and complex legal strategy to force the federal government. The problem is that in the process one must be careful not to end up with another Atlanta and a LeRoy Johnson. What is important is not just the vote but how to use it politically (Howard Zinn).
3. One of the uses of voter registration is that in the process you get into the community and begin to see their needs as a whole, which cannot be done from the outside. This is what is happening in a different form in Buttermilk Bottom (Pete Stoner).
4. One of the problems we face is to harmonise our sense of urgency with the realism of long-range projects. We become frustrated because we don't reach goals, but we don't know what the goals really are. One goal is to free the minds of people and get them thinking and acting on their own-- and to find the real leaders and get them to see what is wrong and what must be done and to get them to move out (Charles Sherrod).
5. All the talk about long-and-short-range goals, and defining program m makes us forget some very simple goals. Basically, what we are after is some kind of change for the better for people, primarily Negroes. What was attractive about the early history of SNCC was that changes were taking place. The question facing us is what people will be the agents for the necessary change. Finding them is what we call organising, finding second and third line leaders future persons. No matter what goals we have, we won't reach them if we don't do this. We must examine our programs and see to what extent we are committed to do this.  
The goals we organised for have changed rapidly, even in the last six months. If there is to be any change, however, one goal is the breakup of the Dixiecrats. The money for real change, e.g. in education, has to come from the federal government, and won't without a change in Congress. We are not in a position to actually shape that change but to act as catalysts to bring it about. Once it happens or is in the process of happening, we shall have to take a long look at it and rethink our role (Bob Moses).
6. As an example of this rethinking process: we got into the Voter Education Project program as a convenient method of organising and working in the field, knowing we might lose that money because we weren't serving VEP's purpose. Now we have to rethink our relation there (Ella Baker).

Following the general discussion on goals and purposes, Bob Moses was asked to give a brief summary of the accomplishments of the Freedom Vote campaign in Mississippi:

We needed a program in Mississippi which people could grow with and organize around. The Henry Campaign was just such a program. In addition it gave an opportunity not just to work at voter registration in a vacuum, but with content and around issues. It gave us a vehicle to organize in the Negro community, to bring a lot of students South, and to get on radio and TV.

Voting has always been in our minds as a vehicle for organizing. We haven't registered people but we have found leadership leadership and have begun to build community organizations. In fact, money has been cut out. An attempt was made to challenge the election legally, but got lost with the President's assassination and is now dead.

#### *Comments by others of the Freedom Votes:*

1. It got good national coverage and focused attention on the One Man - One Vote campaign (Dr. Hedgeman).
2. The actual work was more than originally planned and got a wider area than originally planned. The total vote of 83,000 was not as high as expected due to harassment, but the total was greater than the difference between the two party candidates and could have toppled Johnson (Mike Sayer).
3. People for the first time did something--voted--and with something for them to do, we were able for the first time to go into some areas (Frank Smith).
4. Important positive effect on the staff of the whole organization should be noted--especially in Mississippi (Jim Forman).

This ended the discussion on political programs.

#### *V. FOURTH SESSION: Afternoon, December 28. Discussion on SNCC organization Jim Forman Chaired the session*

The session on SNCC organization was closed to all except executive committee members, staff and ex-staff.

Jim Forman began with a history of the structure of SNCC. Back in 1960 and 61 the Coordinating Committee was composed of two representatives from each state and from a few organizations, but it never functioned effectively. In Oct. 1961 a field staff was set up, and at the Spring Conference in 1962 a new constitution was prepared with a coordinating committee from local protest groups which was to meet threetimes a year to direct staff. It was to elect an executive committee of 15, which had no advisors as such but two "adult" members. Traditionally they have been Miss Ella Baker and Dr. Howard Zinn.

- The problems are:
- a) we do not have viable local protest groups to send representatives to the Coordinating Committee.
  - b) there is no active campus organizing being done to develop these.

As far as main staff, we have a chairman who is overall director, who spends much of his time interpreting SNCC to the North; an Executive Secretary to manage the staff operation, who recently has been needed to coordinate fund raising activity and spends a good deal of time out of the office. Last summer the coordinating committee elected a staff coordinator to work in the office and field (although Worth has been in Selma and Ruby Doris Smith Robinson has been carrying out his functions). The main task of the office is to serve the field staff, with the additional tasks of coordination of northern campus activity on behalf of SNCC and "Friends of SNCC" groups.

Ella Baker called for a listing of the present coordinating committee. After discussion the following list was drawn up:



Present

|                              |                            |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Tougaloo (Joan Trumpauer)    | Washington (Courtland Cox) |
| Louisville (Nancy Pennick)   | Knoxville (Marion Berry)   |
| Committee on Appeal[Atlanta] | Tulane (Cathy Cade)        |
| (Willie Paul Berrien)        | <del>WAS</del>             |

Absent

|                   |                                 |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Cambridge         | Baltimore                       |
| Norfolk           | Pine Bluff & others in Arkansas |
| Hampton Institute | Dallas County Alabama           |
| Rome Georgia      | Southern Illinois               |

It was not clear how to count all the Mississippi groups

A general discussion on the problem of representivity and functioning of staff and protest groups followed. Marion Berry pointed out that we should get the coordinating committee actively to work to develop a wider base than just the staff. A problem of continuity of people was recognised. Jim Forman stated that a southern campus coordinator has been appointed to work on that problem. Courtland Cox suggested that we use the structure as we have it now, but make it work. The function of a small stable policy-making group meeting frequently was the function of the executive committee. Stokely Carmichael felt there was a problem in the behind-the-lines groups making policy for those actively at work. Marion Berry emphasised that the problem was essentially that proposals made did not get carried out, that plans get scattered when an emergency arises somewhere. Several people expressed concern over the lack of staff representation on the executive committee, and it was suggested that the project directors become part of the executive committee.

The membership of the executive committee was then discussed, and in relation to this the question of our constituency came up. Casey Hayden stated that the staff was supposed to service the base, and that theoretically SNCC's constituency is southern college students. But it is closer to the truth to say that the constituency is now the staff itself. We must really examine what our constituency is. We neglect southern college groups by 1) not drawing our staff workers from them but rather from the North somewhere; and 2) not providing local leadership for them. The question was also essential; we need to carry out group decisions.

Bob Moses stated that the constituency was not so much students as in local movements. We have made inadequate provision for local adult leadership who are involved with out work to become part of the decision making structure.

Howard Zinn made the point that this is a problem of all democratic organisations--how to have representation from those active and still have a small enough group to make decisions. If we could clarify the role and composition of the executive committee then we wouldn't worry about the coordinating committee being too large or unwieldy because you would want it large for representation. We should have an executive committee meeting frequently, to include staff, which would plan basic short range strategy.

At this point, despite objection from staff persons in the room, the matter of reorganisation was referred by the chairman of the session to the executive committee for consideration.

The discussion then proceeded to consideration of problems in relation to the Friends of SNCC groups. Northern Coordinator Dinky Romilly reported that there are between 13 and 17 Friends of SNCC groups (depending on how you measure activity) and some 120 high school and college groups outside of areas where adult groups are located. The issue for discussion was the

extent to which the groups can and should engage in local action. At the last meeting, it was pointed out, there was a general agreement that each situation should be considered separately but that there was no general feeling against it, depending on the local situation. Jim Forman described the situation in Chicago, where the Chicago Friends of SNCC have become a key action group in the city, and do relatively little fund-raising. Dinky felt that in general the problem of groups wanting to do direct action did not exist, but that the real problem was that once people got active in Friends groups they wanted to come South to work. This was stated to be a general hiring problem, not a Friends group problem per se.

Courtland Cox felt that it would be wrong to change the concept of Friends of SNCC groups, that eventually quite separate groups should develop in the North as local protest groups. Mendy Samstein questioned whether action would cut into fund-raising activity, and was told that groups raise funds around action, but that there is no clear answer to that question. Jim Monsonis stated that we are using the term "action" here in a very sloppy sense. There is action on local problems and there is action in support of events, etc., in the South, and while the former could conceivably cut into fund-raising the latter is one of the tasks of a northern support group.

