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Inquiries or Requests for Further Information should be directed to:

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party
Box 3127
Jackson, Mississippi

Telephone: 352-9788
Area Code 601

or

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party
Washington Office
1353 "U" St. NW
Washington D.C.
20009

Telephone: 332-7732
Area Code 202
In 1960 the Mississippi Democratic Party failed to honor its pledge to support the nominees of the National Democratic Convention. Immediately after the convention the Mississippi party convened a convention and voted to support unpledged electors in an effort to defeat the nominees of the Democratic National Convention.

C. THE CLOSED SOCIETY:

"It can be argued that in the history of the United States democracy has produced great leaders in great crises. Sad as it may be, the opposite has been true in Mississippi. As yet there is little evidence that the society of the closed mind will ever possess the moral resources to reform itself, or the capacity for self-examination, or even the tolerance of self-examination," from *Mississippi: The Closed Society*, by James W. Silver.

Civil rights groups working in Mississippi are convinced that political and social justice cannot be won in Mississippi without massive interest and support of the country as a whole, backed by the authority of the Federal government. As the political leadership of Mississippi feel threatened by the winds of change, they devise new and more extensive legal weapons and police powers. Police preparations were made all through the spring to harass, intimidate, and threaten the educational and political programs now being carried on in Mississippi. Five new bills, prohibiting picketing, banning the distribution of boycott literature, restricting the movement of groups, establishing curfews, authorizing municipalities to pool police manpower and equipment, and increasing penalties that may be assessed by city courts, were hurriedly signed into law. Other similar bills are still pending.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE FREEDOM DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party was conceived to give Negro citizens of Mississippi an experience in political democracy and to establish a channel through which all citizens, Negro and white, can actively support the principles and programs of the National Democratic Party. The Council of Federated Organizations (COFO), a confederation of all the local civil rights and citizenship education groups in Mississippi, is assisting local citizens to develop the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

This party is open to all citizens regardless of race. It was officially established at a meeting in Jackson on April 26th; the approximately 300 delegates present elected a temporary state executive committee, which will be responsible for setting up precinct and other state meetings. These meetings will parallel those of the Mississippi Democratic Party, and every effort will be made to comply with all state laws which apply to the formation of political parties. Registered voters in the Freedom Democratic Party have already attempted to attend precinct and county meetings of the Mississippi Democratic Party, an experience which only offered further proof of the racial discrimination rife within this party and of its disloyalty to the National Party (See Appendix).

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party is presently engaged in three major efforts: (1) Freedom Registration; (2) Freedom Candidates; and (3) The Convention Challenge.
A. FREEDOM REGISTRATION:

Official registration figures show that only some 20,000 Negroes are registered in Mississippi as compared to 500,000 whites. This represents less than 7% of the 435,000 Negroes 21 years of age in the state. The Freedom Registration is designed to show that thousands of Negroes want to become registered voters. By setting up registrars and deputy registrars in counties across the state, some 100,000 or more persons may be inscribed on the Freedom Registration books by the time of the Democratic Convention. Last November some 83,000 Negroes voted in a mock gubernatorial race, in which COFO President Aaron Henry ran against Gov. Paul B. Johnson.

The Freedom registrars will use simplified registration forms based on voting applications used in several Northern states. Any person who registers in the Freedom Registration will be eligible to vote in the Freedom Democratic Party conventions and to participate in party work.

B. FREEDOM CANDIDATES:

The four candidates who qualified to run in the June 2 primary in Mississippi were nominees of the Freedom Democratic Party. The Freedom Candidates plan to run again in a mock election under the auspices of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party in November. This will help to establish the fact that thousands of Negroes are deprived of citizenship participation because of the racist character of Mississippi's voter registration procedures.


The Platforms of the candidates of the Freedom Democratic Party articulate the needs of all the people of Mississippi, such as anti-poverty programs, Medicare, aid to education, rural development, urban renewal, and the guarantee of constitutional rights to all. This is in sharp contrast to the lack of real issues in the campaigns of the candidates who won in the primary. Senator Stennis did not even bother to campaign in the state.

C. THE CHALLENGE TO THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION:

Delegates from the Freedom Democratic Party will challenge the seating of the "old-line" Mississippi delegation at the Democratic National Convention this August in Atlantic City, New Jersey. All steps necessary to preparing and formally presenting the challenge of the Freedom Democratic Party are being taken. Several State Democratic Conventions have already passed resolutions in support of the challenge. BUT WE NEED YOUR COOPERATION AND HELP!

1. We need convention delegates to champion the cause of representative government in Mississippi.
2. We need people who will speak out in the credentials committee and on the convention floor.
3. We need hundreds of Democrats - individuals and organizations - to instruct their delegates, petition their representatives, party leaders, and the President to face up to the fact that only a renegade Democratic Party exists in Mississippi - a party which enjoys the benefits of national affiliation, but spurns all responsibilities. Such a party can only continue to bring disgrace to the National Democratic Party.
APPENDIX A

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In 1876 Rutherford B. Hayes, newly elected President of the United States, ordered the withdrawal of Federal troops from the South. That order, for all practical purposes, marked the end of Negro participation in Mississippi government. With the troops gone and Reconstruction in its death-throes, the white population of the state united with their brethren across the South to carry out the grand design of "Redemption." Redemption meant the restoration of absolute white rule, and it entailed, first and foremost, the disfranchisement of the Negro freedman. Before the blacks could be dealt with - returned to their place - they had to be stripped of the power given them by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments; they had to be driven away from the ballot box.

