

Western Region Office
CONGRESS OF RACIAL EQUALITY
2085 Sutter Street
San Francisco 15, California
JO 7-3430

March 29, 1965

REPORT TO: James McCain, George Wiley, Floyd McKissick, James Farmer, Ike Reynolds,
Wilfred Ussery, Virginia Burton, Dick Rapp

SUBJECT: SAN DIEGO CORE

FROM: Louis S. Smith, Field Secretary, Western Region

There is something going on in San Diego CORE that defies description. I won't spend too much time on it in this report, but if you hear of someone "blowing their lid" in this chapter, don't be surprised.

I have the feeling that I have been through some sort of brain-wash treatment. Before you decide that I have already gone off the deep end, talk to Hal Brown at the next NAC meeting. I have talked to several other people who have visited San Diego CORE and they all report that they have had similar experiences. On with the report.

I arrived in San Diego, Thursday, March 4th, in time for the general membership meeting. No one knew who I was except Hal Brown, the Chairman, who knows me personally. I wanted to get a look at the Chapter in the "raw", without any polish just for my sake. The meeting started out orderly, but I was disturbed to see that all the program and ideas were flowing from the chair. There were very few committee reports and these were generally weak.

Suddenly there was a motion to stop all direct action because of lack of confidence in the chairman. After heated debate, the motion was badly defeated. Discussion then started on a Zoo employment project that the chapter has involved itself in. Another motion came from the same group that had made the previous motion. The motion was to drop the Zoo project, again for lack of confidence in the chair. After a bit of confusion, the Chairman ruled the motion out of order because the chapter had previously adopted the project and negotiations had already begun. A challenge to the chair's ruling, then..... get the picture?

After this outburst was silenced, Hal Brown told the group that he was concerned over the charges made against him (lodged with the National Office) and started to read them to the membership. I sensed that all hell was about to break loose, so I got up, had Hal introduce me, and took the chair. I took up the matter of the charges, pointed out chapter weaknesses that were so apparent that I had already seen them, had a philosophical discussion about CORE and was able to bring the group together to such a degree that they agreed to have another meeting the following night.

I spent the remainder of the night and the next day talking to people from both factions and arrived at the following conclusions:

1. Hal Brown has been a strong chairman and the membership has leaned heavily on him instead of themselves. (I pointed out the danger here, using Bronx CORE with Herb Calander as an example)
2. That the chapter split developed when Hal Brown pushed to have two members expelled. One was accused of belonging to the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), and the other of belonging to the Communist Party (CP).
3. That there is no question about the membership of these individuals in the above mentioned parties.
4. That there is more than ample proof that they were injecting their philosophies into the chapter.
5. That the Hal Brown faction, though technically right by the constitution, had strictly enforced it against those who wanted to support the CP and SWP members.
6. That the 6 month period that this controversy has been raging has taken its toll on Hal, and prompt decisive action needs to be taken to deal with the situation.
7. That if there were no chapter split, due to the poor construction of the chapter, it was heading for trouble anyway.

FRIDAY EVENING, MARCH 5th.

I held an orderly and, I felt, constructive, meeting. I suggested constitutional changes, (see enclosures) that would change the emphasis from general membership meetings to committee meetings, with the view towards getting more members active in the program developing and direction setting phases of the chapter. I should explain that the present constitution of San Diego CORE allows that if you miss three general membership meetings in a row, without a validated excuse, you can be dropped to associate membership. I stressed the need for the two Vice-Chairmen to take charge of the operation of establishing and maintaining a strong committee structure. I explained to the group that democracy carried with it the responsibility of individual participation. I also pointed out that this was the way that leadership was developed within the chapter. The membership, including Hal Brown, were in complete agreement with this position.

As for members who felt that their voting rights had been taken unjustly, I suggested that they present their reasons and we would set up a committee consisting of the Chairman and two Vice-Chairmen to review the cases to determine if any question existed about their membership. About nine people came forward to file complaints.

The membership also agreed that the spirit of the constitutional changes would go into effect immediately, so that on May 5th we could abolish the entire active membership list, and only those people who had been active in committee work, officers (who had functioned) and those persons who had assumed a functional role in organization, such as office manager, would then be constituted active members with voting rights and the constitutional requirements for active membership would be followed from then on. The May 5th date was chosen because elections are to be held in the middle of May, and this would assure all those persons who wanted to be active in the chapter their right to vote in this election. I received complete backing of these proposals and authorization to proceed with the formalizing of them.

I should explain that the membership committee had consisted of two people, and it was impossible to straighten out the membership roles within the framework of the old constitution. For example, it was determined by the sign-in sheet at general membership meetings who had attended. Many people claimed that they attended meetings, but did not sign the sheet. The truth seems to be that no one ever told the membership that this was the reason for signing in. I know that when I walked into the meeting, no one asked to sign in.

The meeting ended in a friendly atmosphere. I was invited to a fund raising party, and accepted.