Ella Baker stated that we should recognise the fact that at this time expanding into the North is beyond our capacity. This was the general consensus.

*Unions.* Bill Mahoney raised at this time the question of the Washington office as a northern office, and especially its relation to unions. What is it that SNCC wants them to do in relation to unions? They have talked with a number of them, got them to finance the Fall Conference, but at the meeting with the IUD officials the next day, SNCC leadership was not present.

Ella Baker asked whether then unions wanted us to become organisers in the South for them and was told that at the meeting IUD officials stated they were not interested in control of SNCC but in working out mutually helpful relations. Jim Monsonis made the point that we have to be careful and consistent in our dealings with union officials. Word had reached him that Jack Conway felt highly insulted because none of the SNCC leadership was present. Mike Sayer explained that we were not given to understand it as a highly important one, and that we were somewhat caught by surprise.

It was suggested that the advisory committee help us work out a position toward the union movement based upon more information on what is currently happening in the labor movement. That was agreed upon as a general consensus.

*Establishment of Advisory Committees.* Ella Baker proposed that since there were other people on whom SNCC should call for advice and knowledge, in addition to herself and Howard Zinn, they would be willing to undertake the development of a proposal on various advisory committees, which would have a purely advisory (non-policy-making) role. As there might be some secretarial and other expense involved, she asked authorisation to go ahead. There was a general consensus on the question for her to go ahead.

*Establishment of a tax-exempt arm.* Bob Moses stated that over the past few years as a natural outgrowth of SNCC activity there have come a number of activities which are entitled to tax-exemption, and that since we did not have such exemption are now being channeled through other groups. He felt it was important for SNCC to develop its own tax-exempt arm, and when in New York had explored this. Shad Polier has offered to give legal aid to this, and that a decision could come fairly soon. What is needed is:

1. a proposal and description of the projects which would fall under this, e.g. SNCC education, work-study programs, community centers, etc., and
2. someone who could staff it and set it up.

He expressed that it should not just be a catchall for things we want covered, but a creative body which would try to get substantial funds for different things, although he recognised the problem of how to spend substantial tax-exempt funds in the South in such a way as not to support the status quo.

Despite further unhappiness on the part of some staff about the inability of the group to decide on some of these things, this also was referred to the executive committee for further handling, and the meeting was ended for dinner.

## VI. FIFTH SESSION, Evening, December 28. HUAC and Freedom of Association Marion Berry, Session Chairman

### A. HUAC

The chairman summed up the discussion of HUAC which had been had at the Staff Retreat last winter--a position of opposition and noncooperation--and asked whether there was anything new to be added to the discussion. John Lewis reported that during the past months, both he and Jim Forman have taken public stands against HUAC, despite the fact that there was no official SNCC position. For example, John recently spoke on the West Coast on behalf of the National Committee to Abolish HUAC, and the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedom, where he took the position that we cannot separate civil rights and civil liberties, that eventually the two struggles must come together, that in the South we are yet involved in a struggle for civil liberties--the right to protest--rather than civil rights per se. He pointed out that the time will come when we are likely to be called before the Committee--what position shall we then take?

In response to a request for background, Howard Zinn gave a history of HUAC. It grew out of the Fish Committee in the 30s, was established as a temporary committee of the House in 1938 with Martin Dies of Texas as its first chairman. This set a pattern, for its chairmen have generally been Southerners or Republican conservatives. The purpose of the committee is extremely vague: to investigate "unamerican activities;" despite constant pressures the committee chairmen have never defined what "unamerican activity" was. In practice their work is one of interrogation of people on political activities, with the connection being constantly drawn between progressive activity and communism. It has a very large appropriation and a wide range of coverage. As a result of its activity several hundred people have gone to jail on various kinds of contempt charges (e.g. using the First Amendment, which has not yet been established as protection against such investigation). It is a very powerful committee, with few congressmen having courage to vote against appropriations for it.

SNCC should decide which of the various possibilities it will take with regard to the committee: noncooperation, aggressive cooperation, First or Fifth Amendments, etc. Marion Berry stated that last year SNCC took the position that it would not publicly declare itself until called. Then people could take the First or Fifth Amendments as individually preferred.

A general discussion followed on the nature of the committee and what position SNCC should take. In the discussion the following points were made:

1. The problem is not HUAC but the atmosphere around HUAC and what HUAC accusations force organisations to do. The SCLC situation with Jack O'Dekk is an example of the self-policing the committee forces. We should be very clear on the question of free association and be very clear on our strategy when accused or baited (Mike Sayer).



2. NOT SURE WHETHER THE GROUP  
the does not really expect to find the  
organisation ineffective. We need to put them on the defense by  
declaring what we are doing as being right, not trying to defend  
(Stokely Carmichael).
3. A resolution would be meaningless, since there are so many groups now  
on record against HUAC. A simple resolution is no action at all. (Charles Sherrod).
4. SNCC needs to have a position to guide its staff. Last year when I was  
subpoenaed by mail in Selma, I was willing to abide by SNCC policy,  
but there was no policy. I want to know what position toward cooperation  
members should take (Bernard Lafayette).
5. There are many possible positions to take: First or Fifth Amendments,  
the Quaker approach of total noncooperation on the basis of individual  
conscience, the open Women Strike For Peace approach. The serious issue that  
they are after and which is crucial for us is what groups we will work with.  
One possible position is to be glad to tell them what we do except for whom  
we work with. Or are we prepared to say to them, as did Women Strike For  
Peace, we will work with everyone (Casey Hayden)?
6. This question of position should be, as was adopted last year, one of  
individual conscience (Charles Cobb).
7. The openness of the group, in fact, determines the position. If we are  
totally open, we can then take a strong stand. In taking this stand,  
we need to be careful because people can go to jail, and we need to plan  
that kind of thing (Mike Sayer).
8. (In response to question regarding whether we have considered filing a  
suit on HUAC): Suits challenging it legally have been filed by other  
groups. This should not be our function. Our essential way of working is  
not to mess around with the courts and with suits, but to appeal to a high-  
er law. We must not play around in the trap of getting caught up with leg-  
alities (Stokely Carmichael).
9. Since it is set up by Congress, it is hard to get at through the legal  
structure. This is not the question before the group. We have not de-  
cided whether to attack it yet, and considerations of strategy for its abol-  
ition are premature. HUAC stands in the way of freedom; therefore, sooner  
or later we must attack as we will the rest of the system. It is especially  
important in the South. HUAC has attacked Southern white liberals whom we  
need to develop the full movement. To free these people we will have to  
sooner or later attack the committee (Sam Shirah).

Howard Zinn summarised the discussion as follows:

There are three things we have to do here: 1) express a general philo-  
sophical position in regard to HUAC as a protection for John and Jim; 2)  
work out a strategy of defense against HUAC; and 3) work out our attitudes  
toward people under attack or potentially under attack.

On (1) the general position is clear and just needs stating. On (2)  
we need to take both a legal and an extra-legal approach, as with other  
parts of our work. Just as some things, e.g. lunch counters, can be at-  
tacked outside of the courts, other things have to be considered inside.  
Here we must bring into play the projected legal advisory committee, and  
begin to file creative and perhaps 'way out suits to try to break the Com-  
mittee open. In addition we need to put extra-legal pressure on the Presi-  
dent, on the Supreme Court, on Congress, to defund HUAC.

all the other conditions are right, we could get HUAC abolished overnight by Court action. On (3) SNCC would generally agree on some general statement of openness, but in real life there are no pure cases and other issues are often involved. We need to guard against letting other issues become the excuse to avoid the principled position as often happens. Need to get to the point where we defend "the Communist Negro homosexual who doesn't look good," and protect and defend people even when for a combination of reasons they are dysfunctional.