Mississippi and the white South accomplished this goal in less than twenty years. The method was simple terror: beatings, lynchings, arson, torture. It worked. Paralyzed by fear of the nightriding Klans, the Negro voter in Mississippi soon became all but extinct. The pattern was repeated in all the states of the late Confederacy, and in 1901 the last Southern Negro Congressman left the House of Representatives. If Mississippi's scourging of the black electorate seemed more brutal than that of the other ex-rebel states, it could be excused on the grounds that Mississippi had a far greater percentage of Negroes than the rest -- and thus, far more reason to fear. The means, in any case, were not important; the victory had been won. Mississippi was once more the undisputed realm of the American White Man.

The black body politic destroyed, the way was clear to build, under the wing of the state government, a society in which black "arrogance and aspiration" would be impossible. Jim Crow was born, and the Mississippi Negro came slowly to understand that certain "privileges" and facilities were "FOR WHITE ONLY" - among them was the voting booth. The unwritten law of the new order (they called it Segregation) did not long remain unwritten. Lilly-white legislatures passed bill after bill, enforcing the new system in every conceivable area of life, buttressing the wall, building higher, filling the chinks. By 1920 the Mississippi Negro had come to understand that everything he did was a privilege, everything he had was a gift - subject to revocation at the whim of the "white folks." The equation for the maintenance of his happy condition was simple: so long as the Negro could mount no power, he represented no threat to the system; so long as he had no vote he had no power. Keep him from voting. Negros who objected either swallowed their objections, left for Chicago, or died objecting.

And so developed the lunatic non-politics of the Sovereign State of Mississippi. The state has always been too poor for economic issues to form the basis of any meaningful political conflict. The state has always been too preoccupied with the maintenance of its iron grip on the Negro to work toward eradicating its poverty. The status of the Negro has always been the one crucial all-pervading issue; it has always been the one subject absolutely closed to controversy. Consensus on the subject of the Negro has been essential, and required consensus in one area has a way of spreading to other areas. Solidarity became the keynote of Mississippi politics, but behind the wall of solidarity there existed only a vacuum. The prize always
went to the candidate who could shout longest and loudest the word "Nigger," who was most eloquent in his appeals for the maintenance of "Our Way of Life." Bizarre stunts replaced stands on issues as a means of gaining support. There was always, of course, the vague antipathy of the hill folk for the rich planters of the Delta, but any political movement could easily be quashed by raising the spectre of Negro power and calling for all-important solidarity.

In 1954, with segregation at last under attack, white Mississippian\s began to organize and institutionalize the state's isolation; the White Citizens Councils were formed in Indiana. Under pressure from the Freedom Movement the Councils were to grow into a semi-official Committee of Public Safety, exercising something that looked very much like political rule over most of the state. Spreading from the Delta, the Councils organized all over Mississippi, loudly voicing their unswerving devotion to the principles of White Supremacy and State Sovereignty, and girded for the coming attack on Mississippi's Way of Life.

Although the 1960 Freedom Rides were shocking and spectacular, they did not constitute a real threat to the Mississippi status quo. The lack of lasting results of the Freedom Rides was graphic proof that assaults on segregation per se would not work in Mississippi as they had in the upper and seacoast southern states. All of Mississippi was hard-core. The power structure of the state, as embodied in the state government, was absolutely resistant to the idea of any change in race relations. The government itself could spearhead the heavy-handed attack on "freedom riders", secure in the knowledge that the more vigorous and brutal the attack, the better the chances for re-election. There existed no political base for negotiation, no sound reason for moderation. It was clear that the Freedom Movement would make no positive headway in Mississippi until the racial composition of the electorate was radically changed.

Voter registration, therefore, was chosen as the prime focus of movement activities in the state. In comparison to the massive demonstrations taking place in the rest of the South, the program sounded mild. Voter registration volunteers would be working under the legal umbrella of hundred-year-old Constitutional amendments with the outspoken approval of the President - there was certainly no national controversy over whether the Negroes had the right to vote.

There was no controversy in Mississippi either: the white population was unanimous in the belief that voting was a privilege, one for which the Negro was obviously unfit. Robert Moses' voter registration drive in McComb, Mississippi, met with met violence and registrars who stood fast for disfranchisement and White Womanhood. The balance of power in the registration books of Pike County did not change. In early 1962 voter registration workers moved north into the cotton counties of the Delta, and Greenwood became the focus of voter registration activity. Here again the spectacle of queues of would-be Negro registrants provoked the white community into vigilante action - this time with the added touch of Council organized economic freeze-outs.

With the Freedom Movement work force steadily growing - the new recruits being for the most part native Mississippian\s, the voter registration workers settled down to the long dull grind of spreading the gospel. Canvassing and persuasion took up most of their time; a good
deal of it was spent in dilapidated county jails. There was always the risk of an occasional beating; lynch mobs and shootings were infrequent but never unlikely. It became apparent that this was going to take some time.

