

SNCC 40th Workshop: “Black and White: Together or Separate?” (CONT’D)

Session: “Black and White: Together or Separate?”

Date: April 2000

Location: Raleigh, NC - Shaw University

Panelists:

Joan Browning - Freedom Rider, civil rights activist

Muriel Tillinghast - SNCC Field Secretary

Bob Zellner - SNCC Field Secretary

[Hollis Watkins](#) - SNCC Organizer

[Charlie Cobb](#) - SNCC Field Secretary / Journalist

u

This is how these groups that are being oppressed or pushed into these situations feel—making sure you're bringing in information from those outside sources versus putting on your impression or perspective on those groups.

And then once you build a net and understanding of information to those students you're working with—be it through books, readings, current time information, or bringing in people to speak to you—then you look at setting up relationships with other dominant groups, be it Society of African American Culture, be it Asian Student Association. Set up things where y'all meet, maybe on an issue forum, or you meet on an outing or something. You share that way.

And once that's established, [when it] kind of sticks, then you look at the issue of racial equity or racial justice. Because you got an understanding of the perspective—not from your own diatribe, your own little group—but perspective from a broader sense, those being oppressed.

If you just walk up in there with the liberal—kind of white liberal mentality—“Well, this is how we white liberal fellows should be fixed, but this is why we should fix it,” not thinking of how they would want it to be fixed, versus implying yourself onto them—another dominant form—then you set yourself up again.

First you understand the base. You ask the people around them who are dealing with oppression, what they are really feeling, and get an understanding from reading through what they're going through—which is implying what you think they're going through. Then you look at the racial equity and the racial oppression through justice and apply that in whatever way. That's how we work with different student groups.

Hollis Watkins: Let's see if we can move around. There's a sister here, then you brother.

Audience Question: I have a question with the evolution of SNCC [indistinct]. I want to know, what impact did the liberation struggle in Africa, the rising Black consciousness, and the meeting with Malcolm X affect SNCC's decision to move to that exclusive Black organization. I think you started talking a little bit about the personal evolution of SNCC members individually, but as an organization, how did that affect the direction?

Charlie Cobb: There's no short answer to this. Just suffice to say that as we developed, an important part of our development was exposure to this ever-wider range of people and ideas. We started out literally with a civil rights idea. And then, over time—because what we were doing—got exposed to—and lots of ways to talk about that—[Oginga Odinga](#) and coming to Atlanta, and what happened. And the young people in Alabama, the African liberation movement, the emergence of independent African nations that were occurring at the same time as a lot of the [19]60s Civil Rights Movement.

Particularly what was happening in South Africa, from Sharpeville all the way through the arrest of Nelson Mandela—all of this is affecting us.¹ And films and books and ideas are all affected. I don't think you can speak to it organizationally in any significant way. I think you could say yes—I could talk about people I was close to, and I could tell you with very precise terms how they took these ideas and what kind of impact these ideas [had]. And I think it must not be very different with students who are active today.

Bob Zellner: But we're also having some effect on them. I think the African [indistinct] and one of the ironic things is that SNCC moved to become exclusionist at the same time Malcolm X was moving from a separatist position to an inclusive, more revolutionary position.

Muriel Tillinghast: I just wanted to say that we did public accommodations testing on Route 40 which used to be the highway from New York City to Washington, DC. And part of the focus on that was because African delegates could not eat at any of those restaurants. So, to that degree, yeah.

And I can remember one time when Stanley Wise was arrested in the car, and Stanley took on the monocle of an African diplomat as a means of getting out of the arrest. I'm just trying—that was

¹ The Sharpeville Massacre occurred on March 21, 1960, when South African police opened fire on a peaceful anti-pass law protest, killing 69 Black demonstrators, marking a turning point in the global anti-apartheid movement.

a humorous part—but there was a cross-fertilization. But organization—I can say you we put it on the table as something that we looked at.

Audience Comment: For all your concern about not linking up and not talking about different things, it seems like there's a really powerful set of themes running through everything that you guys have been saying today. And I think there are elements of it that are really crucial to answering the question that you raised: What does this organization look like?

And I think a big part of the answer is: you don't know until you're in the middle of it. And that each organization is going to be different, each struggle is going to be different. Each one is going to come out of the local circumstances, and your success is going to be from being open, and learning, and humble—as Joan was suggesting—and willing to absorb all of the stuff that's going on, and reflect back what's best in it and what's most important.