Discussion continued on point #3. The positions argued were the freedom of the individual conscience in deciding what he will do vs. the fact that a person is called not as an individual but as representative of SNCC. He speaks for the whole organisation as well as himself, thus suggesting a group position. There was no consensus. Issues and points involved were:

Can the organisation bind the individual ?

We don't know at this point enough of the legal possibilities.

Since SNCC is a popular organisation in comparison to those the Committee usually deals with, we should use this advantage to smash the Committee somehow.

The chairman of the session recommended that the group come to a general position, that on the basis of this legal strategy be worked out later after consultation. The real issues involved are whether to make our position public.

It was pointed out by Ella Baker that those who cannot agree with whatever position emerges should make it known to SNCC before it becomes an issue.

Bob Moses argued that we make our position on HUAC very public; that we carefully work out a statement and a rationale, and that we then seek to get it widely published, perhaps even in the congressional record. What we do toward individuals, in hiring policy, somewhat different is an important question. The experience in Mississippi of the past few years, e.g. the Braden incident and this summer's incident of a controversial person, leaves him taking a practical, hard line position to avoid such situations. However, these are cases of people with no real organisational connexion. The case of the regular staff person who is known and trusted is clear: we must stand in total solidarity with him.

Charles Sherrod supported the concept of open opposition, citing his personal history of moving from collegiate red-baiting to a present position where anyone one is welcome if they participate in the work, as being based on practical experience. Feels we should declare ourselves in regard to the enemy.

After the chairman declared the discussion would focus on whether to publish an anti-HUAC position, the following points were made:

1. Publishing will raise questions among people. We shouldn't publish unless prepared to follow up by attack on Committee (Joyce Ladner).
2. These will be raised anyway, especially in view of unfavorable press such as the White article. There is a tactical advantage in declaring and publishing first: it puts us on the offensive (Donna Moses).
3. Most of the people who know us will be surprised we haven't already declared ourselves in this way. Cannot see any damage coming from this, but what are advantages (Jim Monson)?
4. Our policy of being open and aboveboard is received favorably. Open declaration would be in keeping with that (Doug Harris).
5. There is a strong educational advantage both within SNCC and in the South in general. In Mississippi experience, people do fear communism. Since they are part of America and Americans fear communism, such a piece would definitely help as an educational tool. Suggests group to work out rough draft during these few days here (Bob Moses).

Such a committee was appointed, consisting of Moses, Thelwell, and Guyot, to report to the Executive Committee meeting.

The discussion then turned to position in regard to openness in staff hiring.

John Perdue argued that we always will have some criteria to include and exclude people; do not take everyone; no point in the "kiss of death" involved in taking controversial people.

Ivanhoe Donaldson stated we cannot afford to take such a position. We must have total personal freedom since this is what we are working for, and we must choose people on the basis of ability rather than politics.

Sam Shirah stated that to take the exclusion position puts us in a position of questioning people's motives and denying a minority group its political rights. If we do this we are beginning to crumble.

A general discussion then followed in which the following points, among others, were made:

1. Laying oneself open to attack does not depend on whether you really have communists working or not, but on your positions and goals. We must take a principled stand against political criteria for hiring, in a public statement. (Howard Zinn)
2. There are practical matters involved: e.g. money. We have, when necessary, accepted money with strings: e.g. VEP money, and we may have to again. We have to be practical (Bob Moses).
3. We have to choose our issues to fight and not try to fight everywhere at once. Do that when we really decide to, but for now we shouldn't blunt our attack on other things (Bernard Lafayette).
4. The only way to be safe from attack is to do nothing. We must reject money and support with strings. We must support the principle and not accept conditions which embody what we are trying to fight (Larry Guyot).
5. Even our present openness does affect fund raising regularly. Because our fund raising efforts have been diffused over a wide area, we have been able to raise money despite some loss due to red-baiting. More important than whether we take a stand is that this issue should be handled in such a way as not to divide the staff and become in itself divisive (Forman).
6. It is not true that exclusion beforehand saves you trouble later, for you waste more energy on self-policing and internally divisive actions than would be spent fighting the question in the open (Mike Sayer).
7. Personnel recruitment is much more complicated than our position toward HUAC. In situations where the political affiliation will definitely hurt, we should take Bob's pragmatic position. Otherwise political affiliations are irrelevant. We must deal with the question on individual basis (Cox).
8. It is important that we do not remain fragmented and disunited around this issue. We should discuss it, take a position, and close behind it. The discussion can be reopened at a later date but at this time drift is not good. The real disagreement is whether political association is irrelevant. It is between a principled position that political association is never relevant even when it causes turmoil, and a pragmatic one that it would have occasional relevance. In practice there are not necessarily very far apart since there are other issues that enter in. What we need is a criterion of flexibility without a flat statement one way or the other, and with a sophisticated "selection committee" (Bob Moses).
9. Bob defined it clearly. The question is whether other values are as important as racial equality; whether we are willing to compromise on other values when compromise advances achievement of this value (Howard Zinn).
10. There is another very practical side to the issue. One of our goals is to involve the Justice Department. Therefore we need, in some sense to cooperate with them. We must have people who can testify in court without threatening the whole situation because of another issue. Nor should we



forget that we are not just talking about Communists and non-communists. What do we do about other groups outside of the general consensus: e.g. John Birchers or Black Muslims (Jim Forman)?

11. We must remember that practicality involves responsibility for those with whom we work. No group is totally without the practical factor in specific circumstances. Two examples given from the recent life of SCEF show this. We cannot disregard the practical dimension complete (Ella Baker).

Though no formal position was taken and there was disagreement, the general consensus seemed to indicate a position of non-alignment, of no political test for members. There was no position on whether to declare this openly, however.

The discussion ended at this point and shifted to a discussion of internal staff education, led by Howard Zinn.

Howard Zinn: All of the staff are people who both work and think. This is a problem because many are people who left formal education because they were dissatisfied, for a new form of education. Education in the classroom tends to be removed from real problems because educators are by nature removed from where most people live. That is the nature of academic life and why most SNCC workers have left it. Yet they feel a loss because there is information we need which is available in the academic world. We need to take time off and read, not just generally but on subjects specifically related: history of the Supreme Court, the Alien & Sedition Acts, on HUAC, Bazelon's book, *The Paper Economy*, Senator Clark's *The Senate Establishment*.

How we can best do this education without curtailing action resulted in several suggestions:

1. We might take all workers out of the field in shifts, for 4-5 days at a time, to go somewhere in intensive discussion with people who know and care.
2. We might have people now in local project areas who do not have a full job load. They could coordinate education for the staff locally in their spare time amidst local activity.
3. Someone in the main office might coordinate educational activity, circulating material, etc.

The proposal was discussed and the need for education of various sorts elaborated upon. Jim Forman pointed out that there are other people working with us whom we need to educate on even more basic levels, and those in projects with specific knowledge should make use of it. Charles Sherrod mentioned that a group of lawyers under Hal Witt wants to teach people the art of writing affidavits which they would circulate and use. Casey Hayden expressed some doubt whether we are prepared to do so yet. We do not have sufficient staff coordination. What we need is just to begin in a small way by sending a few items a week out to all people just to get a common source of information established. Sam Shirah stated that there is a definite need for more staff coordination, that isolated people need the stimulation of each other as well, and that a workshop would be much better than just readings. We need a retreat place of some kind to come away to for a rest. Jim Monson mentioned that on the basis of conversations since the Washington Conference he felt money was available for staff education. Zellner suggested that some project act as a pilot project.

After this discussion, Howard Zinn offered to work further on it, if there were someone who would work on it with him. He was given general approval.

