

TESTIMONY OF STOKELY CARMICHAEL

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE
NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

—————
MARCH 25, 1970
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1970

43-665 O

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 20 cents

S 521-24

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN JR., North Carolina
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
BIRCH BAYH, Indiana
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota
JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Maryland
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia

ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
HIRAM L. FONG, Hawaii
HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
MARLOW W. COOK, Kentucky
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Maryland
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut, *Vice Chairman*

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina
BIRCH BAYH, Indiana
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia

HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
MARLOW W. COOK, Kentucky
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan

J. G. SOURWINE, *Chief Counsel*

JOHN R. NORPEL, *Director of Research*

ALFONSO L. TARABOCHIA, *Chief Investigator*

RESOLUTION

Resolved, by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, That the testimony of Stokely Carmichael before the subcommittee in executive session on March 25, 1970, is hereby released from the injunction of secrecy and ordered to be printed and made public.

Approved May 12, 1970.

TESTIMONY OF STOKELY CARMICHAEL

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1970

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in room 154, Old Senate Office Building, Senator Strom Thurmond presiding.

Present: Senators Thurmond and Bayh.

Also present: Jay Sourwine, chief counsel; John R. Norpel, Jr., research director; and Alfonso L. Tarabochia, chief investigator.

Senator THURMOND. Will you hold up your hand and be sworn?

The evidence you give in this hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. (Nodding assent.)

TESTIMONY OF STOKELY CARMICHAEL, ACCOMPANIED BY HOWARD MOORE, COUNSEL

Mr. MOORE. Before we proceed, Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a motion that I would like to make part of the files in the proceeding. I will give the original to Mr. Sourwine—

Mr. SOURWINE. Which I will pass to the chairman.

Mr. MOORE (continuing). To quash and dismiss the subpoena. And I would like to make this motion a part of the official files and record of this testimony.

Senator THURMOND. It will be received.

(The motion referred to follows.)

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

In re: Mr. Stokely Carmichael

To: The Chairman and Members of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

MOTION TO QUASH AND DISMISS SUBPOENA

Comes now, Mr. Stokely Carmichael, through his undersigned attorney, and moves that a certain subpoena calling for his presence before this subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the 25th day of March, 1970 to give testimonial evidence commencing at 10:30 am in the forenoon and continuing until adjourned be quashed and dismissed on the grounds that the Resolution of the Senate, Number 366 and 46, as modified from time to time, authorizing the same, are unconstitutional under the First and Fifth Amendments, United States Constitution, on their face and as applied by reason of their vagueness and overbreadth.

Dated this 25th day of March, 1970.

HOWARD MOORE, Jr.,
*Suite 1154, 75 Piedmont Avenue, N.E.,
Atlanta, Ga. 30303,
Counsel for Mr. Stokely Carmichael.*

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may I address myself to the motion?
 Senator THURMOND. Do you wish to say something on the position first?

Mr. MOORE. I think it is reasonably clear, and it does not really require any argument, that the decisions of the Supreme Court and lower court decisions have made it quite clear that overbroad proceedings such as these offend the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution of the United States, and they have a tendency of trampling on the First Amendment rights as to the public concern.

And the resolutions of the Senate are vague as to making inquiries into matters of opinion and thought and association.

Senator THURMOND. I will be glad to hear counsel for the subcommittee.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have only this to say, Mr. Chairman. First, this subcommittee is being asked by this motion to stultify itself by declaring its own authorizing resolutions to be unconstitutional.

Second, I think the question of the subpoena is now moot. Mr. Stokely Carmichael is here, and has been sworn. He came pursuant to the now challenged subpoena. But he is here, and having been sworn, he is under a clear duty to remain and testify. And I think any proceedings about the subpoena are out of order at this time.

Senator THURMOND. The chairman will overrule the motion.

You may proceed.

Mr. MOORE. Before there is any additional testimony, or an attempt to examine this witness, I would like to state for the record that the General Counsel has been kind enough to provide me with a copy of Senate Resolution 366, and Witness' Handbook and Senate Resolution 341. I have requested of counsel for the subcommittee a copy of the resolution of the Committee of the Whole authorizing the holding of this particular hearing. And I have been advised by the General Counsel that there is a general mandate permitting this particular hearing.

Is that a correct statement of our conversation?

Mr. SOURWINE. No; that is not precisely correct, Mr. Moore, although I could very well have given you that impression. I told you that I did not believe that there was a separate resolution dealing specifically with the issuing of a subpoena to Mr. Carmichael. And that is as far as I went.

The subcommittee is continuing a number of lines of investigation which have been authorized by the committee in the past and which have been underway for years. And it is in connection with one of these lines of investigation that the subcommittee is proceeding here.

Mr. MOORE. May I make an inquiry as to what lines of investigation?

Mr. SOURWINE. I was about to make an opening statement before I asked the first question, but I have not had an opportunity to do it yet.

Mr. MOORE. And I understand by the opening statement that you will identify the inquiry and the line of investigation, and the pertinency of questions and answers will be related to the lines of investigation and inquiry?

Mr. SOURWINE. Surely. As counsel surely realizes, the question of pertinency is to be raised in connection with any particular question. If the witness does not understand it, he is entitled to an explanation as to pertinency at the time the question is asked.

What I had in mind now, if it pleases counsel and the Chair, is a general statement of the purpose of this hearing and the purpose of calling Mr. Carmichael.

Mr. MOORE. And may I make one further statement?

As I understand counsel, there is no separate resolution of the Committee of the Whole authorizing the subpoena to Mr. Carmichael for his presence here today.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is my understanding.

Mr. MOORE. We would object to Mr. Carmichael being present under the subpoena which has been issued. And we ask the subcommittee not to proceed with his testimony at this time, until there is a proper authorization for his presence by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, if I may address myself briefly to this, there is nothing improper in the proceedings to this day. The objection, of course, is one which counsel may make, and it is for the Chair to rule on. But the witness, as I say, is here, and has been duly sworn. And I think any proceedings prior to that are moot now.

Mr. MOORE. We would like to say that, if there is no proper resolution, the witness would like to be excused. And I will ask the chairman to excuse him from testifying, even though he has responded to the subpoena by being present, and he had no alternative but to be present.

Senator THURMOND. The Chair feels, for the reasons stated by counsel, that the motion should be overruled.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, as the Chair knows, this subcommittee is engaged under its general mandate in an investigation of subversive activities in the United States, including organizations under the control of the Communist Party, U.S.A. and other organizations seeking the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

As a part of this investigation the subcommittee seeks to determine as well as it can, from as much information as it can gather on the subject, the nature of organizations which, or the members of which, participate in violence or preach the violent overthrow of the Government or violent revolution.

The subcommittee has reason to believe that Mr. Carmichael, who is here today, may be able to give the subcommittee information with respect to some of these organizations.

That is not to charge Mr. Carmichael with anything at all; it is simply a statement as to the reason why he is called as a witness.

And at that point I would like to say, Mr. Carmichael, that the asking of a question is not intended to be a statement. Your answers will go in the record. And they are what is important, because the questions concern what you know or do not know, and if you do not know, all you need to do is say so, and if you do know, you will have all the time you need to make an answer as full as you wish responsive to the question. And that is the record that will be made.

And the committee is particularly interested here today in several points:

1. Financing;
2. Communist connections if any; and
3. The nature of leadership of several specific organizations about which Mr. Carmichael will be asked, notably the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, the organization known as the

Panthers, the so-called Latin American Solidarity Organization which held a meeting in Cuba, and the Puerto Rican Independence Party.

The subcommittee is also interested in the question of whether Mr. Carmichael himself has been engaged in any relationships with foreign nations in an improper way. And again I say, this is not to make a charge that he has.

That is the extent of the inquiry which it is proposed to go forward with today, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, may I make an inquiry?

Is any of the information which constitutes reason to believe that Mr. Carmichael would have information pertinent to the subjects which have been identified here derived from any wiretaps or electronic surveillance of Mr. Carmichael or any of his associates in the organizations that need to be questioned about?

Senator THURMOND. I would be pleased if counsel would respond to that.

Mr. SOURWINE. I must apologize. A note was handed to me while counsel was speaking, and I was sufficiently discourteous to read it. And I would ask you to repeat your inquiry.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask Mr. Shelburne to read my question back, please.

(The reporter read from his notes as requested.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Not to the best of my knowledge. I think I can say categorically "No." I have no knowledge—I will state this for the record—of any information obtained from any wiretaps of Mr. Carmichael or his associates by anybody at any time.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Sourwine, may we make further inquiry?

What is the basis for the reason to believe that Mr. Carmichael would have pertinent information?

Mr. SOURWINE. We must separate the question of fact from the question of doubt, Mr. Moore. If there is any connection of a subversive nature between SNCC and any subversive organization we think Mr. Carmichael would know about it, because he used to be a very important man in SNCC.

The same thing is true with respect to the Panthers.

With respect to the Latin American Solidarity Organization, we know that he went to Cuba, that he was an honorary delegate to the conference of that organization.

There is no doubt about the opportunity of this witness to be well informed with respect to the matters we are asking about. I am not putting words in his mouth with respect to what the facts are. If I ask Mr. Carmichael a question and his answer is no, the record stands no. I am not here to argue with the witness, but to ask for information, to try to secure what information he has in the areas of the subcommittee's interest.