And that if you are approaching it from the local perspective, and trying to do a little bit—trying to see what's moving in a direction and move it a little bit further—that's when you're going to have the opportunity to take advantage of the luck that comes your way. When something is going on, but nobody's found it yet, and you move it a little bit further, then suddenly it blossoms into this thing that nobody could have directed from the outside.

I'm an ex-student activist now, and I was a student activist about 10 years ago, and worried a lot about these questions. And frankly, I think I was, in many ways, kind of a piss-poor student activist. But the thing was that the experiences of immersing myself in a local situation, learning how to talk to all sorts of different kinds of people, learning how to listen to all sorts of different kinds of people—wound up, years later, in a direction that I never could have anticipated—giving me the tool to be a historian and to being a teacher in the City University of New York.

So that I can go into a classroom, and all of the stuff that I learned that didn't really get put to great world-changing effect in the movement is now the stuff that I'm able to use to make a difference as a teacher, and to have a perspective on the movement, and write some of the histories. I think that that sense of localism and that sense of openness is something that came through beautifully in all five of your talks.

Hollis Watkins: And all of those organizations should be grounded in work.

Muriel Tillinghast: That's right. Work.

Hollis Watkins: Did you have a short one [question]? I'm hoping that we will continue to dialogue one-on-one. In one or two small groups. [singing]

*Ain't gonna let nobody turn me 'round,
turn me 'round, turn me 'round,*

*Ain't gonna let nobody turn me 'round
I'm gonna keep on a walkin', keep on a-talkin',
Marching up to freedom land.*

[ENDS AND GOES TO VIDEO OF A NEW BREAKOUT CONFERENCE - GO TO PAGE 8]

SNCC 40th Workshop: “Where Are We Today? Issues of Race, Justice, and Peace”

Session: “Where Are We Today? Issues of Race, Justice, and Peace”

Date: April 2000

Location: Raleigh, NC - Shaw University

Panelists:

[James Lawson](#) - Nonviolence Theorist / SNCC Mentor

[Charles Sherrod](#) - SNCC Field Secretary / Albany Movement Leader

Comments:

[Lawrence Guyot](#) - SNCC Organizer / Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party Leader

****NOTE:** The video continues with a gap. Some dialogue is missing at the beginning.**

James Lawson: Alright let's hear what you want to see out of this workshop.

Audience Question: I'd like to hear your personal beliefs about—in the long run, what did desegregation of schools and public facilities...what were the gains and what were the losses. Schools and public facilities. But I think public schools—the issues from public facilities are even more heightened in schools.

Audience Question: I'd like to talk about how organizing today—is it more inclusive to organize around race and race issues or class issues, and if one has become more or less important since the time of SNCC in the [19]60s.

Audience Question: I was wondering if you can talk briefly about the role of the clergy and religion in general in SNCC in 1961, and what is the role of religion and clergy today?

Audience Question: Reverend, you brought up wanting to see new leaders in the SNCC society right now. I wanted to know, how could SNCC be useful right now, and what's its purpose, and where is it going? What's the future of SNCC? Do you see that?

Audience Question: What do we do about the resurgence of the segregationist politics at the electoral level?

Audience Question: [indistinct] some of these issues of the [19]60s are still [indistinct] and how they expand, extend past Black [and] white. [Indistinct]

Charles Sherrod: Say it again?

Audience Question: How they're more than Black and white. How they affect other racial/ethnic groups.

Audience Question: I think you're asking, you know that the issues are more than just issues of race. There are larger issues here that affect all groups of people—other ethnic groups, whites too—and what's going on? Can they talk about...how does race fit into this? But what's the larger picture, right?

Audience Question: Right and how does this same issue touch different groups besides Black and white issues?

Audience Question: Yes. I'd like the panel's opinion on how to inspire or motivate today's youth to tackle these issues, because that's a very big problem.

James Lawson: Today's youth?

Audience Response: Myself included.

James Lawson: One assumption I'd like you to make at the very beginning is that we did not dismantle racism in the United States in the [19]60s. Be sure you understand that. I understood it. [Dr. Martin Luther] King understood it. A lot understood it. Charles Sherrod understood it. That while we wanted to desegregate, we did not complete that task in the [19]60s. It's still an unfinished task.

