

Several items have developed on Lyndon's "profits from poverty" program which need a bit of airing.

First of all, there's the matter of how much it costs to get top executive talent, or, the personal "profits from poverty" angle of the program. R. Sargent Schriver, director of the program, gets \$30,000 per year. This is enough, roughly, to support 5 families in reasonably decent style--\$6,000 per year. We don't know what Schriver does with this \$30,000. We suppose he is able to get by on it, along with his other sources of income and those of his wife, the former Eunice Kennedy.

Schriver has a deputy director, Jack Conway, who came to him from the AFL-CIO. Conway gets \$28,000. This is enough to support at least four families. Then, there are the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Assistant Directors, each of whom gets \$27,000, for a total of \$81,000 per year. This would support at least 13 families. These 3 assistants have 11 assistants of their own, each of whom is paid \$21,445, for a total of \$235,895 per year. This would support 39 families. Finally, these 11 assistants have 20 assistants each of whom is paid \$18,935 per year, for a total of \$378,700. This would support 63 families.

Now, presumably, all of these directors and deputies and assistants had good jobs before they bellied up to the poverty trough. So, if Lyndon had just decided to give the poverty money to the poor, instead of to his rich and near-rich friends, there would be 124 families who had a decent living in the U.S. who hadn't had one before. As it is, the poverty executives are soaking up \$974,595 per year that they didn't need (supposing they had adequate jobs before Poverty came along), and those 124 families are eating, wearing and living in, the same old promises they had before Lyndon gave them the Great Society.

Then there's the corporate angle to the profits from poverty program. We've mentioned before some of the corporations to whom Lyndon has given poverty contracts. Among them were General Electric, Ford's subsidiary Philco, Bell-Electronics, etc. Now comes the daddy of all the corporate poverty contracts--the biggest yet. It goes to Litton Industries, Inc., of California, in the amount of \$13,400,000. Litton is a widely diversified defense contractor which produces everything in the electronic field from radio tubes to nuclear submarines.

Litton will run a Job Corps camp 40 miles Southeast of San Francisco at a former Seabees training site in which boys 16 to 21 years of age will be taught how to be good, docile workers for outfits like Litton. Here's how the director of the program, Litton's "industrial psychologist" Steven Uslan, describes the

way he'll spend the \$13,400,000:

"A kid is going to think that's a foreman up there, not a teacher. We'll have time cards to punch. Department heads will be managers. We'll have supervisors and shop foreman. This will be a typical industrial organization, in which I'll be the equivalent to the general manager.... Their training environment will be so much like actual job environment that when a boy goes to work later for the John Doe Company he will say to himself, 'It's just like school.'"

Dr. Strangelove ? No, just that nice old industrial psychologist from Lyndon's friends at Litton.

Uslan is being a bit coy when he mentions the "John Doe Company." Three of the jobs the "kids" will be prepared for are electronics, business machine repair, and office occupations. Litton, of course, uses large numbers of workers in these categories. What Litton is doing, in effect, is using federal tax money to train its future employees, not only in the skills Litton can use most profitably, but in the attitudes, also, towards work and towards corporations which Litton employees will have to have, if outfits like Litton are to survive and prosper.

It's a sweet deal for Litton--they get ready-trained employees and they not only don't have to pay for the training, they make a profit by doing the training at the expense of the U.S. Government. Such a sweet deal, and such a profitable one, must have some politics behind it, we reason. So we look for who runs Litton, and we find Hubert's old friend Charles B. Thornton, whom we have previously mentioned as being associated with Hubert's other friends, the Bell brothers of General Mills, Inc.

Yup, Ol' Charles is Chairman of Litton, and he took time out from his chairman chores during the campaign last fall to be Hubert's head fund-raiser on the West coast. Of course, there may be no connection at all between Thornton's help in the campaign and the lush poverty contract. What do you think ?