I think it should be pointed out that the fact of being called before this subcommittee should not be considered one of opprobrium. There have been many hundreds of witnesses before this subcommittee, including, among others, military and naval officers of rank as high as lieutenant general and admiral—as a matter of fact, we had one full general once, Mr. Chairman—and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the Attorney General of the United States, and a great many other people.

The subcommittee will call whomever it has reason to think has information on the point that it is trying to gain information on.

Mr. MOORE. To use a common expression among lawyers, this is really a fishing expedition—

Mr. SOURWINE. No, sir; it is an inquiry—

Mr. MOORE. May I finish, please?

This, in common lawyer's terms, is a fishing expedition as to whether or not Mr. Carmichael might have any knowledge gained from his association with and participation in organizations that the subcommittee might consider or think to be subversive.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is not a fishing expedition, Mr. Moore. And if it pleases the chairman, I do not want to bandy words with counsel. This is a serious purpose here to get information. And if we can get at it, we can get away in an hour and a half.

This is exactly, counsel, the same kind of an inquiry that there would be if there was an accident at the corner of Virginia Avenue and Second Street. If Mr. Carmichael had been in that vicinity at the time of the accident, he would be a person that could properly be called and asked if he was there, and if he heard and saw the accident, asked what he saw and what he heard, for the purpose of developing the facts.

That is all we are doing. There is no opprobrium connected with the fact that he was there.

Senator BAYH. Would it be appropriate, Mr. Chairman, for me to interject an interrogatory to our counsel here at this time?

Senator THURMOND. I know of no objection. You are a member of the Judiciary Committee and of this subcommittee.

Senator BAYH. I apologize for my late arrival to you and to our witness. I had another meeting.

As Senator Thurmond knows, it is not always easy to get where you have to be.

Could you give me some idea for the record as to whether generally it is a custom to notify the members of this subcommittee that it is meeting?

Mr. SOURWINE. It surely is.

Senator BAYH. Why is it that I received no notice of this until it just came to me through the grapevine as I was at another meeting?

Mr. SOURWINE. Sir, a notice of our meeting was delivered to your office by the Post Office Department. I did not learn until a moment ago that although the Senate post office was told last night that they had to be delivered last night, they did not deliver them until 9 o'clock this morning.

Senator BAYH. Would it be fair to ask when the subcommittee decided to hold these hearings, and whether maybe more than even a 12-hour notice might be better ground rules to follow? I don't know what you are trying to find out from this witness, but I think by any reasonable interpretation he would not be insulted by suggesting that he is controversial, and that perhaps the members of the subcommittee would feel that they have a responsibility to be present and to be heard if we had sufficient notice.

Mr. SOURWINE. Senator, I very deeply regret this, and I am sorry that I have come under the Senator's displeasure.

Senator BAYH. It is not displeasure, I am just trying to find out if there is some way—Mr. Sourwine, when did we anticipate having Mr. Carmichael here?

Mr. SOURWINE. The notice was not sent until yesterday, because it was not until 2:30, perhaps, when I talked with Mr. Carmichael on the phone, that I knew that he was coming. And we do not ordinarily send notices of hearing until we know the witness is going to be there. I was in another hearing yesterday afternoon. I was called out of it to take the phone call from Mr. Carmichael. I was, I think, remiss in not having given instructions with regard to notice immediately at that time. The fact is that I did not do it, I went right back into the hearing. And that continued until after 5 o'clock. I then gave instructions to have the notices prepared and sent, and that they had to be delivered last night.

I am advised that this was given to the Post Office Department, but that the person to whom the notice was given was subsequently told by his superior that the Senate post office was not going to deliver any notices after 5 o'clock, period; and they delivered it the first thing this morning. That is the first notice I have ever had of that. And I have been working for the Senate a great many years. But I will be guided by that in the future.

As to the time when the subpoena was issued, the subpoena was issued 4 or 5 days ago by the chairman. And it was delivered to the marshal in New York for service on Friday. For some reason unknown to me the marshal did not attempt to serve this subpoena until Tuesday, when I think either he contacted Mr. Carmichael or Mr. Carmichael contacted him by telephone. That is what I am told.

Senator BAYH. I do not want to pursue this to any unreasonable length, but in the light of the controversy involved, and I would suppose the controversy involved in some of the questions that might be asked, I think it behooves us and the members of the staff to do everything we can not to put the Senate and one of the committees in a light of trying to resort to some kind of illegal tactics or something out of the normal procedure.

I fear that we have done this.

Mr. SOURWINE. I should like to assure the Senator on the record that, while I fully recognize what he says, that the subcommittee is in this light, it is not as a result of anything that counsel did or that was deliberately done by any member of the subcommittee staff, nor was it the intention of the Chair. The matter has been handled routinely. I had not anticipated that there would be any trouble over this hearing. And I had no reason to believe Mr. Carmichael would attempt to make any, and he clearly has not attempted to make any. And I renew my apology, sir.

Senator BAYH. It is not necessary to apologize. I just want to try to get a ground rule here and stick to it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I will try to see that this problem never arises again if I can avoid it.

Senator THURMOND. You may proceed.

Senator Bayh, do you have any other statement?

Senator BAYH. No; I just got a call from the leader, and I have to go on the floor.

How long do you think you will be?

Mr. SOURWINE. I think we should be through within an hour.

Senator BAYH. I will ask my staff man to stay here, and I will try to return.

Senator THURMOND. You may proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Just for the record, you are Stokely Carmichael?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes, I am.

Mr. SOURWINE. And your name is S-t-o-k-e-l-y?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is a name which unfortunately is much misspelled.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I think that it is a British name. I have no control over that.

Mr. SOURWINE. No, sir. My own name is frequently misspelled, and I have no control over that.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. The name was given to my forefather when he was a slave taken from Africa by Europeans.

Mr. SOURWINE. I was not making any comment adversely upon the name, only upon the people who constantly misspell it. I am glad to see it set straight in this record.

You were born in Trinidad?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When, sir?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. June 1941, according to the records, and my mother.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are a naturalized citizen of the United States?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I am.

Mr. SOURWINE. Naturalized in New York City in 1954?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you are a graduate of Howard University?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was your degree?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I received a B.A. majoring in philosophy. I did work in political science, and I did work in sociology. I carried a double major and a minor in history. And I was an honor student.

Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you. Do you have any graduate degrees?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Not officially.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are not a man of independent wealth, are you?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I would rather take the first and the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am sorry, I meant nothing by that question except to lead up to this one. Did you work your way through school? You made your own way through school by your own efforts, did you not?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I received several scholarships.

Mr. SOURWINE. You earned your scholarships?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is all I am trying to get on the record.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I didn't understand you.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am sorry.

May I say something off the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator THURMOND. Yes; off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Since 1960, Mr. Carmichael, have you had opportunity on several occasions to travel outside the United States?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes, I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you mind telling us, just briefly, approximately when, to the year, if you remember, and where you went on these trips?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I would rather plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Carmichael, have you ever been connected with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I would rather plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you currently connected with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I would plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us if you were ever connected with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes, I was.

Mr. SOURWINE. In what position, sir?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. In different capacities. I served as field organizer, particularly in Mississippi and Sunflower County, where Senator James O. Eastland is from. My job then was to organize my people, Africans living in the United States here who were constitutionally denied the right to vote, even though they had the basic right to vote, to organize them and try to bring them into a broadening political modernization so that they would be entitled to the right to vote.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever become a principal officer of SNCC?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes, I did. And I moved up and became chairman of the organization.

Mr. SOURWINE. You would, then, be in a position to know whether that organization was at any time infiltrated by members of the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Well, it would depend. Is there some way that I can identify—

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not holding you responsible for knowing all about everybody who ever joined SNCC.

Mr. Chairman, may I strike the last question?

Let me ask a more direct question.

During the time that you were the head of SNCC, and prior thereto, did you ever have any personal knowledge of an attempt to infiltrate the organization by the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have been called the organizer of the Black Panther organization, is that correct?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you had any connection with the Black Panther organization?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you in a position to tell us anything about the source of funds used by the Black Panther organization?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever been in Puerto Rico?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes, I have been in Puerto Rico.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you go to Puerto Rico, sir?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I am not quite sure, but I think it might have been in January or February of 1967, although I would say that I am not quite sure.

Mr. SOURWINE. How long were you there, approximately?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I don't think I spent more than 3 days in Puerto Rico.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have knowledge of any connection between the Communist-oriented Movimiento Pro Independencia, the MPI, the so-called Independence Movement of Puerto Rico, and any organizations in the United States?

Mr. MOORE. Would you repeat that question, Mr. Sourwine?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, I will ask it again perhaps in better form.

Do you have any knowledge of any connection between the so-called Independence Movement, the MPI Party of Puerto Rico, and any organization in the United States?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. It is impossible for me to answer such a question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know what the Movimiento Pro Independencia is, the MPI Party in Puerto Rico?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I don't know what type of organization it is. There are a lot of organizations—for example, I am invited here by this committee. I do not know the internal workings of the committee, et cetera, so I could not answer the question.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have not formed an alliance with this committee either, have you?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I personally formed an alliance?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Senator BAYH. Mr. Sourwine, by that do you mean a public declaration of sympathy and support?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Or do you mean kind of private, informal arrangement?

