

Afna merican

"News For You"

© Student Nonviolent
Coordinating Committee
360 Nelson St. S.W.
Atlanta, GA. 30313

JANUARY 12. 1967

Vol. III

SNCC:

The Black Shining Prince - poem by le graham.....	1
Letter to Julian Bord - from Senator Gruening of Alaska.....	3
The Angry Children of Malcolm - by Julius Lester SNCC Photo Dept.....	4
HUAC - Law Professor's Statement on the House Committee on Un-American Activities (from the Congressional Record/October 22, 1966).....	14
Fact or Fiction - (Rhodesia) - from Jet Magazine.....	22
No Clouds In The Sky - Documentary by Gwen Patton.....	22
Where We Stand - Statement by Roy Wilkins of the NAACP from the Congressional Record/November 10, 1966.....	27
People With A History - by Michael Wright of SNCC Research Department.....	36

The Black Shining Prince

For you, Malcolm
where ever you are.

Big Red is
DEAD! they said as smiles from white men & the black bourgeois
covered his body & tomb. But he lingers on in Black minds. guns
with black fingers on
the trigger.

I

Death has taken him away. And
my heart bleeds red droplets that are black. as a thought. & the
darkness reminds me of his
sweet black face.
o what beauty & gone to waste. Not
a part of this race!

II

So long are the days. And
my existence unreal
since the departure of my
he was of my own realm
how i wish for his return
far away from home
maybe it is best he stay from this crue world today (painted
in white by insane artists in disguise.)

BROTHER. For
. O
, so
. But

III

Come death
come & rest me. introduce me
to sleep in the form
of 1000 pills. LSD. Western Ideas. Dope. In 100 doses. Or words in
arrows piercing my head
from the bow
of geronimo. & it need
not be formal, the introduction. "Why?" answers death, with the
mind of some sumb ofay.
Well,
my mind imprisoned.
thoughts no thoughts. not mine &
meaningless. I'd
like to experience you, my friend. Could
be better ... & maybe
i could
see
Brother Malcolm.

Black Prince(cont.)

IV

Yeah.malcolm is gone.but
he still lives on

in the Black Masses.Betty Shabazz.LeRoi Jones.
Robert Williams.Patrice Lumumba.Black Nationalism.&Stokely
Carmichael's black power.& other people of color in Asia,Africa
& Latin America.

& it is the reality of such people.shooting black
guns.words.insults.running through streets & alleys screaming
aloud against charlie (charley. charles. ofay. blue-eyed. whitey)
that his death will be avenged.

V

He's gone.his
death lingers on.&
so
does he.

BY le graham

UNITED STATES SENATE

Washington, D.C.

December 6, 1966

Dear Julian:

Following an Alaska custom, we always address people by their first name, never later than the first meeting. Heartiest congratulations on your victory! I am more than delighted; particularly, in that the Supreme Court rendered the decision unanimously.

You are quite right in saying as you have that the United States is the aggressor in Vietnam. I have documented that in my speeches repeatedly. Keep up the good work! Nothing is more important in our national life right now than to bring this inexcusable, immoral, and totally unjustified invasion to an end.

With best wishes, I remain

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING, U.S.S.

The Honorable Julian Bond
State Representative-Elect
360 Nelson Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia

THIS IS THEIR MESSAGE: THE DAYS OF SINGING FREEDOM SONGS AND THE DAYS OF COMBATTING BULLETS AND BILLY CLUBS WITH LOVE ARE OVER. "WE SHALL OVERCOME" SOUNDS OLD, OUT-DATED. "MAN, THE PEOPLE ARE TOO BUSY GETTING READY TO FIGHT TO BOTHER WITH SINGING ANY MORE!"

T H E A N G R Y C H I L D R E N O F M A L C O L M
X.

by Julius Lester

The world of the black American is different from that of the white American. This difference comes not only from the segregation imposed on the black, but it also comes from the way of life he has evolved for himself under these conditions. Yet, America has always been uneasy with this separate world in its midst. Feeling most comfortable when the black man emulates the ways and manners of white Americans, America has, at the same time, been stolidly unwilling to let the black man be assimilated into the mainstream.

With its goal of assimilation on the basis of equality, the civil rights movement was once the great hope of black men and liberal whites. In 1960 and 1961 Negroes felt that if only Americans knew the wrongs and sufferings they had to endure, these wrongs would be righted and all would be well. If Americans saw well-dressed, well-mannered, clean Negroes on their television screen not retaliating to being beaten by white Southerners, they would not sit back and do nothing. Amor vincit omnia! and the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was the knight going forth to prove to the father that he was worthy of becoming a member of the family. But there was something wrong with this attitude and young Negroes began to feel uneasy. Was this not another form of the bowing and scraping their grandparents had had to do to get what they wanted? Were they not acting once again as the white man wanted and expected them to? And why should they have to be brutalized, physically and spiritually, for what every other

American had at birth? But these were only timid questions in the mind for which no answer was waited. You simply put your body in the struggle and that meant entering the church in Albany, Danville, Birmingham, Greenwood, Nashville, or wherever you were, entering the church and listening to prayers, short sermons on your courage and the cause you were fighting, singing freedom songs---Ain't Gon' Let Nobody Turn Me Round and you would name names, the sheriff's, the Mayor's the Governor's and whoever else you held responsible for the conditions and---always at the end---We Shall Overcome with arms crossed, holding the hands of the person next to you and swaying gently from side to side, We Shall Overcome Someday someday but not today because you knew as you walked out of the church, two abreast, and started marching toward town that no matter how many times you sang about not letting anybody turn you around red-necks and po' white trash from four counties and some from across the state line were waiting with guns, tire chains, baseball bats, rocks, sticks, clubs and bottles, waiting as you turned the corner singing about This Little Light of Mine and how you were going to let it shine as that cop's billy club went upside your head shine shine shining as you fell to the pavement with someone's knee crashing into your stomach and someone's foot into your back until a cop dragged you away, threw you into the paddy wagon and off to the jail you and the others went, singing I Ain't Scared of Your Jail

'Cause I Want My Freedom. Freedom! Freedom! Was it a place somewhere between Atlanta and Birmingham and you kept on missing it everytime you drove that way? It was a street in Itta Bena, Mississippi. Ain't that a bitch? Freedom Street! Ran right by the railroad tracks in the Negro part of town and Love Street ran right into it. Freedom and Love. It would be nice to have a house right on that corner. Freedom and Love. But from what you'd heard it was just a street in Itta Bena. Maybe it was a person---Freedom. Somebody sitting on a porch somewhere. You wondered what he looked like as you sat in the jail cell with ten, twenty, thirty others and one toilet that wouldn't flush and one useless window stopped up with bars. If it was summer the jailer would turn the heat on and if it was winter he'd turn it off and take the mattresses and you'd sing Freedom Songs (your brother sent you a note and said you looked real good on the six o'clock news on TV walking down the street singing) until the guard came and said Shut Up All That Damn Noise and you'd sing louder and he'd take one of you out at a time and everybody'd get quiet and listen to the screams and cries from the floor above and then that one would come back, bleeding, and you'd sing again because if one went to jail, all went; if one got a beating, all got beatings and then that night or the next day or the day after the people would've got up enough money to bail you out and you'd go back to the church and march again and your brother would see you on the six O'clock news for thirty seconds between the stock market report and Jackie Kennedy flying to Switzerland with her children for skiing lessons.

But a response did begin to come from the nation. All across the North young white kids held sympathy demonstrations and then with the Freedom Rides in 1961 whites came South to go to jail with Negroes --- for Freedom. Those who came said integration was their fight, too, because they could never be whole men, either, in a segregated society. Some whites stayed after the Freedom Rides and moved into Negro communities to live and to work.

At that time there was a split between activists in The Movement. Some felt that more and more demonstrations were needed, while others felt that the effect of demonstrations was limited. Power was what was needed and power came through having a say in the system. That came through the ballot. Once you had some say in government, you could have a say about jobs. After all, what was the point of desegregating a lunch counter if you didn't have the money to buy a hamburger?

So began the slow tedious work of going into a town, finding someone who wouldn't be afraid to have a civil rights worker living in his house and would help the worker become known in the community. The civil rights worker had to find a minister courageous enough to let his church be used for a mass meeting and then he had to go around the community asking people to come out to the meeting. At the mass meeting there was usually hymn singing and a prayer service first. Then the minister would make a few remarks before introducing the civil rights worker, who by that time, if he were a veteran, would've been through the sit-ins, the Freedom Rides, five or six different jails and a lot of hungry days. He had dropped out of college, or quit his job if he had never been to college to become a full-time organizer for SNCC. His job was simple: organize the community to march down to the courthouse to register to vote. In small Mississippi towns, though, he didn't even think of organizing the community. He would feel good if he could convince five people to go. If five went and if the inevitable happened (violence, arrests), he had a good chance of organizing the community. It was not important at that time if one name was put on the voter registration rolls. The most important thing was to get the people organized.

It was out of Mississippi that one of the most important concepts of "the movement" came. Let the people lead themselves. SNCC field workers provided

the impetus to a community, but let the community choose its leaders from its own ranks. To symbolize their new feeling, they began wearing denim work overalls, saying that they, too, were one of the community, that community of the poor. They rejected the idea of the 'talented tenth,' who would come out of the colleges to lead. There would be no 'talented tenth'. Only the community.

There were still demonstrations, but now they were not aimed as much at public accommodations, the most obvious symbols of oppression. The picket line around the courthouse, the symbol of the seat of power, were the new targets. The immediate result was the same. Heads that had been beaten before were beaten again. Heads that had never been beaten were beaten. New bloody heads were on the six o'clock news alongside ones that still had scabs from the last head-whipping session. If you were a civil rights worker in Mississippi you learned many things quickly. Don't sleep by windows if possible. Don't answer a knock at the door in the middle of the night unless your caller showed you nothing less than his birth certificate. If you're on the highway at night, you learned to drive as if you were training to be an astronaut. If a car was following you while you were doing 90 and it didn't sound a siren, it was safe to assume that the people in that car were not delivering a telegram. One SNCC worker, an ex-stock car driver, learned how to make a U-turn while doing ninety. (Take your hands off the wheel and pull the hand-brake. The car will spin around. Release the hand-brake and accelerate.) Each organizer had his own little techniques for staying alive. Non-violence might do something to the moral conscience of a nation, but a bullet didn't have morals and it was beginning to occur to more and more organizers that white

folks had plenty more bullets than they did conscience.

