

# THE CAMPUS CORE-LATOR

NEWSLETTER OF THE BERKELEY CAMPUS CHAPTER OF THE CONGRESS OF RACIAL EQUALITY

September, 1964 — Editor: David Friedman

"THE WHOLE HISTORY OF THE PROGRESS OF HUMAN LIBERTY SHOWS THAT ALL CONCESSIONS YET MADE TO HER AUGUST CLAIMS HAVE BEEN BORN OF EARNEST STRUGGLE..... IF THERE IS NO STRUGGLE, THERE IS NO PROGRESS."

----- FREDERICK DOUGLASS



The end of a demonstration.  
(photo by Michael E. Bry)



Preparing for arrest at  
the Sheraton Palace. (photo  
by Howard Harawitz)



Picket line on Auto Row  
(photo by Michael E. Bry)



Sit-in at Cadillac Agency  
(photo by Howard Harawitz)

C O N T E N T S

Contact List For Civil Rights Organizations..... 2

Sit-In At Cecil Poole's Office..... 3

The Mississippi Summer Project And The Closed Society..... 6

A Parent Looks Beyond The Summer..... 9

Excerpts From Mississippi Campaign Literature..... 13

March Up Market Street..... 16

Legal Lynching: The San Francisco Civil Rights Trials..... 18

Recent Trends In The Local Civil Rights Movement..... 23

CORE Civil Rights Conference..... 25

Boy Scout Freedom Campere..... 26

Prospects For Civil Rights..... 27

"We Will Not Stop Demonstrating" (street-rally speech) ..... 30

Campus CORE Civil Rights Forums..... 32

CORE National Convention, 1964 ..... 33

Campus CORE Summer Activities..... 35

Berkeley School Board Recall..... 36

Fan Mail For A Freedom Fighter..... 38

Review : "The Civil Rights Movement And Employment" ..... 39

-----  
Editor: David Friedman

Technical Staff: Jack Weinberg  
Bryson Collins

Publisher: Berkeley Campus CORE  
Post Office Box 162  
Berkeley, California

All unsigned articles or comments are the responsibility of the editor.  
All printing and mimeographing was done by donated labor  
-----

### Sit-In At Cecil Poole's Office

It was shortly before a regular Campus CORE meeting that we learned of the disappearance of three civil rights workers in Mississippi, and the discovery of their burned-out car. Newspaper headlines screamed the story, and television stations devoted their entire news reports to it. The nation was briefly shocked by an event that it could easily have predicted, and should have prevented.

We were angered by the hypocrisy of a public that ignored the murder of countless Negroes, but wept false tears when Northern white students disappeared. We believed that had James Chaney been alone, the Northern press would not have reported the disappearance of this Mississippi Negro freedom fighter, as it has not reported the murders of five other Mississippi Negroes since January 1, in two counties neighboring Neshoba County. We felt that the 200 searchers sent in by President Johnson were nothing more than a burial detail, and we were determined to demand federal protection for other civil rights workers, and for Mississippi Negroes trying to register to vote.

We were told that a "broad-based" community protest march was being organized, but we felt that the first public demonstrations should be by the friends and contemporaries of the murdered students. Five Campus CORE members were in Mississippi, and without immediate federal protection, they were in serious danger. It was decided at the Campus CORE meeting to hold a sit-in the next day, at the office of United States Attorney, Cecil Poole. Poole is the direct representative of the Attorney General in the Bay Area. He used to be a Negro.

We formed a group of 35 when we met the next day at the main post office in San Francisco. We did not notify the press until after entering the building, for fear that we would be locked out of the office if Poole learned of our plans. However, Poole was away from his office, and by the time he returned, over an hour later, the press was present in full force, including television cameras.

Our official spokesman was Tom Miller, chairman of the Campus CORE employment committee, and our demands were summarized in a mimeographed leaflet, which we distributed to the press and to interested citizens. We had thoroughly discussed Poole's possible reactions, and had voted on how to proceed, particularly if we were threatened with arrest, and if our demands were not granted.

Our immediate demand was that we be allowed to use Poole's private line to the U. S. Attorney General. Poole kept us waiting for half an hour after he arrived at the office, and then would not extend Miller the courtesy of a private interview. Our list of demands were read to Poole by Tom Miller, under the pressure of television cameras and reporters' questions. We indicated that we would not leave the office until we had received adequate assurance that federal marshals would be used to enforce constitutionally guaranteed rights in Mississippi. When questioned by a reporter, Poole stated that he would have us "arrested" if we did not leave his office at closing time. Later, he was to regret this statement. When questioned about this threat, Miller coolly replied that we were not leaving without adequate guarantees, and that we would be the judge of what was adequate, and what was not.

Poole then agreed to put through a call to the office of the Attorney General, and to allow Miller to present our demands to Mr. Katzenbach, who is second in command to Robert Kennedy. (Kennedy was in Berlin at this time, talking about "freedom".) He had to do this, to avoid appearing unreasonable, but his attitude was entirely political, and unresponsive to the extent of our feelings, and to the seriousness of the situation. Although Poole is a Negro, he is known as a reactionary element in the San Francisco NAACP, and is a member of the NAACP executive committee which recently tried to unseat Dr. Thomas Burbridge because of his part in the San Francisco Auto Row sit-ins.

When the phone call was put through, Miller was invited into Poole's inner office (no others were allowed to accompany him), where he underwent a harassing interview with several "feds" in the room. He reports that Poole asked "who is really behind this demonstration", and claimed moral superiority in the situation because "I'm a Negro". However, Miller was allowed to read our list of demands to Katzenbach, and he then rejoined the group of sit-ins to await a response.

Poole's response was a meaningless statement that he understood our feelings, and respected our intentions, but that the federal government was already doing all that it could do in Mississippi. He made reference to FBI agents in the state, and to the 200 men searching for the three missing young people. After a brief (and unnecessary) consultation with the rest of us, Miller replied that this was not enough, that FBI agents had been "observing" in Mississippi for years, and that the massive hunt for the three men was just a way to cover up the government's refusal to enforce federal law in Mississippi. He accused President Johnson, Attorney General Kennedy, and Cecil Poole of complicity in murder, of hypocrisy, and of cowardice. Poole again stated that we would have to leave at closing time, this time adding the fact that his office contained "classified information", and hence that we would be violating security regulations if we stayed. However, when asked by a reporter if he meant to have us arrested, Poole turned the question aside.

We had decided that if arrests were threatened, we would move to the outside corridor, where we would still be arrested, since that entire wing of the building closed at 5:00 PM. This would eliminate the charge of "violating security". While the charge was phoney, it could have been used to obscure the issues, or to impose large jail sentences on people as a "warning". However, Poole had received instructions not to arrest anyone. The scandal of arresting us while doing nothing in Mississippi, would have been too great. We won this little contest of nerve by forcing Poole to admit that we would be "ejected" rather than arrested, a significant difference. He tried twice to slur over the distinction, but Miller pinned him down.

At 5:00 PM, Poole ordered a group of federal marshals (who might have been of more use in Mississippi) to carry us from the office. As usual, they handled us very gently while in view of the press, but were unnecessarily rough when we were alone. Several people were thrown down stairs, or dragged by one arm down a flight of stone steps. One obviously pregnant woman had another demonstrator dumped in her lap. One should realize that the demonstrators were completely non-violent all this time. A reporter for the San Francisco Chronicle said, in a comment that was never published, that our singing during the "ejections" gave the office the atmosphere of a church.

The other part of the building, housing the post office, did not close until midnight, so we decided to continue our sit-in in the post office. We were met at the door by security guards, marshals, and Cecil Poole, who this time threatened to arrest us for "loitering for no legitimate purpose" if we even entered the post office. Apparently, our questions concerning his intention to arrest us in his office led him to believe that we were afraid of arrest. After consulting with attorney Beverly Axelrod, most of us filled out bail sheets and then entered the post office. We were determined not only to protest what we considered federal complicity in murder, but to defend our right to make such a protest in a federal building which was open for business.

Once again there were no arrests. The evening dragged on slowly and uneventfully, livened only by a few hecklers. There was the little old lady who told us all to "Go to Hell", after telling Ed Rosenfeld that "You damn Jews are behind all the trouble". Despite the fact that most of us had on suits and ties, other passersby maintained that we were unemployed beatniks with no other place to sleep.

Most of us felt that we would be arrested at midnight for trespassing, but shortly before that time we were told that we would again be "ejected". The chief marshal appealed to us to walk out and not subject his men to unnecessary work. We decided that we could not walk out until our demands had been met, but that there was no need for us to sit so far from the door. In order to be as cooperative as possible, we moved close to the outside door. We realized our mistake when the marshals began roughly tossing us out the door and down the small flight of stairs outside. In the absence of the press, these men handled us as if we were hardened criminals. Perhaps the most brutal treatment came from two Negro San Francisco policemen, who were either brought in because of their known sadistic natures, or in order to "prove themselves". No one was badly hurt, but as we ended the day's demonstration with freedom songs, we had serious doubts about the kind of men that we were asking the President to send into Mississippi.

We returned the next day, and the same sequence of demands, inadequate response and ejections occurred. We were joined this time by a girl who had grown up with Andy Goodman. Her simple, honest grief eclipsed all the planning, press relation and arguments about tactics. She made us realize the full enormity of our government's acquiescence in the inhuman system of Mississippi, in the philosophy of political murder and of white supremacy.

Our action did no apparent good. The country was not ready to get angry even at the blatant murder of three of its most self-less people. Like the Germans during Hitler's regime, the American people will not accept their collective responsibility for the atrocities committed in their name. They prefer not to know what is happening. I am writing after the bodies have been found, after weeks of racial violence in the Eastern ghettos, after Goldwater's nomination. I write in the knowledge that the story that Goldwater had given Alabama Governor George Wallace veto power over the Attorney General appointment and even Supreme Court appointments did not produce enough public interest to force the Republican nominee to deny or admit the accusation. I no longer speak or act out of faith in this country or its people or its future. But as the crisis becomes more profound and

more widespread, those of us who are aware are even more obligated to do whatever can be done, to act however much it seems to occur in an empty world. There is in this at least a new kind of freedom

---- Michael Anker  
---- David Friedman

---

The Mississippi Summer Project And The Closed Society

The "official Bible" of the Mississippi Summer Project is Mississippi: the Closed Society, by James W. Silver. Ironically, Silver is Professor of History at Ole Miss, the natives' affectionate name for the University of Mississippi. Professor Silver's main hypothesis is that since 1875, Mississippi has been tightly controlled under white supremacy, political conservatism, states rights, and religious fundamentalism. The net effect of this crop of ideological weeds has been to turn the state into a closed society--closed in a number of ways. Obviously the opportunity for Negroes, and for that matter many whites, to earn a decent living and lead a life of reasonable peace, comfort, and dignity is closed. But what Mr. Silver is worried about most of all is a state of mind; specifically, the ability of white Mississippians--which by turns puzzles and enrages the outside world--to take the position, "We're right, the rest of the world is wrong, and that's all there is to it."

As a summer volunteer doing research and field work in agricultural economics, I had the opportunity to talk to Mississippi bureaucrats and can report that the Silver thesis is all too valid. A civil rights worker trying to elicit information from a state agency will usually be given a runaround if he is so naive as to identify himself as being connected with COFO. (The initials stand for the Council of Federated Organizations--CORE, SNCC, NAACP, and Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference--who are jointly running the Mississippi Summer Project.) Or else he will receive evasive responses, the substance being that everything is just fine in Mississippi. For example, during the course of an interview I had with two bureaucrats in the Mississippi Cooperative Federation, I revealed that I was one of "those outside agitators." One of the two men refused to speak with me further; the other was civil enough to continue the interview, but it was impossible to get straight answers from him. He assured me that Negroes did business with and participated in farmers cooperatives in Mississippi. But when I asked him whether he considered this to be an encouraging sign of bi-racial cooperation in a state where the United States Agriculture Department maintains separate county extension agents for white and Negro farmers, he warned me that the Mississippi Cooperative Federation was strictly a business enterprise and was not about to go on any crusades. Moreover, he was empathetically unenthusiastic about organizing new coops, which was why I had come to him in the first place, (Mississippi has the weakest farmer coop movement of any agricultural state.) Indeed, why should anyone want to start coops? As everybody knows, things are great--never been better--in Mississippi.