End of Evening Session

VII. SIXTH SESSION, Sunday Afternoon, December 29. Discipline, Fund Raising Coordination, SNCC Organisation. John Lewis, Chairman

The chairman began by summing up some of the problems relating to the internal staff discipline of the organisation. Recently there have been a number of things which have brought this to a head: e.g. stealing from the Freedom Houses, staff possessions disappearing while in jail, etc. We have had an open policy--"whosoever will come" philosophy--and a high degree of autonomy. As a result people have been abusing it, leaving projects and going to New York or other projects at will. If we had as much discipline as the Black Muslims, we would be a powerful organisation. Staff discipline at the moment is at a low ebb. We have begun to get a decent subsistence, at least a regular one; and we have lost some of our concept of sacrifice and identification. We have adopted a uniform which we wear everywhere in a self-righteous way. Do we really wear it to identify with the working class, or is it now a status symbol?

Joyce Ladner pointed out that the Freedom Houses have always been a problem and we ought to consider abolishing them since they are, at times, a disgrace to the movement. Mike Thelwell stated the problem is that we need to keep regular schedules in them and have a person appointed to keep them in order. Courtland Cox pointed out that a part of the problem is that except for a few persons, the staff has become so mobile that it is difficult to feel responsible for a living place.

Bernard Lafayette stated that we ought to get rid of the illusion that we are doing so much and being indulgent. We should get rid of those persons who won't cooperate in a regular staff discipline. We need more workshops in nonviolence in depth, to probe the depth of our commitment and to learn personal responsibility and discipline. Charles Cobb pointed out that the closeness of the SNCC staff to each other has fostered an attitude that all things are to be shared and when Staff come out of jail sometimes all of their clothes are gone. Mindy Samstein questioned the extent to which lack of discipline hinders our effectiveness and wondered whether mobility does not cover up lack of work and even willingness to work. One of the pitfalls of being successful is that you cease to work. Ivanhoe Donaldson stated that the problem is not money or success: we have always been sloppy. We must decide the basic question of whether we are going to live what we preach. The leadership has shirked responsibility in not enforcing discipline, or delegating responsibility. Too much has been left up to Forman; the field must become more responsible. Julian should not have to hold up checks to force the field staff to send in those biographies. Stokely Carmichael emphasised that we are not running a reform school or rehabilitation center, but an organisation with a purpose. We need to develop a program, then train people to work with us, not try to deal with personal disciplinary problems.

Charles Sherrod stated that the essential problem is one of authority: who tells whom to go or not to go, to work or not to work. Forman has too much of the responsibility resting directly on him. The problems of personal discipline ought to go to someone else. Ivanhoe Donaldson stressed that one of the key problems of the field is staff fatigue. We must be more cognisant of the need for rest: this is at the root of many disciplinary problems.

A number of other problems relating to staff discipline were brought out, including the problem of cars and the use of them, agreement to carry out assigned tasks, etc. Since many of these related to the question of authority within SNCC, Jim Forman gave a brief history of the organisation of SNCC. The structure that was developed in 1962 had in mind a staff of 25 or so, directed by active coordinating and executive committees. As



work began in the North on publicity and fund-raising and SNCC became better known and received more income, the staff expanded to a present staff of about 130. We have moved from a \$14,000 debt in 1962 where it was necessary simply to survive, to go to the North and to the Voter Education Project for funds, to a present large expenditure in 1963 with a small balance.

A number of things kept us going during the difficult times. One was the equalisation of sacrifice throughout the organisation. (Which is why CORE, SCLC, and NAACP Task Forces will eventually have trouble: the sacrifice is not equalised.) Another sustaining factor was the allegiances developed to projects, which compensated for the lack of income, but created a very decentralised organisation where at times the allegiance to the project overshadowed allegiance to SNCC and central discipline was limited.

Part of the problem also is that our vision of what we want to accomplish has shifted. We went into Albany, for instance, with a concept of freeing the minds of the people there, but see now that there has to be a program along with this. With this growth in objectives has come a different philosophy of work, of the need at times to intensify the issues somewhere by concentrating staff, sharing program and concepts from one area to another. Staff should travel from project to project more to learn from each other.

What we need to carry out the tasks of the central office now is a more efficient central administrative group: a small administrative council which can meet monthly. If we elect six staff to the Executive Committee, making it 21, then we should have an administrative council of 10 elected by the Coordinating Committee, composed of 5 non-staff members of the Executive Committee, 3 staff, and the Chairman, and the Executive Secretary. This should include local protest groups and should be a more central and knowledgeable body than the other committees will be.

On discipline in general: not all problems should come directly to me. Bring them to the project heads, not to the Atlanta office. Within the office we are going to restore a staff coordinator and Ruby Doris back to her own responsibilities. We must be fair about criticisms of the Atlanta office. At times it is treated as being outside of the movement: a servant of the field. It needs to be accepted as part of the total movement also.

Courtland Cox stated that we must begin right away to handle some of these matters and suggested: 1) this month a weekend conference of staffs of two or more different areas; (2) that we settle this weekend whether Worth Long is Staff Coordinator; (3) that the Executive Committee meet more frequently but that Forman go ahead and set up this administrative committee. He later clarified this to mean that the Executive Committee, supplemented by the project heads, meet the next two months and that the steering committee be elected at the next Coordinating Committee meeting.

On transportation, Jim Forman suggested that we could solve many of the problems revolving around transportation if we had a transportation coordinator.

Jim Monson's spoke about the discipline of staff coming North to New York. There have been a number of problems from the way people handle things in New York. We use staff up from the South for speaking, but often staff do not let the office know they are in town: all staff must check in with the New York office when in town, and should let us know they are coming. Also when the office asks them to do something, they are sometimes irresponsible, showing up late or not at all for speaking engagements. If staff are on vacation we will respect that, but should know if they are there.



The second problem is that people come to New York on specific projects and make contacts without our knowledge. When we are asked to continue them or when contacted people call us we are in a bad position. All persons involved with some kind of project in the New York area should at least let the office know generally what it is about.

The third disciplinary problem is a discipline of behavior: how you conduct yourself at someone's home, etc.; and a discipline of the mind and speech, especially when speaking for SNCC. Some have taken a very radical line which when pushed they can't defend. One must speak to people where they are, not necessarily where one would like them to be.

*Stokely Carmichael* suggested that we draw up a list of persons who have proven irresponsible and not use them anymore. *Bernice Reagon* supported the need for a list of capable speakers, not just people who have been to jail. While traveling with the *Freedom Singers* she found they had to represent SNCC and to correct serious misconceptions which previous speakers had often left with people.

*Dottie Zellner* stated that among the problems of discipline, we fail to confront each other when in disagreement. We don't want to fight with each other and therefore tell someone else our complaints rather than the specific person. This is a corruption of the concept of good will.

Several persons spoke against the idea of a speakers bureau, and although a problem was recognised, there was no consensus on how to handle speaking discipline.

*Jim Forman* summarised by stating that because of the fluid nature of our organisation, with new people all the time, we ought to hold these discussions, e.g. on HUAC, discipline, etc., every year, even though they repeat the previous year's discussion. This is a part of our growth and constant re-evaluation. A large meeting which includes staff and others, such as this one, is important, even though it cannot come to specific agreement, because it is on the basis of this that final decisions can be more responsibly made. After discussion on procedure for the rest of the meeting, the session was adjourned.

#### VIII. SEVENTH SESSION, Sunday Evening, December 29. Field Reports: Albany and Raleigh. *Joyce Ladner*, Chairman

*Charles Sherrod* presented the written Southwest Georgia report, reading for the benefit of the body, the introduction. Comments were asked for from the other staff in the Southwest Georgia project. Following that there was general discussion:

*John Perdue*: One of our main problems is that we haven't gone very far in setting up institutions to enhance the power of the Negro. We need to reduce the economic control of the white man and thus free the people for action. Self-help and government programs ought to be concentrated on to change the structure of things there. (Presentation of the *Perdue* report, dealing with cooperatives and credit unions.) Three main suggestions: (1) credit unions for Negroes (2) organisation of consumer cooperatives should be explored; (3) try to begin to get workers interested in unions and unions interested in Southwest Georgia.