Mr. SOURWINE. Counsel will withdraw the question and apologize for asking it. There was a slight amount of frivolity in the question, and I should not have asked the question, because the subcommittee is aware of the relationship between itself and the witness, and I have no right to try to inject levity into this proceeding.

The question is whether you know of the existence of the MPI in Puerto Rico?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes, I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever have any dealings with the MPI or its representatives?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I was invited by the MPI to Puerto Rico to speak, as I am invited here to this committee to speak.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Mario Sanchez Martinez Robell?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I cannot answer, because it has been such a long time, and because I do so much movement, I meet so many people, it is very hard for me to remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. Again, I am not trying to trap you, nor am I trying to state as a fact that the committee has information to the effect that these two named individuals are representatives of the MPI and that you did meet them and deal with them while you were in Puerto Rico. Does this help to refresh your recollection?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. You must remember that I was in Puerto Rico in 1967. That is a few years ago.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is correct.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Since that time I have met literally thousands of people.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not criticizing you for your memory, I am only asking you for the fact. If you cannot remember you cannot remember.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I cannot remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right.

Are you aware that on the eve of your visit to Puerto Rico in January 1967 the chairman of the MPI—he made this declaration in January just before your visit.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I did go in February.

Mr. SOURWINE. Apparently you did go in February.

Juan Mari Bras, the chairman of the MPI, declared:

Just as imperialism uses Puerto Rico as a bridgehead for its penetration into Latin America, so will the MPI offer itself as a bridge over which world revolution can penetrate into the United States.

Now, remember the question is only, did you know he said this? I am not saying this is true, or that you said it.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. No, I did not hear that statement.

Mr. SOURWINE. I will advise the Chair for the record, it is the information of the subcommittee that public records indicate that Mr. Juan Mari Bras did say this. And on this basis I will ask the witness, do you have any idea what he was driving at?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I never heard the statement.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not saying that you should know—

Mr. CARMICHAEL. If I don't know the statement, then I don't know what it means.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever meet Juan Mari Bras?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I think I did. You said he was the chairman.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, he was the chairman of the MPI.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Then I imagine in functionary procedures when I arrived I would have met him.

Mr. SOURWINE. You and he signed a joint pact of alliance between SNCC and the Independence Movement of Puerto Rico, did you not, at the airport in San Juan?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I would plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. I will state for the record, Mr. Chairman, that a detailed memorandum with respect to that pact of alliance will be found in the hearing record of part 19 of "The Communist Threat to the United States Through the Caribbean," beginning at page 1365. We are asking Mr. Carmichael about it now because it is the first opportunity we have had since we learned of the existence of the pact.

Mr. Carmichael—

Mr. MOORE. Could we see it?

Mr. SOURWINE. I do not have a copy of it here, sir, but I could surely get it for you.

Mr. MOORE. Could someone get it while the proceeding is going on?

Mr. SOURWINE. We will send you a copy of part 19 of "The Communist Threat to the United States Through the Caribbean."

Mr. Carmichael, did you know in Puerto Rico a Norman Pietri Castellon, who was at the time of your visit to Puerto Rico the head of the University Students for Independence, the Federacion Pietri Castellon of Puerto Rico?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. What was the question? Whether I know him or not him?

Mr. SOURWINE. Simply whether you knew him, whether you remember knowing him.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I cannot remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you remember whether you signed a joint pact of an alliance with the head of UPI, the University Students For Independence?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I plead the fifth.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember meeting Juan Pedro Rua?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I do not remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. I show you a picture of yourself and Mr. Rua—unfortunately it is not a very good picture of him—as printed in the National Guardian of February 4, 1967. Does that refresh your recollection?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. The picture speaks for itself. And I still cannot see the face.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is correct; the surroundings are there, however, and the question is if that refreshes your recollection of having met him?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. If that is the man, then I am speaking to him. It does not mean that I know him, because I speak to many people. There are many pictures in the papers, for example, where people are asking me questions. It does not mean that I have met them personally.

Mr. SOURWINE. I see.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. It looks to me like it was in some sort of a dancing club, doesn't it?

Mr. SOURWINE. I was not there, and I cannot testify to it at all.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I see a jukebox in the background.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is a fairly short article. Would you do us the courtesy of glancing at the article and seeing if there is any comment that you would like to make about it. It mentions you.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I have no comments to make on it.

Shall I read the whole article?

Mr. SOURWINE. If you wish.

Have you read it all now?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Still no comment?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Still no comment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this for the record as the article that was shown to the witness.

Senator THURMOND. Without objection it will be admitted.

(The article referred to follows:)

[National Guardian, Feb. 4, 1967]

CARMICHAEL AT SAN JUAN—PUERTO RICAN AND U.S. NEGRO STRUGGLES LINKED

(By William A. Price)

The struggle by Negroes for black power in the U.S. has been joined with the fight by Puerto Rican militants for the independence of that island commonwealth. In a "protocol of cooperation" signed Jan. 26 at the San Juan, P.R., International Airport, Stokely Carmichael, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and Juan Mari Bras, head of the Movement for Puerto Rican Independence (MPI), said their organizations are "in the vanguard of a common struggle against U.S. imperialism." Supporting the joint effort is the Student Federation for Independence in Puerto Rico.

In New York Jan. 27 SNCC stated: "The three organizations affirmed the need for a joint struggle against the political, economic, social and cultural oppression inflicted upon Afro-American and Puerto Rican peoples by the U.S. Just as black power signifies a struggle for liberation and the control of Afro-American communities by black people, the independence struggle in Puerto Rico is for control by Puerto Ricans of their own lives and the wealth of the country. Black people constitute a colony within the U.S.; Puerto Rico is a colony outside the U.S."

Signing of the protocol followed a street clash in Santurce, Jan. 25, when Carmichael headed a column of 200 advocates of Puerto Rican independence on a six-mile march from the University of Puerto Rico to a U.S. military installation at Fort Brooke. The group carried signs opposing "Yankee military service," and calling for independence. One sign read in Spanish, "We Support Black Power in the U.S." The group was attacked by about 60 youths who threw eggs, shouted and started fist fights. Carmichael, dressed in blue jeans and wearing a Puerto Rican straw hat, was surrounded by his student followers to protect him until a police cordon separated the two groups.

The joint communique issued in San Juan reflects a growing trend among militant black groups in the U.S. to identify their struggle with that of oppressed colored peoples in other parts of the world and to view the plight of the rural Southern Negro and the Northern urban ghetto dweller as that of victims of a similar domestic, internal colonialism. At a Jan. 24 press conference in San Juan, Carmichael said: "Brothers, we see our struggle linked to the struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America against foreign oppression, particularly by the U.S. We all have the same enemy. For this reason, we strongly support your just struggle for independence. For this reason we support all peoples who are struggling for self-determination."

Another issue joins the black-power advocates of the U.S. and Puerto Ricans who call for independence—joint resistance to the draft. Legal tests have been instituted by many Puerto Rican youths who contend that the U.S. has no authority to induct for its military service men who have no vote in Congress and only limited autonomy over the internal affairs of their island under the present commonwealth status of Puerto Rico. In San Juan, Carmichael said the U.S. "tells us that we are going to fight for a so-called 'democracy,' but we know the hypocrisy of that claim. We know, in our own flesh and in our blood, what 'American democracy' means . . . If we are to fight, we will fight—but in our own country, to liberate our people."

The three organizations supporting the San Juan protocol agreed, according to the SNCC Jan. 27 statement, upon the following:

(1) Joint action against the draft in particular, and the American war in Vietnam in general, to be carried out by Afro-Americans and Puerto Ricans in the urban ghettos of this country.

(2) Joint action for better housing, education, and living conditions generally in the urban ghettos, as well as against police brutality.

(3) Joint action to bring international focus to the problems of the Afro-Americans and to the Puerto Rican struggle for independence.

SNCC said it had agreed to aid MPI's efforts to raise the "colonial" case of Puerto Rico at the United Nations during its current session. MPI and the Puerto Rican student independence group (SUPI) have agreed, SNCC said, to help raise before the UN the case of Afro-Americans in the U.S. "The question will be raised there," SNCC said, "not as a domestic issue, but as a matter of concern to humanity; not as a question of civil rights but of human rights."

Both SNCC and New York-based Puerto Rican independence groups will demonstrate against the planned U.S. visit of Brazilian President-elect Artur Costa y Silva who, SNCC said, represents a military dictatorship in his country, supports an economic policy maintained on the poverty of millions and has said he will seek U.S. military aid to put down "so-called 'external subversion'" which, in effect, means armed suppression of movements working for basic changes to benefit "the impoverished of Brazil."

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Carmichael, this news story on which you have declined to comment indicates that you did participate in the signing of a so-called protocol of cooperation with one Juan Mari Bras, the head of the Movement for Independence of Puerto Rico.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I don't—

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not arguing with you, believe me; I do not say that by way of argument. Do you care to tell us whether it is true that this protocol stated that the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the MPI were united "in the vanguard of a common struggle against U.S. imperialism"?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. The protocol speaks for itself. But I would say that I never take newspaper articles as authorities, because myself having been in the public, I know how they misquote either maliciously, or it is sometimes impossible for a journalist to get all of it, and it puts down what he thinks is said. I have heard statements over the radio or television by journalists, and I am sometimes shocked as to what they say I have said. So I never accept newspaper articles as authorities.