If a civil rights worker does not identify himself as such, the chances are he will get the information he is looking for. An agricultural economist on the State Agri-

Culture and Industry Board was most helpful in providing me with statistics when I told him I was writing a thesis for the University of California. But he too was suspicious of me because I was an outsider (official Mississippi being as anxious about its "image" as a teenage girl). He asked me what I thought about the state's social system. "It's not perfect," I replied. He then produced the latest FBI figures on major crime, which revealed that Mississippi had the lowest crime rate in the country. "Don't you think there is a correlation between the social structure and a low crime rate?" he asked triumphantly. I said I was sure that there was a correlation between Mississippi's crime rate and the figures. For in Mississippi there are four codes of justice to cover four possibilities: (1) crimes by whites against whites, (2) Negroes against whites, (3) Negroes against Negroes, (4) whites against Negroes. How many crimes in categories (3) and (4) are reported is anybody's guess. Since January 1964, at least six Mississippi Negroes have been murdered.

The mentality of the closed society pervades all public life in Mississippi. The State Democratic Party boasts of its separation from the National Democratic Party. It proclaimed in a recent election pamphlet, "We do not have to belong to and participate in an integrated national party." When the FBI re-opened its Jackson office shortly after James Chaney, Andy Goodman and Mickey Schwerner were murdered, Gov. Paul Johnson announced on TV that the FBI was re-opening the office not because state and local authorities were unwilling and unable to safeguard people's lives, but because Mississippi was becoming so prosperous (the state has the lowest per-capita income in the country) that organized crime "wanted in" on the Mississippi bonanza. The spirit of delusion was evidently contagious, since J. Edgar Hoover, who had come down to Mississippi to check up on the search for the then missing bodies, wholeheartedly agreed with Johnson. Almost all the daily papers have denounced the summer volunteers as outside agitators, communists and beatniks. In reality, the Mississippi Summer Project is quite "square" by Berkeley standards. Finally, summer volunteers have been angrily refused entrance into white churches.

How successful has the Summer Project been in breaching the closed society? Of course it is impossible to evaluate conclusively one battle in a war which has just begun. On the other hand, changes are already apparent. A fact easily overlooked is that the very existence of Northerners and Westerners in the state has forced the white community to recognize that, however much they might like to, they can't completely divorce themselves from the outside world. An integrated car in downtown Jackson still gets its share of dirty looks and shouted epithets, but the sight is becoming so frequent that the die-in-the-last-ditch white supremacist must feel himself beleaguered. Among the white college students there is, along with hostility, a measure of curiosity. The Association of Tenth Amendment Conservatives, an Ole Miss student group, took it upon themselves to visit the Freedom House at Ruleville. They talked for about an hour and went away exposed if not convinced. Students at Mississippi Southern University in Hattiesburg have made similar overtures.

Aside from the reports of violence (which occur at the rate of at least a dozen incidents per day) the aspect of the Summer Project which has attracted the most publicity has been the formation of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Its structure parallels that of the State Democratic Party, but in two respects is rad-

ically different. First, any resident of Mississippi of voting age--white or Negro--may join the FDP. Second, the FDP is pledged to support Lyndon Johnson. FDP delegates will go to the Democratic National Convention and demand to be seated by virtue of being the "loyalist" Democratic organization in Mississippi.

If the FDP delegation is seated--at this writing the chances range from "not bad" to "very good", the effect will be that Mississippi voters will be able to rejoin the National Democratic Party. This might turn out to be something of a mixed blessing, since the Democrats' position on civil rights and other problems besetting Mississippi, has been less than ideal. If, on the other hand, the FDP's demands are totally rejected, its raison d'etre will be undermined and its future jeopardized.

Until Negroes are allowed to register for the vote in large numbers, Mississippi will remain a closed society, and unfortunately, COFO workers do not occupy the position of voter registrar in any of Mississippi's 82 counties. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a help, but does not go nearly far enough, since it does not provide for Federal Referees to register voters in counties with a demonstrable pattern of discrimination. Nevertheless, the day of reckoning is fast approaching for the whites who run Mississippi politics. They will have to choose between complying with federal court orders to register Negro voters (thus ending their political reign) and defying the courts (thus risking federal intervention and possibly occupation). The Mississippi Summer Project of 1964 has proceeded on the assumption that federal intervention was not forthcoming, an assumption which turned out to be tragically correct. The price of Washington's inactivity has been three lives and a few voters registered. The possibility that the Mississippi Summer Project is only a beginning and that the strength of the national government may be required to crack Mississippi must be faced by everyone in the civil rights struggle.

-----Joe White

---

### Addendum

People in the civil rights movement would do well to be extremely skeptical of the liberal assertion that the seating of two members of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party delegation as "delegates at large" represents a civil rights victory. The argument runs that the Freedom Democratic Party people had no legal case at all, but rather a moral case; and that the Democratic National Convention's unprecedented decision to create delegates at large and a watchdog committee to see that the Mississippi State Democratic Party allows Negroes to participate in Mississippi politics will in the long run bring civil rights to Mississippi.

Let's examine the facts. In the first place the FDP based its claim to official recognition on the contention that it was the Democratic Party in Mississippi explicitly pledged to the support of the Democratic ticket. This contention is indisputably correct. The Mississippi State Democratic Party publicly boasts that it is not bound by the national party and in fact Democratic electors in Mississippi did not cast their votes for John F. Kennedy in 1960.

Secondly, the FDP is accused of not following Mississippi law to the letter by not holding convention in each of the state's 82 counties. True enough. What was not reported on the TV is that in some sections of Mississippi it is still impossible for civil rights workers to move in even relative safety and that any Negro in these areas who so much as attempts to register to vote, much less organize a political party, is taking his life in his hands. It is also true that the FDP did not follow the law which states that a political party must advertise its conventions in local newspapers. How indeed could they, when the papers refused to accept their ads because "the Freedom Democratic Party is not a legal political party."

Someone who faithfully watched the TV also did not learn that the members of the "regular" Mississippi delegation, suddenly so concerned about legality, devote their political lives to evading and ignoring the law of the land, that registered Negro voters were turned away from the regular State Democratic Party conventions, and that only 6.3 per cent of Negroes eligible to vote in Mississippi are registered.

Nevertheless, the Democratic Party regulars persisted in their analysis that somehow the FDP had no legal claim to be seated. I would argue that they were using the issue of legality as a smokescreen to cover their fears--the fear that Lyndon Johnson would lose the entire South were the Freedom Democrats seated, the fear of the "white backlash," and the fear of calling white supremacists by the right name.

Considering the eagerness of the liberals to compromise (the California delegation is a good example) one might reasonably ask what was behind the idea of organizing a political party in Mississippi loyal to Johnson. The answer is that many people in COFO assumed that because the Democratic party is the more liberal of the two major political parties, the civil rights movement must work within the Democratic party and loyally support it in the hope that the Democrats would throw out their southern, white supremacist wing and that a truly liberal party would emerge. This was not an unreasonable hypothesis, and 1964 provided a fine year to test it. The results are clear enough. The Democratic Party proved no more willing to seat the FDP delegation than to provide Federal protection for civil rights workers in the South, Federal referees to uphold voting rights, or courageous leadership in the face of the so called backlash. The civil rights movement now must critically reexamine its political perspective.

-----Joe Whit

---

#### A Parent Looks Beyond The Summer

What can the parent of a Mississippi volunteer say that would add to Mrs Chaney's words or the Pieta beauty of the photogtaph of the Goodmans as their son's body came off the plane?

My boy and his delightful wife are safely home, and a second summer of stress for us is ended. (He was there last year too.) More was accomplished in Mississippi than the volunteers themselves seem to realize. This was more than a matter of modesty -- and I find that to be a nearly universal quality of the volunteers.

They are so overwhelmed by what remains to be done, so troubled by the things that were not done right by the incredible group of amateurs who have cracked the South and riveted the attention of the nation in less than five years, that their eyes have not yet found perspective.

Consider what it means to go into a plantation hamlet regarded as so dangerous that the decision to tackle it was not made 'til a month into the summer, and find that 315 of 350 eligible were willing to register with the Freedom Democratic Party in three days' time? And that carloads of these plantation hands, their utterly unprotected day-labor jobs and very lives at stake, were willing to escort the Freedom Riders safely out of range -- people they had never met or had any contact with before? Or in a state where unions won't touch the Negro, outside a handful of crafts and enterprises, for a housemaid to speak out at one of the nightly rallies and say it's about time they went on strike and made some real money? Or for three local Negro workingmen, youthful to middle-aged, now to be circulating a petition asking President Johnson to set up a pilot project of the war against poverty in Clarksdale, and to be planning a delegation to take the petition to Washington themselves?

The people are in motion! The People, Yes!

Without this, the individual heroes die in vain, suffer beatings in vain, go to jail in vain. With this, everything, anything is worthwhile.

Here, perhaps, is where the perspective of an older generation is helpful. For some of the volunteers tend to place too much stress upon those who refused to register, those who were apathetic or still fearful, or those who may have done things because it was a white man telling them to. But that was always the case -- at least since Reconstruction and the later black-and-white Populists were crushed, and the little-known Sharecroppers Union of the 1930s. It is the new that is important, and there are respects in which the South already need make no apologies to the North.

For example, my son wrote last month that "only" eighty had come to a precinct meeting. Only! I happen to belong to a Democratic club. Believe me, no one short of Gov. Brown could bring out eighty to one of our meetings, and few clubs are more active than ours. The right to participate is only the precondition for democracy. It is the actual participation that counts. And I wonder if there is more today in any state of the Union than among the Negroes of Mississippi? 100,000 Freedom Democratic registrations! In a population only ten times that large, including a huge proportion ineligible because they are under-age, with semi-literacy the usual standard, and fear reinforced -- or so the killers thought -- by many murders this very year.

But numbers without clarity are worth little. And the Freedom Movement is succoring America from a hypnosis that has crippled the country for a generation. Thirteen years ago I participated in what might be called a premature Freedom Ride. It developed into a remarkable movement of brief duration, and the local leaders, knowing that I write, asked me to come back the next year to gather material for a book. And so I asked the one pastor of a major denomination who had made his church available to us what he thought of the Red smear that had been used against us. He answered: "When that Freedom Train come down the track, my people gonna get

on board, and they ain't gonna care what color the cars are painted!"

No rational man believes that today's freedom train is a red express, but there are those who wish to make us see it through a red filter, and others who are terribly distraught that some drops of red might actually have splashed on it the last time it was in the shops. But the former are failing, and the latter find that most people couldn't care less.

A month ago, Senator Eastland made a speech about alleged "second-generation radicals" in the Summer Project. The New York Times published his names, presumably in pursuit of its function as a newspaper of record. But the San Francisco Chronicle, receiving the same UPI story, dropped the paragraphs that named names, except for one individual in the East. The Examiner and Tribune did not carry the story at all. And the reason was spelled out by, most amazingly, the editor of a Mississippi newspaper, who also refused to report the speech by "his own" senator, explaining this in conversation by saying that the "Communist" issue "is irrelevant"!

Last week some Democrat politicians in Sacramento -- men of very good will -- learned this too. I was about to drive down to the bus station to pick up my son and daughter-in-law on their return from the South, when the phone rang. The mother of another volunteer told me that the pressure was being applied to cause the new Democratic State Committee to reverse the pro-Freedom Democratic Party decision of the outgoing committee, and every parent who could should go to Sacramento to lobby. My son and I went. The next day he was to be one of the four Summer Project volunteers addressing the open session of the Resolution Committee. One newspaperman asked him, in unfriendly fashion, whether he was the son of the Mandel of "Operation Abolition." The very sincere man in charge of the lobbying asked Bob to withdraw as a speaker, as did the legislative secretary of a man who was really pushing hard for the resolution. Neither of them had anything against Bob or myself: they feared that Red-baiting might be used against the resolution. Bob insisted on speaking, and did. No one echoed Eastland. No newspaper dared to question the motives of anyone who had put his life on the line in the South. When the resolution passed the next day, the full committee of 900 tough politicians rose in a standing ovation for the kids who represent what America really believes in deep down in its soul. And every newspaper reported this with amazement, and with the reverence it deserved.