In mid-1963 Negro registration stood at roughly three percent of all registered voters in the state; fewer than six percent of all eligible Negroes were registered. It was decided that no dramatic progress would be forthcoming in the actual registration of Mississippi Negroes until the Federal Government saw fit to enforce the Constitution in the Sovereign State. Attempts at registration, however, were to continue. The pressure on Mississippi from within Mississippi - and with it pressure on Washington - would increase. Programs for the political education of the Mississippi Negro would be developed, along with their regular voter registration activities field workers would be expected to organize communities and to teach them the rudiments of Democracy. The Freedom Vote Campaign for Governor in the autumn of 1963 (in which large numbers of white volunteers participated for the first time - under COFO auspices) proved the basic soundness of this approach. Negroes in the state were eager for political activity; they wanted to register, they wanted to vote.

The U.S. Department of Justice in the meanwhile had not been completely inactive. The Civil Rights Act of 1960 had empowered the Department to institute suits against entire states as well as against individual registrars in cases where a "pattern or practice" of voter discrimination was found. Suits were brought against the registrars of Forrest and Madison counties, enjoining them from further interference with Negro applications. When Department investigators discovered "pattern and practice" in some sixty-odd of Mississippi's eighty-two counties, a suit was brought against the state itself, challenging the validity of the "constitutional interpretation" segment of the application form. An extremely important Circuit Court decision in the spring of 1964 ordered the registrar of Panola County to disbar with both the constitutional interpretation test and the "duties of a citizen" section of the form. At about the same time a constitutional amendment outlawed the stipulation of payment of poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections.

By May of 1964 the focus of the Freedom Movement political workers had largely shifted to political education programs and state-wide community organization. The Freedom Registration campaign was conceived; the Freedom Candidates ran for national office in the Democratic Primary on June 2. And the newly formed Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party announced its plan to unseat the "regular" Mississippi delegation to the National Democratic Convention. The new party is composed entirely of native Mississippians. Organizational efforts throughout the summer are being focussed on the Atlantic City Convention in August.

This is roughly where we stand in the summer of 1964. The State Legislature was in a panic throughout the spring; it has just passed what is probably the biggest batch of clearly unconstitutional laws in the history of this country. The Citizens Council is stronger than it has ever been. The Ku Klux Klan has revived in the southwestern part of the state, and burning crosses have been spotted all over the state. The Hederman papers have managed, in a few short months, to foster a
climate of panic and fear in the white community that has spread throughout the state. It is in this climate that voter registration workers and political workers must continue and intensify present registration drives and build up the mass basis for the Freedom Democratic Party --Freedom Registration. The danger now is greater than it ever has been - and so is our hope.
APPENDIX B

"HOW NEGRO DEMOCRATS FARED"

(The following is a summary of a longer report by the same title describing, through the affidavits of the participants, the experiences of Mississippi Negroes who attempted to take part in Democratic Party precinct and county conventions this summer.)

This past June Negroes in several parts of Mississippi attempted to attend precinct meetings of the Mississippi Democratic Party. These meetings, in which all registered voters are theoretically entitled to participate, form the base of a pyramid which culminates in the Democratic State Convention. It is in the course of this series of meetings that state party officials and National Convention delegates are elected. In this Presidential election year the Negro Democrats were not only fighting for their right to be included in the party. They also sought to insure that the state party would remain loyal to the candidates of the National Democratic Party in November. To accomplish this, they pressed for the election of delegates who shared their views, as well as for the adoption of resolutions affirming loyalty to the National ticket.

The amount of Negro activity in the precinct meetings was sharply circumscribed at the outset by the outstanding fact of Mississippi politics: the massive disfranchisement of Negro voters. The climate of fear that pervades the state acted as a further check: a sworn affidavit from a resident of Nashoba County, for example, explains that no Negroes went to precinct meetings there "because it was impossible ... to make the attempt ... without suffering great economic and physical harm."

**********

In eight precincts (in six different counties) Negroes went to their polling stations before the time legally designated for the precinct meetings (10:00 AM), but were unable to find any evidence of a meeting. Inquiries addressed to public officials proved futile: some officials denied knowledge of any meeting, others claimed that the meeting had already taken place. In these precincts Negroes proceeded to hold their own meetings and elected their own delegates to the County conventions.

In three precincts (in six different counties) Negroes found the white precinct meetings, but were excluded from the meetings. In Hattiesburg Negroes were told that they could not participate without poll tax receipts, despite the recent Constitutional amendment outlawing such provisions.

In ten precincts (in five different counties) Negroes were allowed to attend the meetings, but were restricted in some way from exercising their full rights: some were not allowed to vote, some were not allowed to nominate delegates from the floor, others were not allowed to take part in choosing those who tallied the votes. In several meetings the Negroes were unable to introduce their resolution calling for loyalty to the National Party, in others they were unable to bring their resolutions to a vote.
In six precincts (primarily in the liberal town of Greenville) Negroes were allowed to participate fully in the precinct meetings. However, in some cases they were included only after white voters stalled the meetings until well past 10:00 AM in an effort to phone up enough additional white voters to offset an unexpectedly large Negro turnout. In all but one precinct (in Greenville) the resolution of party loyalty was defeated.

On June 23, 1964, Negroes tried to take part in the second level of Democratic Party meetings, the County Conventions. Most of these Negroes had been elected delegates to the county level by all-Negro precinct meetings. One, however, was a delegate from a multi-racial meeting in Jackson.