Mr. SOURWINE. (Handing document to Mr. Moore.) That newspaper article was page 1365.

Mr. Carmichael, when you went to Cuba in 1967 did you go as a representative of an organization or organizations, or just as a private citizen?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Sourwine, in the information that you referred me to at page 1365 of part 19 of the hearing of November 27, "The Communist Threat to the United States Through the Caribbean, Violence in Puerto Rico," I do not see the pact. You referred in your question to a pact—

Mr. SOURWINE. I referred to a memorandum with respect to it that you will find beginning on that page, if my notes are correct.

Mr. MOORE. But it does not show the signing of it. This is something from the testimony of a fellow by the name of Tarabochia.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Tarabochia is sitting across the table from you, Mr. Moore, right here.

I am sorry, I do not see the point of this information. What are you trying to get at, sir?

Mr. MOORE. I would like for the record to indicate that you have given or provided to me—is this my copy or do you have to return it?

Mr. SOURWINE. It is yours.

Mr. MOORE. You have given to me at my request part 19 of the hearings, "The Communist Threat to the United States Through the Caribbean."

Mr. SOURWINE. That is right. I did so because you asked it after I had offered for this record and accepted a statement that a reference, to wit, a memorandum with respect to the subject matter, began at that point in that article. There has been no misrepresentation, I am sure.

Mr. MOORE. I was under the impression, however, that the memorandum or pact had actually been made a part of the record, and would show the signers of the pact.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am sorry you were under that impression when it is not so.

Mr. MOORE. Thank you for the copy.

Senator THURMOND. You may proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember the question? I will be glad to ask it again.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Ask it again.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you went to Cuba in 1967 did you go as a representative of any organization?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I plead the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who financed your trip to Havana in 1967, Mr. Carmichael?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Carmichael, have you engaged in any propaganda activities in behalf of Fidel Castro or the Communist government of Cuba?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever made use of the facilities of Radio Havana?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you the Stokely Carmichael who attended the first Latin American Solidarity Organization Conference in Havana from the 31st of July to August 8 of 1967?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Carmichael, in the meeting of the Latin American Solidarity Organization in Havana on July 20, 1967, a Columbia delegate named Manuel Cepeda Vargas presented a report from the organizing committee which, in making reference to what it called the struggle of North American Negroes, stated that they were brothers within the movement who were united by a common cause, and emphasized that the organizing committee contemplated the possibility of inviting a few Negro leaders from the United States, and made mention of Stokely Carmichael as one person to be so invited. Were you in fact invited to attend that conference?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Which conference is that?

Mr. SOURWINE. The first conference of the Latin American Solidarity Organization in Havana on July 20, 1967.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I really don't know. I will have to take the fifth amendment for my own protection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Carmichael, I will tell you that the Latin American Solidarity Organization Conference in Havana was inaugurated on July 31, 1967, at 9:45 p.m., by a speech delivered by the then President of Cuba, Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado. Immediately after that inaugural speech there was a meeting of the heads of delegations for the election of officers. "Che" Guevara was elected honorary president. And at that same meeting Stokely Carmichael was elected honorary delegate. Did you know in advance that this was going to happen?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will have to plead the fifth on that, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you first learn of this—that is, of your election as honorary delegate to the Latin American Solidarity Organization Conference in Havana?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Carmichael, did you address the plenary inaugural session of the Latin American Solidarity Organization Conference in Havana on August 1, 1967?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. That particular session of the conference, that is, on August 1, 1967, was dedicated to the Vietnamese people. According to reports of the conference, the session was addressed by five other delegates and 11 observers. Can you name for the subcommittee's records any of these five other delegates and 11 observers who spoke that evening?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will have to plead the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. In the next day's session of the conference in Havana, that is, on August 2, did you address the conference again?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you went to Havana in 1967 did anyone go with you?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is there any reason, Mr. Carmichael, why your association with George Ware, Julius Lester, and Elizabeth Martinez Sutherland, or any of them, would tend to incriminate you in any way?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. It has been reported that on July 31, 1967, in Havana you and George Ware and Julius Lester held a joint press conference. Is that correct?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you tell us whether you know George Ware?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes; I knew Mr. Ware.

Mr. SOURWINE. I see you used the past tense. Is he no longer with us; is he no longer alive?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I don't know; he might be dead.

Mr. SOURWINE. I see. At the time you knew him who was he? What was his connection? How would you identify him?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. He was a member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. I have forgotten his exact title.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Julius Lester?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes; I knew Mr. Lester.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did he hold a similar office in the SNCC?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I think he was the photographer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did either of those individuals go to Cuba with you in 1967?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. It has been reported, sir—and I want to give you an opportunity to speak to the point of whether it was reported accurately—that at a press conference on July 31, 1967, in Havana, held jointly by you, George Ware, and Julius Lester, you said, "When the United States has 50 Vietnams inside and 50 outside, this would be equivalent to the death of imperialism." Did you make that statement?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. The Cuban publication Granma in its issue of August 2, 1967, published a letter dated the preceding day—that is, August 1, 1967—purporting to have been signed by you, which was addressed to "Our Comrades in the Struggle Against Imperialism and Racism."

Did you write such a letter, Mr. Carmichael?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth. Was it in Spanish? Although I took Spanish I don't speak Spanish very well.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am practically not informed. Your question, was it in Spanish? would appear to imply that you do not remember writing such a letter. Is that the fact?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I plead the fifth.

Mr. SOURWINE. It has been reported, sir, that in an interview which you gave to Radio Havana on August 4, 1967, you stated,

and I quote—I am not purporting to question you, only to quote what it has been reported you said—“We have been forced to employ guerrilla warfare.” Do you remember making such a statement on such an occasion?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you yourself ever employ or participate in guerrilla warfare?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. In the August 13, 1967, issue of the publication *Verde Olivo*, the official publication of the Cuban Armed Forces you were quoted as having said, “I will feel proud to be a member of the Cuban Armed Forces.” Did you really say that?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever become a member of the Cuban Armed Forces?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever have—

Senator THURMOND. What period are you referring to when you ask him whether he ever became a member of the Cuban Armed Forces?

Mr. SOURWINE. “Ever” covers the period of his lifetime down to the present.

Senator THURMOND. Did he plead the amendment on that?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Senator THURMOND. Do you want to ask him from 1967 on?

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, sir, in 1967 become a member of the Cuban Armed Forces?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I would plead the fifth amendment.

Senator THURMOND. I would like to ask you this question. Have you been a member of the Cuban Armed Forces between January 1967 up to date?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Carmichael, did you ever have a private conversation with Fidel Castro?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you were in Hanoi in the fall of 1967 what officials of the North Vietnamese Government did you meet?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever perform any services for the Government of Hanoi?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Carmichael, 4 years ago you were quoted as having said in August 1966 in Harlem, N. Y., that, “They are building stores with no windows in Cleveland.” Were you correctly quoted?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were further quoted as saying on that same occasion, “It just means we will have to move from Molotov cocktails to dynamite.”

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were further quoted as saying, “If we had any sense we would have bombed those ghettos long ago.”

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Carmichael, it is inconceivable truly that you ever wanted to bomb any ghettos or urged anybody to bomb any ghettos. Don't you want to deny that you did?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am sorry, sir.

According to a report, sir, you stated in Havana, "We are going to start with guns to get our liberation. Our only answer is to destroy the Government or to be destroyed." Did you really say that?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you were in Peking in the People's Republic of China in August of 1967 did you see a friend of yours in the government compound maintained for the American colony?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Can you repeat that question, please?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, I will rephrase it. When you were in Peking in China in August of 1967 did you go to visit a friend in the American colony?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Anna Louise Strong?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I am not sure. My attorney was just trying to bring me up to date on that. I am not sure.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Robert F. Williams?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes; I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you visit Mr. Williams several times in Peking during August of 1967?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I will plead the fifth amendment on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you visit the People's Republic of China at any time?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Excuse me.

Does the Chairman wish us to proceed without his presence?

Mr. SOURWINE. The Chairman has got to go to a rollcall.

Mr. MOORE. Would it be possible for Mr. Sourwine to proceed in your absence?

Senator THURMOND. Either way you would like to.

Mr. SOURWINE. I cannot substitute for a Senator, Mr. Chairman. So we are necessarily temporarily suspended.

(At this point in the hearing a short recess was taken.)

AFTER RECESS

Senator THURMOND. The subcommittee will resume.

You may proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. During the recess, Mr. Chairman, I gave Mr. Carmichael a document of some 14 single-spaced typewritten pages.

Did you have an opportunity to complete it?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. No, I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. This purports to be, Mr. Carmichael, a copy of a broadcast report with respect to statements made by you in the course of an interview given by you in Havana, Cuba, to one Mario Menendez, editor of the Mexican magazine *Sucesos*. Do you recall having given such an interview?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I plead the fifth.