I discuss this issue because we are not done with it. The House Unamerican Activities Committee held secret hearings in San Francisco during the Republican Convention to gather material for an open hearing here according to very well informed people in the newspaper world and elsewhere. The intention will be to smear the civil rights movement as Red.

People have to give thought right now to how they will meet this. And any who believes they may be subpoenaed must decide what course they will pursue. I cannot conceive of what the Committee could possibly wish to ask me about the civil rights movement except whether I can prove to their satisfaction that I am really my son's father. However, there was no more reason to call me in 1960. Therefore, I wish to put them on notice --and thereby offer a suggestion to others who think they may be called--that I will answer no subpoena from them, because

their chairman, Edwin Willis of Louisiana (and "Operation Abolition") is not a United States Congressman within the meaning of Article 14, Section 2 of the Constitution. Permit me to cite it:

"when the right to Vote at any election . . . for Representatives in Congress . . . is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State . . . the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State."

It is no accident that Willis was the leader of the fight against the Civil Rights Act in the House.

Any form of non-cooperation with HUAC is honorable, but no test of 14:2 can be made if people take the Fifth Amendment. Nor will the issue of voting rights be clearly joined if people take the First Amendment. I hope witnesses will confine themselves to 14:2. If a thousand young people, Mississippians and outsiders, could put their lives on the line to win the right of Mississippi Negroes to vote, we can put some period of our freedom on the line to win that right for the Negroes of Louisiana by facing the courts with the need to answer publicly whether or not Willis is a Congressman. And as he is not, no subpoena issued by a committee he chairs can be legal.

In this problem and in others, the Freedom Movement must think beyond the problems it has already faced. Elsewhere in this issue there is a review of an article on the civil rights movement and employment. I have not had the opportunity to read it, but the aspect of the problem to which I would like to direct attention has usually been missed by writers on the subject.

A major reason for the violence used by white building trades workers in Philadelphia last year against pickets seeking jobs for Negroes was direct fear of losing their own jobs in an increasingly automated society. In addition to the need to open unions to Negroes, and to pass New Deal-type legislation creating useful jobs meeting internal American needs -- both of which are essential, and both of which will take hard and long fights -- there is an additional means of easing the pressure on the job market. Because it falls into the category of policies that have made President Johnson popular with all classes in society (if not with all sections of all classes!), it is something toward which we can move more rapidly than either of these other areas of enlarged employment.

There are today two crises demanding immediate solution: Negro equality and foreign policy. Had there been any doubt of this, Barry Goldwater has laid it to rest. These are the issues on which he is seeking to turn the clock back. One aspect of the Cold War that we have still not moved very far out of is the policy of refusing to trade with the countries regarded as probable adversaries in World War III. Today those countries produce half the gross product of the entire world outside the United States. The history of foreign trade shows that it is in very close proportion to a country's gross product: we do much more business with advanced countries than with underdeveloped ones. Therefore, were we to resume commerce with lands now producing as much as those we presently

permit unrestricted trade with, our foreign trade would double. As foreign trade now permits two million jobs, this change in policy would provide two million more. Most of these jobs would be in fields that the Negro finds it "easiest" (if that word is ever applicable!) to get into: industrial production, warehousing, longshore, maritime transport. In any case, by taking that many people, of whatever race, off the labor market, opportunities for the rest would rise by that number.

My point is that America is one, and its problems are one. This is already recognized by the Freedom Movement when its spokesmen say to Washington: if you can send troops to Vietnam, why not to Mississippi? Civil rights without jobs means little. Negro unemployment cannot be seriously dented without seriously reducing white unemployment. Expanded foreign trade is the easiest way to do it, although it cannot solve the problem by itself. The only place where an explosion of foreign trade can be achieved is with countries with which we have barred it. This is why there is a relationship between jobs for Negroes and ending the Cold War. It cannot be dodged.

----- William Mandel

-----  
Excerpts From Campaign Literature:  
Paul B. Johnson For Governor Campaign, 1963.

Mississippi Republicans Endanger Mississippi With Two Party System:

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

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

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

A DIVISION OF CONSERVATIVE MISSISSIPPIANS INTO TWO POLITICAL CAMPS as now being attempted by these self-styled Republicans, WOULD GIVE THE BALANCE OF POWER IN MISSISSIPPI TO OUR MINORITY GROUP. This would be the end of our way of life in Mississippi and the peace, tranquillity, law and order we now enjoy in all of our communities would soon come to an awesome end.

Mississippi Has All The Benefits Without The Very Real Dangers:

... As Mississippi Democrats we are enjoying all of the so-called "benefits" of this two party system, through our State Democratic primary elections, without

exposing the people of Mississippi to the disastrous events and conditions that would surely follow the division of conservative Mississippians into two political camps thus giving the balance of power into the hands of the minority.

-----

Platform and Principles, Mississippi State Democratic Party

(Adopted in Convention in the city of Jackson, June 30, 1960)

The Democratic Party of Mississippi stands today where it has always stood with feet firmly planted on the solid foundation of the Constitution of the United States, pure Americanism and the traditional Southern American Way of Life.

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

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

... We expressly condemn the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Brown school case rendered May 17, 1954, and subsequent decisions of that court, and inferior federal courts, striking down state constitutions and laws providing for the conduct and operation of public schools... within the states.

We are opposed to any legislation, federal or state, setting up what is known as a Fair Employment Practice Commission...

We believe that every person shall have the right to work and no person shall be denied that right because he or she is not a member of a union or other labor organization...

We favor the poll tax and are opposed to any attempt to abolish it...

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

We oppose the ratification by the United States of the Genocide Convention and of the United Nations, the proposed Human Rights Convention and the Civil Rights Convention...

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

We believe in the doctrine of interposition as defined in the appropriate resolution adopted by the Mississippi Legislature, 1956.

We believe in the separation of the races in the universities and colleges, in the public schools, in public transportation, in public parks, in public playgrounds, and in all spheres of activity where experience has shown that it is for the best interests of both races that such separation be observed...

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF MISSISSIPPI... that we, acknowledging with humility the divine power of Almighty God, and standing fearless in our belief in constitutional government, the rights of the states, segregation of the races and preservation of your traditional Southern American Way of Life, do hereby affirm and declare:

(1) that we reject and oppose the platforms of both national parties and their candidates....

-----

Who are the Poor?

Average family income in 1960 was \$6,800, certainly not "poor." But "average" is an abstraction. If a man with an income of \$200,000 a year lives in a mansion and the only other house on the block belongs to his chauffeur, with \$4,000 a year, the average income for that block is \$102,000--which tells nothing about either inhabitant. Something like this has happened nationally.

Half of all American families earn less than \$5,600. Almost one third earn less than \$4,000; 22% earn less than \$3,000; 13% earn less than \$2,000; and 5% of our families earn less than \$1,000.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics regards \$1,500 in cash and benefits--free food and fuel, for example--as necessary for a lone individual to live modestly. And in 1959 the U. S. Department of Labor surveyed 20 American cities to find what is a "modest but adequate" family budget. The average was about \$6,000, of which a family of four spent about \$4,000 for food, shelter, taxes, medical and working expenses.

If the lowest adequate income for an individual is \$500 and that for a family \$2,000, there are still 20 million Americans who fail to meet those standards. As the standards rise, so do the totals. If the minimums are raised to \$1,000 and \$3,000, there are 36 million poor. If to \$2,000 and \$4,000, there are 54 million.

Most noticeable of the poor is the Negro, once concentrated in the rural South, now two thirds in the cities. Many went from field to factory during World War II and the Korean War, when labor was in demand; but being the last hired, they were the first fired when automation or recession came. Negroes still average 40% less than whites in wages and have double the white unemployment rate. They are 22% of the American poor--double their proportion of the population. But, numerically, the great majority of the poor are white.

Poverty is not particular to any region. It is a normal reservoir in all rural areas. It is a migratory stream of desperation headed for the cities. And it is now a festering concentration in every metropolis in the land.

---- Excerpt from "The Invisible Americans"  
by Ben H. Bagdikian, The Saturday Evening Post, December 21-28, 1963

-----

### March Up Market Street

On Sunday, July 12, we witnessed the ultimate in political opportunism on the part of conservative Negro ministers and spokesmen for the ILWU. The event was a 35,000 strong march and rally in San Francisco, officially sponsored by the Church-Labor Alliance, and featuring speakers James Farmer, John Lewis, A. Philip Randolph, and Rev. Ralph Abernathy. The leadership included the Reverend Hamilton T. Boswell of the Ministerial Alliance, and William Chester of the ILWU.

A mass rally had been scheduled by CORE for this date, as part of a protest campaign attacking the Republican Party for its refusal to adopt a strong civil rights plank. CORE was forced, however, to go along with the plans of the Church-Labor Alliance since it was quite clear that a separate rally by CORE would have little chance of success.

The Reverend Boswell has been a vigorous opponent of the militant civil rights movement which has developed in the San Francisco area over the past several months. Despite his hostility to the movement, he has not hesitated to use it for his own personal political aggrandizement. His public disavowal of the Sheraton-Palace sit-in did not prevent him from being a signatory to the agreement between the Ad Hoc Committee and the Hotel Association. Boswell found in Chester an ally who, like himself, did not wish to damage his ties with the Democratic Party machine, but who at the same time finds it necessary to pose as a champion of civil rights.

The Boswell-Chester combination was not satisfied with controlling the demonstration. They did not wish to share the public platform with any local figures associated with the militant section of the civil rights movement. At the same time they wanted the endorsement of their march and rally by the San Francisco United Freedom Movement. Dr. Nathaniel Burbridge, militant chairman of the San Francisco NAACP, and leader of the Auto Row sit-in, was offered a place on the program, and the United Freedom Movement endorsed the demonstration. Dr. Burbridge felt it necessary to bring to the attention of the marchers and the public some of the facts surrounding the San Francisco civil rights trials, and to call for pressure upon the local Democratic city administration to curtail its political persecution of the civil rights arrestees.

This attitude toward the Democratic city fathers did not set well with the Boswell-Chester axis, and they moved to clean up the demonstration so that such un-Democratic attitudes would not be in evidence on Sunday. Late Saturday night Dr. Burbridge was informed that there was no place for him on the program the next day. But the axis had not counted on the militant support behind Dr. Burbridge. The vast majority of Bay Area civil rights activists look to Dr. Burbridge as a principled and courageous leader, and have little but contempt for the likes of Boswell. Chester was to discover on Sunday that support for Burbridge would come even from a majority of Ad Hoc Committee members, where supposedly the ILWU has some influence.

The word of Burbridge's exclusion spread rapidly, so that when the march up Market Street began, the only people unaware of what had happened were the Sunday militants, who knew only what the white newspapers chose to tell them about the civil rights leadership. No one knew what could be done so late in the day, but the feeling was almost unanimous that not only Dr. Burbridge, but all of the civil rights defendants had been cruelly cheated.

To add to the frustration of the activists, the rally turned out not to be a demand for a strong civil rights plank and a progressive platform, but an anti-Goldwater rally. Even the most militant speaker of the day, James Farmer, found it necessary to make anti-Goldwaterism his main theme, rather than anti-racism. Among the speakers on the platform were Governor Rockefeller and Henry Cabot Lodge, backers of William Scranton, suppressor of the Chester, Pennsylvania civil rights movement. And to assure the world where the demonstrators stood, Rockefeller was allowed to attack Goldwater, but when he pointed out the anti-civil rights records of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson as Senators, he was roundly booed by the political imbeciles who believe that the way to progress is to support whichever spokesman of big business and Southern segregationists happens to use the most liberal rhetoric.