In Canton (Madison County) Negro delegates were at first unable to locate the County Convention, as the meeting was not being held in the legally designated place. When they did discover a group of whites who were in the process of drawing up a slate of delegates, they tried to join the meeting. They were informed that there would be no County Convention this year. The white group claimed to be the County Executive Committee and told the Negroes that the meeting was open only to members.

In Greenwood (Leflore County), another hard-core area, Negro delegates were also denied the right to take part in the County Convention. The whites presiding over the meeting refused to recognize their credentials on the grounds that their precinct meeting had not been “official.” A white group claimed to be the delegates from the same precincts. (At the precinct level the preceding week Negro groups had been unable to locate the white meetings; they were told there were no meetings; one group, which had arrived at 10:00 AM was informed the meeting was already over).

In one of the more “liberal” areas of the state, Meridian (Lauderdale County) Negro delegates attended the County Convention, but were not allowed to participate fully, nor were their credentials ever recognized. The meeting refused to consider their resolution of loyalty to the National Democratic Party.

In Ruleville and Greenville, Negroes did not participate as delegates, but were allowed to attend the meetings as observers. None of the white delegates from the lone precinct in Greenville which had taken the “radical” stand of adopting the Negroes’ resolution on party loyalty showed up at the County Convention. (Ruleville: Sunflower County; Greenville: Washington County).

In Jackson (Hinds County) a Negro delegate, who represented one half of his multi-racial precinct’s single vote, was seated with his Negro alternate in the back of the Convention room. His credentials were not seriously questioned and he was not prevented from participating in the meeting. However, the other half of the vote, a white woman, was seated with her white alternate at the front of the room, in the proper seating location for their precinct.
In Vicksburg (Warren County) Negro delegates were unable to nominate delegates from the floor to supplement the list already drawn up by party officials. However, they were allowed to participate in some aspects of the meeting and their opposition to the unpledged elector resolution received press coverage. One Negro delegate, who had elected herself because no meeting was held in her precinct, was not recognized as an official delegate, even though there was no white delegate from this precinct at the convention.

*******

The above summary of the experience of Negroes who attempted to participate in the county and precinct meetings of the Mississippi Democratic Party unequivocally substantiates what Negroes have been saying to officials of the National Democratic Party for years:

1. Negroes are discriminated against by Mississippi's traditional Democratic Party. They are not wanted as members of this party, and are not permitted to function in the party's operation.

2. Mississippi's traditional Democratic Party is opposed to the programs and policies of the National Democratic Party and will not commit themselves to support these programs and policies. Nor will they commit themselves to support the Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates to be selected by the National Party.

The Negro voters who attended the precinct meetings felt that one aspect of the functioning of the white Democratic Party came as a surprise to them - as a result of their attendance at these meetings. They discovered that whites do not attend the precinct meetings except in token numbers and that the delegates selected are usually chosen in advance by some party official. They felt that the role of the whites in the meetings was primarily to ratify lists of names drawn up by others. They concluded that officials of Mississippi's traditional Democratic Party have been very lax in attempting to create a widely based party and in attempting to actively involve as many people in the party's machinery as possible.

The fact that in most areas Negroes were not treated so crudely at the county level can perhaps be attributed to the very different social composition of the county meetings. The county conventions are run by the top political figures in the area. Negro delegates also observed that most of the other delegates were professional men, businessmen, and the like - the so-called finest men in the community. These people did not feel threatened by the presence of a few Negro delegates, but only irritated. Consequently the whites simply ignored the Negroes.
"We are not allowed to function effectively in Mississippi's traditional Democratic Party; therefore, we must find another way to align ourselves with the National Democratic Party."

**********

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (FDP) is open to citizens of all races and encourages the political participation of all.

**********

The Freedom Democratic Party was established in April, 1964. At a meeting on April 26 approximately 200 delegates from across the state set up a Temporary State Executive Committee for the party. The following people were elected to serve on the Committee (the number in parentheses refers to Congressional District):

Dr. Aaron Henry, Chairman
Clarksdale (II)

Rev. J.W. Brown
Hattiesburg (V)

Mr. Percy Chapman
Jackson (III)

Mrs. Annie Devine Canton (IV)

Mr. Samuel Glover Canton (IV)

Mrs. Pinky Hall Hattiesburg (V)

Rev. Merrill Lindsey
West Point (I)

Mr. Leslie McLemore
Holly Springs (II)

Mr. Charles Robinson Canton (IV)

Rev. R.L.T. Smith Jackson (III)

Mr. Eddie Thomas Vicksburg (III)

Mrs. Evelyn Wright Hattiesburg (V)

**********

The Temporary State Executive Committee is responsible for supervising the calling of precinct, county, district, and state meetings at which the delegates to the National Democratic Convention will be selected. As of July 5, the Temporary Executive Committee has fixed the following dates for the FDP meetings:

**Precinct and County Meetings:** To be held before August 2nd, at times convenient for each area.

**District Caucuses:** To be held during the week of August 2-8 in the following cities:

- Columbus (I)
- Clarksdale (II)
- Jackson (III)
- Meridian (IV)
- Hattiesburg (V).
The State Convention will convene on August 9 in Jackson.

The precinct meetings may be attended by anyone who has been registered on the Freedom Registration books, including persons who may be registered on official voting books of the State of Mississippi.