Eighty percent of children of color in our country are in segregated schools—North, South, East, West. Eighty-plus percent. Mississippi is one illustration. Private academies are white. That's

where Trent Lott and his company in the [19]60s decreed, as these—as lawsuits were coming down the pike and pressures were changed.²

Trent Lott and the Mississippi Sovereign Commission and the White Citizens Council moved to put white children into white academies. And in some counties, the public schools were all Black, and the private academies and private schools were white. That's why Trent Lott was [indistinct] because he wants to destroy the public school system. Period.

Charles Sherrod: Same thing in Georgia.

James Lawson: All across the South, that's the case. So we did not dismantle racism. That is the task still to be done. And I do not care what former President [Ronald] Reagan says, or Bill Clinton—racism is epidemic, pathological, and securely in place.

I want to make the second assumption: that racism is not a peripheral issue in the United States—thereby the concern primarily of Black people. Racism, as it comes out of slavery, was an economic institution. And it was a national economic institution. It was an economic institution which Wall Street and the financial pages today still preach and teach—namely, that it's important for there be a lot of people who work, but who are kept poor, so that the results of their work go into the hands of a few.

That was what slavery [was]. Slavery was an economic theory. Understand that nearly 4 million people were released from slavery by the Emancipation Proclamation. Those 4 million people, working for 250 years, produced massive wealth for a few people and provided the development of capital for the industrialization of the United States.

I did not say, for the industrialization of Birmingham—I said, for the industrialization of the United States. And the banks of the North and the industrialists of the North greatly benefited from slavery.

When we talk about slavery, when we talk about racism, you're talking about a problem that has affected the body politic, the spiritual politics, the political politics, the social politics, the cultural politics of this nation for over 250 years—and still does.

It is an issue for all people now. Both the church and the Democratic and Republican parties and Wall Street want you to think that racism is a peripheral issue. But speaking as a pastor, the critical law of the spiritual life, according to the Scriptures—Moses and Jesus as the primary

² Trent Lott, a Mississippi politician, was associated with segregationist politics in the 1960s and later drew controversy for defending symbols and institutions tied to white supremacy during the civil rights era.

figures in the Judaic-Christian Scriptures—principle law is: “You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and mind and soul and strength, and your neighbor as yourself.”

This does not represent four or five different laws, but a single law. A human being cannot be a human being without their neighbor. Race, racism, prejudice and bias and violence and sexism are all deniable to that fundamental religious principle. Those are two assumptions I want to put on the table.

Charles Sherrod: What was the first question?

Audience Member: Okay, I didn’t catch his question. Your question—the one that came before we started this.

James Lawson: The beloved community...is that community—does it have a role for white people?

Audience Question: Particularly suburban, wealthy, kind of white people.

Charles Sherrod: The community in our country is made up of all kinds of people. We've got people from just about every country in the world. So whatever the solution to the problem of race in our country, it's going to be solved by the people of our country.

I cannot see how each one of us cannot be a part of a solution. And that was the reason why in the [19]60s I was kicked out of SNCC. I made a proposal and acted on the proposal that white students, before the Mississippi program in [19]64, about two or three years before.

Before the Mississippi project, I had 16, 30—large numbers of white students on the project. And it was based on the fact that I believed that whatever solution we come up with has got to be a multifaceted solution, and we all must participate in this.

No matter how unsettling it makes me, I gotta deal with it. I gotta deal with your problems, your culture—and you gotta deal with mine. And by working together, being close together, there's no better chance to observe those differences and make adjustments in our working together.

So what I found out—I found what SNCC found out—that’s why they did the Mississippi project—was that anywhere we wanted action to happen, when we wanted action to happen, and we were with some white students there—an action would have some kind of action. Maybe action went wrong, somebody would get hurt or whatever, but there wouldn’t be a quiet moment. From the time that white students appeared on our project, there wasn’t a quiet moment.

White students from these universities brought with them the media and protection of the United States government at all levels. Way back then, little old long-haired boy here was thinking like

that. And I knew that if one of them got hurt down there, we would get resources. A whole lot of cousins and aunties.

Now, I don't have no aunties that owns a big company. No cousins, no brothers, no sisters that own nothing. But they did. And they do. Y'all do. And all those resources that you have, that you don't even think about—because you just go without a thought. I knew that they would be at our fingertips at some point.