As each speaker was introduced, "We want Burbridge" was chanted by young people in the crowd. As people became aware of what was happening, the chants grew louder. Boswell soon lost his head. He cried out "Then go find him," and "Go get Hitler, or Goldwater." Boswell's attempt to make the chanters look like right-wing agitators backfired, however, and the chants grew louder and more insistent. The henchmen of the Boswell-Chester axis were not prepared to give in to anything so gross as popular demand, and when Burbridge arrived at the platform behind the speakers' rostrum (where he was listed as a platform guest) Revels Cayton of the ILWU and his goons made every effort to exclude him from public view. Tom Miller of Campus CORE attempted to get Burbridge up near the rostrum, and Cayton met this advance by shoving him backwards (while shouting that Miller was pushing him). Thereupon, Miller began pushing back, and Burbridge successfully made it to the front of the platform. Revels Cayton was furious and continued swearing and screaming that Burbridge would never speak.

Meanwhile, the chanting from the crowd was loud, but leaderless. It became clear that Burbridge would not be allowed to speak unless Boswell's hand was really forced. Just before Reverend Abernathy, the last scheduled speaker, was introduced, Tom Roland of Campus CORE leaped to the platform, and as Boswell and his henchmen raged helplessly (they were on national television, and could not use strong-arm tactics), Roland announced that Dr. Burbridge was the real leader of the San Francisco civil rights movement, and exhorted the crowd to demand that he be heard. The microphones were turned off, but not in time. The crowd roared its approval, and when Reverend Abernathy came to the microphones, he introduced Dr. Burbridge, who spoke briefly about the crimes of the Democratic Administration of San Francisco, and the biased courts of this "fair" city.

Only one day later, Dr. Burbridge was sentenced to nine months in prison for peacefully sitting-in at Auto Row to help win freedom for his people. As far as we know, Reverend Boswell has never gone to jail for this purpose.

-----Tom Roland

-----CAMPUS CORE NEEDS YOUR SUPPORT-----

THE MASS MEDIA ARE CLOSED TO US, BUT YOUR \$15 CONTRIBUTION WILL PAY FOR 5,000 LEAFLETS. Please use the enclosed return-address envelope!!

## Legal Lynching: The San Francisco Civil Rights Trials

On March 6, March 13, and April 11 of this year, nearly 500 persons were arrested in a series of civil rights sit-in demonstrations in San Francisco, sponsored by CORE, the NAACP, and the Ad Hoc Committee to End Discrimination. The demonstrators were mostly college students, but doctors, lawyers, workers, clergymen and college professors were also arrested while protesting the discriminatory hiring practices of the Sheraton-Palace Hotel, the Cadillac Agency, and the Automobile Dealers Assoc. On all occasions the arrests had been preceded by months and sometimes even years of negotiations (and attempted negotiations) to end discrimination by these business establishments, and by weeks of sidewalk picketing. The demonstrators were completely non-violent (even if the police were not) and no property was damaged in the hotel or the auto agency. Nevertheless the Sheraton demonstrators were charged in groups of ten to fifteen with disturbing the peace, and the Cadillac demonstrators with trespass, unlawful assembly, and failure to disperse, in addition to disturbing the peace.

From this point on the demonstrators were subjected to almost unbelievable harassment, mistreatment, judicial injustices, and vilification by the press, public officials and the judges themselves. I shall describe just some of the many incidents and statistical facts about the trials, proving beyond any reasonable doubt a systematic attempt by the city government and many of the San Francisco judges to deprive the defendants of their civil liberties and crush the civil rights movement in the Bay Area.

The model of justice under the American judicial system is the right to a fair trial before a fair and impartial jury of one's peers who have not pre-judged one's guilt or innocence. In addition, a defendant must be tried before a fair and impartial judge, who favors neither the prosecution nor the defense. A defendant must be presumed innocent unless or until he is proven guilty beyond any reasonable doubt, and his trial must not be commented upon by either the press, public officials, or members of the judiciary while it is in progress. The Supreme Court has stated that a defendant "would be put under a heavy burden in establishing his innocence at the impending trial," if public officials commented upon it before its conclusion. (Delacey v. U. S., 199 F 2d 107, 1952)

Here, however, is how justice is meted out in San Francisco, California:

### Public Statements and Press Hostility

Before any of the trials had even begun, Governor Edmund Brown, Mayor John Shelley, and Police Chief Thomas Cahill publicly declared that "the pickets violated the law." Their statements were carried in all the newspapers and were undoubtedly read by all prospective jurors in the pending trials. During the trials, Judge Drewes called the demonstrations "intolerable," and Superior Court Judge Raymond O'Connor called the demonstrations a "criminal conspiracy" and demanded a grand jury investigation of civil rights leaders. Newspaper editorials and articles (sometimes indistinguishable) were equally hostile and contributed to the creation of an atmosphere of guilt before a single case had come to trial. This is how the impartiality and presumption of innocence essential to the administration of justice is assured to defendants in San Francisco civil rights trials.

### Systematic Exclusion of Negro Jurors

In a study of 34 of the civil rights trials by the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers Guild it was shown that out of 204 Negroes called for jury duty, only 10 actually served, and the great majority were excluded by the prosecution on peremptory challenges (for which no reason for exclusion need be given). At least two prosecutors, George Duke and Fred Whisman admitted that their official policy was to exclude all Negroes from their juries. (Sworn affidavits of defense attorneys John George and Benjamin Davis. Executed May 15 and June 12, 1964) and this was certainly the pattern throughout the trials. This is how the right to be tried by a jury of one's peers, without regard to race or nationality, is guaranteed to defendants in San Francisco civil rights cases.

### Prejudice of the Judges

The evidence of judicial prejudice against the civil rights defendants is overwhelming.

1) Although the law of California states specifically that defendants in misdemeanor trials are not required to be present unless so ordered by the judge, and despite the fact that the rule in California and other states is not to require defendants in misdemeanor cases to be present, especially if they are students or if their jobs would be jeopardized, the judges in San Francisco required every defendant to attend court every day. Trials sometimes lasted as long as a month, daily trips into San Francisco were required for those who lived in the East Bay, and as a result many persons were forced to drop out of school or suffered a sharp drop in grades. Others lost their jobs and suffered great financial difficulties.

2) Municipal Judge Elton Lawless (most appropriately named) referred to a Negro defendant as a "nigger," and constantly remarked in open court, "Well, they broke the law, didn't they?" He also coached the prosecution by suggesting that the prosecutor object and then sustaining the objection. Judge Lawless refused to allow any mention of civil rights during the trial, declaring that the cases were simply disturbing the peace cases and that no other issue was involved. Then, on television, he justified meting out 30 and 60 day jail sentences to young students by asserting that these were not simply misdemeanor cases, but political cases, and because the demonstrators, he said, were a threat to society.

3) Judge Clayton Horn, like Lawless, refused to allow the mention of civil rights despite the fact that the defendants' motivation or intent was an essential element in their guilt or innocence. He held three defendants in contempt of court for laughing when Horn said, "Civil rights is not an issue in this trial."

4) Judge Andrew Eyman forced a jury in one of the cases over which he presided to deliberate for 2 days when they could not reach a verdict, and refused to allow them to hear all the testimony they had requested to have repeated to them while they were deliberating. When defense attorney, Theodore Rosenak objected to this, he was told to "shut up." When the jury was finally unable to reach a verdict (two Negroes and one white were in favor of acquittal), Eyman attempted to disqualify the Negro jurors for partiality, but was stopped when the jury foreman defended them.

5) Judge Clarence Linn sentenced S. F. CORE chairman Bill Bradley to 5 days in jail for being an hour late to court one day.

There are many other similar incidents involving Judges Maloney, Friedman, Drewes, Mana and several others. But this should sufficiently illustrate the attitude of the Judges in San Francisco to the civil rights demonstrators.

### Sentences

The sentences meted out to the young students, doctors, lawyers, and clergymen who had demonstrated for racial equality and equal opportunity in employment were perhaps the most shocking examples of the injustices of the San Francisco judiciary. This is best illustrated by the contrast between sentences given to civil rights demonstrators convicted of disturbing the peace and sentences given to non-demonstrators in San Francisco convicted of the same crime. While only 9% of those convicted of disturbing the peace in San Francisco ever receive jail sentences, 70% of the civil rights demonstrators convicted of disturbing the peace received jail sentences of up to three months. The average sentence for disturbing the peace in San Francisco in the past few years has been a 5 day suspended sentence and a 25 dollar fine, yet civil rights demonstrators, most of whom had never been arrested before and who were voluntarily submitting to arrest for the cause of racial justice averaged 30 to 60 day jail sentences and \$100 fines. These sentences are far worse than those received by civil rights demonstrators who have been arrested in New York. The San Francisco sentences are also harsher than those received by Freedom Riders in Mississippi in '61 where 44% received fines only and the harshest jail sentence was 120 days compared to the 270 day sentence received by San Francisco's Dr. Thomas Burbridge, president of the NAACP and professor of pharmacology at the UC school of medicine.

A further injustice in the San Francisco sentencing was that the civil rights leaders, whose behavior at the demonstrations had been no different than anyone else's were singled out for particularly harsh sentences. Furthermore, some defendants have been found not guilty (significantly in the courts of the few fair-minded judges in S. F. while their fellow demonstrators, whose actions were the same, are sentenced to one and two months in jail. Some defendants have been forced to sit in court for two months while the city insisted on trying them for a second time after failing to get a conviction the first time around. The city is now preparing to start on a third trial for some defendants, a procedure uncommon even in felony cases.

The injustices of the San Francisco civil rights trials, it is important to remember, are not merely isolated incidents or the responsibility of a few individual judges. Rather, it is a pattern of harassment and deprivation of rights which has only been possible with the co-operation of the Governor, the Mayor, the police, the press, and the judiciary. The decision to press charges was not the decision of the employers who had been objects of the protest, but rather of the governmental officials in the state and city. The growing demand for racial justice and equal opportunity for all is a direct challenge to the status quo and to its protectors, those in political power and those who own the newspapers and other means of mass communication. The civil rights movement in the Bay Area is one of the largest and strongest in the country. This is recognized by everyone from Governor Brown on down, and the attempt of the power structure to destroy the movement is an unmistakable indication of its attitude toward civil rights: fine in Mississippi, not so fine in San Francisco. For the price of civil rights is that the public interest must take precedent over the private interest, and human rights over property rights. At this moment the power structure is on the side of private interests and property rights. The rhetoric may be liberal, but the actions are diabolical.

There is one very important final point which must be made. The question is sometimes asked, "Even if the trials had been just and fair would not the demonstrators still have been found guilty? Did they not break the law?" As a defen-

dant in one of the Cadillac trials, and having been fortunate enough to have a judge who was, in fact, fair and impartial, I feel certain that the defendants in these cases are legally as well as morally innocent of any crime, and that they would have been found not guilty in fair and impartial courts and in a city whose mind had not been made up for it by the press. My two-week long trial in the court of Judge Fitz-Gerald Ames provided me with an understanding of the legal questions involved which most of the public lacks, and which, I feel, is responsible for the widespread conviction that the defendants, however admirable their cause, did break the law. According to the California Penal Code (available in any Court House or law school library) an individual is not guilty of disturbing the peace unless the prosecution can prove malice in his behavior. If the purpose of any activity is not malicious, and especially if the activity is protected by the Bill of Rights (as freedom of assembly is), then the crime of disturbing the peace has not been committed. The mere existence of noise or large groups of people congregated together is not a crime (e. g. parades, football games, public meetings, etc.) The one and only purpose of the demonstrations was to inform the public and the government of the existence of discrimination and thereby bring public pressure to bear to change these practices. The lack of any violence or property damage is proof of the single-minded purpose of the demonstrators, and the very nature of their activity can hardly be described as malicious.

To be guilty of trespass, according to the California Penal Code, there must be a specific intent to injure or interfere with a lawful business. Aside from the question of whether a discriminatory business is a lawful one, there is the fact that both in the hotel and in the agency, business was free to be conducted, and that the weapon of the civil rights groups in these particular demonstrations was not economic pressure (considering those who patronize such upper class establishments), but rather public and political pressure.

