

movement and other established power centers. The best politics for us all is a truly integrated politics.

In a prophetic remark only months before his assassination, Martin Luther King observed that, with the elimination of legal segregation, the civil rights movement would have to aim for genuine equality for the disadvantaged. Slums would have to be rebuilt, ghetto schools upgraded and meaningful jobs created. That phase of the effort, he knew, would cost billions of dollars. And to achieve such a redistribution of resources, he said, black and poor people would have to "grasp the levers" of political and economic power to "influence the course of events" generally.

Ten years later those levers remain elusive. Blacks invested virtually all of their political capital in Jimmy Carter's Presidential campaign and now wait impatiently for the results. Implicit in the statements of the Urban League and N.A.A.C.P. is the explicit idea recently expressed by the Rev. Jesse Jackson. He told Republican leaders that a disappointed black community should no longer be considered the automatic ally of any single party or party faction.

In one sense, a black interest in energy policy was only the natural consequence of a growing interest in tax and monetary policy and other broad issues. But the N.A.A.C.P.'s experience also points to new difficulties. The black position on Jim Crow laws was always self-evident; the consequences for blacks of one or another economic or foreign policy are by no means clear. In debating the wider questions, civil rights groups will have to rely upon "outside experts" for their research and analysis, perhaps risking, as the N.A.A.C.P. did, manipulation and exploitation by other interests. It will take a special sophistication to protect the integrity and credibility that black groups have attained over the years.

Still, the disadvantaged need effective representation on all the issues that shape their lives. However flawed this beginning, aggressive black voices on all sides of national policy debates should be welcomed by all Americans.

New Republic:

NAACP Energy Policy A Conspiracy

The New Republic also added its voice to the chorus of liberals objecting to the NAACP's energy policy. In their Jan. 28 issue a column headlined "What's good for Mobil and Exxon is good for the NAACP?" suggested the source of the NAACP's energy policy might actually be a "conspiracy." Here are excerpts from that article.

...Others advance a conspiracy theory of sorts. The task force that prepared the report, and especially the sub-group directly involved in its drafting, was dominated by black business executives who work for or lobby for the oil companies. The head of that group was James Stewart, a retired executive of the Oklahoma Natural Gas Company. The chairman of the task force on supply was Robert Bates, formerly an aide to Sen. Edward Kennedy and now a Washington lobbyist for Mobil Oil. Affiliations of Bates's task force members reads like an oil industry registry — Standard Oil of California, Atlantic-Richfield, Southern California Gas, Consolidated Edison of New York City....Outside the NAACP, it looked very much like the oil industry had cozied up and snuck one over or perhaps even had bought itself an ally.

There's no direct evidence to support that charge, but it is clear that the NAACP's justification for parroting the industry line on energy is pretty thin. First, to reject conservation on grounds that it will cost jobs is ridiculous. Avoidance of waste, in fact, would be a source of jobs right in the inner cities where blacks need them most — installing heat exchangers in factories and putting insulation in houses just to cite a couple of examples. Then, too, energy waste is a major culprit in the \$30 billion trade deficit which produces economic consequences and sets limits on government programs that directly affect blacks and other urban poor....Finally, nothing is more illusory than the claim that by deregulating prices and giving the industry greater incentives for exploration you will thereby produce more jobs for blacks. The number of blacks employed in oil and gas is proportionally small, and the jobs associated with exploration and refining are neither labor intensive nor located in urban areas where black employment problems are most severe....

Who Owns The Black Caucus?

The shoe is now on the other foot for the self-righteous radicals of the Congressional Black Caucus — Parren Mitchell, Ron Dellums, and John Conyers — who for years have been throwing "Uncle Tom" barbs at moderates in the NAACP. For these heroes to levy the "sellout" charge at anyone because of their business or industry backers, is hilarious; Mitchell, Dellums, and Conyers have never been against "big dollars" — as long as the money is headed in their direction.

For months the Black Caucus and its white liberal sponsors have been vainly trying to sell James Schlesinger's no-growth energy program and the Humphrey-Hawkins slave-labor bill to their skeptical constituents as "pro-labor", as effecting "anti-poverty" measures, on behalf of British-linked investment banks

in lower Manhattan who initiated those anti-industry policies. Substantial sections of the labor movement are now joined by the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the U.S. in rejection of these British-inspired policies.