And that was the logic, among other things, in bringing whites into our confines. And I tried my best to prepare my people for it. There were some of the Black guys saying: "Every time we go out there, we go to talk to the people and they be looking at the white folks. That's the white folks. I'm sick and tired of—." Well tell them to shut up. Just tell them to shut up. They'll shut up if you tell them to shut up. Tell them before you go to the house. [indistinct] keep looking at the white cat. You talk and adjust.

We had to adjust. What I'm saying is—and I understood it would be hard for...we all were young, getting used to authority, getting used to power—because it's power. We had a little power. We could pull a thousand people in, a thousand people there. That's power. You're getting used to that. But then when you gotta share that power with somebody who represents what you're fighting against—you're getting two things. You gotta unmix those things.

But you see, that mixture is internalized. The hostility is internalized. And if we were to be free from this hostility that was in us, because of our history, then we had to deal with it to get ourselves...it's a whole process. And so we saw some young people becoming free in the short time that we had whites working with us.

And things happened that didn't have to happen. "If the whites weren't there, we wouldn't have had our church surrounded. We wouldn't have gotten that church burned down. That church burned down in one of the other counties." But they were burning churches before they came. I'm telling you what my response would be.

Audience Question: Why these accusations? What was the reality there?

Charles Sherrod: The reality was that we had college students. College students talk better than we do. Express things better than we do. And our people are used to salute white folk [indistinct] And we couldn't stand it. "They respect this white man more than they respect me." And there's some anger involved. "So these folk come around, they gonna leave. I'm still gonna be here." All kind of excuses.

James Lawson: The SNCC break. Why'd SNCC break? Why did SNCC kick, in the mid-[19]60s, white members of SNCC out..tell the whites to go home? This is primarily encouraged by the [Stokely Carmichael](#).

Charles Sherrod: In a word, we were feeling our Cheerios. We could tell a thousand students all over the country to bare their ass at 4 o'clock, October the 15th, in front of every college in the country, and we would have a representative number. Again—sort of exaggerated—but on the other hand, there were movements going on that were doing that. We never promoted those kind of demonstrations. But I'm saying that's the kind of power that we had.

We had a fleet of cars. We had walkie-talkies. We had numbers of people coming to mass meetings to listen to what we had to say. We had support.

James Lawson: And money.

Charles Sherrod: We had money coming. Yeah, we had about—at one point—we had about \$300,000 [\$3,068,096 in 2025] a month almost, \$300,000 a year at least coming in. That was a lot of money.

Lawrence Guyot: I think there's another slant on this and I want to certainly support and congratulate Charles Sherrod openly running biracial projects when anyone else didn't. But I think the other tack on this is SNCC was then faced with—we were suffering a couple of attacks.

One, internally, a lot of the leadership in SNCC decided to write off the Democratic Party after Atlantic City, and they were followed by a lot of people. Two, the money was cutting down. And three, in this period, we had just followed the aftermath of taking a position on Vietnam, and we have to work all of those factors in.

And we had some people who were tired, battle-weary. And I think that when any group—who has been, after all, we're only talking about the most sophisticated political group in American history when we talk about SNCC—but it had reached a point where it was no longer externalizing its creativity. It turned inward, and it stopped being creative. It became rigid. Once the rigidity set in, the question was who could exclude whom—not whether or not it would be exclusion.

So we have to be very fair on that, because I don't think you can study American Southern politics without studying SNCC and Sherrod and Lawson and others. I just think it is so important. Because I think that, as the South was in the [19]60s, America is now. I think we have a country in America that is racially polarized and as it relates to income disparity, and as it relates to the social acceptance of racism—that's what gets me now.

James Lawson: It's socially acceptable. In all sorts of areas. And it's also—there are signs of racism that no one deals with. And of course, you had the racist right—religious and political—pretend that we solved the problems of race, as Reagan said during his presidency, and that we had put those behind us.

The only thing that's really happened is, with the push of the conservative elements, or the racist elements like Trent Lott [indistinct]—with their ascent, their drive and push—George Will, William Buckley, Pat Robertson, James Dobson, a whole host of guys, that's well documented in the literature—what they pushed for then was racism being firmed up in the institutions of America.

So that, as an illustration, one of the signs of racism in the United States is clearly the criminal justice system—and prisons and law enforcement—capital punishment. I've linked those all together. But it is an atrocious part of racism in the United States that is probably as destructive and rapacious as any kind of lynching or as any kind of slavery.