The charge of unlawful assembly is a very vague one. Since it involves doing a "lawful act in an unlawful manner," one would assume that the activities of the demonstrators were lawful, in which case they certainly can't be guilty of the first two charges (trespass and disturbing the peace). But even ignoring this inconsistency (perhaps the prosecutors got a bit carried away in their zeal to put us all behind bars), the charge further states that this lawful act is unlawful if it is done in a "violent, boisterous, and tumultuous manner." As was stated before, the demonstrations were completely non-violent. Secondly the singing of "We Shall Overcome," for instance, is hardly "tumultuous," and thirdly, the definitions of these words are so vague that some lawyers consider the law itself unconstitutional. Let it be said that several policemen were observed singing along with the demonstrators, the scenes of the demonstrations were filled with reporters, cameramen, and employees, and it would seem extremely difficult to attribute the general noise level to only some of the persons present in a given location. I believe the prosecution failed to prove that the demonstrations fit the description "violent, boisterous, and tumultuous." The fourth charge, failure to disperse, is directly related to the previous one, for if no crime was being committed, the order to disperse was not valid.

Furthermore, as Judge Ames pointed out in his instructions to the jury, a sit-in is not a crime in itself, as long as it is conducted at a place of business which is open to the public. It is only illegal if the specific circumstances substantiate the prosecution's charges. He further pointed out that activity protected by the 1st Amendment free speech and freedom of assembly clauses may be legal when the same activity for a non-constitutional purpose would be illegal. A public, political or social protest, in other words can be legal in a public place of business, while a baseball game would not.

The fact that 48 defendants were acquitted and that numerous trials ended in hung juries indicate that had the trials been fairly conducted, had discrimination not been practiced in jury selection, and had public officials and judges not prejudged the defendants during the course of the trials, the outcome would have been different. In my own case the all white jury voted 8-4 for acquittal on all four charges. Despite the fact that almost every one of them had been convinced of our guilt before the trial began, the confrontation with the facts and with the people involved was not only an emotional and educational experience for them, but transformed the prejudices they had received from Brown, Shelley, and the press into a belief in our innocence and a sympathetic understanding of the whole civil rights issue. To divorce civil rights from the civil rights trial as many judges tried to do is absurd, unfair, and prejudicial. When given a fair hearing before an impartial judge where the defendants' state of mind can be revealed to the jurors and where civil rights most certainly is an issue, I feel very strongly that "The truth shall make us free" --the defendants, the judge, and the jurors.

---- Robert Wolfson

For further information, contact:

National Lawyers Guild  
228 McAllister Street  
San Francisco, California

Committee for Justice in Civil Rights Cases  
2890 Telegraph Avenue  
Berkeley 5, California                      Th 5-4123

LABOR

DONATED

## Recent Trends In The Local Civil Rights Movement

The "Movement" as we now know it in the Bay Area is a very recent development. Through the beginning of 1963, there were few significant achievements attributable to direct action. Although direct action groups existed, their goals were either remote or of an extremely limited nature. Thousands of man-hours were spent picketing Woolworth and Kress in sympathy with Southern lunch counter demonstrations; realtors and apartment house managers were picketed because of their refusal, in specific cases, to sell or rent homes to Negroes; employment projects concentrated mainly on demanding that all-white business establishments where specific instances of discrimination could be documented, "integrate" their work force. The Movement had a high moral tone, but little social content. Dimestore picketing had little visible effect (except demoralization). Eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation with petty entrepreneurs brought about concessions of microscopic import: one apartment, one or two jobs. Image was all-important. Suit and tie was the standard direct action costume. Talking and smoking were forbidden on picketlines. Spacing of pickets, and holding of signs "properly" were important. The CORE chapter was considered a "small group of dedicated people".

The Freedom Rides of 1961 brought the first large wave of people into CORE, but local direct action generally followed the above pattern until early 1963. At this time Berkeley and Oakland CORE entered into direct action against Montgomery Ward in Oakland. They considered this action a bold new step (which it was) because "Monkey Ward" already employed some Negroes (about 2%). A seventeen-page fact booklet (now a rare collectors' item) was prepared, presenting CORE's case. In reality, the booklet was a defense of CORE's right to demand more than tokenism in employment. It presented the thesis that token employment of Negroes was a discriminatory hiring policy. After two weeks of picketing, the project was successfully concluded. The new type target demanded a new type agreement. The agreement reached with Montgomery Ward was the prototype of future Bay Area employment agreements. It pioneered demands for statistical reporting, special recruitment policies, and goal projections. Hundreds of jobs for minority people were soon opened. The demands of the Movement had undergone a radical change. Although the number of pickets involved (as many as 60 at a time) was much greater than previous demonstrations, the overall picketline protocol remained about the same.

In June 1963, there was a month long sit-in in the rotunda of the State Capital Building, demanding the passage of a state fair housing law. The action was successful, but even though many local people were involved in the project, it had little real effect upon the local Movement.

The next significant turning point was at the Mel's Drive-In restaurants. This action led to the formation of the Ad Hoc Committee to End Discrimination, and even more significantly, changed the entire mood of demonstration. The notion of trying to maintain a respectable image was almost entirely demolished. The first Mel's lines did not even pay lip service to non-violence. The policy was, "We'll defend our line". There was singing, shouting, clapping, smoking, talking, walking two abreast, dancing, and all types of dress on the line. "Experienced" civil rights demonstrators didn't know what to think. Some stayed away; some tried to instruct the line in proper conduct; some joined in. Never before

were there such large civil rights picketlines. The project was successfully concluded following two large waves of sit-ins and arrests. This was a pioneering attempt at using civil disobedience in a situation where the form of the protest was not directly related to the grievance. The demonstrators were not sitting-in for service; they were sitting-in to protest an unfair hiring policy. Although other local direct action groups did not immediately incorporate massive civil disobedience into their programs, they were unable to maintain the picket line protocol upon which they had previously insisted. Picket lines became more spontaneous, more people joined, the situation became more excitable, and demonstrators put increasing pressure on their leaders for escalation of tactics.

The Lucky Stores demonstrations consolidated the image of militancy and new notions of protocol established at Mel's. It also greatly increased the involvement of the college community in the civil rights movement. One new precedent was established. CORE continued using the shop-in tactic despite almost universal condemnation by the white community. By refusing to be scolded into submission, the movement achieved a new power, and a new respect, from enemies as well as from friends. The notion of image was dead; only results counted!

Little need be said about the Sheraton Palace and Automobile Row demonstrations. They greatly increase the number of people involved in civil rights demonstrations, although the demonstrators still came largely from the college campuses. At the Sheraton Palace, it was proved that the civil rights movement, unlike most modern labor unions, is willing to break an anti-picketing injunction in order to preserve constitutional guarantees. The demonstrations were among the most spectacular and exciting civil rights actions ever held in this country. Mass picketing and mass arrests forced the press to give full coverage, and this in turn became one of the most effective means of mobilizing additional support. The Bay Area civil rights movement became a force to be reckoned with, and a Human Relations Commission, long sought by more conservative groups, was established by the City of San Francisco. A significant development is the new influence of militant young groups of the San Francisco NAACP. The San Francisco NAACP has become one of the most militant chapters in the country. Since the NAACP has better roots in the community than militant civil rights organizations normally do, this new relationship promises hopeful results.

-----Jack Weinberg

-----  
Ed. Note:

The Movement must begin to take a new direction. The lesson of the San Francisco civil rights trials is that the power structure will not tolerate massive social change. The Sheraton Palace action was a small scale revolution against the status quo. Nowhere in this nation can a real social revolution succeed under the present distribution of political forces. Only political power can protect us against crippling harassment in the courts. If our demonstrations become more successful, nine-month sentences like that of Dr. Burbridge will become the rule for civil rights demonstrators. Sit-ins may be made felonies under new state laws. The social forces that are emerging with accelerating automation and unemployment will be used against us, unless we prepare a political base, starting with the Negro community, but responsive to the increasingly urgent needs of white workers and the unemployed.

-----

## CORE Civil Rights Conference

Over 500 people attended a CORE civil rights conference held from 9 a.m. until 9 p.m. Saturday, August 1, at the Lincoln School in Berkeley. The event was conceived and organized by Jim Petras and the Campus CORE Public Forum Committee, of which he is chairman. Throughout the day, three workshops were conducted simultaneously.

Some of the topics and speakers involved were: Police brutality in Hunter's Point, discussed by Ben Carmichael, of San Francisco Youth Opportunities, Carl Werthman, U. C. sociology graduate student, and members of the Hunter's Point Boys' Club; "Area II: Urban Redevelopment or Negro Removal?" led by Jerry Mandel, U. C. sociology graduate student, and Joy Goodwin of the San Francisco NAACP; "Community Power Structure," led by Bill Bradley, chairman of San Francisco CORE, and Jim Petras, U. C. political science graduate student; Orville Luster, of San Francisco Youth for Service, with Horace Cayton, co-author of The Black Metropolis, and Sam Jordan of the Freedom Now Party, speaking on "Life in the Negro Ghetto"; the government's responsibility to the unemployed was discussed by James Herndon of the Negro American Labor Council, and Ann Draper of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

An evening symposium dealt with the role of civil rights organizations in this year's political campaign. Speakers were Seymour Lipset, U. C. Sociology Department; William Sherman, Freedom Now Party; John Burton, Democratic Party; and the moderator was Chet Duncan, Western Regional Director of CORE. The conference was sponsored by three East Bay chapters of CORE: Oakland, Berkeley and Berkeley Campus CORE. Workshop moderators were drawn from all three chapters.

This was a conference of young militants, with a sprinkling of "veterans" from the past civil rights movement. Many of the workshop leaders themselves were young: "big name" speakers, community notables who are usually stuck on a platform for "respectability" were absent from this conference. Instead, individuals who had done research and had experience with the areas under consideration were included. The dialogue between the panelists and the workshop participants was completely democratic, and many discussions ensued about problems in the civil rights movement.

The Negro community of the East Bay was well-represented: from trade unionists in the U. A. W. and other unions, to ministers and professionals, they added a new and important dimension to the previously mostly civil rights movement. If in the following months CORE can actively involve the hundreds of Negroes and whites who filled out information cards and expressed interest in our work, we will have fulfilled the purpose of this conference. The conference was not simply "educational", its purpose was to inform interested individuals of the problems in order to provide some guidelines for action. The conference must be seen as an exploration of ways to overcome bigotry (a recent study commissioned by the city of Oakland shows that 60% of the white population is prejudiced, and 30% practices it), win democratic rights, and gain a decent standard

of living.

A last point that is worth mentioning: All speakers in the political symposium alienated most of the civil rights militants, indicating the profound chasm between liberal or black nationalist politicians, and the real freedom fighters. We saw the irrelevance of the pro-Johnson speaker to the civil rights struggle in the streets; the impotence, passive support, and physical absence of the liberal Democratic legislator from the center of the battle; and the irrelevance of the Freedom Now speaker to the nitty-gritty day to day struggles of the Movement. Which all means that there are no substitutes for the active civil rights militants themselves; that the Negroes and whites in the Movement can only count on themselves; that progressive political action can only come from within the Movement, from the millions of Negroes and the thousands of whites who are demanding Freedom Now despite the New York police, the Mississippi storm troopers, the San Francisco purge trials, and the Democratic and Republican Parties.

----- Jim Petras

---

#### Boy Scout Freedom Camperee

The Brookfield Village Boy Scout troop took part in a Freedom Camperee Friday and Saturday, July 31 and August 1, at the Old Millsite Camp in Redwood Park. The purpose of the camperee, as stated by Gene Novak, one of the leaders, was to acquaint the boys with the historical setting of the civil rights movement and other problems and issues facing the world.

Douglas Jones, chairman of the Housing Committee of the Oakland chapter of CORE, spoke to the group on "Our Responsibility to the Constitution"; and John Lane, past president of the San Francisco Negro Historical and Cultural Society, spoke on Negro history.

There were 25 boys at the outing, which was organized and sponsored by CORE and other civil rights groups. Co-director of the camperee was James Russell, who has worked with the Boy Scouts and other boys' organizations, and is Assistant Coordinator of the Northern California CORE campaign to defeat Proposition 14 (the segregation amendment).

The sponsoring CORE chapters were: Berkeley CORE  
Berkeley Campus CORE  
Oakland CORE.