The following is a sample resolution that may be introduced at precinct conventions where people wish to do so:

Whereas we believe that the National Democratic Party represents the best interests of the majority of the people in Mississippi, and,

Whereas the Mississippi Democratic Party has stated in party literature that it is not a part of the national party and has not supported the Democratic presidential candidates,

We therefore resolve that the delegate(s) from this precinct be instructed to go on record, if they are ultimately selected as delegates to the Democratic National Convention, as supporting the party platform and the persons selected to be the party's candidates.

All of the above meetings of the Freedom Democratic Party will follow the pattern stipulated in the Election Laws of Mississippi as closely as possible. At each level the procedure for the election of delegates and the selection of county and state executive committees will be the same as that followed by the traditional Mississippi Democratic Party. Any variations will be published as official notification by the Freedom Democratic Party Executive Committee.

The Temporary Executive Committee has also decided to conduct a Freedom Vote between August 9-20, during which Freedom Registered Voters will ratify the National Convention Delegates selected by the State Convention.

The delegates and alternates so selected will attend the national Democratic Convention, where they will challenge the credentials of the presently recognized Mississippi Democratic Party delegation. The Freedom Democratic Party delegation will consist of 46 delegates and 22 alternates - the number allotted to the State of Mississippi by the Democratic National Committee.

*******

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party maintains an office in Washington, D.C., which carries on activities to mobilize Northern support for the party. The Washington office is now located at:

1353 "U" St. NW
Washington, D.C.
20009

Phone: (202) 332-7732
332-7733.

The Washington Office is administered by Mr. Walter Tillow and Miss Ella Baker, who are assisted by a small staff.
APPENDIX D

STATE DEMOCRATIC RESOLUTIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE F.D.P.

The Democratic State Conventions of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Massachusetts, and Oregon have already cast resolutions in support of the cause espoused by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Similar resolutions have been passed by the Democratic Executive Committees in New York and California. In addition, two of the most populous counties in Colorado, Denver and Adams, have passed resolutions which they will carry on to the State Democratic Convention on July 18.

The following are samples of some of these resolutions:

**Michigan State Democratic Convention:**

WHEREAS, the traditional Democratic Party of Mississippi is undemocratically constituted in that it discriminates against large numbers of citizens; and

WHEREAS, the traditional Democratic Party of Mississippi does not support the platform and policies of the National Democratic Party; and

WHEREAS, the traditional Democratic Party of Mississippi in 1960 did not support the nominees of the Democratic National Convention despite a pledge made at the convention by leaders of that state's delegation; and

WHEREAS, a Freedom Democratic Party is being established in the state of Mississippi which is open to all citizens regardless of race and which will support the national platform and candidates; and

WHEREAS, the Freedom Democratic Party plans to seek to be seated in place of the delegation from the traditional Democratic Party of Mississippi at the 1964 Democratic National Convention;

NOW THEREFORE be it resolved that the May, 1964 Washtenaw County Democratic Convention hereby asks the state convention to urge the Michigan delegation at the forthcoming national convention to take all appropriate action to seat the delegates from the Freedom Democratic Party of Mississippi if they should petition for credentials and to deny credentials to the delegates from the traditional Democratic Party of Mississippi.

(This resolution was passed unanimously by the Democratic State Convention June 12-13, Lansing, Michigan.)

**Minnesota State Democratic Farmer-Labor Convention:**

WHEREAS:

1. The traditional Democratic Party of Mississippi is a totally segregated party which does not permit hundreds of thousands of Negro citizens in Mississippi to vote or otherwise participate in its affairs.

2. The traditional Democratic Party of Mississippi did not support the 1960 platform or candidates of the national Democratic Party and now proclaims that it is not a part of the national Democratic Party.
3. A Freedom Democratic Party is being established in Mississippi which is open to all citizens regardless of race and is committed to support the national platform and candidates.

4. The Freedom Democratic Party is seeking to seat its delegates to the 1964 Democratic National Convention in place of the delegates from the traditional Democratic Party of Mississippi.

5. Minnesota welcomes this opportunity to demonstrate its devotion to justice and equal rights for all citizens regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this Convention instructs the Minnesota delegation to the forthcoming Democratic National Convention:

1. To take all appropriate action to prevent the seating of the delegates from the traditional Democratic Party of Mississippi.

2. To consider the request to seat the delegates of the Freedom Democratic Party with sympathy and in the light of all the facts that will be presented to the Credentials Committee of the Democratic National Convention.

3. To follow the same policy if the credentials of any other State delegation are challenged on the grounds on which the Mississippi delegation will be challenged.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this resolution shall be sent to the members of the Democratic National Committee, its Chairman, and to the Chairman of each State Democratic Party.

(This resolution was passed unanimously by the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party, meeting in convention June 27, 1964, at the St. Paul Hotel, St. Paul, Minnesota.)

New York State Democratic Committee:

As Democrats and as members of the National Democratic Party, we believe that the national convention, the governing body of the Democratic Party, should consist only of delegates devoted to the principles and objectives of the Party and who are duly elected by members of the Party.

WHEREAS, the present Democratic Party of some states publicly stated that they are independent of the National Democratic Party and that they do not support the policies and platform of the National Democratic Party or the Party itself; and that they oppose the principles, candidates, and objectives of the National Party; and,

WHEREAS, the present Democratic Party in certain states has systematically prevented Democrats, who happen to be Negroes, from voting in the Party primaries and from electing delegates to the Democratic National Convention and, therefore, has no properly elected delegates,
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Credentials Committee of the New York State Delegation at the Democratic National Convention shall exercise every effort to make certain that only those delegates who are pledged to the principles, and objectives of the National Democratic Party as expressed in the Party platform be seated as representing their state Party.