*Dave Bell*: Since the *March on Washington* there had been a period of re-evaluation in Southwest Georgia. What is our commitment to the four counties where we now work? We have gotten to a situation where the people are too dependent on us and will not develop leadership. We should move out into

the 3rd Congressional District, and keep running those four counties alone.

*Charles Sherrod* commented that one of the main problems in the area has been that there has almost never been a normal staff situation: people have always been coming and going; things never get settled long enough for a comprehensive plan to be worked out. There is a need for staff now, which will be intensified soon, therefore against moving into new areas at the present time.

*Bob Cover* stated that we need to move into the area of developing groups of people around specific interests, rather than simply voter registration. People no longer come to mass meetings. We need to start with people's interest and develop programs around them, e.g. with the farmers we need to get them together and force representation of Negroes on various county boards, as is possible under the law--to all the boards which affect farmers. A new approach is needed beyond the mass meeting.

General discussion followed around the questions of development of local leadership, of program in Southwest Georgia, and of staff assignment to the area. In the discussion the following points were made:

1. We don't pick up local staff because anyone with ability leaves to go elsewhere (*Sherrod*). But also the staff has been negligent in using local people, has not given leadership to the people (*Cover*).
2. SNCC hiring policy for Southwest Georgia has been terrible: the place where we send people whom we don't know what to do with (*Dot Zellner*).
3. Disagrees. History important here. In 1962 *Sherrod* proposed to use whites in the area. Despite much misgivings we found that whites could work there. Even this past summer when almost no other project would accept white students, they were welcome in Southwest Georgia and so perhaps we sent too many. But this was not a mistake, rather an experiment. It opened the doors to the use of white people in other areas also. The problem of Southwest Georgia is in some respects the problem of the role of the white student in the movement: serious through lack of program (*Jim Forman*).
4. On Community development. I am a product of SNCC's work in the Fall of 1961. A great change in me, but there has been little attempt at creative use of local people since 1961. Many people stay because they do not want menial, mechanical jobs. The Freedom House atmosphere is not helpful either. It repels many who really want to work (*Bernice Reagon*). This was supported by *William Porter*.

*Jim Forman* drew from the discussion several different general factors relevant not only to Southwest Georgia, but other projects as well:

1. There is a breakdown in our work because of a failure to have a viable political program for the local area beyond voter registration.
2. There has been no adequate in-service training for staff and local leadership. Workshops for staff are needed in every project, either locally or at Highlander, or some such place.
3. There has been a failure of the central administrative staff to deal adequately with the need to oversee the local program.
4. There has been a failure to build a viable student movement. We are not producing leaders out of the student movements who can take local leadership.
5. One of the problems has been a shift in the nature of the program we are trying to carry out. Out of frustration we weren't getting anywhere based upon a short range view of goals. People end up trying to do work other than that for which they were hired: e.g. the role of whites in Southwest Georgia in practice was different than in planning.
6. There has been inadequate screening of staff.
7. In Albany, at least, there has been a problem of religion



There is a tention between organising around political vs. organising around religious or philosophical goals. These are problems in Southwest Georgia, but they apply to SNCC potentially if not actually, in all other projects. We need to come to a resolution of them in this situation.

*Courtland Cox* observed that there was stagnation in Georgia, not because of 'Sherrod, but because of the nature of the original goals: to free men's mind is too nebulous to be a basis for organisation. People come to the movement for what they can get, concretely. We must be prepared to give them somethin concrete.

*Jim Forman* felt that we ought to expand the program there into the 3rd Congressional District, especially into Fort Valley where there is the college which could be drawn upon. This does not mean that we cannot work with the people in the present counties, but tries to get out from under their dependence on us. *Bob Cover* agreed, saying that at most we can register 30 people per month in the area. Politically we are going nowhere there.

*Dottie Zellner* observed that the national image of Albany is that of a failure. We need to counter such publicity as the New Republic article and ex-staff member *Pete de Lissovoy's* articles in the *Harvard Crimson* by something dramatic and politically significant.

*Mike Sayer* suggested that something might be learned from the Mississippi experience. The perspective there is to push to a point where the Federal Government is forced to come into the situation. That should be the perspective of Southwest Georgia also. Perhaps similar things should be done -- Negro candidates and a Freedom Vote registration. If it is done well in the area, it could show, because of the population, that if Negroes had the right to vote they would have won. On this basis then a number of legal challenges could be made. We must find a way to get the idea of a *One Man-One Vote!* campaign across to the nation. This is a good method: it also gives people something to do. It gives a chance to get across a particular political program. In addition the inadequacy of government programs and solutions can be exposed.

*Charles Sherrod* stated that he has opposed this for practical reasons: we did not have the resources, but had to use what we had. At the beginning all we had were minds and bodies. We used these to try to get across a concept of freedom, which, in a very practical sense, is the necessary first step for all other activity. He is prepared to broaden and is in favor of an explosive kind of program if we are prepared to accept responsibility for what happens as a result. In response to a question from *Ella Baker*, Sherrod stated that this "Freedom of the Mind" can also come as a consequence of action programs which develop first.

*John Perdue* observed that we have the conception that once a man is free he stays free. One action does not make a free man. It is clear from the fact that many previous participants in the movement are now not at all active. Similarly, voting will not give to people total fulfillment: they need something beyond. We must develop a wide diversity of program, approaches, actions, for different people. Success must be measured in many different ways, and we haven't been sufficiently flexible until now.

There was a general feeling in favor of the expansion of the Southwest Georgia project into the 3rd Congressional District. *Jim Forman* pointed out that it is not our task to do the work, but to organise the movement. We need to capitalise on interest: e.g. that expressed by some people in Moultrie. We must also explore whether there is a white population in the area that we can reach. If we work on just voter registration, but aggressively as in Selma, we may be able to force a confrontation between the Federal Government and the local governments--using the present momentum and good



will in the area as organising methods. Especially, though, we must explore the white community. The fact that Slater King received many votes for mayor of Albany in the white districts should be carefully considered.

There was a general consensus that we must re-evaluate programs for Southwest Georgia, explore some of the suggestions for changes in program suggested, and consider expansion. The matter of specific action on the subject was referred by Chairman Joyce Ladner to the Executive Committee.

A discussion on the role of whites and work in the white community followed. Sam Shirah began by saying that the question of freedom of the mind applies to the white also. We must destroy the guilt feelings of white as well as black if we are all to be free. Many white people working with us are crippled by guilt. In his own work he feels he can work best among the whites in the Black Belt areas, rather than in the so-called progressive areas. There are so many first steps possible, which, once taken, force one to declare oneself and move into a position where a break is necessary. In these areas, any liberal act whatsoever is a radical act. Identity is a problem for those who get involved. At first guilt over the role of the white community, and a personal sense of guilt, forces the white to embrace "blackness." Some of the whites in SNCC are among the strongest advocates of black nationalism. This is a necessary step for true integration and must be gone through. It is fruitless for all the whites in SNCC to try to be Negro. We must move on to a white nationalism, must accept what we are before we can be completely integrated. We must free our own minds before we can create a model of a truly integrated society. As a result therefore we need to do programming in the white community. Not among the unemployed, necessarily. The Negro movement did not begin there, but among students. We need to build a real movement among white students so that we can catch up and move ahead together.

Mike Sayer added that whites not only have to feel the problem deeply; they must have specific skills. Whites have worked because there were jobs to be done which needed their help. Now one of the jobs to be done is work in the white community. Our enemy is not segregation but something deeper than that and much more concrete. The goals of the organization change as we go through the process of trying to achieve them. The process is what is important.