When I got to the party, I discovered that most of the anti-Hal Brown faction was there and in a matter of minutes I was attacked over the clause in our National Constitution banning Communists from CORE. I tactfully escaped by stating that I myself, because of civil libertarian views, was not in favor of the clause, but as long as I am a member of CORE, I will abide by its constitution and by-laws. I took this opportunity to point out that San Diego CORE was bound by this constitution also, and that it was futile to fight it within the chapter because only the convention could eliminate it and that the fight had to be made there.

SATURDAY, MARCH 6th.

First Vice Chairman, Ambrose Brodus, who seemed to be leading the faction against Hal Brown, had two meetings with Hal and me and it was pretty obvious that there was no cause for a split because they were both pretty much in agreement on the goals and direction of San Diego CORE.

I received an agreement from Hal Brown to vote yes on the members that had complained since the whole membership would be re-evaluated May 5th, as previously explained.

I left San Diego that night, for San Francisco, to meet with Ike Reynolds and RAC members concerning functioning of the Regional Office. I promised to return Monday, March 8th, for San Diego CORE executive committee meeting, at which time I was to have the constitutional changes drawn up for final approval and distribution to the membership.

MONDAY, MARCH 8th

I arrived in San Diego and immediately went to the executive committee meeting which was already in progress. I read the changes I had proposed. I had a "Calm before the storm" feeling and I was soon to discover why.

Ambrose Brodus got up and read a letter announcing the withdrawal of the charges against Hal Brown, and said that he would present it to his "caucus" for approval. The pro "Hal Brown" members of the executive committee, the large majority, started asking questions such as: Will this caucus disband; Are these just words or are you intending to abide by the spirit of the Withdrawal? One member arose and stated that she was not withdrawing any charges, and all hell broke loose. The plans for a demonstration in support of Selma, Ala., which we had been discussing earlier, were forgotten.

The meeting broke up into small debates between the two factions.

Mrs. Mildred Gustavson, who is a constant companion of Ambrose Brodus, stated that, "As long as I am in this chapter I will fight for the right of CP and SWP members to be members of CORE." She was angry when she said it, but she then grabbed her mouth. A member of Hal Brown's faction asked her to repeat that statement for the whole executive committee but she refused. There was an exchange of words at which time she again became angry and repeated it several times.

This was important, for up til now, the claim of the caucus had been that Hal Brown was a dictator, and it had nothing to do with his expulsion of CP and SWP members. Just the undemocratic methods used in doing it. The pro-Hal Brown faction had been claiming that this caucus was deeply infiltrated with SWP and that the caucus was formed by them and their sympathizers. The fact that CP and SWP literature had been distributed to members gave some validity to the latter charge. Add to this the copy of the letter from the organizer of the Socialist Workers Party (See enclosure).

The anti Hal Brown faction left and we started to work preparing for the demonstration in support of Selma. In writing this report, everything seems clear

to me now, but I can assure, it was anything but clear at the time it was happening. I spent a great deal of time with the faction against Hal Brown, and I found myself becoming quick tempered, tired, and for want of a better word, just confused.

TUESDAY, MARCH 9th

The anti Hal Brown faction began meeting early in the morning while the rest of us started preparing for the demonstration in support of Selma. We carried on a successful march and rally in spite of the fact that only Ambrose Brodus and the expelled CP member attended from the faction.

I learned that the faction was meeting again that night, and requested that I attend the meeting, so that I could answer any questions that they might have. I was informed that they would call me when they were ready to question me, which they did.

I was picked up and carried to the meeting. Upon entering, I noticed that the expelled CP member was in the room. Questions were directed at me in a very hostile manner. On the issue of voting rights, they informed me that they would not accept the 3 man board because they did not trust Hal Brown, in spite of the fact that I told them I would sit in and if they had any questions about the way Hal would vote, why not call him now? They refused to call him.

The questions continued and I found myself slipping into some sort of "trance".

I tried to snap out of it by asking them questions but they denied everything, at which point I really began to doubt my sanity. For example, Mildred Gustavson denied that she ever made the statement regarding CP and SWP in the chapter, and the ex-membership chairman denied that I had ever asked the membership committee whether Hal Brown had pressured them into dropping names from the roles. He then attempted to assault me, but Ambrose Brodus pulled him away. Then came my return to reality.

Someone in the group mentioned that there "weren't" many CORE members at the demonstration today, which proves we control CORE." Being monolithic, that is, completely civil rights oriented, I said to myself, "How could these people be

interested in Civil Rights and brag about ducking a demonstration in support of Selma, Alabama? The pieces immediately began falling in place. The CP member offered to drive me home but I refused.

However, before I left the meeting, I explained to the caucus that if they wished to press the charges, I would need some written documentation of the charges and I set the following evening for such a meeting.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10th

I held the meeting with the faction at which time I was informed that they had voted to press the charges. I accepted the charges and promised to pass them on with my own report.