(This resolution was passed by the New York State Democratic Committee on June 15, 1964.

Wisconsin State Democratic Convention

WHEREAS, the Democratic Party of Wisconsin is firmly committed to the principle of one-man one-vote; and

WHEREAS, the Democratic party of this state is committed thru its platform and its candidates to actively strive for legislation that will ensure equality under the law for all citizens; and,

WHEREAS, in certain states such as Mississippi, delegates are selected by a non-representative white minority; and,

WHEREAS, the official Democratic Party in certain states has not supported the national ticket or the national platform particularly in regard to civil rights;

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Wisconsin delegation to the Democratic National Convention be urged to oppose the accrediting of those state delegations that are not loyal to the basic civil rights principles of the Democratic national platform; and Be it further resolved that the Wisconsin delegation to the Democratic National Convention be urged to support the accreditation of the "Freedom Delegation" as an expression of our support for the principle of one-man one-vote, and to encourage those who are working for voter registration of a disenfranchised minority.

(This resolution was passed unanimously by voice vote at the Wisconsin State Democratic Convention, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, June 20, 1964.
APPENDIX E
"The Right to Vote" in Mississippi

Official registration figures show that only some 20,000 Negroes are registered in Mississippi as compared to 500,000 whites. This represents less than 7% of the 35,000 Negroes of voting age in the state.

*******

(The following are selected passages from a speech by Professor Russell H. Barrett of the University of Mississippi, entitled "Voting Qualifications in Mississippi").

"...The present voting laws of Mississippi were intended to be discriminatory... These requirements have their origin in constitutional amendments which were implemented by the legislature in 1955 and 1962, and in both cases public officials carefully avoided making statements which could be used in court actions as proof of intention to discriminate. In 1954 Governor White did say that the amendment would "tend to maintain segregation," but in 1962 Representative Thompson McClellan urged legislators to avoid asking "unnecessary questions" about the legislation in public and there was no debate on the obvious purpose of the legislation in either year.

"The newspapers and the Citizens' Council were less discreet, and they were relied upon to provide whatever explanation the voters may have needed. In October, 1954, Robert B. Patterson is reported to have said at a Citizens' Council meeting, "The amendment is intended solely to limit Negro registration." The Jackson Daily News copied a statement by Patterson as an editorial, and its story on the election results carried the headline, "Constitutional Amendment to Restrict Negro Voting Given 19-1 Lead at Polls." During the campaign on the moral character amendment in 1960 the Jackson State-Times editorialized, "This proposed amendment is not aimed at keeping white people from voting, no matter how morally corrupt they may be. It is an ill-disguised attempt to keep qualified Negroes from voting; and as such, it should not have the support of the people of Mississippi." When the legislature got around to implementing the new requirement in 1962, a news report stated that the new laws "are intended to make it more difficult for Negroes to register."...

"First, the whole pattern of voting requirements and of the registration form is calculated to make the process appear to the voter to be a hopelessly formidable one. The pattern is supposed to bristle with complexities which culminate in the publication of the would-be voter's name in the local newspaper for two weeks. A major purpose of all this is to so overwhelm the voter that he will not have the audacity even to attempt registration. Behind this approach is supposed to be - and all too often is - a collection of fears that someone will challenge the voter's moral character, that he may be prosecuted for perjury, or that he may be subjected to economic or other pressures if he attempts to register. Those who have for years controlled state politics assume that this fear will be a powerful weapon against voter registration, yet the plain fact is that it is by far the most vulnerable of their defenses...."
"A second important point is that the law provides no clear or meaningful standards for its highly general requirements. These now familiar generalities require the voter to be able to explain any section of the constitution, to describe the obligations of citizenship, and to demonstrate to the Circuit Clerk that he is of good moral character. It is clear that these requirements were stated vaguely for one simple reason, to permit the Registrar to apply different standards to different people.

"... It is worth quoting what was said in 1955 by the man who was then President of the Mississippi Circuit Clerks' Association, Rubel Phillips. In complaining about the burden placed by the new law on circuit clerks, he said, "Many clerks feel the law is discriminatory and that a burden is placed on them to disfranchise many persons who have been voting for years. ... Lawyers with less than 10 years of experience probably wouldn't be able to answer the questions properly...""

The FREEDOM REGISTRATION drive is designed to show that thousands of Negroes want to become registered voters. The Freedom Registration forms, which are similar to many in current use in the North, are much simpler than those used by the State of Mississippi. The forms demonstrate what we think to be the only necessary requirements for voting. People do NOT have to be able to read and write in order to register on the Freedom Registration books. Registrars will fill out the forms for those who cannot read and write as they answer the questions. Such people will sign with "X's" in the presence of at least two witnesses. The following is a copy of the questions asked on the Freedom Registration Form:

(1) Write today's date: __________________________

(2) Write your full name: __________________________

(3) How old are you today: __________________________

(4) Are you a United States citizen: __________________________

(5) How long have you lived in Mississippi: __________________________

(6) What county do you live in: __________________________

(7) How long have you lived in that county: __________________________

(8) What is your address now: __________________________

(9) Are you a minister or the wife of a minister: __________________________

All of the statements above are true: __________________________

(signature of applicant)

State of Mississippi, County of: __________________________

Sworn to and subscribed before me by the above named __________________________

on this, the ________ day of __________________________, 196
## Negro Voters by District and County

(The following statistics are from the Congressional Quarterly, Week ending July 5, 1963, p. 1091-3.)