----- Gretchen Kittredge

---

LABOR DONATED

## Prospects for Civil Rights

### The Present

The ghetto Negro is more and more the typical inhabitant of the largest cities of the North. Almost seventy-five per cent of the nineteen million Negroes in the U. S. are urban dwellers; virtually all rural Negroes live in the South. With the increasing urbanization of the Negro and his relocation in the North, the problems which he faces have become more clearly defined. First of all, he gains sophistication from daily contact with many others immersed in the same situation. Further, he is likely to be aware of the efforts of various segments of the civil rights movement, and even may have been reached by some of the activists. Secondly, the urban Negro develops that insight into official American life which come from standing outside of it. The Negro masses do not believe in those myths which assert "equality of opportunity," "equal justice for all under law," and "the highest standard of living in the world"--the central claims of American society. These myths have absolutely no reality for the Negro people.

As the consciousness of the urban Negro advances, the status quo comes more and more under attack, both in a qualitative and a quantitative sense. The problems he faces are themselves analyzed in a more penetrating way than before, and links between them are perceived. Thus the demands he makes are more fundamental, more of a threat to the system. Agitation increases in volume as greater numbers are swept into the Negro movement for change. And of course, the system resists by any means possible. The primary mode of resistance is the use of police terror--a familiar tactic in the ghetto. (As this article is being prepared, every Negro in north Philadelphia is under house arrest; it's night-time there). The white power structure which fortifies and defends the system refuses to be shaken. They attempt to keep agitation for change under their control, to tie demands to the bargaining table and other channels of action which they legitimate. Any independent show of power by the Negro people is crushed; they are then led to the bargaining table where they can only be betrayed--where the white power structure may toss down a few crumbs while insuring its own continued dominance.

It is important to recognize who comprises the white power structure before we can see how it may be shattered. The power structure is made up of business and real estate wealth, and is held together by the city machine. The machines are directly sustained by and responsible to this wealth. Machine politicians repay campaign donations by levying regressive sales taxes rather than property taxes; by using the police as agents for the slumlord. They use Uncle Toms and opportunists like Dawson and Powell to identify their interests with those of the Negro--while they are his main enemy in the Northern ghetto. The political tag for the machine is: the Democratic Party. These machines are the source of strength for the Democratic Party in the North, and are reactionary to the core by their very nature. Philadelphia's Tate can trace his political ancestry, through Dilworth, directly back to Clark and the "liberal" A. D. A. reform machine. The Northern machines are notorious for their war of brutality against the Negro population to keep them subdued and squeezed safely into the ghettos. These are Johnson's staunchest allies. The "moderate" Negro leaders who announced the moratorium have in effect proclaimed their intention to "leave it to Lyndon" and his urban political machines to defend the Negro people.

But there is not very much which Johnson will do. One of the primary causes of ghetto misery is tremendously high unemployment. Yet the Democratic Party program doesn't even creep toward full employment. The "war on poverty" trains workers for jobs which do not exist. It may sway votes, but it will not tear down slums. The civil rights act does not affect the ghetto Negro at all; most Northern states already have stronger laws. This indicates a willingness on the part of the power structure and the Democratic Party to do away with legal segregation, but at the same time it shows their inability to alter the status quo which is their life. The Democratic Party is powerless to stop the so-called "white backlash." It cannot provide a basis on which Negro and white workers can unite instead of fighting over what jobs remain. At the very most it can present vapid illusions about upward mobility for Negroes, all the while using the national press to smear militant protest about the real world. The civil rights movement would plunge into disaster if it supported this bankruptcy.

### The Future

The movement for civil rights is being transformed as it sinks roots into the black ghetto. A new leadership is emerging which reflects the aspirations of the urban Negro--a very militant leadership which includes such figures as Jesse Gray, Rev. Galamison, and Malcolm X. Yesterday's militants--like King and Rustin--are the new Uncle Toms. Men like these never had a working base in the ghetto, were never responsible to the feelings of the urban Negro as the new leaders in many ways are. Yet, even the new leaders in all their militancy are likely to be thrust aside as the movement becomes more and more viable in the ghetto. The new leaders still bear scars from the old days when things were organized differently. For example, when tenants' councils developed during the Harlem rent strike, Gray as a leader lacked a clear program to extend the activity of the councils to include school boycotts, self-defense, and political action. In fact, he acted as a fetter to further any spontaneous development of the tenants' councils.

It is natural that the more militant Negro leader should be associated with separatism. The oppressed urban Negro perceives the social roots of his frustration and, simultaneously, the commitment of the white power structure to making him its scapegoat. Thus, the emergence of a separatist phase signifies a turn of the civil rights movement towards the working class Negro. Importantly, it is only through such self-assertion that the Negro can ever win freedom. He must control any movement which is to liberate him in order to insure that it will remain responsive to himself, rather than to the power structure. With this self-assertion, he can eventually win allies to his struggle.

The first hurdle which needs to be cleared is the coming election. Liberals are panic-stricken at the thought of a Goldwater victory. But a vote for Johnson will not arrest the drift of American politics to the right. By 1972, a Goldwater may be the left-wing candidate, opposing a real fascist, simply because we will have exhausted our energies in working for the lesser evil, in rallying the Negro and white workers around their "friend," a man from a party which can offer no solution. Remember: to ask a Negro to vote for the Democratic Party means support for continued police brutality, continued mass unemployment, more of slums and misery. Johnson's program does not justify the subordination of the Negro struggle to his victory.

The Negro today faces the dilemma that the labor movement resolved so disastrously twenty years ago. Faced with the choice, independence or absorption into the Democratic Party, Reuther and the CIO leadership, fresh from organizing victories and relatively militant, chose the latter. Today the Democrats are so sure of labor's vote that Kennedy-Johnson openly denounced the demand for shorter hours (labor's major jobs proposal) and still received rousing support. It is almost certain that the same disaster will overtake the Negro unless the struggle develops alternative political institutions. The Negro must have allies, but not those which place a noose around his neck. His hope is to strike out independently, to exert a leftward pull on those sections of the white working class which are threatened by unemployment. The Trade Union Leadership Council in Detroit, which stands between Reuther and Negro radicalism, demonstrated considerable power to attract dissatisfied white workers to its banner. The Freedom Now Party, especially in Michigan, is a hopeful sign. We must aid these movements in their expansion.

The power of the Negro people is constantly under assault by the agents of the power structure. The press makes daily attacks upon the militants, who are slandered as "racists in reverse" and prophets of desperation. With the help of Wilkins, Rustin & Co. the newspapers assure the Negro that he can win freedom only by relying upon his enemies. The facts belie that course.

Independent political action must begin now. The "white backlash" will not end on election day, but will end when there is room enough in the society for all. The Negro masses cannot wait for the fossilized trade unions to eradicate racism in their ranks, but must build a movement based on their own participation and serving as the awakener of the white working class in an assault upon corporation supremacy. The power structure can be smashed--but never by working with it through the Democratic Party, which paves the way for reaction by acceding to its basic premises. It can only be smashed from the outside. The field of struggle cannot be left to the white racists and to a Johnson whose Democratic Party answer is "law and order" through police terror, not jobs, housing and schools. It is time for the Negro people to win the struggle with a mass demonstration of their own, independent power. That is the only answer.

---- Charles Leinenweber

---

\*\*\*\*CAMPUS CORE NEEDS MONEY\*\*\*\*CAMPUS CORE NEEDS MONEY\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*CAMPUS CORE NEEDS YOUR SUPPORT\*\*\*\*

The many activities described in this newsletter require funds as well as the time and effort expended by our active members. If you believe in our work, but cannot take part in investigation, planning, negotiation, or direct action, support us by financial contribution.

A contribution envelope is attached. Makes checks payable to Berkeley Campus CORE. Our mailing address is Post Office Box 162, Berkeley, California.

We Will Not Stop Demonstrating! (Speech given at Campus CORE street rally)

Our "friends" tell us to stop demonstrating. They tell us that demonstrations will hurt our cause. They tell us that demonstrations will get Goldwater elected. Well, we have always had friends who have advised us against demonstrating. But this time the stakes are high, and some civil rights people are listening. These people are making a great mistake.

Let no one think I like the idea of Goldwater winning the election. It scares the Hell out of me. There is a difference between Goldwater and Johnson. I don't really like Johnson, but I have lived under his type of regime, and I'm used to it. I can't even imagine how bad it would be to live in a country which was captured by the extreme right.

Still I advocate that the civil rights movement stay in business. I advocate that we continue doing what we have always done. Why? There are many reasons.

If Goldwater gets elected, I will hold the liberal prophets of doom responsible, not the civil rights movement. These are self-fulfilling prophesies they preach. Over and over they state publicly that people who are angry at our demonstrations will vote for Goldwater. The great majority of whites still do not support Goldwater. They will vote for him only if it is made clear that a vote for Goldwater is a vote against civil rights. It is not Goldwater who is making this clear, it is some of our liberal friends. The bigots are frustrated. They don't know what to do about the civil rights movement. Our liberal friends are telling them what to do. They are telling them to vote for Goldwater.

By curtailing demonstrations, we guarantee a Goldwater victory. He can lose the election and still have a victory. He can tell the people: "I am the only one who can stop the Negroes." "They're scared of me." "I am the only one who can control them." Goldwater's greatest weakness as a candidate is that people don't think he can produce. He can't create jobs, he can't win the cold war, and he can't stop the civil rights movement without destroying even the formal democracy that exists in this country. Even the poor whites who form the bulk of the "white backlash" know this. If we stop demonstrating, we will prove to them that Goldwater can produce.

Cowardice has always been the characteristic trait of the American liberals. They are willing to take a principled stand, as long as there is no risk involved. As soon as a risk develops, however slight, they chicken out. They didn't learn their lesson during the McCarthy period. They kept backing up before they were shoved. They formed their own un-American activities committees in their own organizations. Fearing to take a unified stand against the witch-hunt, they allowed it to grow to such menacing proportions that only the Army could stop it. Sure the right wing is a menace, but if we keep backing up, when they try for more power, even the Army won't be able to stop them, and it won't want to.

We must keep fighting for equal opportunity, we must keep fighting for justice. If we stop raising demands, if we stop raising issues, neither party will be responsive to our needs.

But exactly what do our liberal advisors ask of the civil rights movement? They ask the movement to stop holding demonstrations. They ask it to cool things down. Maybe the movement can call off its demonstrations, but it can't cool things down. All it can do is withhold leadership. People can't be turned on and off. In those areas where violence is feared, a moratorium on demonstrations will make things hotter. The active civil rights leadership is not firmly entrenched in the Negro community, and it will lose its influence as soon as it stops producing results. Within the community, a moratorium on civil rights activity can only be interpreted as a sign that the movement is not totally committed to the problems of the ghetto. It will show that the movement has reservations. The people are angry. The people are bitter. The situation is tense, and justifiably so. The civil rights movement holds some promise of results to the Negro community. This cannot be withdrawn. The reality of protest is with us. The only question remaining is whether the protest will have direction or whether it will not.

When civil rights groups demonstrate, they do so as part of a program with specific aims. Often the program has much to be desired, but protests with a program is far better than disorganized protest. A moratorium on demonstrations is a moratorium on planning. The oppression of the ghetto remains, pressures build up, and in one way or another they will be released.

The civil rights movement is being asked to play the role of an Uncle Tom. An Uncle Tom is a Negro who has the ear of the white power structure. They allow him to grant certain favors to the Negro community. They even allow him, if necessary, to act militant, in return for which he controls the Negro community. The civil rights movement is not able to play this role. Any such attempt would be disastrous. It cannot control the Negro community, nor should it want to. Its only proper role is to work toward producing the most effective programs for the elimination of the economic and political oppression of the Negro. Neither blacks nor whites who consider themselves part of the movement can say "we'll be good boys 'til November." If we could stop the protests, come November, there wouldn't be a movement. Come November, the Democrats once again will have bought the Negro vote for nothing, and they will have learned how to blackmail the civil rights movement. The scare out, sell out pattern will have been set. Next year, they'll try to repeal the Bill of Rights to again frighten us off the streets, and keep us from exercising our rights.