How naive, how idealistic they were then. They had honestly believed that once white people knew what segregation did, it would be abolished. But why shouldn't they have believed it? They had been fed the American Dream, too. They believed in Coca Cola and the American Government. "I dreamed I got my Freedom in a Maidenform Bra." They were in the Pepsi Generation, believing that the F.B.I. was God's personal emissary to uphold good and punish evil.

That was before the countless demonstrations where the F.B.I. took notes standing next to cracker cops while they were wiping the nigger blood off their billy-clubs, and checking the batteries in their cattle-prods. That was before the promises of the Justice Department began to sound like the teasing of a virgin who never gets down to where it's at. Sure, it was nice to see that picture of Bobby Kennedy up all night at his desk during the Freedom Rides. He looked almost like a civil rights worker, drinking coffee with his shoes off, but it took those Freedom Rides to make the ICC rule out segregated seating on interstate bus travel. It was Birmingham, '63 that finally forced the Image of Youth and Liberty, John Kennedy, into proposing a Civil Rights Bill, which was then almost immediately comprised into ineffectiveness when the Brother of the Image, Bobby, the K. appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee. They didn't like the idea of the march on Washington, but managed to turn it into a Kennedy victory and finally endorsing it as being in the American tradition, whatever that means. After the March, the American Monarch had the Big Six Negro Leaders over to the

White House for tea and cookies and to chat with Jackie about the Riviera in the winter (it's a whole lot better than the Delta I hear). The Monarch, his face rugged from the spray of the wind-swept Atlantic, as thousands of eulogies have proclaimed since his swift demise, stood there smiling, feeling pretty good because all the liquor stores and bars in Washington had been closed for the day so there was no danger of a bunch of niggers getting ahold of some fire-water, forgetting that they weren't in Harlem, Buttermilk Bottom and all those other weird-named places niggers picked to live in. (The order forbidding the sale of alcoholic beverages is one of the biggest insults Negroes have ever had hurled at them. It would have been much easier to take if it had simply been said The Great White Father can't trust his pickaninnies if the bars and liquor stores are left open.) Jack could also stand there and smile because John Lewis of SNCC had had his speech censored by the more 'responsible' leaders, who threatened to withdraw from the march. Even censored, Lewis' speech raised pertinent questions--- questions that had been on the mind of many, those not leaders, those not responsible. "The party of Kennedy is also the party of Eastland. The party of Javits is also the party of Goldwater. Where is our party?" But Jack could smile, because John Lewis had deleted from his speech the most pertinent question of all, "I want to know--- which side is the Federal Government on?"

A lot of people wanted to know that, particularly after Lyndon Baines Johnson became President of the United States in a split second one Friday afternoon. When he asked for the nation's help and God's in that cracker drawl, Negroes began pulling out road maps, train schedules and brushing up on their Spanish.

A lot of them had always wanted to see what Mexico was like anyway, and it looked as if the time to do that thing was near.

But Big Lyndon, despite his beagle hounds and daughters, fooled everybody. Not only did he strengthen the civil rights bill and support it fully, he started giving Martin Luther King competition as to who was going to lead "the movement." King lost.

With the push for the civil rights bill in Congress, there began talk of a white backlash in the '64 elections. It seemed that whites were getting a little tired of picking up the papers and seeing niggers all over the front page. Even if they were getting their heads kicked in half the time, four years of seeing that was about enough. The average white person didn't know what niggers wanted and didn't much care. By now they should have gotten whatever the hell it was they said they didn't have and if they hadn't gotten it by now, they either didn't deserve it or didn't need it.

What was really bothering Northern whites, however, was the fact that the Movement had come North. De Facto Segregation and De Facto Housing were new phrases meaning No Niggers Allowed in This School and You Damn Well Better Believe No Niggers Allowed in This Neighborhood. If you believed the liberal press, though, it wasn't as serious a problem as the one down South, because in the North segregation wasn't deliberate, it just sort of happened that way. Many Negroes never found out what De Facto meant, but they assumed it was the De Facto and not segregation they ran up against when they couldn't find an apartment to rent outside of Harlem. Soon, though, the mask fell from the North's face. In New York it happened when CORE threatened a stall-in on all

of the city's express-ways the morning of the World's Fair opening. The threat alone was enough to make over three-fourths of the people who drove to work leave their cars in the garage and take the train or simply call in sick. The threat alone was enough to make New York liberal newspapers read as if they had come out of the editorial room of the Birmingham News and the radio and television commentators sounded as if they had acquired Southern accents over night. A few months later, an organization of whites arose in New York which called itself SPONGE—Society for the Prevention of Negroes Getting Everything. It was difficult to speak any longer of a North and a South. As Malcolm X once said, that everything south of the Canadian border was South. There was only up South and down South now, and you found "cracker" both places.

While the North was being shocked into realizing that there were Negroes in its midst, the South was sympathizing with the assault that Mississippi was about to suffer. Almost a thousand white students were going into the State in June, 1964, to work in Freedom Schools, community centers and to register people in the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, a political party organized that winter which was going to challenge the state Democratic organization at the Democratic Convention in August.

The Mississippi Summer Project was the apex of white participation in the Movement, and marked the end of that participation. Within SNCC, there had been widespread opposition to the idea. Many felt that it would be admitting that Negroes couldn't do the job alone. Others thought that it would destroy everything which they had accomplished. Whites, no matter how well-meaning, could not relate to the Negro community.

A Negro would follow a white person to the courthouse, not because he'd been convinced he should register and vote, but simply because he had been trained to say Yes to whatever a white person wanted. Others felt, however, that if they were ever to expose Mississippi racism to America, it would only be through using whites. After all, SNCC had repeatedly informed the press of the five Negroes killed that year in Mississippi, because of their involvement with The Movement. The press had refused to print or investigate the information. Put a thousand white kids in Mississippi and the press would watch everything and print it. And who could tell? Maybe one of the white boys would get himself killed and really make some publicity. A few said it. Most thought it. It happened.

The murders of Goodman, Schwerner and Chaney stunned the nation. Whites were shocked. Negroes were hurt and angry. Rita Schwerner, wife of one of the murdered men, reflected the feelings of the Negroes as she commented that if James Chaney had been killed alone, no one would have cared. This was made even more evident the following year when Jimmie Lee Jackson's murder in Alabama evoked little reaction from whites, but the murder of Rev. James Reeb brought thousands of whites to Harlem on a march protesting the slaying.

The Mississippi Summer Project had accomplished its purpose; the press came to Mississippi. The feature stories it wrote usually went something like, "Blop-blop is a blue-eyed blonde from Diamond Junction-on-the-Hudson, New York. She is a twenty-year-old junior at Radcliffe majoring in Oriental metaphysics and its relationship to the quantum theory, when the sun is in Saggitarus. This

summer she's living with a Negro family in Fatback, Mississippi who has never heard of the quantum theory, etc., etc., etc." All summer the articles came about white boys and white girls living with poor Negroes in Mississippi. It didn't escape the attention of Negroes that seemingly no one cared about the Negro civil rights workers who have been living and working in Mississippi for the previous three years. Didn't anyone care about Willie Peacock, born and raised on a Mississippi plantation, who couldn't go back to his home town because he was an organizer for SNCC and the white people would kill him if he went to see his mother? Apparently not.

Mississippi was taken out of the headlines in July, however, when Harlem held its own summer project to protest the murder of a thirteen-year-old boy by a policeman. Summer projects, northern style, usually involve southern coke bottle with gasoline, stuffing a rag down the neck and lighting it. Things go better with coke. - Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Rochester and Chicago sent coke after coke after coke that summer but the granddaddy of them all, Wats to come the following summer.

If the press had ever screamed as loudly for an end to segregation and discrimination as it screamed for law and order, segregation would be a vague memory today. Somehow, though, law and order becomes all important only when Negroes take to the streets and burn or wipe out a few of the white man's stores. Law and order is never so important to the press when the police is whuppin niggers' heads on the week-ends. It slowing began to dawn on Negroes that whites didn't care quite as much about helping them get their freedom as they did about law and order. "Law and order must prevail" has become the cliché of the 60's. Law and order have always prevailed --- upside the Black

man's head at every available opportunity.

The system was breaking down, but it was breaking in ways few had foreseen and fewer understood. The walls of segregation and discrimination were not crumbling and giving way to flowers of love and brotherhood. The walls were crumbling, but only to reveal a gigantic castle with walls ten times thicker than the walls of segregation. The castle was painted a brilliant white and lettered in bright red were the words Racism. What it meant to the Negro was simple. The white man only wanted you to have what he wanted you to have and you couldn't get it any other way except the way he said you could get it. Racism. It was the attitude that closed the bars and liquor stores on the day of the March. It was the attitude which made newspapers and government officials, even Big Lyndon Himself, say, "that if Negroes went about things in the wrong way, they would lose the friends they already had." It was the attitude that made the press continue to call Muhamud Ali, Cassius Clay even though that was no longer his name. But the movement was moving. It was no longer a Friendship Contest. It was becoming a War of Liberation.

More than any other person Malcolm X was responsible for the new militancy that entered The Movement in 1965. Malcolm X said aloud those things which Negroes had been saying among themselves. He even said those things Negroes had been afraid to say to each other. His clear uncomplicated words cut through the chains on black minds like a giant blow-torch. His words were not spoken for the benefit of the press. He was not concerned with stirring the moral conscience of America, because he knew--America had

no moral conscience. He spoke directly and eloquently to black men, analyzing their situation, their predicament, events as they happened, explaining what it all meant for a black man in America.