Litton has always been interested in educating people. This interest is shown by the fact that two of its directors are on the board of the Times-Mirror Co., publisher of the Los Angeles Times. The Times probably comes as close to advocating native American fascism as any paper in the country. Thornton is one of the Litton directors who's on the Times board.

Stevan Uslan points out that the Litton poverty contract will not just train the "kids" in occupations that'll be useful to Litton. No Indeed. The Litton Job Corps program, says Uslan, will also train the boys in the "culinary arts and custodial or building maintenance." What pretty words the Great Society has for cooks and janitors. So the Litton poverty program will also be training the poor of America to take their places in their adulthood, cooking for and cleaning up after Lyndon, Hubert and

their friends in the corporate elite. What a glowing future for the "kids". And it's costing only \$13,400,000, including Litton's profit !

Cooking-for-and-cleaning-up-after brings to mind another battle front in Lyndon's continuing war on the poor. On April 13 the Washington Post carried a story headlined "LAZY HOMEMAKERS ALSO SERVE IN THE GREAT SOCIETY."

Stanley Ruttenberg, Lyndon's Manpower Administrator, has had a gem of an idea for solving the domestic servant problems of Great Society housewives. Not long ago Lyndon conducted an investigation and he discovered that, as he put it, " Housewives cannot get the help they need for work in the home or in the yard." Well, when Stanley heard this from the Chief, he right away knew that something had to be done for the housewives (those, that is, who can afford to hire servants to do their dirty work for them.) He checked the chief's findings, and, sure enough, the housewives were having trouble finding good, reliable household help.

So Stanley, who was a union organizer before he found out about the riches of Poverty, came up with this idea: Lyndon's Small Business Administration could loan businessmen enough money to go into business as labor contractors, supplying housewives with domestic servants, all trained in how to say "yes ma'am" and "no ma'am", and how to take the masters coat when he comes in the door, and how to iron his shirts just right, and how to serve at table when the master and mistress are having friends in, and how to change diapers, and amuse the sons and daughters of the Great Society while their mothers and daddies are making money and having fun.

But the businessmen would't have to pay for the training. That would be anti-Great-Society. No, Lyndon's Labor Department would actually pay for the training, and the businessmen would just do the training. They couldn't make as much off it as Litton Industries, maybe, but there'd be a tidy profit nonetheless. Then, when the "girls" were all trained, the businessman, using Lyndon's small business loan for expenses, would go around to the housewives and sell the "girls" services. He charge the housewives for the "girls" services, and then he'd pay the "girls" whatever wage he had to, to get them to do the work.

Won't that be a lovely way to fight the war on poverty ? Of course troublemakers will suggest that the "girls" may also be housewives; that maybe they have children of their own they'd like to be able to care for; that they have husbands who'd like a hot meal when they come in from those janitor's jobs Lyndon's fixing up for them; that maybe they'd like to have an afternoon now and then when they could go shopping, or to a card party, or for a ride in the country, or to the zoo, or the museum, or to the concert, with their children.

Well, Lyndon and Schriver and the poverty and corporation executives have the perfect answer for such troublemakers. They're

radicals, left-wingers, beatniks, who are clearly in the pay of the Communists (Chinese, probably) and who just don't want to admit that the Great Society is really G-R-E-A-T.

Meanwhile, the suburban homemakers, some of whom are doubtless the wives of the Litton executives and the poverty executives, can rest easy. Help is on the way.

Lyndon's bringin' it.

*

*

*

A situation such as developed around Selma brings a great many interesting things out of the woodwork and from under the rocks. It is a time when organizations and individuals can be identified for what they really are, rather than for what they pretend to be in less troubled times.

One of the clear identities which emerged as a result of Selma is an organization called the Southern States Industrial Council (SSIC). This outfit was formed in 1933 to represent "business and industry in the sixteen Southern States..." says its pamphlet. It is a propaganda and lobbying group which speaks with the "voice of free enterprise from the conservative Southern viewpoint", the pamphlet goes on.