### First District (Northeast)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Negro Pop. Over 21</th>
<th>Negro Regis. Voters</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attala</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickasaw</td>
<td>3,054</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choctaw</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itawamba</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>5,130</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>4.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowndes</td>
<td>5,302</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>5,172</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxubee</td>
<td>3,054</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oktibbeha</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontotoc</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentiss</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tishomingo</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second District (Northwest):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Negro Pop. Over 21</th>
<th>Negro Regis. Voters</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivar</td>
<td>15,939</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>3.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>3,704</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coahoma</td>
<td>14,404</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>12.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>6,246</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>4,323</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>8,757</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphreys</td>
<td>5,551</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquena</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leflore</td>
<td>13,567</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>1.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>7,163</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panola</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.03 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitman</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>7.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharkey</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>13,524</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahatchie</td>
<td>6,183</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.07 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippah</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>13.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunica</td>
<td>5,822</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>20,619</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>12.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalobusha</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Negro pop. over 21</td>
<td>Negro Regis. Voters</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third District (Southwest):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>9,340</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amite</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiborne</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copiah</td>
<td>6,607</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinds</td>
<td>36,133</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>3,913</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>6,926</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthall</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>10,726</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazoo</td>
<td>8,719</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth District (Central):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemper</td>
<td>3,221</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale</td>
<td>11,924</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leake</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>10,366</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neshoba</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankin</td>
<td>6,944</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>3,752</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth District (Southeast):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrest</td>
<td>7,495</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>7,427</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl River</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F
THE VOICE OF THE TRADITIONAL MISSISSIPPI DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The following are selections from the "Platform and Principles of the Mississippi State Democratic Party", adopted in Convention in the City of Jackson, June 30, 1960 (The Party has not yet adopted its 1964 platform; it will meet in Convention on July 28 in Jackson):

... We are opposed to strong centralized government, national or state.

We believe in States' Rights and local self-government, and are unalterably opposed to any encroachment upon the rights of the states by the federal government, or any department or agency thereof, and upon county and municipal government by the state, or any department or agency thereof.

We believe in the three separate and distinct departments of government as set forth in the federal and state constitutions, namely, legislative, judicial, and executive, and oppose the encroachment upon or usurpation of the functions of one by either of the others, and we expressly condemn the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Brown school case rendered May 17, 1954, and subsequent decisions of that court, and inferior federal courts, striking down state constitutions and laws providing for the conduct and operation of public schools and public education within the states...

We are opposed to any legislation, federal or state, setting up what is known as a Fair Employment Practices Committee, commonly known as "FEPC".

... We are opposed to the enactment by the Congress of the United States of the so-called anti-poll tax measure as being in violation of the rights of the states to fix the qualifications of electors and in violation of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. We favor the poll tax and are opposed to any attempt to abolish it either by federal or state legislation.

We believe in the time-honored and cherished traditions of the South and opposed to any legislation, movement, or policy which would do violence to or destroy them.

We oppose the ratification by the United States of the Genocide Convention of the United Nations, the proposed Human Rights Convention and the Civil Rights Convention, the so-called World Government, World Court, or any other proposal of the United Nations...

We favor the amendment of the Constitution of the United States to limit the treaty making power of the President and the Senate...

We believe in the segregation of the races and are unalterably opposed to the repeal or modification of the segregation laws of the State, and we condemn integration and the practice of non-segregation. We are unalterably opposed to any and all efforts to repeal the segregation laws.

... We believe in the statements and principles of the Southern Manifesto, adopted by southern members of the House of Representatives and Senate in the Congress of the United States in May 11, 1956.
We believe in the separation of the races in the universities and colleges, in the public schools, in public transportation, in public parks, in public playgrounds, and in all spheres of activity where experience has shown that it is for the best interest of both races that such separation be observed.

... Under God, The Author of Liberty, we stand for individual freedom and personal dignity of the American citizen.

***********

The following resolution was adopted in Convention in Jackson, on August 16, 1960 (after the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles):

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Democratic Party of Mississippi in Convention assembled in the City of Jackson on this 16th day of August, 1960, that we, acknowledging with humility the divine power of Almighty God, and standing fearless in our belief in constitutional government, the rights of the states, segregation of the races and the preservation of our traditional Southern American way of life, do hereby declare and affirm:

1) That we reject and oppose the platform of both National Parties and their candidates.
2) That we reaffirm and readopt the Platform and principles of the Democratic Party of Mississippi adopted... on the 30th day of June, 1960.
3) That we wholeheartedly approve the courageous and forceful Minority Report as to that portion of the National Democratic Platform entitled "Civil Rights" presented on behalf of the Sovereign States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

***********

The following are excerpts from campaign literature distributed in the Paul B. Johnson for Governor Campaign, 1963:

MISSISSIPPI REPUBLICANS ENDANGER MISSISSIPPI WITH TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

The "overnight" Republicans in Mississippi are playing with political dynamite by advocating a two-party system in our state.