Mr. SOURWINE. From the portion of this document that you were able to read, are there any comments that you care to make with respect to it?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. None whatsoever.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you want to have it back to complete the reading of it?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Without objection, I ask for the admission of this document.

Senator THURMOND. Without objection, it is received for the record.

(The document referred to appears in the appendix, p. 21.)

Mr. MOORE. Will you provide us with a copy?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, I will.

Mr. MOORE. May I have copies of these other articles?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. Do you want copies of everything that was offered for the record today?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. Surely. You have been furnished with a copy of the hearing record.

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. So you want the Guardian article and this broadcast report?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Carmichael, did you visit the People's Republic in 1966?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Robert F. Williams?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Yes, I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you last see him?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you first establish a relationship with the Castro government of Cuba?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I plead the fifth amendment, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever receive funds or fees or compensation from the Government of Cuba?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I plead the fifth amendment, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any knowledge, Mr. Carmichael, of plans for guerrilla warfare in the United States?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I plead the fifth amendment, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you give the subcommittee any information about stocks or stores or caches of guns or ammunition or explosives?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I don't know anything about that, so it would be impossible for me to give you any information.

Mr. SOURWINE. I understand. Thank you for answering the question.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I have been out of the country for 14 months.

Mr. SOURWINE. I understand.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. And I have been studying very hard.

Mr. SOURWINE. There is much concern in the United States today over bombings. Can you give the subcommittee any advice on what might be done to deter this type of violence?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Of course, I have just returned to the country, and I have been picking up only the information I get on television and the news.

Mr. SOURWINE. We understand.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I do not know who is responsible for the bombing, or what their grievances are. However, I could say historically, though, that as long as there is injustice I am sure people will find ways to

demonstrate their grievances. If people are really concerned about stopping violence, they should insure justice. And if justice were assured, I am sure violence would stop.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you give the subcommittee any information about the importation into this country of narcotics?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I am afraid I could not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever belonged to an organization which you knew or had reason to believe was controlled by Communists?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Sourwine, when is an organization controlled by Communists?

Mr. SOURWINE. Since I said "which you know or had reason to believe was controlled by Communists," the question called for a subjective answer from his own mind, whatever answer he gives is the answer. I am not charging that he ever was so connected.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, for me to have a clear definition of "Communist"? Because I am not quite sure I understand the term.

Mr. SOURWINE. For the purposes of the question, "Communist" would mean a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. How are these people identified? For example, anyone in this room—

Mr. SOURWINE. They are frequently not identifiable, that is the problem; all you can ask a person is if he knows it. Mr. A might be associating with Mr. B for years, and Mr. B might be a Communist, and Mr. A might not know it.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. So then it is impossible.

Mr. SOURWINE. All you can do is ask Mr. A if he did know.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I see. So these people are not identifiable?

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to find out if you know any. We always ask a question of this nature to a person who is engaged in organizational activity on a wide basis.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. For example, when I was in college in political philosophy courses I did much reading on philosophy of political systems around the world. I covered in my course capitalism, socialism, communism, fascism, et cetera. I know I have a working definition of Communists—that is, a theoretical definition. Of course, these definitions are not usually the same ones applied on a practical basis.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am talking on a practical basis, meaning a conspirator, a servant of the international Communist conspiracy, a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. I do not mean just Marxist-Leninist.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. Then we are working from two different definitions, because I do not know any conspirators, et cetera.

Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you, sir.

Have you ever received any money directly or indirectly from a source known to you to be controlled by or connected with the Communist Party, U.S.A.?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. That would follow from the first question, obviously.

Mr. SOURWINE. I agree. And I do not argue the point. I simply make it on the record.

Can you tell us the present whereabouts of Mr. Eldridge Cleaver?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. The last time I saw Mr. Cleaver was in July in Algiers.

Mr. SOURWINE. In Algiers. Thank you.

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I was the guest of the Organization of African Unity for a conference they had on the Pan-African Festival, and an intellectual festival on the relationship of culture on the African Continent.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any knowledge or information with respect to any link between Puerto Rican terrorists and these bombings which have taken place in the United States?

Mr. CARMICHAEL. I do not know any Puerto Rican terrorists.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no more questions of this witness, Mr. Chairman.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you. That will complete the hearing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then, will we stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair?

Senator THURMOND. Thank you for your attendance.

The subcommittee will stand adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 12:25 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.)

APPENDIX

(Subsequent to the hearing, the following article was submitted for the record:)

[From the Daily World, March 24, 1970]

STOKELY LAUDS THE EARNEST REVOLUTION

(by Tom Foley)

NEW YORK, March 23.—Stokely Carmichael told a benefit meeting for African liberation movements in New York City's Town Hall on Sunday that "those who understand the need for revolution are the quietest. You can't go around yelling and shouting, you have to be serious. Because revolution is serious."

Carmichael, who has been studying in Africa with President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana (now in exile in Guinea), told a cheering audience: "This generation is the one which will bring liberation to black people all over the world."

The meeting was dedicated to the memory of those Africans killed by South African police at Sharpeville on March 21, 1960. It was sponsored by the American Committee on Africa. The program included Abdulrahim Abby Farah, Somalia's United Nation's ambassador, chairman of the special U.N. committee on apartheid, who spoke on the meaning of Sharpeville.

Bethuel Setai of the African National Congress and Peter Molotsi of the Pan Africanist Congress both spoke as representatives of South African liberation movements. Dennis Brutus, a South African poet and chairman of the South African Non-Racial Organizing Committee, read several of his poems written while imprisoned on Robbin Island, the apartheid regime's "Devil's Island."

Stars of the evening were two South African singers, Letta Mbulu and Miriam Makeba. Miss Makeba, who is Carmichael's wife, wowed the audience with songs from South Africa, Zimbabwe and the U.S. Letta Mbulu drew an enthusiastic response, especially when she sang the South African song, "Yumbel" ("Let's Get Together").

EXCERPTS OF UNDATED RECORDED INTERVIEW GIVEN BY STOKELY CARMICHAEL TO MARIO MENENDEZ, EDITOR OF MEXICAN MAGAZINE SUCESOS, DURING CARMICHAEL'S STAY IN HAVANA

Question. What is the students nonviolent coordinating committee?

Answer. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee is the organization for which I work and a group of young black people in the United States who decided to come together to fight racial and economic exploitation.

Question. When and why was it founded?

Answer. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee was founded in 1960 by a group of young black students who felt the need to come together and actively fight against racial segregation in the United States. They came together because they felt the older organizations were not doing an effective job and were not actively participating. Most of them were taking their troubles to the courts and we felt that you could not take a problem of injustice by some white people to black people to the courts if those courts were again all white. You were taking an unjust problem to the people who themselves were unjust.

It could not be solved that way. The only way to solve it was in the streets. We used the name nonviolent because at that time Martin Luther King was the central figure of the black struggle and he was still preaching nonviolence, and anyone who talked about violence at that time was considered treasonable—

amounting—to treason, so we decided that we would use the name nonviolent, but in the meantime we knew our struggle was not about to be nonviolent, but we would just wait until the time was right for the actual (word indistinct) name. We came together, we would coordinate activities between the students wherever we would have a nonviolent demonstration.

But after 1 year many of us decided that demonstrations were not the answer. The only answer was organizing our people. So we moved into the worst State, Mississippi, and began to organize our people to fight, and we're now at the front where we are encouraging people to pick up arms and fight back.

Question. What are the political, social, and economic goals pursued by your organization?

Answer. Politically, we want black people inside the United States to be free of oppression. We also want the peoples of the third world to be free from oppression particularly Africa, Asia, and Latin America. We see that our freedom, our liberation, depends on these people and vice versa, their liberation depends on us, so we must wage the same struggle.

Politically speaking (words indistinct) inside the United States we want the right to politically control the communities in which we live. Inside the United States we cannot do that. The communities in which we live, which they call ghettos, are politically controlled by whites. So in a real sense, we're colonials inside the United States, just like colonials in Latin American countries, or I would say probably all the Latin American countries, with the exception of Cuba, are controlled politically from the outside by the United States. They are now colonies on the outside. But politically, we would seek to free those colonies of any political intervention from the outside.

Economically speaking, we want our people to be able to enjoy a life and to get all the things they need to have a decent life without having to struggle as hard as they now do because they're economically exploited by the imperialist power structure of the United States, just as the colonies outside are economically able to divide those resources among the people of the—backward—communities. We do not want to set up, for example, a black capitalist system. We want to economically destroy capitalism because capitalism goes hand in hand with racism and exploitation. Wherever capitalism has gone, those two characteristics are sure to follow, racism and exploitation, so we must destroy the capitalistic system which enslaves us on the inside and the people of the third world on the outside.

Socially, I guess we want what most people want out of life, where we could have people who are happy and who are free and who can live a life (? better) than they now live and who could make the decisions and participate in decisions that affect their lives, and that they would never feel ashamed of the color of their skin or ashamed of their culture. In order for capitalism to exist it must make the people they conquer, make them feel ashamed of themselves, ashamed of their culture. And what we want to do is to make our people not ashamed (word indistinct) so that they can feel that they're equal to anybody else, psychologically, physically, and morally.

Question. What are the relations between the colored people of the North and the South, especially, and in the whole United States of America?