*Raleigh, North Carolina. Report by Reginald Robinson.*

A written report was presented by Reginald Robinson on the voter registration project in Raleigh, financed by the VEP and by the Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO. The project just got under way in late Fall, and centres around mobile registrars with cooperation from Raleigh Citizens' Association. Questions followed, and a short discussion was held about Raleigh. Among the comments were:

1. We are working in Raleigh because of VEP money which was available, primarily. It is an easy area as far as voter registration goes, and could even be a "rest area" for staff from hard core areas (Jim Forman).
2. There is one major problem. We can register all of the Negroes because the white power structure feels it can manipulate them to political advantage, in supporting the Democratic Party. What we really have to do is to organize the Negroes to deal with their problems and not let them be used. This is a problem eventually with all of SNCC: we can't just register people and leave. We really must do political education and organization, which, at present, we are not doing (Doug Harris).
3. Easy registration is for political reasons. The state democratic party is worried about inroads of the Republicans and wants to increase the power of the Democratic Party by Negro votes (Jim Forman).
4. We should continue to work there, but in the meantime look into other

potential issues in the community so that when the time comes to make a break with the power structure, we can have organisation, knowledge, and whatever else is needed to work for Negro interests (Bernard Lafayette).

Bob Moses used the Raleigh project as a beginning point for comments about border areas in general. There are four things we must watch out for and do in these areas:

1. This is a good place to recruit new staff, since there are so many Negro colleges around, and part of the task of the staff in these areas ought to be recruitment.
2. We must work out a philosophy of what to do with Negro office holders, which will emerge in such areas, e.g. Atlanta. We must function as the critical left-wing of their support, raising issues to them, and in general trying to work out a way to capitalise on this possibility to really make gains.
3. There is a multi-million dollar community development project being planned for North Carolina, which some persons working with John Regie in the National Council of Churches are going to run. We ought to get people on the staff of this project and get some southern kids into it, so that they can benefit from it, and also so they can help shape it.
4. What happens in the border states now will set the tone for what happens in the deep South in the future. We have committed ourselves publicly in such a way as not to be able to play too directly a role in the present shaping of the border areas. We have a major role to play as a critic, and to push for deeper changes than people are going to work for on their own.

This concluded the evening session and the last session of the full body. Beginning the next day, all meetings were of the Executive Committee supplemented by project heads and a few other persons.

#### MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Monday Evening, December 30. First Session of the Executive Committee

Courtland Cox presided over the full meeting of the Executive Committee on both December 30 & December 31, 1963.

It was agreed, regarding procedure, that the secretaries would summarise the previous discussion on matters to be acted upon, and that the group would then decide by consensus. Other items added to the agenda at this time were (1) appropriation of money for cars; (2) the Washington Office; (3) the New York Office. Subsequently, other items were also added to the agenda.

#### 1. Buttermilk Bottom

After a brief discussion it was moved that SNCC offer two staff persons to the Committee on Appeal For Human Rights to assist their all out drive to desegregate Atlanta, and that we assign staff to Buttermilk Bottom as a separate project (John Lewis).

After discussion in which it was pointed out the difficulty of thinking of a section of a city as a separate project, the motion was revised to authorise two field secretaries to be assigned to Atlanta generally, to work both with the Committee on Appeal and Buttermilk Bottom and whatever else may come along. It was stressed that these should be two separate people and not the Atlanta office staff.

The revised motion was agreed upon by consensus.

## II. Washington, D. C. Demonstration

It was moved by Jim Forman that SNCC call for renewed demonstrations around the nation, beginning on or around February 1, on the issue of civil rights and youth unemployment.

Several variations in time and exact focus were seen as necessary, depending on the local situation. It was suggested that perhaps in the South, where Lincoln's birthday is not celebrated, we might consider demonstrations staying out of school and focusing attention on the school situation.

The consensus was that the Washington demonstration on February 1 will signal renewed demonstrations by youth around the nation, focusing on civil rights and youth unemployment.

## III SNCC Organisation

### 1. The Coordinating & Executive Committees, and the role of the Staff.

The original proposal, to expand the Executive Committee to 21 by the addition of 6 staff persons elected by the staff, and to appoint a steering committee composed of 5 Executive Committee members, 3 staff persons, and the Chairman and Executive Secretary, was presented.

A counter motion was made by Marion Berry that we take the 21 persons and divide them into functioning committees, having the whole body meet frequently: this in order to ensure non-staff participation in decision making

Extensive discussion was held on the matter of reorganisation, the basic concerns being to strike a balance between efficiency and democracy, and between staff-domination and local leadership participation.

The original proposal was revised by Jim Forman to an eleven person administrative committee, consisting of 3 staff, 3 Executive Committee members, 2 advisors, the Chairman, and the Executive Secretary and the Staff Coordinator.

It was stressed, in response to objections, that the main policy making function would remain with the Coordinating Committee, that the Executive Committee would still be central, and that the administration committee would function, meeting frequently, as a group for review and implementation of the policy making bodies.

The point was made that a good deal of the problem is due to infrequent and unrepresentative meetings of the Executive Committee, and because of the lack of representation of Staff.

Jim Forman stated that (1) if we enlarge the Executive Committee to include staff--three project heads and three at large--and it were to meet once a month, with by-laws outlining its responsibility, then much of the problem would be solved. (2) In addition, it would still be good for this body to appoint an administrative council which could meet quickly to handle emergency problems as they emerge, rather than leaving emergency problems in the hands of the Chairman and Executive Secretary alone. (3) The Executive Committee would have to meet monthly on a fixed date.

This revised proposal received general approval of the group and was accepted by consensus.



uary 24-26; location to be determined by the Chairman.

It was agreed by consensus to table appointment of the administrative committee until the next meeting when all the project heads can be present. Until then, the following were delegated to meet in the function of an administrative committee just before the next Executive Committee meeting to handle administrative functions such as agenda: John Lewis, Jim Forman, Worth Long, Ella Baker, Howard Zinn, Bill Hansen and Lester McKinnie.

2. *Staff Coordinator.* There was general consensus that Worth Long should leave the Selma project and resume his function as staff coordinator.

3. *Action on local protest groups.* Since there seems to be inadequate attention given to the development and also the role of local protest groups, the Chairman of the session called for someone to draw up a proposal for action on the part of the Executive Committee to deal with this problem. Jim Forman volunteered to present a report to the next Executive Committee meeting.

4. *More on the Administrative Committee.* Jim Forman reopened the discussion on the administrative committee by suggesting that it take over the functions of the personnel committee. There has been a lot of confusion on who does hiring and staff direction. The understanding ought to be that locally staff should recruit anyone they wish to work with them, but if it involves financial support of the individual, then such hiring must go thru the Atlanta office. It was suggested that the procedure would be that the administrative committee would review staff requests and applications and report to the Executive Committee, which would actually make decisions. This will give the matter of hiring and rejection an organisational structure, and protect individuals from criticisms. This understanding of the personnel function of the administrative committee was agreed upon by consensus of the body.

#### IV. The Upper South (Border Areas)

1. *Recruitment.* It was agreed that we ought to work out a program of recruitment of new staff from the schools in the border areas. A proposal was presented by Jim Forman that the Southern Campus Coordinator should work with four campus travelers, whose concern it would be to do speaking and recruiting: Bruce Gordon (Carolinas and Virginia); Chico Neblett (Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas); William Stafford (Alabama and Georgia); Prathia Hall (the border areas). In addition, he proposed that each local project ought to appoint a student coordinator whose function would be to involve students in the program, and a recruitment person, whose task is to find potential new staff persons. In the discussion it was brought out that we should (1) make an effort to get to the Southern meetings of fraternities and sororities (a sheet was passed around to find out who belonged to what group); and (2) concentrate more on conferences where students gather, to try to find new staff recruits and new contacts. The Forman proposal was agreed upon by consensus.