These inexperienced, so-called Republicans proudly boast that "they are not bound by any deep-seated taboos and prejudices handed down blindly from past generations," but they never discuss the real dangers of a two-party political system in a state like Mississippi with a "block-voting" minority group that represents over 45% of our population.

These self-styled "young men and young women and older people with young ideas" either do not know or they deliberately ignore the facts of life as they exist in Mississippi today.

A DIVISION OF CONSERVATIVE MISSISSIPPIANS INTO TWO POLITICAL CAMPS, as now being attempted by these self-styled Republicans, WOULD GIVE THE BALANCE OF POWER IN MISSISSIPPI TO OUR MINORITY GROUP. This would be the end of our way of life in Mississippi and the peace, tranquility, law and order we now enjoy in all of our communities would soon come to an awesome end.
... As Mississippi Democrats we are enjoying all of the so-called "benefits" of this two-party system through our State Democratic primary elections, without exposing the people of Mississippi to the disastrous events and conditions that would surely follow the division of conservative Mississippians into two political camps, thus giving the balance of power into the hands of the minority.

Our Mississippi Democratic Party is entirely independent and is free of the influence or domination of any national political party, and it offers an adequate framework for candidates of widely varying views to offer their services to people. Mississippi has no need for a two-party system that would divide our people and stretch our political campaigning over many additional months with resulting expense, confusion, and disunity.

REPUBLICAN PARTY ALWAYS REJECTS THEIR CONSERVATIVE LEADERS

... The truth is that neither national party is "conservative." Both the National Republican Party and the National Democratic Party are the dedicated enemies of the people of Mississippi. The national leaders of both--consistently across the years--have pursued courses of action which have moved our beloved country ever leftward -- which have threatened our citizens with ever more centralized power at Washington.

The National Republican Party has followed the National Democratic Party like a shadow. Both have moved toward socialism as they entered to organized "have-not" minorities in the heavy populated urban centers, ignoring the great, silent, unorganized majority of decent, responsible citizens in this country...

Neither party as constituted today offers any hope to free men and women who value their independence and their honor. Both parties...if their platforms and their past actions are any guide -- threaten our Mississippi traditions, institutions and segregated way of life.

The Mississippi Democratic Party -- which long ago separated itself from the National Democratic Party, and which has fought consistently everything both national parties stand for -- offers to the citizens of Mississippi and to the troubled white conservative voices in the land...

The Mississippi Democratic Party is not subservient to any national party... Our free electors may vote for any American leader who will expose the principles in which we believe.

...Let's defeat the National Republican Party's candidates on November 5th by a vote so overwhelming that it will bury forever these "overriding" Republicans who would like to rule our state and hand it over to a minority group.
Unpledged Electors

Through the system of unpledged electors, officials of the state Democratic Party are seeking to substitute their voice for that of the voters of Mississippi. They are seeking another means through which to play hide-and-go-seek with the rest of the nation. Mississippi's all-white one-party power structure would like to wait until the Electoral College meets after the election to decide who the people in the state have voted for. Through the system of unpledged electors, a handful of men would be able to bargain a majority of Mississippi's votes with the leadership of the National Republican and Democratic Parties.

The following quotations give some idea of the current thinking of some of the major political figures in Mississippi, as well as some of the presidential electors. The system of unpledged electors may well be paving the way toward a "Democrat for Goldwater" movement:

Jackson Mayor Allen Thompson (quoted in the Jackson Clarion-Ledger, July 17, 1964):

Jackson Mayor Allen Thompson Thursday voted his approval of Republican presidential nominee Barry Goldwater, but affirmed continuing support of Alabama Gov. George Wallace. Thompson ... said Mississippi "has a golden opportunity with Goldwater" because "he is a man who thinks like we do".

"He said he felt Goldwater could carry Mississippi 'and possibly one or two other states without the support of Wallace,' but if Wallace decides to give everything he's got to Goldwater the South will have a chance in November. We'll have a chance to have somebody not afraid of pressure groups."

Thompson said he felt Goldwater was unafraid of "pressure groups or liberals" because he told the Negro vote "we don't want you, or care about you."

"The South, Thompson said, will be "wrecked" by the Democrats this summer. There will be quite a change in the attitudes of the Democratic Party," he said. "You talk about a hot summer - it's going to be a long hot summer for the National Democratic Party."

Presidential Elector Frank E. Shanahan, State Rep. from Warren County said he had offered to aid in a "Democrat for Goldwater" movement if it promoted the Arizona Conservative in his presidential bid and not just the Republican Party. "You've got a lot of local (Democratic) office holders in Mississippi who are going to vote for Goldwater," Shanahan said, and contended many would join a "Democrat for Goldwater" organization if the National Republican Party would promote such a group. (Jackson Daily News, July 17, 1964).

State Legislators Hayden Campbell and Russell Davis from Hinds County announced their support for Barry Goldwater, Republican presidential candidate, saying that Goldwater was the last hope for conservative government. Campbell said, "We, in America, have just witnessed the founding of a new political party... We have seen the birth of a new party in San Francisco. It is now the Conservative Party... We in the South cannot be a part of splitting the Conservative vote and giving the election to Lyndon Johnson. It is a time for all true conservative Southerners to come out openly in every way and support the leader of our new national party...