Answer. The Black people who are living in the North are first generation people; that is to say, it is the first generation of Black people that have been born in the North. Most of the people in the North migrated from the South right after World War II. They migrated from the South because racial discrimination was the (worst) and most brutal in the South and they were told that in the North people didn't care about the color of your skin. It didn't matter. You could get an opportunity and good job if you just worked hard.

And we believed that nonsense and packed up our bags and went north. But what we found when we got north was that life was the same. So the (word indistinct) that we found in the North was that there's nowhere in the United States where you can go under the capitalistic system and enjoy a decent way of life. So that you have now people who do not have hope in any of the legal systems (words indistinct). So that the relationship has become very strong because the people from the South no longer look to the North as an escape, and we now see that the only way that we're going to get out of our, of the capitalistic system, and get our liberation is that both of us join hands and see ourselves as one people.

What you have now across the United States is a feeling of solidarity among Black people wherever we are, and our saying is that when they touch one, they

have to touch all. That saying is more than a slogan because it now has meaning. Every time a racist police dog shoots one of us they have to fight the entire city, and now it is not only one city, they have to fight entire cities, so the Black feeling of solidarity is very, very near.

Question. Some persons think the Negroes in the United States only think of the fight as a racial conflict against the whites instead of interpreting the case as a class struggle. What do you have to say on this matter?

Answer. Well, that's very, very important, because inside the United States the racism is so strong it is almost impossible to get white people to struggle with them, and there are many reasons for that. Most of the poor whites, the white working class in the United States, when they organize, their fight is never a fight for the redistribution of land. Their fight is a fight for more money. All they want is more money. They do not have any concept of the distribution of wealth because they are so capitalistic in their own approach. So what happens is that the ruling class of America then begins to exploit other countries in the third world and make more money. When they get more of those profits, they share those profits with the white working class.

But the ruling class never cuts down on its profits. It makes more, as a matter of fact. Once it begins to share its profits with the working class, the working class becomes part and parcel of the capitalistic system and they enjoy blood money. They enjoy the money that is exploiting other people, so that they are then incapable of fighting the very system, because they become a part of it by accepting the blood money. So it's hard to develop a white working class revolutionary consciousness. What you have then is white people who are fighting to save their money.

For example, that is why you cannot find white working class people in the United States who oppose the war in Vietnam, because it is from the war in Vietnam that they enjoy the living that they do, and the luxuries that they enjoy. If they opposed the war in Vietnam, they would be smashing the system. Unfortunately, they do not recognize that, if they smashed that system, they could build a better system for themselves, but they are so afraid of giving up the dollars that they now have, that they hang onto it and they wage the fight to keep the system going. So that what you do have at this point, unfortunately, is black people waging the fight and interpreting it as a black-white struggle, which it does, in fact, become, because the white working class begins to attack us, because they are afraid that we will destroy their way of living.

The only way, we feel, to develop white working class revolutionary consciousness is when the United States begins to lose its profits that it gets from around the third world. Once she begins to lose that and her profits are cut down and she must begin to turn inside for the way of life, then and only then will the white working class develop a revolutionary consciousness. So what that means is that at this time we will struggle. We would like white working class people to struggle with us. Whether they do or do not, it doesn't make any difference; we will struggle. When they finally join the fight, we will welcome them, but until that time we will struggle.

And another reason why it is (? so) is because the white ruling class in America recognizes Marx's concept of the inevitable class conflict which will come about. In order to avoid an inevitable class conflict in the United States they began to exploit the third world and to bring the money from the third world into the United States and share it with the working class, so now what you have is they have just postponed the inevitable class conflict. What you have now developed around the world is that the third world has become the proletariat and the white Western society has become the bourgeoisie. So that when you have lines drawn along lines of color, it is also class because of the way white Western society has itself incorporated most of its working class. That is precisely what Europe did when she sat down and divided up Africa and Latin America. She avoided inside her countries the inevitable class conflict. But that cannot be postponed any more; the confrontation is here.

And finally, I think that what people outside the United States recognize is that unlike any other people, we were the only people who were made slaves inside the continent of the people who were exploiting us. Other people were slaves in their own countries, so that when they fought they could develop a nationalistic concept as a point of unity to come together. We were brought inside the United States, which is the most vicious thing that the United States could have done. So we cannot develop a nationalistic concept. Our concept must be around our

color, because it was our color around which they decided to make us slaves. So that our color is in a sense our nationality because what the white man has done is just follow Africa. He has spread black people all across from Africa (? clear) on to the United States, through the Caribbean into Cuba, into Brazil, all the way up through South America, and finally into the United States, and we're just (? planted) all over these countries without any nationality.

Now, in Cuba the African has a concept of nationality because they were exploited along with the whites in Cuba. So they called themselves Afro-Cubans and can feel a part of the Cuban system, especially since the revolution. Unfortunately, for us inside the United States that cannot be done because for 400 years we have been the victims of brutal fascism and no white man has ever come to our defense, really defense, except John Brown. All of the others talk, they talk, but none of them are actually willing to fight to destroy the system of which they are a part.

Question. What relations exist between the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Movement for Independence of Puerto Rico? How do you see the interrelation between the struggle of the Puerto Rican people for their independence and the fight of the Negroes in the United States? How do you see the fight of the Negro people of the United States of America as they help the Puerto Rican, and the unity between the two organizations?

Answer. Now, Brother Malcolm taught us that we must internationalize our struggle. In an effort to follow some of his teachings, we started with Puerto Rico; we started with Puerto Rico for many reasons. No. 1, it is very close to the United States in terms of geographic position. No. 2, it is a real colony of the United States in every sense. And thirdly, a large number of people who live inside the ghettos of the United States with us are Puerto Ricans.

And what we find happening is that we were fighting Puerto Ricans. Instead of joining hands with our Puerto Rican brothers and fighting the system that oppresses both of us, we were made to fight each other while the white policemen sat around and laughed. So we thought one of the ways to start raising the political consciousness of our people to join hands with the Puerto Ricans was to begin to go externally to the island of Puerto Rico and raise questions of independence. That worked very, very well because prior to this year if the police attacked the Puerto Ricans, blacks would not do anything. As a matter of fact, we were liable to join sides with the police and help beat up the Puerto Ricans. And if a policeman attacked a black man, the Puerto Ricans would not do anything; they would probably join hands with the police and beat us up.

But this year, because we have been able to raise the question and raise the political conscious of both groups, when the police attacked the Puerto Ricans in New York, blacks and Puerto Ricans took to the streets together to fight the police. The same thing happened in Newark, and the same thing is happening in Chicago. So as from that trip we have raised the political conscious and we were able to sit down and bring both groups together and begin to talk about fighting the system that oppresses both of us.

Question. What sort or type of fight will develop in the United States against the imperialist policy? Do you think that the armed way is only way left for the North American people to obtain the Government's to obtain the Government? What is your opinion (replacing) the revolutionary violence with the reactionary violence?

Answer. When we say that we insist, we say very clearly, that the only solution is black revolution and that we're not concerned with peaceful coexistence, armed struggle is the only way, not only for us but for all oppressed people around the world for a number of reasons. People who talk about peaceful coexistence are talking about maintaining the status quo because the only way that you can disrupt an imperialistic system is when you disrupt it by force. You do not disrupt it with talk. That has been crystal clear to us. It has been crystal clear to us, especially, because for 400 years the majority of African-Americans inside the United States have been talking, talking, and talking. And the reason is because when you talk you play the imperialist game. They invented the game of talk, and when you talk, you talk in their language.

But now we have a new game. It's called guerrilla warfare. They cannot play our game and if you want to win a game, you've got to make the rules. If somebody else makes the rules, they'll always win. The imperialists have made the rules of talk, so when you sit down to talk with them you can't possibly win. They'll always find a reason why they can't do this now, or why they can't do it then, and they'll seem very rational and you will sit there and try to reason with them, on their grounds, in their terms, but they can't do that. In the first

place, they have no right to oppress people, so there's no need to talk about oppression. They have absolutely no right to oppress and to exploit anybody else, so to begin to talk about freeing yourself from exploitation and oppression from the people who oppress you, gets to be ridiculous. It's like a slave sitting down with his master and talking to his master about when his master is going to let him go free. That's nonsense. The master has no business enslaving him. So all the slave has to do is get up and kill the master if the master refuses to stop enslaving him. That is the only solution.

So it is crystal clear, as far as we're concerned, armed struggle, that is all, no time for talk. We have talked and talked and talked and talked for too long. You must disrupt the system by any means necessary.

Now, secondly, reactionary violence can be legitimized by people in power. For example, if I were to shoot a man who had slanted eyes, it depends if I shot him in the United States or if I shot him in Vietnam; there would be two different reactions. If I shot 30 men who had slanted eyes in Vietnam, they happened to be Vietnamese, I would get a medal, because I would be in the Army. If I shot 30 people who had slanted eyes, or one person who had slanted eyes, in the United States, in New York, I would get the chair, the electric chair, for murder.

So it's never a question of violence; it's a question of who can legitimize violence, that is all. A policeman can shoot and kill anybody he wants to kill for any reason and go to court and say "I did it in my duty," and they'll let him go. But a man who shoots a policeman is automatically going to jail, so you never discuss violence as far as we're concerned. It is whether or not you can legitimize it.