In fairness to Hal Brown and to the group presenting the charges, I will not comment on them at this time, but will wait until the hearing, if such is ordered.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As I mentioned earlier in this report, some work needs to be done to strengthen San Diego CORE. This cannot be achieved with the split in the chapter that now exists. This chapter cannot be unified because some people don't want to unite the chapter. Examples:

Why did the caucus turn down my recommendations concerning voting rights, even after I guaranteed that right, then turn around and ask for a hearing to regain their voting rights? Why the boycott of the Selma project? Why the deliberate "untruths"? Incidentally, the ex-membership chairman apologized a day later and admitted he was wrong. Why does the caucus claim that their fight is against the chairman, yet with elections in May, when they could vote him out, they choose to go through with hearings on their right of vote, even after I explained to them that the hearings may drag past election day, and my proposal would guarantee this right before election?

There are many more things that will come out in the hearings around the charges that I will not mention here.

FIELD REPORT: FROM LOUIS SMITH, FIELD SECRETARY, PAGE 8 - SAN DIEGO - 3/29/65

To sum up this report, I would make the following recommendation:

That Wilfred Ussery, Dick Rapp and Virginia Burton, who are Western Region NAC members, set a hearing date to act as a sub-committee of the NAC, for the purpose of hearing the charges and reporting back to the next NAC or steering Committee meeting. I would also recommend that Ike Reynolds sit in on these hearings. These hearings should be held in San Diego.

I am only making the above recommendation because there is a chance that I may have become prejudiced towards the caucus, and that there might be some information concerning the charges that were not presented to me when I was in San Diego. Hal Brown also insists on a hearing of the charges because he feels that is the only way to fully clear his name.

#####

Copies of this report have been sent to the following:

All NAC Members
All CORE Department Heads
Ambrose Brodus, San Diego CORE

SAN DIEGO CORE
CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

ARTICLE III, MEMBERSHIP, shall be deleted and replaced with the following:

ARTICLE III, MEMBERSHIP:

1. There shall be three (3) categories of membership. They shall be, Active, Associate, and Student, as herein-after defined:

A. Active Membership

The individual(s) may participate in all phases of the organization and is entitled to voting privileges. He is also a member of the National Organization, and as such is subject to its rules and regulations.

B. Associate Membership

The individual or group is a supporter of CORE and may participate in limited phases of the organization as determined by the General Membership Meetings. He is not entitled to a vote. He must pay yearly dues as determined by this Constitution.

C. Student Membership

A student shall be defined as an individual who attends High School full time or is under eighteen (18) years of age or both. The student must fulfill the requirements for active or associate membership.

In order to participate in any CORE sponsored direct action project, the student must have the approval, in writing, of his parents or guardian and be bound by all National policies as defined in Article IV of the By-laws of the National Organization.

2. Active Membership Requirements

In order to be constituted an active member, the individual must make application to the Membership Committee; subscribe to the purpose of the organization and the CORE Rules for Action; undergo a probationary period including attendance at an orientation session; and must assume the responsibility of a functional role in the organization, such as committee membership. After being reported upon by the Membership Committee, and having fulfilled the above requirements, he shall become an Active member, upon approval by a two-thirds vote at a general membership meeting.

3. Removal and Limitations of Membership:

A. Any person not participating in the functioning of the organization for a continuous period of three months, unless otherwise validated, may be removed from the Active Membership rolls and given status of an Associate Member. Such action shall be decided upon by the General Membership Meeting by a majority vote upon receipt of a report from the Membership Committee.

The Membership Committee may not recommend that any Active Member be made an Associate Member unless the Membership Committee gives ten (10) days written notice to the member involved stating the pending action, the reason for it, and the date and place of the General Membership Meeting at which the Committee intends to recommend his change to Associate status. If the affected member requests a hearing before the Membership Committee, it shall be granted. The Membership Committee shall give the member written notice of the decision of the General Membership Meeting.

B. Memberships shall not be available to any person who persistently violates the CORE Rules for Action; or attempts to subvert the CORE group through allegiance to other groups or organizations, and as further defined in Article VII, Sections 1 & 2 of the National By-Laws.

4. Only Active members may vote or hold office.

5. Any person or group who regularly supports CORE financially shall be a Contributor.

6. Members may transfer from other local (Affiliated) Chapters on receipt of a letter of good standing from said chapter. Members must agree to abide by this Constitution. The Membership Committee is to handle the transfer and report it to the next General Membership Meeting. No vote is required.

ARTICLE VIII: COMMITTEES, shall be amended to include Section 5. (This Section shall go into effect after May 5, 1965)

ARTICLE VIII: COMMITTEES

5. Committee Members: Except for the first meeting attended by a member of any given committee, all persons may be eligible to participate and vote on committee matters upon their second attendance of a session of that committee within the space of three meetings, if they decide to become members of that committee.

Continued membership shall require attendance at two out of any four consecutive committee meetings. All committee meetings shall be open to Active Members, who may participate in discussion with permission of the Chair.

- I. Voting rights are denied some active members in good standing by false claims regarding their membership status.