2. *Negro Candidates.* It was stated that we ought to work to run candidates in all areas where we work, to get the issues out before the public. In 1964, it was suggested, we ought to have 14-20 candidates running, not with an idea of winning, but to put pressure on the regular candidates. There was some controversy about the political stands which should be taken by candidates, some arguing for a moderation of radical program in order to get broad support, especially in areas where there is a possibility of winning. Others felt that this way we get trapped in the long run and is self-defeating. There was no consensus and the continuation of the discussion was reserved for a later date.

## V. The New York Office

A proposal for expansion of the staff and program of the New York Office was presented in a written form by Jim Monsonis. It asked for the increase of staff from 2 to 4, to include an office manager type, and a field secretary with southern experience. In program, the proposal was to expand fund-raising to \$200,000 goal; to develop some political work in support of Southern action and problems; and to expand services to the Atlanta office. After the disabilities of a rotating field person were explained, and the possibility of a substantial independent study for the field secretary were outlined, the proposal was accepted by consensus, subject to finding personnel. Jim Monsonis was delegated to work out the problem of personnel with the administrative committee and submit a report at the next Executive Committee meeting. Jim Forman indicated that such expansions among the Friend groups in general mean we shall have to consider in the future the matter of their representation in the decision making structure of SNCC.

## VI. The Washington Office

Courtland Cox presented a proposal for the expansion of the Washington office making the following points (1) the recently established Washington office has not been supported by Atlanta; (2) Bill Mahoney has been making very useful contacts with the federal agencies and with Congress; (3) the office ought to expand into the area of political and social action as well since it is there; (4) SNCC ought to take the work with the federal government seriously, send requests to Mahoney for information wanted; (5) financially the office can support itself and raise additional money.

Bob Moses added that in addition we ought to think of getting someone with legal training to work there also, to work as Timothy Jenkins did part time during the past year.

It was moved by Jim Forman to accept the proposal, and to include in its work tackling some of Washington's problems. In this context there was a general discussion of several mistakes which have been made, confusions in description of SNCC policy, etc. It was pointed out that in relation to the public there are four sensitive areas of discussion: labor, Negro candidates, openness of association, and what kind of society we are trying to achieve. Perhaps we ought to formulate some ways of expressing our beliefs and basic concepts on these issues so as to present our position in the best light. It was agreed by consensus that the question of public relations and the image that SNCC presents should be a key topic for the next meeting of SNCC-

The Washington proposal for the expansion of the office was accepted by consensus, with the recommendation that Bill Mahoney attend the next meeting of the Executive Committee and present a report on Washington activity.

## VII. Transportation

Ivanhoe Donaldson presented the report on transportation: SNCC needs a strongly organized transportation unit, which it does not now have. We need, for instance, to complete the arrangement if possible to lease a fleet of cars, on which Mike Standard is now working. In addition, with those cars we presently have, we need to develop a discipline and a budgeted plan of use. Proposals:

1. All drivers are to be covered by AAA or Allstate insurance.
2. All legitimate traffic fines henceforth are to be paid by the driver, not SNCC (with some flexibility involved in special cases).
3. Need to control much more carefully money given to people for travel



expense.

4. All repairs on cars over \$100 should be considered carefully to determine whether they should be made.

It was pointed out that the problem of irresponsibility with cars has been discussed before, but no solutions have ever been found. What sometimes looks like selfish control of a car has to do with responsibility for its car and upkeep.

Forman suggested that Ivanhoe undertake the responsibility of being transportation coordinator, and he agreed to set it up at least. It was suggested and agreed by consensus that Ivanhoe present a full report to the next meeting of the Executive Committee.

A proposal to get a new bus for Mississippi, made by Ivanhoe, was tabled pending further conversations with the Mississippi people.

It was agreed by consensus that all purchases and major repairs henceforth will be cleared through Ivanhoe first.

After an explanation of the present negotiations involving the leasing of a fleet of 20 cars for 2 years for \$22,000, it was agreed by consensus that should an immediate decision need to be made, the administrative committee would have that power.

#### VIII *Advisory Committee*

A proposal presented by Ella Baker that the Advisors draw up a plan for advisory committees, in at least the following areas : legal, education, political-economic, medical-psychiatric, was agreed by consensus.

Various suggestions as to persons who might be included were invited by Ella and several were given at that time.

#### IX *Tax-exempt Arm of SNCC*

The proposal originally made by Bob Moses, was summarised and re-presented (see page 11 of the minutes). Bob Moses has asked Ella Baker if she would direct the setting up of the tax-exempt arm and she has agreed to initiate it. Charles Sherrod suggested that in view of Miss Baker's long and faithful service to SNCC, we ought to start giving her subsistence and expenses. Ella Baker responded that she will draw expenses but nothing more. She is shifting back to New York soon and will undertake this task then. She wants it understood that she will not compromise other activities and associations because of this position and that this may eventually cause a problem.

It was agreed by consensus that the proposal as outlined, with Miss Baker setting up the arm, would be accepted. On the matter of a list of projects which should be included in the proposal, Bob Moses suggested that we begin with the various things we are now doing which could be covered. This was agreed by consensus.

Miscellaneous: Bob Moses asked authorisation to send a delegation to New York to attend the meeting of HARYOU, following up on conversations he had had on his last trip to New York, exploring whether such a youth program might not be possible for Southern urban areas. A delegation of Bob, Ella Baker, Charles Sherrod, and someone from the New York office, was approved to attend the January 3-4 meetings of HARYOU.



## X Summer Projects

1. Mississippi. Bob Moses reported on possible summer plans for Mississippi. The initiative for summer projects in Mississippi came out of the Freedom Vote, when a lot of white students came in. A number of problems are involved in considering the state with white students this summer, including the development of Negro leadership, possible violence, the ability of present staff to direct them, etc. After heated discussion at the last COFO meeting, it was decided to limit the number of white students in Mississippi this summer to 100.

While I was up in New York, summer projects were being discussed at two points. The Yale students want to send students down in quantity, feeling that they could pay their own way. A limit of 50 was tentatively suggested to them. The National Council of Churches also plans summer projects in the South in a big way, concentrating large numbers in organized projects in cities, e.g. 100 in Savannah. Jack Pratt is working on this, which will be presented to the Council for United Civil Rights Leadership.

In addition Dr. Blyth of the literacy project is working on a proposal for a six-week training program in literacy work. If we decide to have him go ahead and set up such a project he will have to be put on a retainer.

Groups are obviously organizing to come down. SNCC has to decide whether to have a project, what it will do, and how many will be involved.

There are essentially two proposals. (1) pushed by Al Lowenstein, pour in thousands of students and force a showdown between local and federal governments in an election year. (2) develop an intensive educational program and with Blyth, work out just how many could be used. Perhaps if we go ahead with the latter, the National Council of Churches could fund it. Another group of students (graduates) is being organized at Harvard by Guido Goldman to work on cultural education, working out a program directly with Tougaloo.

John Lewis argued for a concentration of program on Mississippi this summer, doing both the smaller, intensive program and the saturation program. The second part, organized strictly around the issue of voting, can force a physical showdown between the federal and local governments, which is needed at the time of the conventions. Johnson cannot fail to respond.

Charles Cobb raised the consideration of what happens after the summer, when everyone leaves. Does not feel we can handle the whole situation. Bob Moses reminded persons that COFO has voted down this suggestion, and it will have to be brought to them again for consideration. Joyce Ladner felt that there might be a negative reaction from local Negro leadership because of this outside invasion.

Ivanhoe Donaldson felt that the administrative part of the problem can be worked out, and felt that we need to concentrate on the issue itself.

Bob Moses pointed out at this point that this is a very divisive question, having divided people in Mississippi as it has this group. He would not declare a personal opinion on the question when asked, feeling it would be too big a responsibility to make alone.

Marion Berry argued in favor of the saturation proposal. This next year is an important year politically, with the election. We have had no test of the new President, and if we don't do it now, we shall not have a real opportunity again. We shall have to educate people to the dangers involved and the problems. That can be handled: the essential question is that it

is our big chance to force Johnson to commit himself.