SSIC speaks through a semi-monthly bulletin which is mailed to a list of subscribers including businessmen, politicians, and other notables. It also speaks through a weekly newspaper column called "Sensing the News", written by the executive vice president of SSIC, Thurman Sensing, and published in a great many Southern (and other "conservative") weeklies and dailies.

SSIC's headquarters is in Nashville, Tennessee. It pretends to have some special relation to the South, other than its liking for the views of Southern politicians. However, its financial supporters are almost wholly northern industrial and financial firms. Its principal contributor is the E.I. duPont de Nemours Co., which we have had occasion to mention several times in these pages. Other contributors are Firststone Tire & Rubber Co., General Motors, Louisville & Nashville RR, Household Finance Co., General Electric, Phillips Petroleum, Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph, and Union Bag-Camp Paper Co.

Now lets see what these corporations, through the SSIC column Sensing the News, had to say about the situation in Selma. (And remember that, whatever the corporations and their officials say publicly and officially about civil rights, this is what they're saying behind the cloak of their front organization, SSIC.)

In the April 13, 1965 Congressional Record, George Andrews, Congressman from Alabama, inserted one of the Sensing the News columns. Here's part of what the column said:

"There neverreally was a problem in Selma that could not have been ironed out in courts of law. If anyone was denied registration who was entitled to it, the laws and the courts offered an abundance of protection. If anyone was unjustly injured the same courts and laws were their protection."

Thus, what duPont and the other corporations are saying is that Negroes who seek their constitutional rights should do so through the Alabama courts and the Sheriff Jim Clarks. It's hard to believe they could really think that justice is available in these courts, when they've used them over the years pretty much as though they were branches of the corporations. Jim Clark, in Selma, proudly proclaims that he formed his posse back in 1942 for the purpose of putting down attempts of workers to organize unions. The Alabama State Troopers, not two months ago, were used for the same purpose in a county adjoining Dallas.

The column, as could be expected, makes no mention of the murder of Jimmie Lee Jackson by an Alabama Trooper, but it does comment on the death of Rev. Reeb. The column refers to Reeb as "A Boston minister who had gone where he had no legitimate ministry."

We're not sure whether the KKK, Gov. Wallace, or SSIC said it first, but they certainly all said it, and it probably doesn't make much difference who was first. That's like worrying about which of the heads of a three-headed monster is going to eat you up.

The column gets in its bit of red-baiting by referring to the "principal agitation group" (SNCC? SCLC?--take your choice) as infiltrated by "beatniks, leftwing revolutionaries and, worst of all by Communists."

Then it concludes that "The crisis in Alabama was a synthetic crisis, created for the purpose of promoting strife."

Dupont, of course, owns an enormous tract of land in Dallas and adjoining counties which it intends to use for industrial purposes when it gets around to it. Several of the other corporations already have plants in Alabama, and others of them will be moving in to take advantage of the low wages and the anti-unionism of the sheriffs, the state police, and the rest of Alabama officialdom.

When the corporations begin explaining to Negroes and civil rights workers about their benevolent non-discriminatory hiring policies, the workers need to keep in mind that it's organizations like SSIC, financed by these and other corporations, which have kept alive the poison of racism throughout the South these past hundred years. They're good American free enterprisers, you see, and until only very recently, there was plenty of profit in fomenting race hatred.

*

*

*

In case anyone's still wondering just what the war in Vietnam is all about, and why it is necessary for the Great Society to kill and be killed over there, we think we've found another clue to the mystery.

Last week Lyndon gave General Motors a \$114,500,000 contract to build some 155 milimeter howitzers and some General Sheridan tanks; he gave General Electric \$15,192,000 to build some engines for his jet fighters; and he gave Hughes Tool Company \$5,560,046 to build some helicopter trainers. We figure this amounts to \$135,353,046 worth of reason why the Great Society needs a little war now and then.

*

*

*

But it would be silly to worry. If things get too bad, Lyndon will make another speech.

*

*

*

April 22, 1965

Jack Minnis