No, we won't stop demonstrating. We won't let the reaction scare us into quitting and making a deal to accept the status quo. We're tired of "friends"; we want allies.

----- Jack Weinberg

-----  
Ed. Note:

On Wednesday, July 29, several national civil rights leaders signed a statement calling for a "broad curtailment, if not total moratorium of all mass marches, mass picketing and mass demonstrations until after Election Day, next Nov. 3."

Among the signatories were: Roy Wilkins (NAACP), Whitney Young (Urban league), Martin Luther King (SCLC), A. Philip Randolph (Negro American Labor Council), Bayard Rustin (March on Washington). James Farmer (CORE) and John Lewis (SNCC) were present at the signing, and Wilkins stated to the press that they personally approved of the declaration, but needed the ratification of their organizations before signing it. There was the usual confusion in the national press, with most newspapers announcing that all of the above-named leaders had signed the statement.

At its business meeting the same evening, Campus CORE voted to send the following telegram to Farmer:

We demand that no curtailment of civil rights demonstrations be promised.  
Berkeley Campus Chapter  
Congress of Racial Equality.

The answering telegram was received the next day:

CORE has not agreed to moratorium. Continue present plans.  
James Farmer  
National Director.

Of course, Farmer has no authority to sign any moratorium. His participation in the announcement, without ascertaining the will of the chapters, was dictatorial. We suspect that many telegrams were received by the National Director that night, puncturing his carefully inflated trial balloon.

---

#### Campus CORE Civil Rights Forums

The Campus CORE Public Forums Committee conducts a continuing series of talks, debates, and symposiums on issues concerned with civil rights. The public is invited to attend Campus CORE business meetings, and to hear the Forum speaker after each meeting. Meetings are held Wednesday evenings, with the exact time and place advertised by posters on campus and at the corner of Bancroft and Telegraph Avenues. Some of the past speakers and topics have been:

Professor M. Rogin(U. C. Political Science)---"Politics and Civil Rights"  
Norman Hill(National CORE Program Director)"Negroes and the American Economy"  
Professor D. Gold(U. C. Sociology)-----"Violence and Non-violence in Civil Rights"  
Inge Powell(U. C. Grad. Sociology)-----"Persuasion vs Coercion in C. R."  
Joe White (U. C. Grad. History)-----"Report from Mississippi"  
Gil Fernandez (Portugese Guinea) &  
Jose Mapondera (Southern Rhodesia)-----"Race and Politics in Africa"

Joe White is an active member of Campus CORE, and recently returned from Mississippi, where he participated in the Mississippi Summer Project.

CORE National Convention, 1964

This year's National Convention, held in Kansas City, Missouri, was perhaps more notable for what it didn't do than for what it did. More time was spent on internal problems than perhaps anyone really wanted or planned, but there appeared to be no alternative.

The convention was the scene of the first test of the new civil rights bill, signed by President Johnson the afternoon of Friday, July 3rd. A young Negro Mississippian went into the hotel barbershop immediately after the bill was signed and asked for a haircut. He was refused, and the staid Muehlbach Hotel lobby became the scene of a large, beautiful and typical CORE demonstration. Concurrent negotiations resulted in an announcement by the hotel that, in conformity with Federal Law, any barber who refused to cut the hair of any patron would be fired. At 8:00 AM the following morning, the haircut was performed. Another notable demonstration took place the following day, again in the lobby of the Muehlbach Hotel, to welcome and serenade Mrs. Klunder, widow of the Cleveland minister who was slain by a bulldozer, and Mrs. Chaney, the mother of one of the three Mississippi Summer Project workers murdered near Philadelphia, Mississippi. An inaccurate report that a nearby cafeteria was discriminating brought most of the Western delegation to its doors for a possible sit-in, but the sight of Bill Bradley sheepishly carrying a tray full of food to a table put a halt to that activity.

The work of the convention was, as I said earlier, taken up predominately by internal CORE problems. The first major issue was the trusteeship of the Washington, D. C. chapter and the expulsion of Julius Hobson, its chairman, by order of the National Action Council. After some preliminary skirmishing both on and off the floor, and a somewhat disjointed debate, during which most of the Western delegates tried with little success to find out what the facts were, the decision of the National Action Council was sustained by a large vote. A number of the Northern California delegates, myself included, abstained from this vote due to our inability to accept any of the points of view expressed during the debate.

Most of the other important internal problems concerned proposed amendments to the CORE constitution, all designed to make the organization more national, more federal in form. Obviously, chapter autonomy would have to be lessened to bring about such changes. The national leadership proposed that the constitution be amended to grant them specific powers to place chapters under trusteeship, and to suspend or expel chapters, all of which powers the national office did not specifically have, or had in somewhat limited form. Many of the Western delegates felt that the proposals were vague, ambiguous and unnecessary, and felt that they intruded too much on the rights of the chapters. Much work was done to alter or defeat these amendments, but most of the changes urged by the national office were adopted, though somewhat softened. Copies of the final amendments are not yet available, so I will not attempt at this point to state them in any detail. In general, they specify procedures whereby the National Action Council may place chapters in trusteeship, or suspend or expel them. The amendments designate the causes for such action by the National Office and include therein such things as violation of CORE Rules For Action, and (most objectionable, in my opinion) being taken over by members of "an organization whose aims are inimical to the best interests of the civil rights movement." It should be noted that although the constitution did not previously enumerate

some of the powers spelled out in the new amendments, the National Action Council did in fact attempt to exercise them, and did so successfully in the case of the Washington, D. C. chapter. The new amendments specify for the future the situations in which those powers can be used, and the procedural rules and regulations governing their use.

The constitutional amendment proposed by the National Office which concerns college chapters, dealt with chapter representation at the National Convention. Under the old rules, each chapter in the United States was entitled to as many as five votes at the National Convention (depending on the population of their constituencies). In an attempt to give the Southern states, which for obvious reasons have few chapters, more representation, or (depending on your point of view) in an attempt to minimize the voting power of several large cities and metropolitan areas, it was proposed that a limit be put on the number of National Convention votes from each metropolitan area, depending on the population of that area, and that each college chapter of CORE be entitled to only one vote at National Conventions. Most of the Northern California delegates and a scattering of delegates from other parts of the country supported my position that this was not the best way to increase the voting strength of the South, and that campus chapters should not, in any event, be so discriminated against. Unfortunately, our position was defeated, and henceforth all college chapters will have a single vote at National Conventions, and metropolitan areas will have a maximum of ten or twenty total votes, depending upon their population, and independent of the number of chapters they contain.

In other actions the constitution was amended to provide for one additional national official from each of the five regions. Each region now has a national CORE vice-chairman and two representatives on the National Action Council. The Western regional offices were filled as follows: Hal Brown, chairman of the San Diego chapter, was elected vice-chairman from the Western region. Virginia Burton, chairman of the Berkeley chapter, was elected regional representative on the National Action Council. Dick Rapp of Seattle was elected at the 1963 convention to a two-year term as a Western regional representative on the National Action Council. Both Hal Brown and Virginia Burton were elected by the convention after being nominated by the Western regional caucus against opposition from Wester Sweet of San Jose, formerly our other representative on the National Action Council. Wilfred Ussery of San Francisco was re-elected as 2nd vice-chairman of CORE.

Turning outward, in my opinion the most important trend evident at the convention was the open espousal of direct political action by CORE. Hitherto CORE had held the public position that political activity was no proper part of the civil rights movement; but the trend of events in the United States seems to have convinced the majority of CORE members and certainly the national officers that that position is no longer tenable. Tangible evidence of the new position are CORE's 1964 political party convention projects. The National Convention applauded enthusiastically and adopted wholeheartedly the Republican convention project after a report by CORE Program Director, Norman Hill, and endorsed the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, in its attempt gain seating at the Democratic national convention. The convention was shaken by the report of Dave Dennis, CORE field secretary in Mississippi, whose voice broke when he attempted to tell us what it was like to send field workers out on projects and never see them again.

The 1965 National Convention will be in the South, probably in Mississippi. It is significant that despite all the internal disputes, there was near unanimous sentiment for that decision. This indicates the growth and viability of CORE, and demonstrates our ability to heal wounds caused by growing pains.

-----Malcolm Burnstein

-----  
Campus CORE Summer Activities

----- Jack Weinberg

We have found it quite impossible to include in this copy of the Core-lator a discussion of all the projects in which Campus CORE participated during the summer. Since many of our most significant activities do not appear anywhere else in this issue, we would like to make a brief mention of some of them. Any Campus CORE member who was in Berkeley during the summer could fill in the details, and many of these activities and their significance will be discussed in future issues.

During much of the summer, the CORE chapters of California have been demonstrating against the Bank of America. Campus CORE has supported this action by either participating in B of A picket lines in the Bay Area or holding our own demonstrations in Berkeley (some of which have had several hundred participants). This action, although not officially concluded, is no longer in the direct action stage. Many of our demands have already been met, and B of A has hired over 450 minority persons in California in one month. We also participated actively in the demonstrations at the Republican Convention, and in fact, the two people who were carried from the floor of the convention were our members. The picket line appealing to Pres. Johnson to intervene in the San Francisco civil rights trials was organized and led by Campus CORE. Despite the efforts of the press to portray this as an anti-Johnson demonstration (which it was not), several hundred picketers turned out. Campus CORE has taken an active part in the battle to defeat Prop. 14. A very large part of this work has been voter registration, and we have helped to organize several registration drives, the largest of which resulted in 2,000 persons registered in one day.

Over the summer we have had several internal educational programs including speakers at most of our meetings. The topics of these speeches included a critical analysis of non-violence, a sociological analysis of a typical active Southern CORE chapter, a report from Mississippi, and a discussion of race and politics in Africa. We have also had a dinner meeting at which a detailed orientation session was given for our old members as well as our new ones. This meeting included intensive negotiation training. This idea was repeated in an all day session to which we invited interested local high school students at which a detailed history of the local civil rights movement was presented. At this session we also had a mock civil rights trial and a discussion of civil rights and the high school.

Three of our most significant projects took place so late in the summer that they cannot be discussed in this issue. They are: a successful sit-in demonstration in which we supported Richmond CORE in their dispute with the Richmond Housing Authority, a successful civil rights-labor project in which we supported the East Bay Municipal Employees Union, and a sit-in demonstration in support of the Welfare Rights Organization which is in progress at the time of this writing. We consider all three of these very important, and will discuss them in great detail in our next issue.

## Berkeley School Board Faces Recall Over Desegregation

On May 19, 1964, the Board of Education of the City of Berkeley adopted a set of far-reaching proposals aimed at the problem of de facto school segregation. Within two days, a recall petition, supported by the Berkeley Daily Gazette, was being circulated throughout the city by a group calling itself PANS (Parents Associated for Neighborhood Schools). To understand these events, we must go back to 1962:

Almost two years ago, the Berkeley Chapter of CORE wrote a long letter to the School Board, pointing out the widespread de facto segregation in the Berkeley schools and asking the Board to take action. The Board responded immediately, appointing a highly qualified 35 member citizens' committee, representing many viewpoints within the city. This group, known as the Hadsell Committee, met for almost a year, took testimony from over a hundred experts, and studied both the Berkeley situation and school systems throughout the country. It then submitted a report to the Board, which was distributed free to all interested citizens, and discussed thoroughly in two public meetings, each attended by over 2,000 people, at which more than 100 persons spoke, mostly in support of the committee's conclusions. The Board then ordered the school staff, under the direction of Superintendent Wennerberg, to prepare a report on the educational soundness and practicality of the proposals of the Hadsell Committee. The new report was discussed at another public hearing, and then a series of proposals was adopted at the May 19 meeting of the Board.

What did the Hadsell Committee find, and what did the Board do in response? The committee found that 14 out of the 17 elementary schools and 2 out of the 3 junior high schools were thoroughly segregated, and that this had extremely severe detrimental consequences for the academic education of minority children and equally serious effects on the social development of all children. They found that this problem was aggravated by excessively rigid ability grouping and tracking systems, which were applied in a discriminatory fashion, causing internal segregation of the city's single high school.