And the oppressed people of the world must legitimize violence in their own minds as the way to solve their problems. Once they have legitimized violence, then there is no question, there is no answer, it is just a course of taking that which belongs to them. So the reactionaries only stay in power by violence. That's the only way they stay in power, but they legitimize their violence, and they tell everybody else that violence is not the way. Take away the guns from the imperialist forces and see how many people would listen to them. Take away the bases in Santo Domingo, take away the bases in Venezuela, take away the bases in Brazil, take away the bases in Chile, take away the bases all over South America and get the guns out of there and you would see, nobody would listen. But it is because of the guns that people are forced to listen and so the only thing you have to do is to get you some guns and the will to fight, and then, the answer is clear.

For example, we want you to look at people who are pacifists, and all this nonsense about pacifism. The United States, Britain, France, and Russia developed the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb. After they developed the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb, then all four of them got together and said "Let us stop nuclear tests, there will be no more testing of bombs." And everybody was sitting there and falling for this nonsense because they would say to the people "We don't want anymore bombs and if more people would get bombs it would just mean violence." But what they were doing was that they had the bomb and they were stopping other people from developing the bomb. So they were keeping other people unequal. If everybody was to be equal, everybody must have the bomb. That's the only answer. If some people have the bomb and others don't, it is inequality. That is just one example of how the West uses violence as a way to stop other people.

It is crystal clear that the West has developed the best system of weapons that they have, but there is one thing. Weapons can never defeat the will of men to fight and that is precisely where the world is today. The oppressed people have the will to fight and they're fighting the people who oppress them, and they have weapons. A good example of that would be Vietnam where the United States, with all of its weapons, cannot defeat a little nation as small as Vietnam because they have the will to fight and they're willing to fight to the death rather than to let the United States enslave them. That is very important.

And the discussion is never around that, the discussion is of the right of people to defend themselves against aggression. When the United States talked about bombing Cuba and bringing missiles to Cuba, they said that Cuba did not have the right to defend itself. They said that Cuba shouldn't even get antimissiles and the rest of the world was looking at Cuba rather than at the United States because the United States had no business to (? form) aggression inside Cuba, just as they have no business (? forming) aggression inside Vietnam, and what happens is that the people of Vietnam are fighting not only a defensive war but defensive propaganda, in fact they begin to accept that definition.

The people of Vietnam have every right to send a bomb over to the United States and start bombing the United States, that would be a real equality in terms of a fight. That would be real equality, but instead they are now forced to fight a defensive war, and that was the position Cuba was also in with the missiles, they were also fighting a defensive war. And people have been telling me about Debray's book, which I haven't gotten a chance to read yet, "Revolution in Revolution?", is that he points out that we must begin to move beyond defensive wars and I think that's where the next step is for the peoples of the third world, to move beyond defensive wars.

Question. What do you think of guerrilla warfare in the American Continent to obtain its liberation? What do you think of this sort of fight being developed by the colored people in the country and cities of the United States of America?

Answer. It's crystal clear to us that the way the imperialists take everything is by force. The only way it has conquered all the countries here is by force. They have made the Indian population of Cuba, for example, extinct. They took their land, they did that by force. The only way you can get rid of that is by force. The only way to start your force is to start right now by guerrilla warfare. Guerrilla warfare should never be discussed as to whether it's right or wrong. It is the only way. It is the only way to stop exploitation and oppression. To wage a discussion as to whether it is right or wrong is to play the game of the imperialists. When you are waging a war, there is no right, there is no wrong, it is just what you feel is necessary to obtain your goals, and that is what we must understand, those of us who are in the oppressed world.

There is no question, guerrilla warfare is the only way. We will not raise the question of whether it's right or whether it's wrong, we will only raise a tactical question of when we use it. That's the only question we should be concerned with. Guerrilla warfare is where we are moving to in the United States, we are going to develop an urban guerrilla warfare, and we're going to beat them in urban guerrilla warfare, because there is one thing the imperialists do not have. Their men do not have the will to fight. They do not have the will to fight. What they call guerrilla warfare is in fact hand-to-hand combat.

See, their men are cowards. White America is the most cowardly nation in the world. It could send a million troops into Vietnam and they cannot kill the Vietnamese people. The Vietnamese people in hand-to-hand combat would wipe them out. So what they do is they say "in Vietnam they're fighting guerrilla warfare," and you think that guerrilla warfare is dirty, its not clean, its not supposed to be done. And they said, "to beat guerrilla warfare, we will now send men and planes to drop bombs," and nobody questioned "isn't it more disgusting to send a man in a plane who can drop 50 or 60 bombs on defenseless women and children or use napalm and bomb them and burn them to death than to fight them hand-to-hand combat. Which is more honorable?" So that is the question, it is just when we use it. Urban guerrilla warfare is the one way we will beat the United States because they cannot use bombs on us, because we are inside their country. They will have to fight us hand-to-hand combat. We will win, we will win.

The counterpart of that will be in the south, in the country, where we know the land, where we know the terrain, where we have worked it for years, where the white man is in (word indistinct) with sweat from us. He has enjoyed us walking all over the country. Well, we've walked over it so much so that when we take to the hills there, he doesn't know it. He will be unable to find us. We will (?hit him) again, we will be able to beat him again in guerrilla warfare. The only way that you can bring men to their knees is through guerrilla warfare because guerrilla warfare is the one warfare they cannot fight with their big guns and their big bombs. And that is the one place you beat them because they do not have any guts.

Question. What do you think of solidarity between all countries that fight for their liberation?

Answer. It is the only answer. I think that what we do not recognize, or we have not recognized in the past, is that capitalism has become international, and that we are fighting international capitalism. In order to fight international capitalism, you must wage an international fight. What has happened in the past, for example, is that if one nation was struggling everybody wished that nation good luck, but nobody (?served) as part of that same fight. Although they could see that the same countries were oppressing their countries they still didn't make the connection in their minds that that was their common enemy.

What we've done today is that we have made the connection in our minds. We do see a common enemy. So that it is crystal clear to us that we're fighting an international structure that enslaves us all, and the only way we can beat it is to

internationalize our struggle. So you have an international power fighting an international power. That is the only way we can win because if we do what Che says we should do, that is, to create two, three, many Vietnams, we will have them fighting on all fronts at the same time, and they cannot win.

When we isolate the struggle, they can bring all their power on one country. And once they do that, that country is lost, but they cannot fight us all at the same time. So that even if we do not have the same goals, even if we don't have the same ideas, the same political ideology, we have the same common enemy, and that, if nothing else, is what is going to bring us together.

Question. What do you think of the solidarity organization for Asia, Africa, and Latin American countries? What does an organization such as yours expect from the Aalapsol?

Answer. Well, one of the things is that we are now beginning to concretize our relationship with those groups because what we've come to find out is that we must concretize it, we must make it international. So the first thing we want to do is get (to meet) all of the fighters that we read about, to sit down and talk with them and exchange our ideas. Once we've done that we can begin to move together, to plot together how to fight for our liberation.

For example, when they start bombing a country or when they start assassinating a liberation, let's say they assassinate a leader of the liberation struggle. A few months ago, they assassinated Ben Barka. See, what the rest of us, if we had been together, should have done was to take Johnson, or to take De Gaulle, and put a gun to his head and say "if Ben Barka isn't free in 24 hours, De Gaulle is dead, or Johnson is dead, or Harold Wilson is dead." And not many any—but the only way we can do that is to internationalize our struggle, because they have their systems of the CIA and all the other intelligence agencies which are international and work hand in hand with each other, so they can assassinate and bring coups against governments when they begin to move for their liberation. And to protect those governments, for inspiration and aid, we must begin to do the same thing to develop that. So I think that's one of the concrete ways where we can begin to move.

But more importantly is that once we have seized power—as we will—the question is to begin to develop an international system that will not give vent to capitalism, where we can trade with each other based on our needs, on what we need and on what each country has, rather than fight to control the world market where we would set prices for goods by profits and not by needs of humanity. And that is the concept that we must begin to talk more and more about, because we will find out that as we seize power unless we have the spirit, the will, and the intelligence of the leaders in Cuba, most of us will end up the way all other countries that have coups or that seize power end up, they will accept the entire bureaucratic structure that the imperialists have imposed on their countries and will not be able to fight that. So we must begin to do that.

The other thing is that what we must begin to do is to exchange fighters so that we can begin to understand different areas where the imperialists live. For example, we should begin to exchange fighters with people of Africa and Latin America who are fighting for their liberation, and they should begin to exchange with us, so we can work an international system of guerrilla warfare. And, for example, when we start fighting in the United States the real war if there are people from other countries who are willing to come to the United States and help us fight, that's well and good, and we will be willing to do the same.

We will be willing to go and fight because that is what the capitalists do, that is what they do. Whenever one of their countries is in trouble they send aid to help that country. That is clear what happened in Israel. Israel is an imperialist country backed by the imperialist West and when she was in trouble all of them stood behind her and backed her up, including France. Every one of them stood to back her up and what we have to do is recognize that once the fight starts we must be willing to back up the liberation forces too, with our men, because they're willing to back them up with their guns, their money, and their men, and we must begin to do the same.