When a vote was called for at a General Meeting Thursday night, February 18th, on whether or not the vote on membership revocation would be held by role call, the chairman counted the hands of the "Yes" votes. He then called for the "No" votes. At this point, for the first time, he challenged the people voting as to their membership status, and asked the membership chairman, Mardell Jackson, to bring the membership book forward, the one in which we sign in. The chairman stated he would read the list of names eligible to vote. After the reading of said names, approximately one dozen people whose names were not called and who felt they were legally entitled to vote so stated. Some of these people are: John Porter, Mina Douglass, Rosemarie Laws, Judy Katz, Eleanor Cawley, Henrietta Gaston, George Gaston, Muriel Brodshatzer, David Best, John McGowan.

A melee ensued with a great deal of name-calling and shouting and abusive language freely used. The chairman made no attempt to restore order, even when officials in charge of the Memorial Recreation Center, where the meeting was being held, turned off the lights and blew a whistle. Young boys playing basketball in the building, hearing the fracas, made their way into the meeting room, adding to the general noise and confusion. Realizing a complete breakdown of CORE rules and parliamentary procedure was taking place, three-fourths of those present left the room claiming that the aforementioned vote was illegal and that the meeting could not continue without the chair's attempt to restore or bring the meeting to order. It was the behavior of the chair which caused the breakdown of the meeting that caused near violence.

- A. The chair refused to recognize the challenge on the vote aforementioned.
- B. He refused to recognize the first vice-chairman, Ambrose Brodus, who called for the point of order.

All this to be substantiated by Muriel Brodshatzer and those others present at the November 18 meeting.

Two weeks later, after Mr. Smith's arrival, Judy Katz was informed for the first time by the membership chairman, Mardell Jackson, why she was no longer considered voting member. This personal incident is an example of similar attempts to deny voting rights to others whose status has been arbitrarily changed.

Membership chairman, Mardell Jackson, informed Judy Katz that she had missed three meetings in the summer while working to defeat Proposition 1r. It is a fact that George Stevens and Judy Katz were appointed co-chairmen of CORE's effort against Proposition 14 by CORE's Chairman.

The questions of, 1) the validity of the charge that Judy Katz missed three meetings in a row this past summer, and, 2) if she had, that she was not notified in any way whatsoever that her voting privileges were rescinded, and, 3) she has, in fact, been allowed to vote between November 3 and February 18 without any challenge to her status all remain to be settled.

II. Individual whose membership is up for revocation was denied the right to be present by the chairman when his "case" was being discussed and voted upon.

III. Deragatory names and blanket indictments made by the chairman to those members voting in opposition to the chairman.

A. On February 11, at a general membership meeting, Art Keever and George and Henrietta Gaston were labeled "Communist" because of the way they had voted, and their supposed intention of voting against the chair. The Chair stated, "Get your communist selves out of here."

The entire atmosphere created by the chair of this chapter, with the accompanying heated discussions and generally tense meetings, both general, executive committee, etc., generates feelings of animosity which results in the use of the term "communist" toward any person voting in opposition

to the chair. One such instance occurred during a meeting between Mr. Brown and Mr. Keever. Mr. Brown told Mr. Keever that Rick Cawley was a "one of those too, S.W.P.". This statement is clearly one based on guilt by association, "complaints" having been brought against Mr. Cawley in this regard.

Another instance occurred on Friday night, February 26. A direct action workshop was planned on this night at Memorial Recreation Center. Mr. Cawley planned to attend this workshop with a friend, Mr. Martin. Since only a very few persons showed up for the meeting it was called off. However, Mr. Martin and Mr. Cawley, in Mr. Cawley's car, sat in the parking lot and visited for a while. Mr. and Mrs. Murdock appeared and were inside the meeting place for a while. As they stood around their car talking, the lady in charge of the Center came down the steps. Mrs. Murdock said to her, "You have a couple of reds sitting in that red car. You better get them off your parking lot." This is, of course, normal behavior for regular enemies of CORE, but is deplorable, to say the least, in a CORE person, supposedly fighting against this same type of blind prejudice.

At a general meeting, during a vote on an issue relative to the controversy, Mrs. Murdock, with a sweep of her hand, indicated a group of persons and said, "Look at all the socialistic voting." Mrs. Gustafson includes this remark as evidence of the general type of behavior which is tolerated by the chairman, who is perfectly capable of controlling meetings. She further submits at this point that the Chairman's attitude is conducive to chaotic meetings.

Mr. Brown also stated at this meeting that "CORE is all right. We will just get rid of these two people and some of their sympathizers."

- B. "You are uglier than the ugliest white man I've ever seen." (This remark was made to a young CORE member, Roger Barkley, who also heads SNCC group locally.)

- C. The phrase "pushy white woman" has become a constantly used expression. Considerable discussion was held concerning the respect roles of whites and blacks, at an executive committee meeting.

The possibility of greater effectiveness of black persons in trying to work in the ghetto was discussed, to no real conclusion. Mr. Brown stated that black women had been forced out of participation by overzealous "pushy white women". He cited examples of black women as Janice Mickey and Peggy Finch; as pushy white women, Lillian Herzberg and Judy Katz. The entire chapter is well aware that Mrs. Mickey and Mrs. Finch have never consistently maintained active membership status for a considerable period of time. This phrase has become a by-word in this chapter, thereby causing white females in some cases to leave the organization, or refrain from expressing opinions. In any event, this constant use of this phrase in a derogatory manner is certainly a violation of CORE rules for action, to say nothing of common decency.