America's reaction to what the Negro considered just demands was a disillusioning experience. Where whites could try to attain the American Dream, Negroes always had had to dream themselves attaining The Dream. But The Dream was beginning to look like a nightmare and Negroes didn't have to dream themselves a nightmare. They had been living one a long time. They had hoped that America would respond to their needs and America had equivocated. Integration had once been an unquestioned goal that would be the proudest moment for Negro America. Now it was beginning to be questioned.

The New York school boycotts of 1964 pointed this up. Integration to the New York City Board of Education meant busing Negro children to white schools. This merely said to Negroes that whites were saying Negroes had nothing to offer. Integration has always been presented as a Godsend for Negroes and something to be endured for whites. When the Board of Education decided to bus white children to Negro schools the following year, the reaction was strangely similar to that of New Orleans and Little Rock. Today, whites in Chicago and New York chant at Negro demonstrators, "I wish I was an Alabama deputy, so I could kill a nigger legally."

When it became more and more apparent that integration was only designed to uplift Negroes and improve their lot, Negroes began wondering whose lot actually needed improving. Maybe the white folks weren't as well-educated and cultured as they thought they were. Thus,

Negroes began cutting a path toward learning who they were.

Of the minority groups in this country, the Negro is the only one lacking a language of his own. This is significant in that this has made it difficult for him to have a clear concept of himself as a Negro. It has made him more susceptible to the American lie of assimilation than the Puerto Rican, Italian or Jew who can remove himself from America with one sentence in his native language. Despite the assimilation lie, America is not a melting pot. It is a nation of national minorities, each living in a well-defined geographical area and retaining enough of the customs of the native land to maintain an identity other than that of an American. The Negro has two native lands: America and Africa. Both have deliberately been denied him.

Identity has always been the key problem for Negroes. Many avoid their blackness as much as possible by trying to become assimilated. They remove all traces of blackness from their lives. Their gestures, speech, habits, cuisine, walk, everything becomes as American Dream as possible. Generally, they are the 'responsible leaders', the middle class, the undercover, button-down collar Uncle Toms, who front for the white man at a time of racial crisis, reassuring the nation that "responsible Negroes deplore the violence and looting and we ask that law and order be allowed to prevail." A small minority avoid the crux of their blackness by going to another extreme. They identify completely with Africa. Some go to the extent of wearing African clothes and speaking Swahili. They, however, are only unconsciously admitting that the white man is right when he says, Negroes don't have a thing of their own.

For other Negroes the question of identity is only now being solved by the realization to those things that are their's. Negroes do have a language of their own. The words may be English, but the way a Negro puts them together and the meaning that he gives them creates a new language. He has another language, too, and that language is rhythm. It is obvious in music, but it is also expressed in the way he walks and the way he talks. There is a music and rhythm to the way he walks and the way he talks. There is a music and rhythm to the way he dresses and the way he cooks. This has been recognized by Negroes for some time now. "Soul" is how these things peculiarly black are recognized by black men in America. In Africa they speak Negritude. It is the same. The recognition of those things uniquely theirs which separate them from the white man. "Soul" and Negritude become even more precious when it is remembered that the white man in America systematically tried to destroy every vestige of racial identity through slavery and slavery's little brother, segregation. It is a testament to the power of "Soul" that it not only survived but thrived.

Now the Negro is beginning to study his past, to learn those things that have been lost, to recreate what the white man destroyed in him and to destroy that which the white man put in its stead. He has stopped being a Negro and has become a black man in recognition of his new identity, his real identity. 'Negro' is an American invention which shut him off from those of the same color in Africa. He recognizes now that part of himself is in Africa. Some feel this in a deeply personal way, as did Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer who cried when she was in Africa, because she knew she had relatives there and she would never be able to know them. Her past would always be

partially closed.

Many things that have happened in the past six years have had little or no meaning for most whites, but have had vital meaning for Negroes. Wasn't it only a month after the March on Washington that four children were killed in a church bombing in Birmingham? Whites could feel morally outraged, but they couldn't know the futility, despair and anger that swept through the Nation within a nation --- Black America. There were limits to how much one people could endure and Birmingham Sunday possibly marked that limit. The enemy was not a system. It was an inhuman fiend who never slept, who never rested and no one would stop him. Those Northern protest rallies where Freedom Songs were sung and speeches speeched and applause applauded and afterwards telegrams and letters sent to the President and Congress --- they began to look more and more like moral exercises. See, my hands are clean. I do not condone such a foul deed, they said, going back to their magazines, feeling purged because they had made their moral witness.

What was needed that Sunday was ol' John Brown to come riding into Birmingham as he had ridden into Lawrence, Kansas, burning every building that stood and killing every man, woman and child that ran from his onslaught. Killing, Killing, killing, turning men into fountains of blood, spouting spouting spouting until Heaven itself drew back before the frothing red ocean.

But the Liberal and his Negro sycophants would've cried, Vengeance accomplishes nothing. You're only acting like your oppressor and such an act makes you no better than him. John Brown, his hand and wrists slick with blood, would have

have said, oh so softly and so quietly, Mere Vengeance is folly. Purgation is necessity.

Now it is over. America has had chance after chance to show that it really meant "that all men are endowed with certain inalienable rights." America has had precious chances in this decade to make it come true. Now it is over. The days of singing freedom songs and the days of combating bullets and billy clubs with Love. We Shall Overcome (and we have overcome our blindness) sounds old, out-dated and can enter the pantheon of the greats along with the IWW songs and the union songs. As one SNCC veteran put it after the Mississippi March, "Man, the people are too busy getting ready to fight to bother with singing anymore." And as for Love? That's always been better done in bed than on the picket line and marches. Love is fragile and gentle and seeks a like response. They used to sing "I Love Everybody" as they ducked bricks and bottles. Now they sing

Too much love,
Too Much love,
Nothing kills a nigger like
Too much love.

They know, because they still get headaches from the beatings they took while love, love, loving. They know, because they died on those highways and in those jail cells, died from trying to change the hearts of men who had none. They know, the ones who have bleeding ulcers when they're twenty-three and the ones who have to have the eye operations. They know that nothing kills a nigger like too much love.

At one time black people desperately wanted to be American, to communicate with whites, to live in the Beloved Community. Now that is irrelevant. They know that it can't be until whites want it to be and it is obvious now that

whites don't want it.

Does all of this mean that every American white is now a potential victim for some young Nat Turner? Does it mean the time is imminent when the red blood of blue-eyed, blonde-haired beauties will glisten on black arms and hands?

For many black people, the time is imminent. For others it simply means the white man no longer exists. He is not to be lived with and he is not to be destroyed. He is simply to be ignored, because the time has come for the black man to control the things which effect his life. Like the Irish control Boston, the black man will control Harlem. For so long the black man lived his life in reaction to whites. Now he will live it only within the framework of his own blackness and his blackness links him with the Indians of Peru, the miner in Bolivia, the African and the freedom fighters of Vietnam. What they fight for is what the American black man fights for --- the right to govern his own life. If the white man interprets that to mean hatred, it is only a reflection of his own fears and anxieties and black people leave him to deal with it. There is too much to do to waste time and energy hating white people.

The old order passes away. Like the black riderless horse, boots turned the wrong way in the stirrups, following the coffin down the boulevard, it passes away. But there are no crowds to watch as it passes. There are no crowds, to mourn, to weep. No eulogies to read and no eternal flame is lit over the grave. There is no time for there are streets to be cleaned, houses painted and clothes washed. Everything

must be scoured clean. Trash has to be thrown out. Garbage dumped and everything unfit, burned.

The new order is coming child,
The old is passing away.

Note about author: Julius Lester is head of the SNCC Photo Department in Atlanta. Some of his other interests include playing the guitar and singing folk songs, both of which he does well. (Ed.)

Law Professor's Statement on the House
Committee on Un-American Activities

(H U A C)

(Extension of Remarks of Hon. William F. Ryan of New York in the House
of Representatives - Saturday, October 22, 1966)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1966, Prof. Vern Countryman, former dean of the University of Mexico Law School and presently professor of law at Harvard University Law School, debated with Francis J. McNamara, the staff director of the Committee on Un-American Activities, at the University of North Dakota Law School, Grand Fork, N. Dak. Professor Countryman's opening remarks outline the constitutional and civil liberties objections to this committee. Since this issue may come before us on the first day of the 90th Congress, I recommend Professor Countryman's statement to my colleagues for study prior to that day.

The statement follows:

For more than twenty-eight years the House Committee on Un-American Activities has pursued a marathon investigation of "subversive and un-American propaganda" in the United States. From 1938 through 1944, under the chairmanship of Martin Dies, it operated as a special investigation committee. Since 1945, under several chairmen, it has operated as a standing committee of the House. During that time, the Committee has spent more than \$7,000,000. Its appropriation for 1966 hit a new high of \$425,000 for a single year.

During its history also, the Committee has been the subject of three book-length studies. The conclusions of those studies were unanimous. Father August Raymond Ogden, who wrote in 1944 and who mistakenly assumed that the Committee would end with Martin Dies' decision not to seek reelection, concluded that the Committee "stands in the history of the House of Representatives as an example of what an investigation committee should not be." But, without any change in its authority or its procedures, the Committee was continued, as I have said, as a standing committee of the House. Robert Carr, then Professor of Law and Political Science at Dartmouth, writing seven years later in 1952, concluded that the "wisest policy to follow would be the complete abolition of the Committee." Frank J. Donner, a New York lawyer with much first-hand experience in attempting to represent clients before the committee, reached the same conclusion in a study published in 1961.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt characterized the Committee as "sordid--flagrantly unfair--and un-American." President Truman said in 1959 that "the Committee on Un-American Activities is the most un-American thing in America."

Abolition of the Committee has been urged by the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Saturday Evening Post, and such diverse organizations as the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Congress, the National Association for the Advancement of

Colored People, the American Friends Service Committee, and the United Auto Workers, to name only a few. Ninety-four members of the House of Representatives, by vote or recorded remarks, have opposed the existence or the performance of the Committee. As the New York Times said last August, in commenting on the most recent disgraceful performance of a subcommittee of the Committee under the chairmanship of JOE POOL, "It is a measure of how low the *** Committee has sunk in public esteem that Senator EVERETT DIRKSON has joined those who condemn its unseemly spectacles and its legislative futility."