Two million people in jail. Over 3,500 people on death row. I—from time to time—have said 50% of those in prison would not be in prison if the Constitution had been obeyed. If they had had proper defense in their courtrooms. If police departments could not frame, lie, and DAs could not insist that their task is to put people in jail, not justice.

On the executions that have taken place since 1976—when a Supreme Court basically appointed by the attacks from the right on activist judges, that therefore permitted the likes of a William Rehnquist to get into the Court, and a number of others—the nine today, most of them are that ilk—reinstated the death penalty in 1976 after it had been pretty much engaged in a national moratorium.

Since 1976, 625 people have been executed across our country. And any number of these people committed their crimes when they were children or teenagers. Any numbers that were mentally retarded. Any number were rather mentally ill. Sizable numbers have been Black or Native American or Latino. And the killing goes on—surely racist.

Then, in the meantime, since 1976, 87 people who were convicted and on death row have been exonerated by independent investigations—not by the DAs, not by the police—but by independent investigations.

One such group has been Northwestern University School of Law, where they have gotten off of death row in Illinois five people. I think a couple of those cases, they solved the murders. They found the murderer. But the person on death row had already been convicted and there, faced execution. So that's in the state of Illinois. Thirteen out of 25 on death row were found innocent. And that's why the Republican governor called for a moratorium in Illinois. Now I'm saying—that's only one—but that's one huge symptom of racism that is highly destructive of families in this country.

Audience Question: I'm from Chicago. The other part of that is that a number of those people had been defended by lawyers who had been disbarred. And it was found out later. I actually

wanted to ask both of you, and Jim Lawson in particular, to link what you're raising now about the state of affairs with something I think you were getting at earlier.

In the earlier session, you took objection to the comments about—"one needs to become a part of the middle class." I think that comment—I appreciated your intervention. I supported the sister trying to chair the meeting, but I appreciated the importance of your intervention, because I think that that outlook is directly linked to perpetuating some of the problems.

Because it offers a kind of counter-explanation—that is, the reason that people are in jail, the reason people are in poverty, etc. That's coming from within the African-American community. I actually also think it's very much linked to a kind of romanticization of patriarchy and the idea that what we need is strong, nuclear, male-headed families and that's going to cure all.

And it becomes a very conservative message, very much linked to indicting people who don't fit that model—the so-called underclass. So, if you want to...

James Lawson: Larry, I hope you feel free to step in, because you're one of our outstanding warriors that's still in the struggle from the [19]60s and still today.

Lawrence Guyot: From you, I consider that the ultimate compliment. But let me say this. I was glad to witness that, because I believe—I do a lot of speaking, and talking and analyzing on the question of race. For someone to say that in the name of SNCC is treasonous. To say that the ideal today—

Audience Member: Did you all hear that? I'm just wondering, maybe you need to tell the story of what happened?

Lawrence Guyot: Why don't someone who heard all of it tell the story? Because I walked in—

Audience Member: Hank Thomas, who was in the Easter conference in 1960. One of the students asked the question, "What can I do as a young Black man to help the struggle?" And Mr. Thomas stood up and said, "Join the middle class and be a good father. Get an education." And that's it, that's all. That was his whole answer to the problem.

Lawrence Guyot: Now what that does not deal with—

Audience Member: He also said it would end poverty...which is not true.

Audience Member: And the fact that an education would automatically put you into the middle class.

Audience Member: Oh yes. He said, "Get your college degree and you will automatically be in the middle class."

Audience Member: Jim, you should probably say what you said. Reenact it.

James Lawson: Well, I simply said, I protest. Larry, go on.

Lawrence Guyot: Let me be not as gentle as he was, and say very clearly: if SNCC had been designed to extend and perpetuate the middle class, it would have never done anything that it did. It would have never decided to go into the least and the most impoverished, the most controlled communities, and say, “We are about facilitating your knowledge.”

I think also we have to be very careful—when we look at the Black middle class—we look at people that we facilitated their pragmatic, psychological, and financial escape and responsibility. And I do that in contradiction to the Jewish community. In the Jewish community, the more money you make, the more you have to answer to the community. In the Black community, the more money you make, the less you have to answer.

Now, some people may not like that, but I think this conference is about forcing us to think. And we should use honesty and raw credibility to have this kind of dialog. Because we fall into the trap of simply becoming a member of the middle class, then we don’t have to deal with national health insurance. We don’t have to deal with housing. We don’t have to deal with the fact that, internationally, we’re 18th in educating people.