Question. What do you think of the solidarity organization for Latin America? What does an organization as yours expect from LASO?

Answer. Well, this is the first LASO conference and we are more than honored, happy, and pleased to be here and to be able to share in LASO and to be part of this for many, many reasons. No. 1 is that Latin America is very close to us geographically. Latin America is one of the countries that the United States really exploits. Many Latin Americans come into the United States. So that all of those reasons and the closeness of Latin America makes it a necessity that we begin to move.

The more important, Cuba is part of Latin America, and that the United States really wants to crush Cuba, and Cuba is an inspiration to others, not only to blacks in the United States but to all Latin American countries to begin to struggle and to begin to fight. So that it is fitting and proper that LASO should be held in Cuba and that we should come to show our solidarity, not just by talk but our willingness to put our life on the line for the struggle of Latin America.

We would then want to be able to explain to the Latin American countries what our struggle is about, because their only way of getting an explanation now is from UP and AP which is the controlled communications system of the imperialists. Vice versa, we cannot get any news about the Latin American countries except from UP and AP that is again the controlled system of the imperialists. So that what we get is that there are bandits or there is a group of rebel forces or Communists fighting in Venezuela, or rebel forces took to the streets in Guatemala or Santo Domingo, or Panama. And only through our political awareness to know that those groups are really fighting for their country are we able to read through the lies and the propaganda that is (word indistinct). So, No. 1, it's the first time we've had a chance to meet real people who are fighting for their liberation struggles and begin to explain the ideologies, so we can see where the common ground is and the ideology and understand their struggle and explain to them what our struggle is without getting the propaganda of the imperialist interpreting our struggles to each other. That's the first thing.

The second thing is that concretely we must tie together our struggles, and that is done just by our mere presence. And thirdly, to begin to counteract the OAS, and the mere fact that we have a conference here is already doing that. It will counteract the OAS and begin to minimize its importance in the minds of our peoples, which is very, very important, because the imperialists control the propaganda and can win the minds of our people. And one of the most important fights today is the fight that we win the minds of our people because when we have won the minds of our people there will be no question, they will be ready to fight, and then to begin to work out systems and ways of helping and aiding each other.

Question. What do you think, or have to say, about the guerrilla leaders like Douglas Bravo from Venezuela, Fabio Vasquez from Colombia, Marulanda from Colombia also, Cesar Montes from Guatemala, and the leaders of the Bolivian guerrillas?

Answer. We want to state to our brothers, or comrades, that while they may not know it, that there are many of us actually who are morally pulling for them, who listen very closely and very attentively to any news we can get about their struggles. And we know they're waging a victorious, a valiant, and a good fight, and that while we do not control the communications system so that we would be able to tell them this, we want them to know that they should never despair and never feel that their fight is in vain or that nobody knows about it.

We know about it and we are 150 percent behind them and the day is not far off when they can come out in the open and together we can join hands and build a world that we're working to build. Our only word to them is to not despair and keep up the fight because there are many of us out here who are depending upon them. We look to them for inspiration and hope.

Question. What do you think of the Vietnam aggression?

Answer. I think it is the most disgusting aggression in the world today. I think it is the height of cowardice displayed by the United States. I think it is the filthiest war that's ever been fought today, and I think because of that and along with the will of Vietnamese people, the United States is going to lose the war.

Question. What made you come to Cuba?

Answer. Well, when the Cuban revolution was being waged I was a young boy but we were very interested in it. My interest was heightened by the fact that when the Prime Minister of Cuba, Fidel Castro, came to the UN he lived in Harlem with black people. He came to the hotel (Theresa), and that meant that our connection with Cuba became a real one in the sense that their Prime Minister, unlike all other prime ministers who come to the country, came to live in a ghetto with us while he stayed in the United States. And we've always felt that we owed something to Cuba, at least that same visit which they bestowed on us by their Prime Minister.

Secondly, we've always known that the Cuban revolution is a good revolution. And, unlike most of the people in the United States—white United States—who question the Cuban revolution, we never questioned it, we know it's good. We just came to Cuba to learn, and in the few days that we've been here what we have gotten out of the Cuban revolution we could never get out of books, movies, or

anything else. By just being able to be here, to live among a free people, and to understand and see how they are solving their problems is beyond comprehension. That is what we came to do, we came to learn. We have learned quite a bit.

Question. What do you think of the Prime Minister of Cuba, Fidel Castro?

Answer. He is the greatest man I've ever met.

Question. What do you think of Che Guevara and what he has said about the revolution in America and Latin America and the whole world?

Answer. We agree 150 percent with Che. He is becoming one of the most widely read men in black United States today. Black people are reading Che wherever you go, and not only that, Che is being read around the world. One of the reasons I think that people are appreciating and looking and waiting for Che is that he is a man who has not talked about revolution but who has gone and helped make one. And he is a man who, even after he won a revolutionary struggle for power in his country, did not settle back in his country but left his wife and went on to other countries to help wage the fight, to sacrifice his very life. You do not find men like that every day.

Question. The fight you are developing in the United States signifies for people, for outsiders, that you have signed your death sentence. What do you think, or have to say, about that?

Answer. Brother Malcolm used to tell us that there were several types of death. I think a dehumanized people who do not fight back are a dead people. That is what the West has been able to do to most of us. No. 3—Dehumanized us to the point where we would not even fight back. Once you've begun to fight back, you are alive, you are alive, and bullets won't kill you. If you do not fight back, you're dead, you are dead, and all the money in the world can't bring you alive. So we're alive today, and we're alive all over the world. All of your black people are coming alive because they're fighting back. They're fighting for their humanity. They're doing the type of thing that Fidel talks about, when you become alive and you want to live so much that you fight to live.

You fight to live. See, when you're dead, when you don't rebel, you're not fighting to live, you're already dead. Well, we are alive and we love life so much that we're willing to die for it. So, we're alive. Death can't stop us.

INDEX

(NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the name of an individual or organization in this index.)

	A	Page
African National Congress.....		21
African Unity, Organization of.....		20
American Committee on Africa.....		21
AP (Associated Press).....		28

	B	
Barka, Ben.....		27
Bayh, Senator Birch.....	1, 4, 5, 6, 9	
Bras, Juan Mari.....	10, 11, 12	
Bravo, Douglas.....		28
Brother Malcolm.....		24, 29
Brown, John.....		24
Brutus, Dennis.....		21

	C	
Carmichael, Stokely, testimony of.....		1-29
Castellon, Norman Pietri.....		10
Castro, Fidel.....	16, 18, 28, 29	
Cleaver, Eldridge.....		19
Communist Party, U.S.A.....		3, 8, 19
Costa y Silva, Arturo.....		12
Cuba.....		4
Cuban armed forces.....		16

	D	
Daily World (newspaper).....		21
Debray.....		26
DeGaulle.....		27

	F	
Fair Play for Cuba Committee.....		8
Fareh, Abdulrahim Abby.....		21
Federacion Pietri Castellon of Puerto Rico.....		10
Foley, Tom.....		21

	G	
Granma (newspaper).....		15
Guevara, "Che".....	14, 27, 29	

	H	
Hotel Theresa.....		28
Hoover, J. Edgar.....		4
Howard University.....		7

	I	
Independence Movement of Puerto Rico.....		9, 10, 11, 12, 13

	J	
Johnson, Lyndon.....		27

ii

	Page
L	
Latin American Solidarity Organization	4, 14, 27, 28
Lester, Julian	15
M	
Makeba, Miriam	21
Mbulu, Letta	21
Martinez Robell, Mario Sanchez	9
Marulanda	28
Marx	23
Marxist-Leninist	19
Menendez, Mario	17, 21
Molotsi, Peter	21
Montes, Cesar	28
Moore, Howard	1
Movimiento Pro Independencia (MPI)	9, 10, 11, 12, 24
N	
National Guardian (publication)	11, 18
Norpel, John R., Jr.	1
O	
Organization of African Unity	20
OAS	28
P	
Pan-African Festival	20
Pan Africanist Congress	21
Panthers	4, 8
People's Republic of China	17
Post Office Department	5, 6
Price, William A.	11
Puerto Rican Independence Party	4
Puerto Rico, University of	12
R	
"Revolution in Revolution?" (book)	26
Rua, Juan Pedro	11
S	
Senate resolution 341	2
Senate resolution 266	2
Setai, Bethuel	21
Sourwine, J. G.	1-20
South African Non-Racial Organizing Committee	21
Student Federation for Independence in Puerto Rico	11
Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)	3,
	4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 21, 24
Strong, Anna Louise	17
Sucesos (magazine)	17, 21
SUPI (Puerto Rico student independence group)	12
Sutherland, Elizabeth Martinez	15
T	
Tarabochia, Alfonso L.	1, 13
Thurmond, Senator Strom	1-20
Torrado, Osvaldo Dorticas (President of Cuba)	14
U	
United Nations	12, 28
UP (United Press)	28
University Students for Independence	10, 11

iii

V

Vargas, Manuel Cepeda.....	14
Vasquez.....	28
Verde Olivo (publication).....	16

W

Ware, George.....	15
Williams, Robert F.....	17, 18
Wilson, Harold.....	27

O