What is the basis for all of this opposition to the Committee? Why is there an increasing demand that the Committee be abolished? The answers to these questions are basically three.

The first and most fundamental objection to the Committee is inherent in its mandate. Since 1938 the sole authority conferred on the Committee, by what is now Rule XI of the House of Representatives, has been to investigate "the extent, character, and objects of the un-American propaganda activities in the United States," and "the diffusion within the United States, of subversive and un-American propaganda that . . . attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

Within the confines of this mandate, the Committee's authority is hopelessly vague. As the Supreme Court said in 1957 in Watkins v. United States, "It would be difficult to imagine a less explicit authorizing resolution. Who can define the meaning of 'un-American'? What is that single, solitary 'principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution'?"

But even more basic is the fact that the Committee's jurisdiction is confined to "propaganda"--which means, in simple terms, that the Committee is to investigate only opinions, associations, speech and other forms of expression. This authority is conferred in the face of the First Amendment to the Constitution which provides that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." Despite that overriding prohibition on the full Congress, the House of Representatives has by rule authorized and permitted one of its committees for twenty-eight years to engage in wholesale abridgment of freedom of speech, press, belief and association. As the Supreme Court said earlier this year in DeGregory v. Attorney General of New Hampshire, "Investigation is a part of lawmaking" within the First Amendment "prevents the government from using the power to investigate enforced by the contempt power to probe at will and without relation to existing need." Nonetheless, the House Committee has for twenty-eight years probed "at will and without relation to existing need

under its mandate to investigate "subversive and un-American propaganda."

The First Amendment, which the Committee has consistently disregarded, states an obvious essential of an open, democratic society. A legislative committee empowered to summon witnesses, to interrogate them in public, to subject them to public exposure, and otherwise to mobilize government authority against them solely because of the exercise of their rights of speech, belief, and association cannot be justified under any concept of democracy.

In a democratic society, overt acts may be investigated, legislated against, and punished. But speech, belief and association must remain free as the First Amendment requires. The Committee's mandate has it backwards. The Committee is given no authority to investigate overt acts. Its only authority is to investigate propaganda. Its jurisdiction is confined to investigation in an area which is forbidden by the First Amendment and which cannot be tolerated by an open society. This is the most fundamental objections to the Committee.

The procedures of the Committee have been remarkably unfair. In its hearing, the Committee has relied mainly on two techniques.

The first is the use of informers or "friendly witnesses." In this aspect of its work, the Committee has shown little interest in the reliability, or even the mental stability, of its informers so long as they are willing to supply the Committee with names of others who can be pursued as "un-American." In 1938 the Committee was so impressed with the testimony of J. B. Matthews that a number of Hollywood personalities, including Shirley Temple, were Communist dupes that it made Matthews its chief investigator--a post which he held for the next five years. One informer who obligingly supplied the Committee with the names of some 300 persons alleged to be Communist or Communist sympathizers was later revealed to have a long history of mental disturbance and alcoholism. Another, praised by Chairman Harold Velde as "one of the outstanding witnesses to appear before this Committee," was then reported by his hometown newspaper to have incurred his twentieth conviction for public drunkenness less than a month before his testimony and his twenty-first conviction for the same offense less than a month thereafter. From the testimony of these informers and others, and from the investigations of "experts" on its staff such as J. B. Matthews, the Committee has been able to label as Communists, Communist sympathizers or Communist dupes hundreds of thousands of Americans.

It has similarly labeled hundreds of organizations. Its most recent hearing was devoted to attempting to show that opposition to our current policies in Viet Nam can only be Communist inspired.

The second technique employed by the Committee in its hearings is to subpoena those named by its informers and staff and to interrogate them about their beliefs and associations. The treatment of subpoenaed witnesses differs markedly from the treatment of informers. Subpoenaed witnesses are not allowed to defend themselves. They may bring attorneys with them, but the attorneys' role is confined to whispering advice in clients ear. If he attempts to address the Committee, object to its questions, or in any way protect his client, he will be ejected from the hearing--as Attorney Arthur Kinoy was ejected last month in the most recent disgraceful performance by the Committee--the performance which provoked even Senator Dirksen to criticism of the Committee. Unlike the informers who are allowed to ramble on for hours, subpoenaed witnesses are not allowed to make statements in their own behalf--they are confined to answering questions posed by the Committee. And the informers who testify against them are never subjected to cross-examination. Cross-examination might reveal that they are drunks, or fools or liars--or simply that they didn't know what they were talking about.

This point is well illustrated by one of the three cases decided between 1959 and 1961 in which the Supreme Court by a 5 to 4 vote, rejected First Amendment attacks on the Committee. As a part of the "balancing" test employed by that slim majority in reaching its conclusion, it was thought relevant that the Committee had "probable cause" to subpoena the witnesses who were in the Supreme Court challenging the Committee's authority in these three cases. In one of these cases, Wilkinson v. United States, decided in 1961, the majority opinion of the Court concluded that the Committee had "probable cause" to believe that Wilkinson was "an active Communist leader" because of the testimony before the Committee about Wilkinson was as follows:

"Q. Was it (the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedom) Communist-controlled?"

"A. Yes."

"Q. Who was the ringleader in that organization?"

"A. I didn't work in that organization and I don't know who the ringleader was. My contact on that occasion was with Frank Wilkinson, I believe."

"Q. Did you know him as a Communist?"

"A. Yes."

Obviously, this is testimony which cries out for cross-examination. What did the witness mean when she affirmed that she "knew Wilkinson as a Communist"? She might have meant any of a number of things--that she had collected Communist Party dues from him; that she had attended Communist Party meetings with him; that she had seen him at meetings which she assumed to be organized by, or attended by, Communists; that she knew that the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms was urging the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and therefor assumed--as does the Committee--that anyone associated with such an enterprise must be a Communist. Or the witness may have merely been trying to accommodate Committee counsel by giving the answers he clearly wanted to his crudely leading questions. Cross-examination might have bolstered her testimony or it might have destroyed it. But under the Committee's rules there is no cross-examination.

I have adverted, in describing this case, to the fact that the Supreme Court in this and two other cases -- Barenblatt v. United (1959) and Braden v. United States (1961)--by a 5 to 4 majority, rejected First Amendment attacks on the Committee's authorizing resolution. There is good reason to hope that these cases would be differently decided under the First Amendment today. Justices Frankfurter and Whittaker, who were in the majority in all three cases, are no longer on the Court. The four dissenters--Chief Justice Warren and Justices Black, Douglas and Brennan--are still there. Two new Justices--White and Fortas--are uncommitted on the precise point. But Mr. Justice Fortas--and even Mr. Justice Clark--concurred in the 6 to 3 decision earlier this year in the De Gregory case (Justices Harlan, Stewart, and White dissenting), which found that a state investigation of subversion violated First Amendment limitations. There is, therefore, reason to hope that First Amendment limitation may yet be imposed on the House Committee.

But it is difficult to get the First Amendment question before the courts. This is not because the Committee has a good record in the courts. It has not. In the past fifteen years only nine of 129 contempt proceedings originated by it have resulted in convictions. It is, rather, because of the Committee's own lawlessness. Its disregard of its own rules and of applicable statutes usually leads to dismissal of the contempt charges on this ground, before any constitutional question is reached.

The federal statute upon which the contempt prosecutions are based requires that the witness have "refused to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry." Obviously, before the witness can violate the statute or the courts can find a violation, there must be a definition of the "question under inquiry."

Obviously, also, no comprehensible definition can be found in the Committee's mandate to investigate "Subversive and un-American propaganda," as the Supreme Court held in Watkins v. United States in 1957. In that case also, the Court reversed a contempt conviction because the Committee had not defined the "question under inquiry." Nine years later, in Gojack v. United States, the Court reversed another contempt conviction for precisely the same reason and also because the Committee had violated one of its own rules by not obtaining a majority vote of the Committee authorizing the hearings out of which the contempt charge arose.

Another of the Committee's rules once provided that if a majority of the Committee believed that interrogation of a witness in a public hearing might endanger national security or unjustly injure the witness' reputation the Committee should first interrogate the witness in executive session to determine the necessity for public hearings. In Yellin v. United States the Supreme Court in 1963 reversed a contempt conviction because the Committee had violated this rule. The Committee's response was to amend the rule to delete any reference to injury to the witness' reputation.

There still remains a rule of the House, which the Committee cannot amend, and which provides that if testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, "the Committee shall (1) receive such evidence in executive session; (2) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and (3) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses." The Committee's evasion of this rule, as exemplified in hearings held in Chicago last year, is to misread it to say that the person affected is only entitled to have adverse testimony taken in executive session if he voluntarily appears as a witness. That misinterpretation of the House rule is now under consideration by the courts in litigation arising out of the Chicago hearings.

Another Committee rule provides that no member of the Committee or its staff shall make public the name of any subpoenaed witness prior to the date of his appearance before the Committee. Yet the usual pattern of Committee hearings is that the names of subpoenaed witnesses almost invariably hit the headlines before the hearings--and frequently before the subpoenas are served. The Committee always professes complete innocence and bewilderment as to how this publicity is achieved, but the headlines continue to appear well in advance of the hearings. This feature of the Committee's performance is also being challenged in the Chicago litigation.

Former Committee Chairman J. Parnell Thomas once expressed the Committee's attitude very nicely in speaking to an attorney who appeared with a subpoenaed client and was then ordered to take the witness stand himself. Thomas said: "The rights you have are the rights given you by this Committee. We will determine what rights you have and what rights you have not got before this committee." This statement, a committee of the American Bar Association later concluded, "sums up with brutal clarity the basic abuse that runs through the entire investigative process."