The Board of Education, chaired by Rev. Roy Nichols, adopted the staff's "ninth grade plan": All ninth graders will attend what is now Burbank Junior High School (which will become part of Berkeley High School), and the other two junior highs will each contain both seventh and eighth grades, the districts for the two schools being drawn (in a natural manner) so as to achieve complete racial integration in each school. Not only does this plan integrate the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades, but it also provides many other educational advantages. New courses (French, additional sciences, art, music) can be offered for the first time. Teachers can concentrate more strongly on the specialities in which they were trained. The incorporation of the ninth grade into the high school has long been urged by eminent educators in order to facilitate career choices (since the student makes his choice among business, college preparatory, shop and other programs when he enters the ninth grade). Furthermore, grades for college entrance begin to count in the ninth grade. The Board did not change the boundaries of the elementary school districts, but instead, will introduce in the elementary schools an imaginative and forward-looking program of compensatory education, costing about \$200,000 per year. Ability grouping will be retained,

but tracking will be made considerably more flexible, and students within each ability group will be integrated as a matter of deliberate policy. Improvements will be made in curricula and libraries, and personnel policies will be completely non-discriminatory. In short, this plan is outstanding throughout the entire country in the degree to which it eliminates de facto segregation on the junior high school level, and simultaneously improves education for all.

What is the nature of the opposition which has formed to throw out the present Board members and replace them with others who will repeal these measures and re-segregate the schools? The opposition has formed the organization PANS (Parents' Anti-Negro Society?). The rank and file membership of PANS includes the usual assortment of reactionaries, bigots, and little old ladies in tennis shoes who can be found opposing all progress in civil rights. It includes a number of merchants; at least one officer is co-owner of a local retail store which has been picketed by CORE for employment discrimination. And of course there are the local paranoids who see the School Board's action as a communistic plot to take over the city. However, much of the driving force behind the recall movement comes from the very group most responsible for school segregation in the first place --- the realtors, one of the most reactionary and bigoted groups in the city. For some time, PANS worked from the Realty Board office, and it presently uses the office of a realtor on Solano Avenue. In addition to the realtors, there is the local rag (the Berkeley Daily Gazette), without whose consistent opposition to any form of school integration, PANS might not even exist. And finally, there are certain politicians, who see the recall battle as an avenue for political advancement.

It is essential that this recall be defeated, and there is little time to prepare. PANS has already submitted its petition, with well over the required 8,000 signatures. The special election is now scheduled for October 6. There is a good chance that if enough students work for the School Board, it will not suffer the fate of the Berkeley Fair Housing Ordinance last year. But a close victory is not enough. Only a large favorable vote will give the Board the courage that it will need to eventually extend its integration program to the elementary schools, where the real problems lie, and where the real opposition will develop. You can help fight the recall in several ways: You and your friends can register to vote in Berkeley, help register other voters, hand out "For School Board" bumper strips, and distribute literature to inform the people about this issue.

To help, contact BERKELEY FRIENDS OF BETTER SCHOOLS, 2001 Milvia St., Th 1-4261, or BERKELEY CORE, 3219 Adeline St. (in Berkeley), 654-7707.

----- Charles Yegian

Ed. Note:

It remains to be seen whether a system which retains segregated elementary schools can produce significant progress, regardless of what is done at the higher grade levels. It is at the elementary school age, after all, that one's attitudes toward education and toward children from different backgrounds are formed. And no amount of "compensatory education" can make up for the damage inflicted on a child by the knowledge that he is rejected and segregated by the

society at large, and the hopeless feeling that no effort on his part can secure for him a position of self-respect and community esteem.

Superintendent Wennerberg's report to the School Board contained, in addition to the program outlined above, a plan for the complete integration of all Berkeley elementary schools. Because of the city's extreme housing segregation, this would have involved a change in boundary lines, grouping of schools, and bussing of many children. No American city has yet adopted a desegregation program as effective as this one, and the School Board, realizing that even the relatively mild "ninth grade plan" would produce a powerful recall movement, rejected the Superintendent's proposal. Those of us that are now fighting to preserve this Board find it hard to condemn them for rejecting a plan that would have ensured the success of the recall, and would then have been dumped by the new Board members. It seems likely that if the present Board can be kept, the elementary schools will also be desegregated within two or three years, particularly since the voting strength of the Berkeley Negro community is growing.

---

Fan Mail for a Freedom Fighter

Tom Roland, teacher of mathematics in the Oakland high schools, spent forty days on Death Row at Mississippi's infamous Parchman Penitentiary, as one of the original Freedom Riders. He is now serving a 30 day jail sentence for a sit-in at Auto Row in San Francisco. His wife, Sue, who is five months pregnant, just finished serving an eleven-day sentence for the same "offense". As a member of Campus CORE, Tom was carried out of the Cow Palace while demonstrating against the racist platform and candidate adopted by the Republican Party. His name appeared in the Bay Area press, and subsequently he received the following unsigned letter, which is reprinted exactly as written:

You cocksucking SON OF A BITCH. If you show up at OAKLAND HIGH AGAIN, you will have your BALLS cut off. We dont need prick bastards and demonstrators like you, you son of a bitch. Your actions at the Convention should have caused someone to cut your BALLS off rite then and there. Get out of town you lousy COMMIE  
SON of a Bitch.

No doubt some of the people who claim to be "on our side" will object to the reprinting of this letter.

---

Review

Robert B. McKersie ---- "The Civil Rights Movement And Employment" ----  
Industrial Relations, vol. 3, no. 3, May 1964, pp. 1-21. Published by the Insti-  
tute of Industrial Relations, University of California at Berkeley.

-----

This article analyzes the various pressure tactics used by direct action civil rights groups, and considers alternative management responses. While the article was written for an academic management journal, it is also of interest to civil rights workers, particularly where it deals with the negotiation phase of a project. The experienced civil rights negotiator will find little that is new in this paper, but it will be useful reading for the less militant and somewhat naive person approaches the matter of negotiation and direct action in terms of persuasion rather than in terms of struggle and pressure against an opponent who will yield only to superior force.

McKersie tells us that once management is faced with the demands of the militant group it may do one of several things:

"When confronted by a militant spokesman, the usual objective of management is to neutralize the power thrust and gain control over the direction of discussion. One approach is for the company to make some conciliatory response, but only as a diversionary tactic. Often the diversionary response takes the form of agreeing to meet with the group at the last moment. . . Most employers recognize that the diversionary approach creates greater problems, hence the more common approach is to 'battle it out' with the movement, using power to fight power. "

Or instead, management may try to "gain control of the situation through the structuring of positive attitudes and the discreet handling of concessions. " In one negotiation witnessed by McKersie:

"By talking frankly about the weaknesses and problems within the company, the company representatives gained the respect of the militants. He also exerted every effort to develop a personal acquaintance with each leader. Between sessions the company maintained contact with at least thirty different leaders. These leaders were asked help in recruiting qualified applicants and the spokesman personally checked on each referral. When complaints were presented, he investigated and reported back either directly to the leader or during the joint meetings. . . In effect, the company executive allowed the representatives to serve as patronage dispensers. He told them about job opportunities and gave them first chance to refer their friends and associates from the Negro community. . . Interestingly, in the case of the negotiations just cited, the company negotiator did not give in on any matter of principle. "

McKersie's article confirms what has been a truism for the more militant civil rights workers. Not only does one have to beware of deceptive tactics on the part of employers, but one must approach the whole process of negotiation as

basically a test of strength with an opponent, and not merely as the delivery of educational lectures on race relations in order to persuade the employer that he is morally wrong. It does no harm to do the latter also, but the negotiator should not confuse the nature of his task.

Considering direct action tactics, McKersie distinguishes between the consumer boycott, the legal demonstration, and various forms of non-violent civil disobedience. The effects of these methods are discussed, and the author presents a useful analysis of the factors which influence public reaction: "The importance of the objective... The concreteness of the objective... The duration of the disobedience... The conduct of the participants... The nature of the constituency... The prospect of future turmoil." The discussion is limited, however, by its avoidance of such important factors as the extent of racism in the community, the political atmosphere, and the objectivity of press reporting. While these factors are not controllable by the demonstrators, they must be taken into account in the planning of direct action.

McKersie's analysis of the consumer boycott is weak, perhaps because of lack of familiarity with the Negro community. He gives the example of a group of ministers, representing 400 churches in Philadelphia, who used the boycott tactic with great success in obtaining jobs for Negroes. While he recognizes that an effective boycott requires the support of the NAACP and/or the Negro churches, he does not mention that these are among the most conservative organizations in the Negro community, deriving much of their power and affluence from the institution of segregation. Furthermore, many businesses will not be affected by a Negro boycott, and boycotts do not help to build organizations by involving new people, raising morals, and toughening attitudes, as do other forms of direct action. Finally, it is unfair to the militant groups to imply that they engage in unnecessarily disruptive activity: The most effective way to persuade Negroes and sympathetic whites to boycott a firm is to conduct demonstrations at the retail outlets. Only when this fails, is civil disobedience attempted. How could a voluntary group persuade its members to risk fines and imprisonment, unless all alternatives had been exhausted?

The article suffers from lack of perspective, since the author ignores the social context of the present struggle. In his concluding paragraph, McKersie says:

"The direct action groups have been successful in forcing employers to take the racial issue seriously and to create additional openings. The due process and persuasion groups now face the difficult task of being just as successful in solidifying the gains and in creating attitudes of acceptance by the white majority. The work of the direct action groups is far from finished, however. In the near future we will witness many demonstrations, sit-ins, and boycotts as the social revolution spreads wider and deeper into our industrial structure."

What a fine example of misguided optimism! The author seems totally unaware that white businessmen and politicians have traditionally used Negro "Uncle Tom" organizations to control the black masses. (McKersie notes on page 2 that the Urban League, one of his "due process and persuasion groups", receives its financial support from the "business community and other interested groups".)

There is no mention in this paper of the need to create many more new jobs for everyone, given the present high proportion of unemployment in the United States. One can already see the limits of the present forms of direct action, and the need for a radical politicalization of the Negro struggle. Indeed, the present mood of the Negro masses may be a forecast of the future mood of the white majority as automation and cybernation raise over-all unemployment to rates approaching the 20% or so under which Negroes now suffer.

One wishes that McKersie had investigated the motivations of management in so vigorously resisting the militant civil rights groups, and had documented the long history of broken promises where agreements were based on good faith rather than power relationships. There is no mystery about why persuasion has become increasingly discredited as an effective tactic: The "good will" upon which persuasion depends does not exist, and never has existed, except in the imaginations of the well-intentioned white liberals who do not control the major sources of employment, and who are too timid to upset the status quo when they have the power. This is not to say that the motivations of management are simple. Racial prejudice, the businessman's conception of the privileges of private property, organizational inertia, timidity, and other factors are involved. Unfortunately, the author's efforts serve only to inform the business community of how best to protect themselves and preserve the status quo, and no businessman reading this article is likely to do any soul-searching as a result.

McKersie makes some dubious generalizations about civil rights organizations. He refers to all Negro militants (presumably, including such men as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.) as "race men", a term usually connoting a black nationalist orientation rather than an integrationist point of view. He makes a serious error by implying that militant groups ignore legitimate problems of management, in particular the problem of recruiting qualified Negroes. This is a misconception held by many newcomers to the Movement. A civil rights group cannot function as an employment agency. It can suggest recruiting methods, including the utilization of existing minority employment agencies. Every employer claims, during negotiations, that "we never get any Negro applicants". Most Negroes are reluctant to apply for jobs in areas where they have traditionally been rejected, and an employer in a discriminatory industry must make it clear to the Negro community that nonwhite persons are now welcome. Generally, a militant civil rights group will make one of its demands the adoption of a set of "equal opportunity employment" policies. The goal estimates of these agreements are simply the results that can be expected to flow naturally from the implementation of time-tested procedures.

We have stressed the misconceptions of the article, because they are shared by most white liberals. Nevertheless, it contains much valuable information. Sophisticated management consultants, public relations men, and other employer representatives will read this paper and try to gain some insights from it. We should also read it to our advantage, while being aware of its limitations.

---- Sam Farber

---- David Friedman

---