IV (Typists note - IV-A not in copy)

- B. Some Negro members who have voted in a situation in which they were in the minority have had it pointed out to them the fact that they were only one or two out of the group of whites voting a certain way. At least one Negro member, John McCown has been chastised by the Chairman with, "How can you as a black man vote against me as a black man?" The "grapevine" has it that this activity is widespread, although of course specific instances are difficult to verify.
- C. Members who have disagreed with the Chair on procedure or conduct of meetings have been told to "get out if you don't like the methods." At a general meeting in January, John Porter begged the Chair to follow the constitution regarding methods of revoking members whom CORE might feel undesirable. The Chair attempted to intimidate Mr. Porter and said to him, "I don't care about methods, John. I am the Chairman and we'll do as I say."

The Chairman went on at great length to tell us in a heated and angry way that he did not need a lawyer to explain the constitution to him; that he did not need a lawyer to explain the constitution to him; that he would not allow Mr. Porter to speak; that he was the Chairman and would make these decisions.

Ken Pennington stated from the back of the room, not in a form of a motion that one way to solve our dilemma was to ask Mr. Beard to sign an oath that he was no longer a member of the SWP. Carl Ramsey said, "Oh no!" Mr. Brown stepped off the podium and walked toward Carl Ramsey with his fist raised and shaking and said, "You don't like it?" Carl Ramsey said, "No, I don't like these methods." Mr. Brown said, "If you don't like these methods you can leave." At this time Mr. Ramsey is out of town on business, therefore cannot be reached for verification but other members present at that time will verify that this is true.

- D. At a general meeting, when the revocation of membership was being discussed, Muriel Brodshatzer reminded the Chair that according to our constitution, we must notify the general membership that a vote would be taken at the next meeting on this issue. Mrs. Brodshatzer had to remind the Chair of constitutional procedure after the Chair announced a vote would be taken at the next meeting on this subject. When reminded of this Mr. Brown's behavior became excited and very vocal. He said, "Damn it, you can fool around with constitutional methods if you want to. But constitutionality and Roberts Rules of Order aren't relevant to the revolution. Damn it, man. I'm sick of all this. Black men's lives are at stake and I'm not fooling around with Robert's Rules and constitutional procedure.
- E. Refused to accept challenge at executive and general meeting as witnessed by Mr. Lou Smith March 4 at general meeting.
- F. At the general meeting on January 7th, a motion was made by Ken Pennington to revoke the membership of those persons in San Diego CORE who are members

of the Socialist Workers Party and the Communist Party. As the vote was about to be taken, Art Kever questioned the legality of the motion, realizing that the local constitution requires that the member in question receive written notice of charges against him and be afforded an appropriate hearing before the executive committee, after notice. At this point A. Brodus called for a ruling from the parliamentarian. The parliamentarian stated, "I do not wish to make a ruling on this question." The Chairman did not instruct the parliamentarian to make a ruling.

Again on March 4th the parliamentarian refused to make a ruling on another issue when the request was made of her by Ambrose Brodus. The Chairman then refused to direct the parliamentarian to make a ruling.

- G. At an executive committee meeting in February the Chairman voted on a motion to recommend the revocation of membership of two members. The local constitution requires that the Chairman vote only in case of a tie.
- V. A. The Chairman has stated publicly before the general membership and privately to certain members of the chapter that Ambrose Brodus is part of a conspiracy to split the leadership of CORE and take over. He has pointed out time and time again that Ambrose is "siding with Socialists".

The membership has been constantly subjected to the Chairman's insistence that there were groups or a group of people within the CORE Chapter whose reason for being there was not civil rights. In vague and sketchy terms he said on many occasions that a sub-group whose aims were different from those of CORE were trying to subvert our membership from the goals of civil rights. Much time was spent on vague innuendos and inferences giving the impression that there was a structured group planning some type of subversion or take-over or division deliberately. No direct accusations or names of suspected people were used by the Chair for a long time. Suspicion, fear, hard feelings and guilt by association among certain

people gathered momentum. At a subsequent time when the Chair revealed that 2 members only whose membership was in question due to their affiliation with other organizations, the number came as a shock to many, since we were led to believe indirectly and without direct names and charges that a great many people were involved in some "plot" against the Chair and against CORE and the movement. It is reminiscent of the McCarthy days and smacks of red baiting.

An example: At a general meeting December 11, two members, Rick Cawley and Delores Grant were openly charged with misconduct by the Chair. In the case of Mr. Cawley, he was told by the Chair that the Chair questioned Mr. Cawley's way of thinking. Mr. Brown was verbose and agitated in his manner of speaking to Mr. Cawley but vague and indefinite as to reasons. Mr. Cawley stated that he was considered all right when he followed Mr. Brown's plea to participate in arrestable action, (Mr. Cawley was subsequently arrested on 3 occasions) but now his loyalty was being doubted. Mr. Brown laughed and said, "I have doubted you from as far back as last summer." However, no reason was ever given, then or subsequently.