And we don’t have to deal with the solution now to urban America. And that’s encapsulated in one book: *The Future [Once] Happened Here* by Fred Siegel. He looked at New York, San Francisco [CA], and Washington, DC. Very simple: subway system. Subway Black people into work in the suburbs. Don’t build any housing, schools, and subway them back and forth. That’s the way to protect our interests. Now, that’s where we are.

Fred Siegel gave a conference at Brooklyn Institution, and every federal agency you can imagine was there. So we’re not talking about—I’m simply saying that if we fall into the—I hesitate and try to restrain myself from slapping people when they raise the question of class.

Because Marty [indistinct] was interviewing me for a piece to be shown about Anthony Williams. He said, “What do you think of Anthony Williams?” I said, “Well, Anthony Williams is a racial illiberal in a city that all of the decisions are made in Washington, DC, on the question of race.” And he said, “Look, that’s not right.”

See, Anthony Williams was concerned about picking up trash. Nobody said, “Yeah, whose trash?” And we get down to the question. He said, “Well, look, maybe the middle class passed you by.” I said “Remember what Malcolm X said: What do you call a Black millionaire?” And the answer is nigger.

But my point is this, And I went on to say, “There is no class to get into to make yourself insulated from the question of racism.” I finish.

James Lawson: The difficulty with that response this morning, of course, is that racism is a form of depriving people of humanity and opportunity. And that's what's going on in our society. Poverty did not produce the dysfunctional—I mean, no, I'm saying that dysfunctionality did not produce poverty. Poverty is present. It's been here.

If you want to see the effect of economic impoverishment in the United States, go and read some of the case studies of communities in the United States—and in some instances, all-white communities—where the factories closed down. The workers, people who had been in those factories [for] 10, 20, 30 years, and who followed their fathers into those companies—those companies stopped. Maybe they shipped out, they closed down.

Go and read the case studies of what happened to those families in those communities. They found an escalation of drug addictions of all kinds. Escalation of suicide. Escalation of all kinds of crime, including family abuse and wife battery. Escalation of diseases of depression and especially alcoholism.

One morning earlier, I opened up the *Los Angeles Times*—about two years ago—and it had a front-page story on Sewickley, Pennsylvania. And my brother Phil was born in Sewickley, Pennsylvania. And I was astonished. Sewickley is a steel town just south of Pittsburgh. The steel mills closed down. Period. And the churches and the schools then discovered this radical escalation of dysfunctionality. Breakup of families and the juvenile delinquency and the whole bit.

And you can study this in Racine, Wisconsin; Youngstown, Ohio; a whole slew of cities all across this country where the factories—and therefore the economy—has shut down. Now, that's what slavery was all the time. That's what racism has been—all the time. Not occasionally, but all the time.

And none of that has been dismantled. The task of dismantling racism, in education, in the economy, in law enforcement, in the courts, in Congress, in the White House, in the governor's mansions, the legislature. The task of dismantling the racism—the economics of racism, the color prejudice, the white male domination of racism, the sexism of racism, the patriarchal standards of racism—that is the unfinished task.

And that's why in the [19]60s, William Buckley and Paul Weyrich called a meeting of some of their friends and said, “We must organize now to not only reverse what the [19]60s are saying, but to put our agendas back on the front burner of the American people.”

And if you read *The New York Times* or *The LA Times* or *The Washington Post* or *The Atlanta Journal [Constitution]*, you'll find that their language is on the front page: “reverse discrimination, welfare reform.” Remember some of them—the Heritage Foundation coined—but they're on the front pages. They're in the commentary.

Lawrence Guyot: And that's why you must organize. Those are the issues of today. They're the same issues. They haven't changed. They've just been lost. And they're not just Black and white. Affects everybody. People are hurting. Wherever people are hurting is where you can organize. How do you do it? You find the people who are hurting. You can't manufacture an issue and expect people to come to a meeting and talk about an issue. People will come to a meeting.

Audience Comment: I want to take issue that the issues are the same. Because I think that the issues are different. And they're different because of globalization and the IMF, and the fact that capital has consolidated its power. So therefore, I think that because they have consolidated their power, the oppression is greater.

And that, at least in our country, we have been educated to think that we have this good life. And this is across the board, both Black and white. You get a couple of pennies who think they're not...(AUDIO ENDS) **CONTINUED IN PART 5.**