Jim Forman spoke in favor of the proposal, though with some reservations. Students from the North bring with them channels of publicity and communication, which is always helpful. It may be difficult during convention time to organise pressure, but there will be a lot of sentiment for the right to vote. There might be some problems of discipline: are people coming to work for SNCC and under our jurisdiction, or "to Mississippi?" That will be important. If we decide to do this, we shall have to begin by training a group of 20 now as sub-section leaders for the larger group to come. People will have to understand that they will operate as a unit, coming to the support across the state to someone in trouble. They must be prepared to get arrested. When something happens we may concentrate the full force on one spot.

Courtland Cox argued that we do not have the political program for these people sufficiently clear yet. We need persons to do the careful educational and organisational work, while using these thousands to create chaos, outside links, and to force federal action.

Charles Sherrrod expressed concern over the effect of this upon the whole of SNCC. Are we willing to risk disintegration of our total operation in such a confrontation?

Jim Monsonis expressed concern that many undisciplined and unorganised people will just wander into the state and confuse the situation.

Bob Moses summarised the argument as follows:

*arguments for:*

- (a) a lot of emotional compression is built up around Mississippi which can be focused.
- (b) Mississippi is a larger question than simply racial segregation, but rather a totalitarian government, a closed society. There is broad support in the nation for a change of this, which is growing stronger all the time as more attention is focussed on the state.
- (c) there is a great willingness of students to go to Mississippi.
- (d) we can force some kind of confrontation, which will not create change at this time, but can be a platform, an opening wedge for future pressure.
- (e) the plans will force some move to buy it off, some negotiation, which will result in some change at least from the totally status quo situation of the present.

*arguments against:*

- (a) the federal government is simply not prepared to make the kind of commitment we will be demanding from them.
- (b) can we mount enough pressure out of this to make them be prepared; is this the best place for the final showdown?
- (c) will this initiate the threatened bloodbath and have violent consequences we cannot handle?

After further discussion and objections and problems of administration and organisation were considered, Marion Berry moved:

{ During the Presidential election year of 1964, SNCC intends to obtain the right for all citizens of Mississippi to vote, using as many people as necessary to obtain that end.

The motion was passed unanimously. Bob Moses was asked to discuss our decisions with COFO and report back to the next meeting of the Executive Committee where we can consider whether to go ahead with action. It was suggested that other SNCC leaders go with him for the discussion with COFO.



## 2. Other Summer Projects

- (a) Jim Herman said that at the next meeting he will present one for Southwest Georgia.
- (b) Marion Berry stated that Knoxville will have a tutorial project this summer which can take many people. He will present the full plan at the next meeting.
- (c) Bob Moses stated that Atlanta ought to be a good place to recruit summer people for the Albany area; perhaps as a work-study project.

## 3. The Political Conventions

Bob Moses presented on behalf of Jim Bevel the idea that we should form an ad hoc group to plan strategy for the conventions and to agitate there. A concern was expressed regarding ad hoc groups and regarding getting caught supporting watered down demands such as at the March on Washington. Because of the rather nebulous nature of the proposal at this time, no advantage was seen in committing ourselves to it. There are possible advantages, though especially since it would be unfortunate not to capitalise on Bayard Rustin's organisational talents and national image, should he be involved. No decision was taken at present. It was decided, however, that should the ad hoc group meet over a proposal, we attend the meeting and then consider it.

## XI SNCC Education

The proposal by Howard Zinn was presented again, followed by the written proposal by Miles Horton for quarterly workshops. Joyce Ladner stated that the two proposals were not in conflict and could be combined. Whoever works on overall staff education from the Atlanta office could also work out the details of cooperation with the Horton proposal.

It was agreed upon by consensus that the staff coordinator be directed to work out with Howard Zinn the specific staff needs of his proposal, and to begin to implement it.

It was agreed to accept the Horton proposal. After discussion on whether it should be accepted subject to outside funds, it was voted that we should go ahead under any conditions as a necessary step in SNCC's program, and that all offices should work on fund-raising. Dinky Romilly was assigned the responsibility for coordination of fund-raising for this project. She was directed to consult with Miles Horton for any suggestions he may have on fund-raising.

## XII HUAC and Freedom of Association

Since the draft statement on HUAC had not been prepared, the decision on a position on HUAC was deferred to the next meeting. No specific assignment was made for persons to work on it. It was also agreed to maintain the present implicit policy on freedom of association until the next meeting when the position paper will be presented.

## XIII National Boycotts

Ivanhoe Donaldson commented on boycotts as a result of the experience with the call for a boycott on Dan River Mills. He stated that we must be more careful on calling boycotts, since every time we call one and do not hurt the company we weaken our attack. There is a machinery that has been outlined. We need to implement it in future boycotts.

It was suggested and agreed by consensus that the proposal for the implementation of boycotts be circulated before the next meeting. The adminis-



trative committee was assigned to follow through on this.

#### XIV White Student-Project

Sam Shirah made a report to supplement his written report on the project for work among white students and included the following recommendations:

1. that SNCC consider this project as important as any other project in the movement. To date it has been considered somewhat "special."
2. that SNCC add persons to the staff to work in teams, possibly as inter-racial teams in some situations.
3. that they work in specific areas as outlined in the written report, including repeat visits.
4. that they be equipped with cars.
5. that the project have a special advisory group.

After several questions of information, Shirah outlined some of his approach to campuses. The role of the worker is essentially the same as that of the Negro in the Negro community: to go in with a radical position and agitate, to try to destroy apathy. In the process you are likely to alienate white liberals. If you are going to relate people to the movement, you must do this from the position of the movement. Working through the white liberal community is roughly parallel to working through the NAACP in the Negro community. The goal is to so act as to get to that small minority of potential radicals, and develop them to try to go further. One person should not attempt to convert everyone. This means, for reasons stated more extensively the other day, that the hard core areas seem most likely places to work.

The suggestions were then acted upon:

1. were given approval, with a general vote of confidence.
2. it was moved that we hire additional people according to need and budget, it being understood that staff needs for this project shall be treated as staff needs for any other project.
3. this was referred to the Staff Coordinator and the Southern Campus Coordinator-
4. this was agreed to, depending on availability and priorities; referred to the Transportation Coordinator and Sam to work out.
5. this was accepted.

#### XV The Mississippi Report

Bob Moses presented the written report from Mississippi, commenting on some of the projects contained within. On the work-study program, he felt that this was a major step forward; the money was easily obtained and this program ought to be extended to other places. For best coordination it ought to be run by SNCC through the proposed tax-exempt arm. On the food and clothing drive, he stated that the National Council of Churches has agreed to handle the project through Church World Service, to supply an equivalent amount to what is collected from their nearest warehouse. The New York office is to follow up on working out the details of the program. On the community centers program, Bob stated that the National Council of Churches has requested the World Council of Churches to consider a project of this kind in the Delta. This would be run by experienced people from other nations.

On COFO Bob stated that CORE is going to expend their staff in Mississippi to ten, concentrating in the 4th District, but under the general COFO discipline. It plans to put \$1,000 per month into the program, no more. SCLC's investment will come via the citizenship schools; NAACP is not interested in working in the program. Which leaves the problem of whether SNCC wants

to underwrite the balance of \$5,118.92 per month projected costs, or whether COFO should start raising funds on its own, as its constitution allows it, or whether the program should be cut back.

After discussion of COFO, the advantages and disadvantages of working under its name, and the disadvantages accruing from independent fund-raising by COFO in terms of cutting into SNCC's fund raising, it was moved by John Lewis that we support the budget, and it was passed.

#### XVI Southwest Georgia

Because of the hour, discussion on Southwest Georgia program was referred to the Executive Committee.

At this point, it being 9:30 PM on New Year's Eve, the meeting was ADJOURNED, and the appropriate party followed.

Minutes taken by *Jim Monsonis & Cathy Cade*  
Prepared for distribution by: *Sanford Rose Leigh*