Mrs. Grant was told that the chapter and the Chairman were disappointed in her. The Chairman again did not give her a reason for this statement, even though the accused person asked to be told why the Chairman was annoyed and disappointed in her. Mr. Brown was vague and did not answer directly. He inferred that word had come to him that she had talked against him. Mrs. Grant denied this, was visibly upset--gave an account of her participation in CORE, stated her confidence in Mr. Brown. This exchange continued until Mrs. Grant left the meeting hall in tears. Since that time Mrs. Grant has voted and agreed with the Chairman 100%. One cannot wonder as to the cause of this consistent support of the Chair after she was so bitterly denounced by the chair.

Mr. Brown has consistently told of his "feelings" of a "plot" and a "sub-group" and "take-over" with no definite accusation and no substantiation before the time that the 2 members came up for revocation of membership.

VI A. The Chair inferred that Art Keever, membership chairman, had told an untruth, when referring to a private meeting of the Chairman and Mr. Keever. Subsequently Mr. Keever resigned.

B. December 10th at general meeting the Chair questioned Fred Cawley's motives for participating in the movement. A great deal of inference and little else caused this questioning. This plus advocacy of violence was responsible for Mr. Cawley's resignation from the executive committee.

VII In January on local t.v. Hal Brown announced his intention of possibly resigning the local chairmanship of CORE publicly and without notifying the board or membership of his action. Many telephone calls ensued and the members were at a loss since the Chairman took it upon himself to make a public announcement without discussing it with his board or membership.

VIII On January 19, 1965, the executive committee met at the home of recording secretary Joan Hayes. At approximately 9:45 p.m. Mr. Brodus, who voted against the Chair on one item, was ordered by Mr. Brown, "Brodus, you owe us an explanation of WHY you voted as you did." The discussion continued with Mr. Brodus retaining his composure, but the Chairman resorted to inviting Mr. Brodus to "step outside and we'll settle this right now." The Chairman was physically restrained by the second vice chairman Ken Pennington, who pleaded with Mr. Brown not to resort to violence.

At this same meeting Mrs. Carolyn Murdock (who is not a voting member of the executive board) offered to "smack you in the mouth, Brodus." She also to call her husband to "eject" the first vice chairman from this meeting. When Mr. Brodus reminded her that he was not addressing her, Mr. Brown injected, "You go ahead, Carolyn, say whatever you want." And she did.

The Chair has repeatedly failed to control the threats of Mr. and Mrs. Murdock and this conduct has encouraged continuance of same at CORE gatherings.

February 4, 1965, the Chairman stood by and listened as Mrs. Murdock threatened to "shove my fist down your throat." This remark was made to a Mr. Gardner at the Memorial Recreation Center.

January 7, Mrs. Murdock threatened physical violence at a general meeting. The Chair supported these threats by adding his threat, "Rick Cawley, if you don't shut up I will have you removed from this meeting. Mr. Murdock assured the Chair that this would not be necessary because he (Mr. Murdock) would remove Mr. Cawley from the room. Threats continued throughout this meeting.

February 4, 1965, at general meeting at Memorial Recreation Center, Mr. Murdock, without provocation, threatened to "beat you half to death, Rick Cawley." The Chair did not reprimand Mr. Murdock.

February 23, after Mrs. Ferne Brown had violently attacked CORE first vice chairman in the CORE office, Mr. Brodus met Mr. Brown and explained to him that his wife had attacked him. Mr. Brown remarked to Mr. Brodus, "I wish you would attack me like you attacked her."

These charges are not against Carolyn Murdock, Brit Murdock or Ferne Brown. These instances of violence and threatened violence are recorded here to substantiate the fact that the Chairman's attitude and conduct have encouraged and supported violence.

The facts listed above are presented by members of the Ad Hoc Committee for an Effective San Diego Chapter of CORE and other CORE members who have not yet become members of the Ad Hoc Committee.

(Names on next page)

TESTIMONY - SAN DIEGO CORE - P 10

Art Keever	Roger Duncan	Mina Douglas
Lee Anthony	Tom Bertolino	Elinor Cawley
David Bess	Muriel Brodshatzer	Judith Katz
Mildred Gustafson	Henrietta Gaston	George Gaston
Willie Martin	Fred Winston	Stanley Crockett
Vivian Duncan	Lillian Herzberg	Roger Barkeley
A. Brodus, Jr.	Rick Cawley	John Porter
Jim Prenn		

LETTERS FROM MEMBERS OF SAN DIEGO CORE

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

On January 19, 1965, I, Elinor K. Cawley, sat in on a meeting of the Exec Committee of San Diego CORE.

At this meeting Chairman Brown threatened violent action against Mr. Ambrose Brodus, 1st Vice-Chairman of CORE. He (Brown) was prevented from further physical action by Ken Pennington who restrained him by taking hold of Brown's belt and the back of his trousers.

I also witnessed one Caroline Murdock repeatedly threaten physical violence. The Chair not only condoned her violation of CORE rules but he also encouraged her by giving her unlimited support when she interrupted Mr. Brodus.