The Supreme Court in Dombrowski v. Pfister (1965) found the Committee's techniques so deficient that a state statute requiring registration of members of organizations cited by the Committee is unconstitutional as lacking "a minimum requirement to assure rationality." But the product of those techniques is reflected in permanent dossiers maintained by the Committee on hundreds of thousands of individuals and hundreds of organizations. And those dossiers are available for private use although too irrational for official use.

Against this record of defamation and intimidation of American citizens must be weighed the fact, finally, that the Committee serves no useful purpose. Even if suppression of propaganda were constitutionally permissible in times of great danger, this country is in no danger from Communist propaganda within the United States, which is all the Committee's mandate reaches. The Communists in this country are, "miserable merchants of unwanted ideas." They could not sell those ideas effectively here even at the height of the depression of the 1930s. Much less can they do so today.

The Committee clearly recognizes this to be true. In disregard of its mandate, it has made no serious effort to investigate propaganda of any sort. Instead, its efforts have been confined to harrassing those whose views it does not approve and to seeking publicity for its members. And thereby it has departed from any legitimate legislative function.

Congressional investigations are justifiable, and necessary, to provide information as to the manner in which existing legislation is enforced by the executive branch. But, as the Supreme Court said in the Watkins case with reference to the Committee, "There is no general authority to expose the private affairs of individuals without justification in terms of the function of the Congress, nor is the Congress a law enforcement or trial agency. . . . Investigations conducted solely for the personal aggrandizement of the investigators or to punish those investigated are indefensible."

But the record is clear that this Committee functions almost entirely for the personal aggrandizement of its members and to expose and punish those investigated. The Committee considers only a handful of bills each year, and all of them fall within the jurisdiction of some other committee of the House. While it is the practice of the Committee to include "legislative recommendation" in its annual reports, these recommendations usually are no more than endorsements of bills processed by other committees. Even where the bills originate with this Committee, they usually have no relation to anything covered by the Committee's hearings. As the St., Louis Post Dispatch said last May, "This Committee is notorious for lack of legislative purpose."

On a most generous interpretation, the Committee can be credited with only four pieces of legislation: (1) A 1943 rider to an appropriation bill excluding certain named employees from the federal payroll, which the Supreme Court later held unconstitutional as a bill of attainder. (2) The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, designed to require registration of "Communist action" and "Communist front" (and, by 1954 amendment, "Communist infiltrated") organizations and their members, but which, because

because of conflict with the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, has produced no registrations. (3) The Communist Control Act of 1954, which amended the 1950 Act, but which is equally unenforceable. (4) A statute of 1962 which amended the 1950 Act again by eliminating a requirement that the Defense Department publish lists of defense plants from which members of "Communist action" groups were to be barred--someone had pointed out to the Committee that publication of these lists might give the enemy more assistance than trouble.

Clearly, this legislative record cannot justify the harm which the Committee has wrought nor its \$7,000,000 expenditure of public funds.

So far, moreover, as the Committee purports to safeguard internal security, it is quite unnecessary. The House Judiciary Committee now has jurisdiction over matters of "espionage." Under this authority, and a similar mandate for the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Judiciary Committees of each House have traditionally dealt with all matters of internal security. If it is felt that the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee should be clarified, that could be done by amending its authorizing resolution to make it cover "Sabotage, insurrection and overt actions relating to internal security" as well as "espionage". Such an amendment would give the Judiciary Committee all necessary authority for protecting national security. But neither the House Committee on Un-American Activities nor its mandate to investigate speech, beliefs and associations should longer be tolerated by a free, democratic society.

Above all, we should not be misled by the Committee's own propaganda--that by pursuing "unAmerican propaganda" in the United States it is combatting the menace of Communism. The Committee has been much more successful with this line than it should have been because all but a handful of Americans have no sympathy with Communism. As we have seen it in operation in those countries where it prevails, we know that its chief characteristics are the use of governmental power to prescribe permissible political views and resort to crude and brutal measures to suppress dissent. But those are also the chief characteristics of the House Committee. These characteristics, no matter how they are manifested, should be rejected in America. Because the Committee is a greater danger to our free society than the Communist propaganda which it purports to protect us from, it is indeed, as President Truman said, "The most un-American thing in America."

FACT OR FICTION?

South Africa:

People are talking about the intensity of the guerrilla action carried on by black Rhodesians against the white rebel regime of Ian Smith's. Although it is not widely reported (Smith has imposed strict and harsh censorship) it has been reliably learned that white farmers and soldiers in the Mondoro area are being killed daily and that they (farmers) have been forced, as a result, to stay in special farms in groups of ten families each for their own protection. (Taken from Nov. 24 issue of Jet)

" " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "

"NO CLOUDS IN THE SKY"

Lowndes County

by Gwendolyn Patton

The pools opened at 8:00 a.m., but black folks were there at 7:00 to make sure that they cast their ballots for those candidates who hopefully may take them out of their "fundamental trick bag". Lowndes County--Black Power--later to be corrupted by white power. Black folks were anxious and frightened.

"Remember we are the second lever."

"Pull the Black Panther lever and go on home".

"Ask the Black sisters to help you in the booth."

So the conversations went on like this for the greater part of the morning. Black folks for the first time felt like citizens. The great day was here in Lowndes County, Alabama.

"Us folks sho' are coming out. Folks want to vote."

"I'm seventy-five and I feel like I've been born again."

"De Lawd sho' want us to vote cause dere ain't a cloud in the sky."

The lady was right. . . there was not a cloud in the sky. When it looked as though it would rain, that lucky ole sun beamed relentlessly upon the heads of first class citizens.

Black folks walked, rode in trucks and cars to the polls. All of them trying to remember the instructions given them the night before at the mass meeting. Some of the new citizens had to be carried because they couldn't walk; others had to be led because they couldn't see. Many were around because they had not registered and wanted so desperately to be citizens, to be a man like their neighbors, to be a part of the "American Dream".

Brenton, a predominately Black precinct, was running smoothly. No trouble. . . not a cloud in the sky. It was a family reunion, a town meeting. Folks were helping one another and feeling for the first time in their lives like "Americans."

"There's trouble in Sandy Ridge".

The conversations changed as the morning progressed. Trouble seemed to be everywhere, and even though there was no clouds in the sky, white lightening was striking everywhere and on every black man.

"I saw Jim Clark."

"White folks ridin' round with guns."

"My boss evicted me because I wanted to vote; I wanted to be a man."

"Black boy, don't come back to Lowndesboro 'cause we is gonna git ya."

"Dese white folks sho' got something up 'cause dey is too quiet."

"Why is the Alabama Troopers here?"

"White folks lined across the street from the city hall; dey waitin' fo' somethin' ".

"Look at the nazi sign above the courthouse."

"I'm scared!!!"

"Man, you forgot your shit?"

"Naw, there ain't a cloud in the sky."

The man is right, but there were clouds, god-fearing, gloomy, death-

No Clouds - 3

like clouds over every black man in Lowndes County. If they win, white folks will kill them; if they lose the Klan will have license to kill the uppity niggers, the bad niggers. There wasn't a cloud in the sky . . .

Is Lowndes County, a creation by Black people, destroyed by white power another episode in the book entitled Human Dignity? Are Black people going to be castrated by white people? There seems to be clouds everywhere.

The Black Panther candidates lost. WHY? The results are:

<u>Black Panther Candidates</u>		<u>Democratic Candidates</u>	
Sheriff/Sidney Logan	- 1426	Frank Ryals	- 1943
Coroner/Emory Ross	- 1391	Jack Golson	- 1901
Tax Assesor/Alice Moore	- 1557	Charlie Sullivan	- 2234
Tax Collector/Frank Miles	- 1556	Iva Sullivan	- 2227
Board of Education/			
Robert Logan	- 1620	David Lyons	- 1894
John Hinson	- 1620	Tommie Coleman	- 1933
Willie Strickland	- 1552	C. B. Haigler	- 2139

How can they lose? How can our Black candidates lose in a county of 81.3 per cent Black?

How did Mr. Logan get 164 votes in this precinct and Mrs. Moore only got 64 votes in the same precinct? Don't cry. HOW DID WE LOSE?

"My voting machine did not make 'X', but they said I voted anyway."

"It's some folks from Tuscaloosa voting in our county, white folks."

"Miss Ann voted for her dead husband".

"Will you help me cause ain't nothing but white folks in dere?"

"I is too scared to 'challenge' white folks; I knows dey cheating."

"I ax the Federal watcher to let the Negro woman hope me, but he pointed to the white official."

"My boss told me to pull the first lever and go home."

"Man, we is the second lever."

"Mr. Charlie voted twenty times cause he voted fo' all the Black folks on his plantation."

"Man, white folks are stealing the election. You got your shit."

"Naw, there ain't a cloud in the sky."

Lowndes County is a foreign country, full of black people, controlled by white people from Johnson on down. Did Johnson and his boys in the Democratic Party have a meeting to make certain that black people don't win the election? Is Lowndes County the example to show niggers that they better stay in their 'places'? Johnson, is that what you are trying to articulate? Is that what you call democracy?

There were no reporters like there were at Wallace's headquarters. Was it because the white folks had conspired together and did not want reporters to relate to the public their cheating, their stealing of the elections which is another chapter in the book entitled White Man's Boss? Is the political struggle of Black people anything in this country? It is thundering now. There is no place to go; no homes, no farms, no lands. . . NO CLOUDS IN THE SKY.

So it was. A beautiful day in Lowndes County, Alabama. God controlled the skies and the white man determined the clouds, the lightening, the thundering...and the victims. Who controls the silver lining?

"Man, you got your shit?"

"Naw, ain't no clouds in the sky."

Election day was over and night began to fall. There were not clouds in the sky, but the white man's clouds began to thicken as the night grew darker.

"A Black man was whipped by a white cop for challenging. He had to go to the hospital out of town."

People had gathered at the Lowndes County Freedom Organization headquarters to discuss protection for the women, for the children and especially for the candidates.

"Man, you got your shit?"

"YEAH! There seems to be white clouds everywhere groping for Black men in the dark. We have to stop that to make certain there 'ain't a cloud in the sky.' "

"Man, we better go home and get our shit together, because we have to control that silver lining."