Secretly the liberals are cursing the U.S. Labor Party for its role in catalyzing the growth of a bipartisan coalition of forces supporting economic growth. Alexander Cockburn, the author of an article in the Jan. 18 *Village Voice* alleging that "Big Oil" has "bought" the NAACP, admitted to a reporter that the Labor Party's role in creating the setting for the new developments was paramount.

In the latest edition of the Amos 'n' Andy show, Black Caucus Big-mouths Dellums, Conyers, and Mitchell are

shaming the pot for calling the kettle black. Who, indeed, has been sponsoring the political careers of Messrs. Dellums, Conyers, and Mitchell for the last 20 years?

The Money and the Policy

It is well known that most of the millions of dollars funneled into the civil rights movement in the post-World War II years comes from the big Jewish organizations like the American Jewish Committee, from the United Auto Workers union, from the National Council of Churches, and from big corporations. Ultimately, the money would be channeled through fronts as the Ford and Field Foundation which funded every Black organization from moderate to militant. Behind it all stand Wall Street and London-oriented investment houses.

The Jewish groups and the UAW began delegating notorious union-wrecker Joseph Rauh to directly manage their "civil rights" investments. During the early 1960s, President Kennedy sent his White House aide Arthur Schlesinger, who also represented the interests of the Americans for Democratic Action, and Attorney General Robert Kennedy deployed his aides Burke Marshall and John Doar, to follow the agitators around and watch over them. The rules of support from these august persons and institutions were that voting rights agitation not be directed at the President and his backers, and that it not get so big that Kennedy's relations with the Dixiecrats be disrupted.

Malcolm X vividly recalled the first rule of the civil rights in his autobiography, in which he recounts how the 1963 "March on Washington", or as he called it, the "Farce on Washington", was entirely taken over to benefit the Kennedy Administration and its backers. Even the most militant group, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, was limited to one indirect, mildly reproving observation on the President's commitment to voting rights for blacks.

The second rule was highlighted the following year at the Democratic Convention in Atlantic City. SNCC had registered 80,000 blacks outside of the closed "legal" channels of Mississippi and organized a delegation to the Convention. Once there, they were counseled by such "friends" as Rauh to accept a totally compromised status as second class delegate-observers.

The heavy hand of Rauh and Company is still evident today. At the 1977 Democratic Convention platform hearings, Rauh testified on civil rights policy, accompanied by Clarence Mitchell — Parren's older brother — sometimes called the "101st Senator" because of his reputed influence as a Washington lobbyist. Mitchell exhorted the committee, "You better listen to this man," while Rauh grinned from ear to ear.

In a recent article in *Commentary*, organ of the American Jewish Committee, Rauh authored an article discussing what black organizations would be obliged to do in order to receive continued donations from guess who.

As long as black groups accept the crushing embrace of British policy's fronts — the UAW, the "Israel Lobby," and various Wall Street foundations and investment banks — no complaints are heard. If they support the liberals, engage in "leftist" exercises against productive industry and labor, or abstain from the political process altogether, the Black Caucus can put itself forward as the most dynamic, determined leadership of the civil rights movement.

Not Bought — Created

Who are these self-proclaimed leaders, anyway?

Parren Mitchell owes his political career to his brother's position as chief lackey for Rauh.

John Conyers got into politics by being appointed an educational director at a UAW local upon obtaining a job in an auto plant; his father had been a union official. After working for Congressman John Dingell as an aide, Conyers ran for Congress in a district that had been redrawn by Dingell to include Conyers's own neighborhood. Conyers won the Democratic primary by less than 100 votes, but with official UAW-Democratic Party backing handily defeated the Republican opponent.

Ron Dellums, the most fabled "radical" in Congress, was financed by San Francisco bank executive Fortney Pete Stark, who also bought his own way into the House. Stark and an organization called Business Executive Move for Peace (BMOVE) conduited funds directly to Dellums and indirectly to the Peace and Freedom Party, which backed Dellums. BMOVE consisted of top corporate officers of IBM, Xerox, the Bank of America, and Business International.

All three Congressmen rely for "grassroots" support on the small army of Wall Street foundation-supported "community projects" whose paid functionaries find time to help make sure the "right" people get elected, one way or another.

Mitchell, Dellums, and Conyers are in no position to accuse anyone of being "bought." They themselves were not bought, but *wholly manufactured* by British-linked financier circles and their political institutions in the U.S. But now that the NAACP has brought under scrutiny the actual content of the British-inspired fascist economic policies coming out of the Democratic Party, and is posing an alternative to the austerity principles underlying these deals, the agents are screaming "foul."