The conduct of the chair clearly showed that he had no intentions of maintaining order at this meeting.

s/ Elinor K. Cawley
March 10, 1965

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

At a general meeting of San Diego CORE, I Arthur Keever, speaking as Chairman of Membership, referred to a private meeting of Chairman Brown and me. The topic discussed was the alleged influence of SWP and supposed CP members. Brown claimed that no such meeting ever took place and denied that this had been discussed with me at this time. By his denial it was inferred that I had told an un-truth. I resigned my position on the Exec Committee.

s/Arthur Keever
March 10, 1965

COPIES OF LETTERS FROM SAN DIEGO CORE MEMBERS PROTESTING VOTING RIGHTS DENIAL

March 10, 1965

I am protesting the denial of my voting rights in San Diego Chapter of CORE. On Feb. 18, 1965, for the first time I was told by the chairman, Hal Brown that I was not an eligible voting member because I had missed three meetings. The following is what lead up to the above mentioned statement by the chairman concerning my voting status. When a vote was called for at a General Meeting Thursday night, Feb. 18, on whether or not the vote on membership revocation would be held by roll call, the chairman counted the hands of the "Yes" votes. He then called for the "No" votes. At this point, for the first time, he challenged the people voting as to their membership status, and asked the membership chairman, Mardell Jackson, to bring the membership book forward: the one in which we sign in. The Chairman, Mr. Brown, stated he would read the list of names eligible to vote. After the reading of said names, approximately one dozen people whose names were not called and who felt they were legally entitled to vote so stated. I was one of these. At this point Mr. Brown said to me that I could not vote as I had missed three meetings. Two weeks later I was informed for the first time by the membership chairman, Mardell Jackson, why I was not considered a voting member. She informed me that I had missed three meetings in the summer while working to defeat Proposition 13. It is a fact that George Stevens and myself were appointed co-chairmen of CORE's effort against 13 by CORE chairman, Hal Brown. I question: ONE; the validity of the charge that I missed three meetings in a row this summer; TWO: If I was not notified in any way whatsoever that my voting privileges were rescinded. In fact I have been allowed to vote from the beginning of my membership in CORE (4 years) until Feb. 18th without any challenge to my status.

s/ Judith Katz

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I, Elinor K. Cawley have been denied the right to vote at meetings of the San Diego CORE. I have not missed three meetings in a row as claimed. I have

been late for some meetings because I work until 9 PM thursdays. I have never missed a meeting of the Fund Raising Committee and have missed very few direct action projects this past year. False claims are responsible for my loss of vote.

s/ Elinor K. Cawley
March 10, 1965

I protest my voting rights being revoked for no reason. I have never missed 3 meetings in a row without a legitimate excuse - which was submitted to membership chairman.

s/Lillian Herzberg
March 10, 1965

Claim to Active Membership Status

- 1) I am a lawyer. I have worked actively as an attorney for SD CORE for about 2 years. I have appeared as counsel of record in both injunction cases against the chapter brought by SD Gas & Elec. Co. and Bank of America, the libel suit by (Name illegible) & the criminal prosecutions against Harold Brown and others.
- 2) In addition to working myself, I have recruited 5 other lawyers who actively participated in the foregoing matters. All of the lawyers served without compensation.
- 3) I may have missed 3 or more chapter membership meetings in 1964. On some occasions I was absent due to the demands of CORE's legal work. On other occasions I was absent for other, even personal reasons.

Before absenting myself for reasons other than CORE legal work, I spoke to Harold Brown and explained my situation. He stated, in effect, that in view of my contributions to the defense of the chapter my absences could not be counted against my status as an active member.

I understood then and now believe that the chairman, Brown, waived in my case what he considered good cause, the effect of consecutive absences from general membership meetings.

s/John Porter
1346 Garnet Ave.

Thurs. Feb. 18 - General Membership Mtg.

Before a vote is taken, chairman asks Steve Wenger to leave room because he sent in a letter of resignation.

Chairman recognizes my raised hand:

I: (Uncertain I had heard correctly) Did we receive a letter of resignation?

Chr: Yes (Annoyed)

I: Does it concern the membership?

Chr: (Angry, addressing me as if I was intruding) What do you want?

I: I feel it is important to read a letter that concerns general membership.

Chr: (Becoming more annoyed) I don't have the letter with me. So what do you want?

I: I did not know the letter was not here. Obviously, then, it can't be read. I feel it should be read in the future.

M. Brodshatzer
3/10/65

Re: My CORE membership status

I have been at most membership meetings since I returned from N.Y. last summer. I did not miss 3 consecutive meetings at any time. There is no reason I know of, why I should be denied membership.

M. Brodshatzer
3/10/65

COPY OF LETTER FROM SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY ORGANIZER

TO ALL MEMBERS OF CORE:

Harold Brown has brought charges against two members of CORE and plans to oust a probationary member also. These charges are that two of these members are members of the Socialist Workers Party and one is a member of the Communist Party, and that those organizations are "inimicable to CORE."