* * * * *

Mr. WALTER, Mr. Speaker, despite the turmoil and distress caused by some Negroes who would rather be destructive than constructive, it is good to note that the leaders of the civil rights movement are decent Americans. They seek to attain the most desirable goals in a peaceful manner and without riots and civil commotion.

I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to a letter recently sent out by Roy Wilkins on behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, together with an address made by him, entitled "Where We Stand":

October 11, 1963

Dear Friend: A few months ago the slogan "Black Power" was introduced into the civil rights struggle. Since then it has created alarm and confusion among leaders of all races and has made it plain that civil rights groups differ not only in strategy and tactics but also in objectives.

It is therefore appropriate at this juncture in history to state more explicitly to restate the fundamental principles which have guided the NAACP since 1909. Our objective now, as then, is the full participation of Negro Americans, without discrimination in all phases of American life.

During these six decades we have employed every method to achieve that objective. If these methods have any single common denominator, it is that they have always been non-violent. Today non-violence is still the only method on the premise that Negroes must defend themselves when attacked by the "right of Negroes and of all others to self-defense is not only an issue. The NAACP has always defended this right.

What we oppose is the doctrine that Negroes should stand in armed readiness to retaliate and deal out punishment their own. The record of unprovoked murders of Negroes and of all others is too appalling to post on exteriorly and internally, but its truth would be disastrous.

Remarks from the Congressional Record-Appendix
November 10, 1966

Proceedings and Debates of the 89th Congress, Second Session
(The NAACP tells how it feels about Black Power)

WHERE WE STAND

Extension of Remarks

of

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF N. Y.

In The House of Representatives
Saturday, October 22, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, despite the turmoil and distress caused by some demagogues who would rather be destructive than constructive, it is good to note that most leaders of the civil rights movement are decent Americans. They seek to attain the most desirable goals in a peaceful manner and without riots and civil commotion.

I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to a letter recently sent out by Roy Wilkins on behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, together with an address made by him, entitled "Where We Stand":

October 14, 1966

Dear Friend: A few months ago the slogan "Black Power" was introduced into the civil rights struggle. Since then it has created alarm and confusion among Americans of all races and has made it plain that civil rights groups differ not only in strategy and tactics but also in objectives.

It is therefore appropriate at this juncture in history to state--or, more accurately, to restate--the fundamental principles which have guided the NAACP since 1909. Our objective now, as then, is the full participation of Negro Americans, without discrimination in all phases of American life.

During these six decades we have employed many methods to achieve that objective. If these methods have any single common denominator, it is that they have always been non-violent. Today non-violence is stridently challenged on the premise that Negroes must defend themselves when attacked. But the right of Negroes and of all others to self-defense is not truly an issue. The NAACP has always defended this right.

What we oppose is the doctrine that Negroes should stand in armed readiness to retaliate and deal out punishment on their own. The record of unpunished murders of Negroes and civil rights workers makes this position emotionally understandable, but its fruit would be disastrous.

As private vigilante vengeance, it would inevitably breed white counter-vigilantism and would furnish a pretext to any law officer wishing to "crack down" on Negro protest.

A more serious issue is posed by the slogan "Black Power." No matter how often it is defined, this slogan means anti-white power. In a racially pluralistic society, "Black Power" has to mean that every other ethnic group is the antagonist. It has to mean "going it along." It has to mean separatism.

We of the NAACP will have none of this. We have fought unceasingly for genuine pride of race and for the inherent nobility of equal citizenship. We deny that racial dignity requires the ranging of race against race.

We are Americans as well as Negroes. While we will fight to defend this country, we are also determined to improve it.

WHERE WE STAND

(An address by Roy Wilkins, Executive Director of the NAACP, before its 57th Annual Convention, Los Angeles, California, July 5, 1966)

In the transition period of the civil rights movement, 1966 is developing into a critical year. The 57th annual convention of our NAACP is thus a gathering of more than ordinary significance.

All about us are alarms and confusions as well as great and challenging developments. Differences of opinion are sharper. For the first time since several organizations began to function where only two had functioned before, there emerges what seems to be a difference in goals.

Heretofore there were some differences in methods and in emphases, but none in ultimate goals. The end was always to be the inclusion of the Negro American, without racial discrimination, as a full-fledged equal in all phases of American citizenship. The targets were whatever barriers, crude or subtle, which blocked the attainment of the goal.

There has now emerged, first, a strident and threatening challenge to a strategy widely employed by civil rights groups, namely, non-violence. One organization, which has been meeting in Baltimore, has passed a resolution declaring for defense of themselves by Negro citizens if they are attacked.

This position is not new as far as the NAACP is concerned. Historically our Association has defended in court those persons who have defended themselves and their homes with firearms. Extradition cases are not as

frequent or as fashionable as they once were, but in past years we have fought the extradition of men who had used firearms to defend themselves when attacked.

We freed seventy-nine Arkansas sharecroppers in a four-year court battle beginning in 1919. They had returned gunfire directed at a meeting they were holding in a church.

We employed the late Clarence Darrow in 1926 to defend a man and his family when a member of a mob threatening his newly-purchased Detroit home was shot and killed. The NAACP has subscribed to nonviolence as a humane as well as a practical necessity in the realities of the American scene, but we have never required this as a deep personal commitment of our members. We never signed a pact either on paper or in our hearts to turn the other cheek forever and ever when we were assaulted.

But neither have we couched a policy of manly resistance in such a way that our members and supporters felt compelled to maintain themselves in an armed state, ready to retaliate instantly and in kind whenever attacked. We venture the observation that such a publicized posture could serve to stir counter-planning, counter-action and possible conflict. If carried out literally as instant retaliation, in cases adjudged by aggrieved persons to have been grossly unjust, this policy could produce--in extreme situations--lynchings, or, in better-sounding phraseology, private, vigilante vengeance.

Moreover, in attempting to to substitute for derelict law enforcement machiner, the policy entails the risk of a broader, more indiscriminate crackdown by law officers under the ready-made excuse of restoring law and order.

It seems reasonable to assume that proclaimed protective violence is as likely to encourage counter-violence as it is to discourage violent persecution. But the more serious division in the civil rights movement is the one posed by a word formulation that implies clearly a difference in goals. No matter how endlessly they try to explain it, the term "black power" means anti-white power. In a racially pluralistic society the concept, the formation and the exercise of an ethnically-tagged power, means opposition to other ethnic powers, just as the term white-supremacy" means subjection of all non-white people. In the black-white relationship, it has to mean that every other ethnic power is the rival and the antagonist of "black power". It has to mean "going-it-along." It has to mean separatism.

Now, separatism, whether on the rarefied debate level of "black power" is embodies in its offer to millions of frustrated and deprived and persecuted black people of a solace, a tremendous psychological lift, quite

apart from its political and economic implications.

Ideologically it dictates "up with black and down with white," in precisely the same fashion that South Africa reverses that slogan.

It is a reverse Mississippi, a reverse Hitler, a reverse Ku Klux Klan. If these were evil in our judgment, what virtue can be claimed for black over white? If, as some proponents claim, this concept instills pride of race, cannot this pride be taught without preaching hatred or supremacy based on race? Though it be clarified and clarified again, "black power" in the quick, uncritical and highly emotional adoption it has received from some segments of a beleaguered people can mean in the end only black death. Even if, through some miracle, it should be enthroned briefly in an isolated area, the human spirit which knows no color or geography or time, would die a little, leaving for wiser and stronger and more compassionate men, the painful beating back to the upward trail.

We of the NAACP will have none of this. We have fought it too long. It is the ranging of race against race on the irrelevant basis of skin color. It is the father of hatred and the mother of violence.

It is the wicked fanaticism which has swelled our tears, broken our bodies, squeezed our hearts and taken the blood of our black and white loved ones. It shall not now poison our forward march. We seek, therefore, as we have sought these many years, the inclusion of Negro Americans in the nation's life, not their exclusion. This is our land, as much as as it is any American's--every square foot of every city and town and village. The task of winning our share is not the easy one of disengagement and flight, but the hard one of work, of short as well as long jumps, of disappointments, and of sweet successes.

In our Fight for Freedom we choose:

1. The power and the majesty of the ballot, the participation of free men in their government, both as voters and as honorable and competent elected and appointed public servants. Year in and year out, the NAACP voter registration work has proceeded. No one except the Federal Government has registered more Negroes in Mississippi than the NAACP. In six weeks last summer, more than twenty-thousand new names were added by our workers alone, with additional thousands during an intensive renewal last winter. That work is continuing under the leadership of our Mississippi State president, Dr. Aaron Henry and of our State Director, Charles Evers. Later this month a summer task force will be at work in Louisiana. Already our South Carolina NAACP is busy on registration, as is our Alabama organization.

We are aware that a Louisiana young man, born along the Miss. border, has been named and confirmed as one of the seven governors of the Federal Reserve Bank. We know that his extraordinary ability finally tipped the scales, but we know also, that, without ballot power, he would not even have been on the scales ready to be tipped.

2. We choose employment for our people--jobs not hidden by racial labels or euphemisms, not limited by racial restrictions in access and promotion, whether by employers or organized labor. We commend a growing number of corporations for expanding their employment of Negro applicants in technical and professional posts, but we insist that only the surface has been scratched.

We commend the "good guys" among the trade unions for the improvement in opportunities and advancement for the Negro worker, but we condemn the policies of some unions which have either barred or heavily handicapped the Negro worker. Negro employment is in a crisis stage. The rate of unemployment ranges from twice that of whites to four and five times the white rate in some areas. The answer to the complaint of employers that workers are not trained is to institute in-plant training, just as they have in other shortages. The apprentice training stranglehold must be broken, the racially separate seniority lines, the still-persisting segregated locals and the remaining crude segregation in plant facilities must be abolished. The demonstrations before the U. S. Steel Corp. offices and plants under the cooperative leadership of Dr. John Nixon, our Alabama president, and Henry Smith, our Pennsylvania president, had wide and beneficial impact. The Negro migrant worker, the forgotten man in the employment picture, must have attention.

In the Watts district of Los Angeles last year the unemployment rate was more than 30 per cent, a rate higher than that during the great, nationwide Depression of the Nineteen Thirties. The Negro teenage rate is nearly 25 per cent as against 18 per cent for white teenagers.

Negro employment is a disaster area demanding the strict enforcement of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The NAACP has filed more than one thousand complaints with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and will file more until the law accomplishes what it was enacted to do. As evidence of his continuing concern, Congressman Augustus Hawkins of Los Angeles succeeded in having his bill relating to Federal employment passed by the House as an amendment to Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

3. We choose to combat the color line in housing. In one breath our opinion makers decry the existence of the poverty and filth and crime and degradation of the slums, but in the next they decry the low-cost housing and fair housing laws. Here in California, the hysteria of whether Negro Americans should live in gullies or be pushed into the sea reached the Proposition 13 stage which the state's highest court has declared unconstitutional. Who cares about the Constitution when a Negro might be enabled to move into the neighborhood? One could think black Americans were men from Mars. Instead, we have been here, side by side with the white folks (some of whom just got here), for 345 years.

They tell us to work hard and save our money, to go to school and prepare ourselves, to be "responsible", to rear and educate our children in a wholesome and directed family atmosphere, to achieve, to "get up in the world."

After we do all this, they look us in the eye and bar us from renting or buying a home that matches our achievements and one in keeping with our aspirations for further advancement. Some public officials, including mayors of cities, and many candidates for elections to public office, are not above public double talk and private single talk on this issue. Any candidate who orates about basic Americanism or "The American way," but who hems and haws over fair housing legislation is no friend of the Negro citizen.

The Administration's civil rights bill of 1966 with its vital section barring discrimination in the rental or sale of housing must be enacted with the amendment already inserted by the committee, providing for administrative redress as well as court action.

Your Congressmen and Senators are at home until July 11 celebrating Independence Day--Freedom Day for the United States. See them or have your branch officers back home see them in person. Urge them to rub some freedom off on twenty million loyal Americans by voting for a strong civil rights bill. Of course the section on punishing in the Federal courts those who attack civil rights workers must pass. And we must have indemnification for victims.

4. Most of all, we choose to secure unsegregated, high quality public education for ourselves and our children. A new report, made public only last week, is a jolt for anyone who thought the 1954 Supreme Court decision was subsequent legislation solved the problem.

The report says officially and professionally what we have contended all along; that predominantly Negro schools are inferior to those attended largely by whites. Also that the achievement gap widens between the first grade and the twelfth. In other words, the longer our children are kept in racially segregated schools, the farther they fall behind white children.

And, lest the non-Southerners feel smug, the report found that segregation for both whites and Negroes is more complete in the South, but "is extensive in other regions where the Negro population is concentrated: the urban North, Midwest and West."

The Federal Government, whose Office of Education has made some strong statements, must follow up with a strong enforcement of Title VI of the 1964 law. The empty promises of school officials and the defiance of the whole State of Alabama must not be accepted meekly by Federal

officials. The furor over the guidelines issued by HEW is another version of the Dixie bluff on race which has worked so well for so many decades. The guidelines are mild. They are legal and not illegal as Governor Wallace proclaimed to his state's educators. They ask the Southerners to do what is for them a strange thing: obey the school desegregation law. On this point the Federal Government must not yield. The Attorney General and the Department of Justice must back up resolutely the legality of Federal action. There can be no temporizing.

Outside the South the call is for unrelenting activity to wipe out de facto school segregation. Boston, Mass., has proved to be the Miss. of the North. In fact, in fairness to Miss. and in consideration of the starting points and traditions of the two places, Boston is below Miss. on this issue. The details, the traps, the methods and the progress will be covered in workshop discussions, but here it must be said that before we can get jobs to earn increased income to buy and rent better homes, before we can contribute to the enrichment of our nation, we must have free access to quality education.

The man who shoots and burns and drowns us is surely our enemy, but so is he who cripples our children for life with inferior public education.

5. We also choose to wrestle with the complex problems of urban life, all of which include an attitude toward and a treatment of millions of Negro citizens. The solution of urban problems will become the solution of living in the last third of our century since more than 70 per cent of Americans now live in urban communities.

If it has been asked one, it has been asked a hundred times: Are we going to have a long, hot summer? The answer has many facets, some extremely complex and difficult. But one quick answer is that the police everywhere can make or break urban racial tensions by their conduct toward minority group citizens.

Last summer you had here an upheaval that shook the world. To many of us who looked from afar, it appeared to be a wild, senseless rampage of hate and destruction. But that was far from the whole truth. There was power in Watts, piled up and packed down through the years: wide-scale unemployment, both adult and teenage, slum housing, crowded schools, non-existent health facilities, inadequate transportation and the Parker police attitude. Everyone was suspect and everyone was subject to harassment in one form or another. The community smoldered under the peculiar brand that police place upon a whole section with their constant sirens, their contemptuous searches, their rough talk, their ready guns and their general "Godalmightiness."

The lesson they and city officials have learned from last year is

to seek not correction and improvement, but still more repression. Mayor Yorty and whoever writes his scripts testified in Sacramento in support of a so-called riot-control bill.

The only thing one has to remember about this bill is that it would allow a policeman to judge whether an utterance or an act is an incitement to riot! On his own judgment he could arrest or club or otherwise deter-- or shoot--a person whom he (not the law or the courts) deemed to be an inciter of riot. Down the drain goes freedom of speech and down, too, possibly, goes a life.

The McCone Report on the 1965 riot called for "costly and extreme" remedies for Watts, undertaken with a "revolutionary attitude." The answer of the City of Los Angeles was to vote down a hospital bond issue. The answer of Mayor Yorty and of his man, Chief Parker, is a trampling-tough riot-control bill which, if enacted, would loose the police, almost without restraint, upon a populace sick to death-- literally--of race control. To blot out any remaining fitful light, one of the gubernatorial candidates, full of disavowals, is the darling of those ultra-conservatives who believe in iron control of what they call "violence in the streets"--their code name for Negroes.

If this is the best thing a great city can bring to a hard urban problem, one largely of its own making, then God pity both the whites and the Negroes!

We have no panacea for all these problems. We do not proclaim that what we declare here this week is going to change the course of the whole civil rights movement. We do not know all the answers to the George Wallace problem in Alabama, the James Eastland problem in Mississippi, or to the Boston, Massachusetts, school committee and its Louis Day Hicks problem. We certainly don't know the answers to foreign policy and to tax and interest rate puzzlers. But in this unsettled time when shifts are the order of the day and when changes is in the air, we can sail our NAACP ship "steady as she goes," with more drive to the turbines, more skill at the wheel, but no fancy capers for the sake of capers.

We can follow down into each community the really advanced blueprint of the White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights," which covered four principal areas: economic security and welfare, education, housing, and the administration of justice. We can expand and point up the community services of our NAACP branches, each of which is, in reality, a citizenship clinic. Just as medical clinics need specialists to cure physical ills, so our branch clinics should recruit volunteer specialists to diagnose and minister to social ills.

We must involve people in the communities in the solution of our problem--not limiting ourselves to our church or lodge or club group.

We must keep the pressure on our local and state education systems through the employment of every legitimate technique: protests, surveys, discussions, demonstrations, picketing and negotiation. Nothing should be overlooked in fighting for better education. Be persistent and ornery; this will be good for the lethargic educational establishment and will aid the whole cause of public education.

Our branches are at work in their territories. In Baltimore, the NAACP won the case against the police commissioner which the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals declared revealed the most flagrant police practices ever to come before the court. The Blair County, Penna., NAACP is busy rooting out the remaining discrimination in public accommodations in Clearfield, Pennsylvania.

This is a small part of the chronicle of "steady as she goes." In a world where the Mayor of Los Angeles is yelling "riot control," where Rhodesia says "never!" to black representation while in America SNCC raises the chant of Black Power where the Federal Government at long last is committed, but both the far right and the far left offer vocal and vicious objection, someone has to drive the long haul toward the group goal of Negro Americans and the larger ideal of our young nation.

Our objective is basically as it was laid down in 1909 by the interracial founders of our NAACP. Back there William Lloyd Garrison expressed the strong feeling that the first NAACP conference "will utter no uncertain sound on any point affecting the vital subject. No part of it is too delicate for plain speech. The republican experiment is at stake, every tolerated wrong to the Negro reacting with double force upon white citizens guilty of faithlessness to their brothers."

As it was then, so it is today. The republican experiment is at stake in 1966. More than that, the dream of a brotherhood in equality and justice is imperiled.

Our fraternity tonight, as it was then, is the fraternity of man, not the white, or brown, or yellow, or black man, but man.

PEOPLE WITH A HISTORY

(Notes on Negro history-compiled and edited by Michael Wright
of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee)

I have endeavored to set down a few facts and commentaries which, quite to the contrary, of those elements, which would have us believe, that the American Black man has no history, I hope will serve as a ready reference source to those pondering upon the question: "What is our history and just what do we have to identify ourselves with?"

I would like to acknowledge that of the many books, periodicals and journals used for research, the three I most often referred to were: Africa's Gift to America, by J. A. Rogers; From Slavery to Freedom, by John Hope Franklin; and Reunion and Reaction by C. Vann Woodward.

EARLY AFRICAN CIVILIZATIONS:

Three great migratory movements resulted in the formation of what history calls the early Egyptian civilizations. They were (1) From the South: the Black and Brown tribes of Ethiopia, (2) From the East: the Semitic Nomads, and (3) From the North: the Mediterranean tribes. These migrations took several centuries and had begun many thousands of years before the birth of Christ. By the third millennium, before Christ, these people had fused into a nation and a thriving civilization ---- Egypt.

"In 2900, B.C. Egypt was under the rule of a Negro, Ra Nahesi, and from time to time, until 1703 B. C., when a new empire was founded, Blacks ruled Egypt. Nefertari, the wife of Ahmose I, great imperial leader, was a Negro woman of 'great beauty, strong personality, and remarkable administrative ability, and was the co-founder of the

Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt. She contributed greatly to the Black tint of her descendants who were to rule after Ahmose I.