Harold Brown wants to expel these members from CORE although he makes no claim that they have committed any actions harmful to CORE. On the contrary, these members have participated in CORE actions and one was arrested twice. He went to jail on one charge and now is under sentence along with other CORE members, including Harold Brown. They are now awaiting the outcome of the appeal against this sentence.

Further, Harold Brown, knowing that this CORE member was also a member of the Socialist Workers Party at the time he joined CORE, put him on the Executive Committee in charge of the Direct Action Committee!

Last summer during the Bank of America action, this member was rewarded for his good work for CORE. Brown gave him a responsible post. Now--with no claim that he or his fellow member have committed any action to harm CORE--Brown wants to expel them!

What has changed? Not the Socialist Workers Party. Since its inception it has consistently fought discrimination. Opposition to Jim Crow has been a basic part of its program. Its members, black and white, participate in all actions against discrimination and for Civil Rights. We deny that the SWP is inimicable to CORE or any other organization fighting discrimination. We support ALL organizations in this field, CORE, NAACP, SNCC, and the Negro Nationalist groups. We don't tell them what to do or how to do it; we support every struggle for equality. We think our record of participation in the Negro struggle in San Diego is beyond reproach, and we promise to continue the same activity in the future.

No, the SWP hasn't changed. But can we say the same for Harold Brown? Why were members of the SWP acceptable to him in CORE in 1964 but not in 1965? He claims the SWP is trying to subvert CORE (with two members?) and that this is a violation of the CORE Constitution. Does Harold Brown mean that he didn't read the constitution until this year and was ignorant of its contents? Or is this just an excuse to expel those members so CORE in San Diego can become more "respectable" in the eyes of certain "friends" of the Negro People?

What makes Harold Brown's motives open to suspicion are the methods he uses. Witch-hunting and red-baiting are the favorite methods of the racists, Birchites, and reactionaries of all stripes. Every Negro organization, including CORE, has suffered these attacks. For a leader of an organization fighting for Civil Rights to use such undemocratic and politically discriminatory methods is--to say the least--shameful. It can only result in harm to CORE.

We appeal to the members of CORE to repudiate such odious methods and to maintain a democratic organization open to all who fight for Civil Rights, regardless of whether they belong to the Socialist Workers Party, Communist Party, Democratic or Republican Parties, or any others.

1853 Irving S.D.
Organizer

s/ L. "Bud" Gardner

What makes Harold Brown's motives open to suspicion are the methods he uses. Witch-hunting and red-baiting are the favorite methods of the racists, Birchites, and reactionaries of all stripes. Every Negro organization, including CORE, has suffered these attacks. For a leader of an organization fighting for Civil Rights to use such undemocratic and politically discriminatory methods is--to say the least--shameful. It can only result in harm to CORE.

We appeal to the members of CORE to repudiate such odious methods and to maintain a democratic organization open to all who fight for Civil Rights, regardless of whether they belong to the Socialist Workers Party, Communist Party, Democratic or Republican Parties, or any others.

COPY OF LETTER FROM AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE SAN DIEGO CHAPTER OF CORE

653 San Miguel Avenue
San Diego, California 92113
March 29, 1965

Mr. Floyd McKissick, Chairman
CONGRESS OF RACIAL EQUALITY
38 Park Row
New York 38, New York

Dear Mr. McKissick:

Among the complaints filed with your office by members of the Ad Hoc Committee for an Effective San Diego Chapter of CORE, is one that would seem to require some immediate action. This one is listed Number 1 on the list of complaints dated 2/23/65, and has to do with denial of voting rights to Active members.

In the testimony submitted to Lou Smith a few weeks ago, the names of ten CORE members, including that of our legal counsel Attorney John Porter who has represented this chapter in every court case this chapter has been involved in, were listed as having been illegally denied their right to vote. Except for two members, there seems to be no attempt by the membership committee nor the executive committee to solve or restore these members to Active status. The reason given for denying them voting rights is that they have missed three consecutive membership meetings. The constitution states that when an Active member is absent from three consecutive meetings without reasonable excuse, his name shall be transferred to the Associate list. The constitution further states that a member so affected must be notified by mail of the action. In most of these cases, these people contend that they have not missed three consecutive meetings.

It is difficult to understand how there can be any reasonable degree of accuracy in maintaining an attendance list since it has never been stated at meetings whether members would be required to sign in or whether the membership committee would sign in the name of each member. No policy statement has ever been made on this issue.

Also, on many occasions there have been no facilities for signing in during the early part of the meetings.

Two of the members who are denied voting rights, Mr. and Mrs. George Gaston, have been very ill during their absence and have stated as much, with proof.

It seems to us that a decision must be made on the membership status of these persons without regard to the rights or wrongs of the matter which got this chapter involved to this extent. We therefore request that the annual election of the chapter officers which is scheduled for the second meeting in May be held up until this membership status situation is solved.

Sincerely,

s/Rosemary Laws
s/Muriel Brodshatzer

Co-Chairmen
Ad Hoc Committee for an
Effective San Diego Chapter
of CORE

s/Ambrose Brodus, Jr.
Spokesman