"Complete control over Egypt, by Blacks was established in the Eighth century B.C. by Piankhi, who's father had gained control over the upper Nile a few years earlier. Beginning in 741 B. C. Piankhi opened a campaign of conquest which ended in the complete subjugation of Egypt. One by one, the cities of the Northern region fell before this Ethiopian. Upon Piankhi's return to his capital he had subdued sixteen princes and had made Egypt a dependency of Ethiopia. Sporadic fighting broke out every year with the Arabs and the kingdom finally fell in the sixth century B. C.

"The first West African civilization, of which there is any record is Ghana. By 300 A.D. at least forty-four kings had ruled in Ghana."

"The territory was divided into provinces, of which there were several subdivisions, suggesting a rather high degree of political organization. An interesting note: the expansion of Ghana was not due to military conquest and that the people on the whole were devoted to the pursuit of peace. The natives were mostly agricultural type people, however, trading was also well established. Their chief town, Kumbi-Kumbi, was an important commercial town during the middle ages. In the eleventh century, the Tunka, or emperor, realized the value of this commercial intercourse by imposing a tax on imports and exports and appointing a collector to look after his interest. Under the Black rulers of the Sisse dynasty, Ghana reached the height of it's power. Tenkamenin, in the eleventh century A.D. was perhaps the greatest of kings in the Sisse dynasty of Ghana. During Tenkamenin's reign, the people of Ghana were spiritualist, believing that every object had good and bad spirits that had to be satisfied if they were to prosper. In 1076, a band of fanatical Mohammedans invaded Ghana; they were called Almoravides. These people, along with a series of droughts, that dried up the important Wagadu and Bagana rivers, undermined the strength of Ghana. These phenomenons made Ghana easy prey to the waves of conquerors, who swept in to destroy the kingdom, in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries."

"As Ghana began to decline, another Black kingdom arose to subplant it. This was the empire of Melle or Mandingoland. It was a strongly organized kingdom by 1235 A.D. Kangaba became it's capital and finally the center of a veritable empire as the influence of the king of Melle spread in all directions."

The people of Melle were predominately agricultural, but were also engaged in weaving, construction and mining.

The credit for consolidating and strengthening the kingdom goes to Sundiata Keita, who overran Sosa, the King of Sosa, and leveled the former capital of Ghana in 1240. The credit for carrying Melle to the glorious heights that it reached was a king named Gonga-Mussa. He was a member of the Keita dynasty which ruled from 1307 to 1332.

Europe was just beginning to feel the effects of her commercial revolution and her states had not yet achieved anything resembling national unity; but Mandingoland, under Gonda-Mussa and his successor, Sulieman, enjoyed a flourishing economy and good international trade relations and could point to with pride, a stable government extending hundred miles from the Atlantic to Lake Chad.

The Songhay empire had been in existence as early as the eighth century, but began to expand by 1000 A.D. so as to include settlements on the Niger from Hukia to Timbuktu, but got no further at this time. Gonga-Mussa in 1325 captured two of the sons of the Songhay king. One son, ten years later returned to his people and started a new dynasty in 1355. This dynasty was the Sonnis. Seventeen kings reigned in this dynasty, the last being Sonni Ali, who raised the Songhay to the position of the most powerful kingdom in West Africa. Sonni Ali began his rule of the Songhay in 1464.

"In 1493 the dynasty of the Sonnis was overthrown by a Sarakelle general, Askia Mohammed, who became the Songhay's most brilliant ruler. He recruited a professional army of slaves and prisoners of war and left his subjects to engage in farming and commerce. Native rulers, four viceroys, and Askia's brother as chief-lieutenant, maintained peace and administered the empire. In short time, Mandingoland and all the lesser states had fallen under the rule of the Songhay empire. Askia's reign ended in 1529 when he was dethroned by his son. By this time, the Songhay empire extended from the Atlantic to Tibeste and Borku, and from the Berber country in the North, to the Mossi and Benin states on the South. Songhay was the largest and most powerful state in the history of West Africa."

(The preceding quotes: From Slavery to Freedom, by John Hope Franklin, 1965, Knopf, New York. Chapters 1 and 2)

Elizabeth Lawson in her "Study Outline" of some of the earlier accomplishments of the African people names the following:

"Rock painting (still preserved); rhythmic music, imaginative and poetic folklore, by the Bushmen of South Africa."

"Domestication of animals by the Hottentots of South Africa."

"Agriculture and a system of exchange using cattle, sheep or goats as the medium of circulation, by the Bantu of South Africa."

"Gold and silver mining, building construction (houses and fortifications), pottery, and metal work, by peoples in the region of the Great Lakes (Africa)."

"Agricultural system, law, literature, music, natural sciences, medicine and a schooling system, in the Kingdom of Songhay."

"Cotton weaving in the Sudan (as early as the eleventh century)."

"...according to some authorities, the stimulus to Greek art came from Africa."

"Blacks brought art and sculpture to prehistoric Europe. They invented many musical instruments, and created sculpture in brass, bronze, ivory, quartz and granite."

"Probably the most lasting and the most important of the discoveries of ancient Africa was the smelting of iron, which Africa taught the rest of the world."

"8,000 year old Ishango finds included an abacus-type of calculating device."

(Preceding quotes taken from: Africa's Gift to America, by J. A. Rodgers, 1959, Futuro Press, New York, p. 17)

THE AFRICAN AND AMERICA:

Most South and Central American archaeologists agree that Blacks were here before Columbus. One of the reasons behind this theory is, that the Negro type is seen in most ancient Mexican sculpture. Riva Palacio, Mexican historian says, "It is indisputable that in very ancient times the Negro race occupied our territory (Mexico) when the two continents were joined. The Mexicans recall a Negro god, Ixtilton, which means 'black-face'."

Colonel Bragnine says in "The Shadow of Atlantis" that he saw in Ecuador a statuette of a Negro at least 20,000 years old.

Africa was the economic foundation of the United States. "The discovery of African labor was an American enterprise. It was the introduction of a hitherto unknown muscular force, proving on trial to be the most perfect agent of production then known to commerce...African labor fixed with eagerness the marvelous and varied and exhaustable wealth of the South." DuBoise

One of the reasons for America's rapid advances in the field of economics was the Molasses Trade. I will point out how this reflected the economic dependency of America. "A pro-American bulletin of 1731 said, 'The molasses trade is the most (if not the only valuable one) of New England.'"

"Why molasses? Molasses meant rum. Why rum? Rum was for the exchange of Africans on the African West Coast. In short, it was the sale of Africans in the New World--the Slave Trade--that laid the financial foundation of the United States."

The use of Negroes came about thus: Good Bishop Las Casas (1474-1566) seeing the Indians dying under the task imposed upon them, suggest the Africans instead--a step that has made Las Casas go down in history as the father of the African slave trade. We must note that Las Casas meant for the African to be used on the plantations. It must not be taken to mean that it was the beginning of the slave trade (African's) in Europe, for, even before Las Casas was born, the Portuguese under the encouragement of Prince Henry practiced it. Sailors, like Venetian Cadamosto, attached themselves to the Portuguese court because of the opportunities for wealth that the Guinea slave trade promised. "By the time of the death of Prince Henry in 1460, seven or eight hundred slaves were being carried to Portugal annually."

In 1517, Bishop Las Casas encouraged the immigration of Spaniards into the Americas by permitting them to import twelve slaves each. That was when the Slave Trade to the new world was formally started. Monopolies of the trade went to the highest bidders. By 1540, the annual importation of slaves to the West Indies was estimated at 10,000.

In 1692, the Portuguese licensed the Portuguese Co. of Cacheo. The Dutch licensed the Dutch West India Company in 1621. In 1634, Colbert organized the French Company of the West Indies. In 1618, James I chartered the Company of Adventurers of London trading into parts of Africa which had the control over the west coast. In 1672, the King of England chartered the Royal Africa company. By 1788, two-thirds of all the slaves brought by

England to the Americas were sold in foreign colonies.

It has been estimated by Dunbar that 900,000 slaves were imported in the sixteenth century, and 4,000,000 in the nineteenth century. By the time of the American Revolution, the American colonies, principally the New England ones, were taking it away from the mother-country principally by using rum as barter for slaves, ivory, gold and other products. There were slaves in all the American colonies. Although less than 1% of the people in the state of New Hampshire were slaves at that time, almost 65% of the people in South Carolina were slaves. Indeed, slavery was dying out in the news and especially in the Northern states before the cotton gin was invented in 1793.

The cotton gin increased the production of cotton greatly - the need hence - for more slaves. The addition of new territory to the young nation encouraged it also. Shortly afterwards, slavery gradually disappeared down to the Delaware-Maryland line. This was not due to the abolitionist sentiment of the North, but rather that it was not economically a necessity to continue it.

Because of the budding industrialization of the North and the persistent problems of the South, an economic conflict began to grow between the North and the South. This conflict eventually led to the Civil War.

There were numerous slave uprisings which occurred from the middle of the eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth centuries. The accounts and legends of these epics are fairly well known as are those of the abolitionist movements (e.g., the revolts of Denmark Vesey and Nat Turner or the accounts of the trials of Frederick Douglass or Harriet Tubman).

After six months of deliberation, President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, which was in reality, the Emancipation Fairy-Tale. Perhaps no other document in history is more mis-interpreted. "It was only a gesture rather than a reality since it only 'freed' those slaves Lincoln had no power to free and kept in slavery those he had power to free... it was the thirteenth amendment that eventually freed the slaves."

The purpose of the Emancipation Proclamation was to enlist the aid of slaves to help fight for the preservation of the Union and ultimately to serve as a fringe benefit, the slaves were promised freedom. 'Honest Abe' wasn't the great abolitionist that history books play him up to be. In fact, it has gone on record that Lincoln sent some slaves who had been freed in 1862 by a Union General, back into slavery. This is more fully documented in 100 Amazing Facts About Negroes, a booklet by J. A. Rodgers.