

must recognize they have badly miscalculated.

The Carter energy legislation already is under mounting attack from all sides. This thunderbolt from the NAACP could give it the coup de grace that it so richly deserves.

The NAACP obviously has done its homework well. It has seen through the shallow thought processes of the Carter energy planners.

Mrs. Margaret Bush Wilson of St. Louis, the NAACP chairman, told the Detroit News that the Carter energy package "was put together by a virtually lily-white coterie of White House advisers who subscribe to a limits-to-growth philosophy. A limited-growth policy tends to freeze people to whatever rung of the ladder they happen to be on. That's OK if you're a highly educated 28-year-old making \$50,000 a year as a presidential adviser. It's utter disaster if you're unskilled, out of work and living in a ghetto."

With this kind of perceptive thinking by leaders of one of the nation's most respected organizations, there is new hope that the nation will reject the Carter approach and devise an energy program that will spur development of all forms of energy so badly needed to provide new jobs

and a healthy economy.

Texas Paper Lauds Energy Push

In technology-rich Texas, the Dallas Times Herald joined the growing list of those applauding the NAACP's recent call for energy expansion in an editorial headlined "Blacks Focus on Jobs" Jan. 20.

...The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People recently adopted an energy report in which it urged deregulation of price controls on new oil and natural gas and argued against forced conversion to coal by "job-producing industries in urban areas."

In addition, the NAACP report asserted that environmental and safety concerns about nuclear power are outweighed by future needs for electricity and the "economic and social objectives that are more important to black Americans."

The NAACP recognized that the pessimistic attitude of President Carter about developing domestic energy resources "cannot satisfy the fundamental requirements of a society of expanding economic opportunities."...

Liberal Press, UAW Slam NAACP Energy Report

Mark Stepp, a black United Automobile Workers (UAW) vice-president and the head of the Michigan UAW Committee on Political Action, has written a letter challenging Margaret Bush Wilson, Chairman of the NAACP's National Board, to debate the NAACP's recent pronuclear policy statement, sources reported earlier this week. The NAACP national headquarters confirmed knowledge of the debate challenge on Jan. 25 in New York.

One black political figure from Detroit responded to Stepp's debate challenge: "Mark Stepp is out of his league."

Although it is now attacking the NAACP for its strongly pro-nuclear energy stance, in the 1950s under the leadership of the late Walter Reuther, the UAW was among the most outspoken supporters of President Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace Plan. Reuther supported the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy as the only way to industrialize the underdeveloped nations and erase the poverty which would otherwise lead to confrontations between the U.S. and USSR.

Black Weekly Echoes Village Voice, Calls NAACP Sellout

The Jan. 28 edition of New York's largest circulating black weekly newspaper, the Amsterdam News, continues the ongoing "big lie" operation being carried out through the media against the NAACP.

In the guise of a news article covering a press conference held Jan. 23 by the Congressional Black Caucus the Amsterdam News charges anew that the NAACP has "sold out to the oil companies" while neglecting to mention the NAACP's strong endorsement of the

development of nuclear power.

In an unprecedented move the paper cites the Village Voice as the authoritative source on "the economic interpretation of the forces behind the turnaround" of the Association and charges that "the NAACP leadership were instruments used by the oil industry experts on the civil rights organization, to further the interests of the industry."

Excerpts from that page one article follow:

In the first major publicly expressed policy difference among Black leadership groups, the Congressional Black Caucus, Monday, followed the National Urban League in taking positions on the energy program in opposition to the pro-oil industry and anti-Carter administration stand of the NAACP.

NAACP chairman Margaret Bush Wilson, who called in November for a new partnership between "Big Government, the Big Minority and Big Oil," aligned the civil rights organization with big oil, in the final position paper. And the NAACP pledged to mobilize citizens nationwide to urge Congress to pass aspects of the program it backed.

...Reacting to (the NAACP's mention of deregulation in their report) the Congressional Black Caucus noted the claim that deregulated prices would lead to significant new production and thus bring economic growth and new jobs...

...the worst burden of deregulation would fall on the low income, elderly, minorities and poor people and the unemployed...The Caucus noted.

...In a statement issued last Friday, National Urban League director Vernon Jordan took positions similar to that of the Caucus...

"The Village Voice did an economic interpretation of

the forces behind the turnaround... (they noted) that even the Wall Street Journal had a lead editorial heralding the NAACP-Wilson paper...

And the NAACP energy paper thus raised a question about the recent gift of \$500,000 from the Rockefeller foundation..."

Jesse Jackson Lauded As New Black Spokesman

Underlying criticism of the NAACP's energy perspective are efforts to put forward the Rev. Jesse Jackson as the real spokesman of black people's desire for jobs and income. On Jan. 22 syndicated columnist Mary McGrory reviewed Jackson's "performance" before the Republican National Committee.

Rev. Jackson Conducts A GOP Revival

With Jesse Jackson and the Republican National Committee it was love at first sight.

And no wonder.

The young black preacher, disciple of Martin Luther King Jr. was the best speaker the RNC probably has ever heard....

For some of them, of course, it was an adventure just to be in the same room with a disciple of King, a scourge of Southern sheriffs and Mayor Daley, veteran of a thousand marches and street fights, alumnus of more jails than he can count, and, of course, a registered Democrat.

They gave him a standing ovation when chairman Bill Brock, in the purr of one who knows he pulled off a dynamite blind date, introduced him at the head table of the Mayflower hotel meeting.

When Jackson finished speaking, the Republicans rose to their feet again. Because they lead sheltered lives, they were taken unawares by his cadenced eloquence, his humor, his play on words.... Make alliance with my people, he said, and I will promise to deliver them out of their bondage to the Democratic Party.

First he opened their pores with the figures. Seven million blacks remain unregistered, despite the Voting Rights Act of 1965. They are the Republicans' for the asking. All the Republicans need to do is offer them programs which will appeal to the blacks' self-interest.

He called the roll of moderate Republicans, who got their winning margins from blacks.

He took them on a tour through black America, through ghettos and jails, continuing deprivations on the land, in the schools, in the professions.

The Republicans were bowled over and not just by the rhetoric.

...It was like a revival meeting. No one would have been surprised to see the Republicans march forward to confess their sin of abandoning blacks, as human beings and voters.

Will it last? Will they backslide? Will the memory of what was for most of them a political and aesthetic experience fade away, and will they return to their old ways of voting massive sums for defense while bidding the slums to pull up their socks?...

"If only," said Brock, "we had Republicans who could talk like that."

New York Times,

"Does Civil Rights Include Energy?"

(editorial), Jan. 27:

It is ten years since Martin Luther King Jr. stunned his allies in the civil rights movement — and their benefactor in the White House — by leaping into another pasture of protest to join the opposition to the Vietnam War. His foray into foreign policy raised a basic question about the scope of black political activity: Should civil rights groups concern themselves only with racial equality and social welfare, or should they pursue the sources of inequality and poverty in the total fabric of economic and even foreign policies? The question reappeared last week when the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People stepped forward to offer what it saw as a black position on energy.

After decades of intense civil rights activity, during which it routinely supported the general policies of liberal Democrats, the N.A.A.C.P. decided on a sharp break with President Carter. It endorsed the oil industry's desire for the deregulation of the price of natural gas. It supported the accelerated development of nuclear breeder reactors as preferable to coal conversion. It pressed for higher rates of growth even at some cost in environmental damage. Government constraints on energy demand and consumption, it argued, can only inhibit growth and therefore retard the financial and social progress of blacks.

Predictably enough, the N.A.A.C.P. suddenly found itself with some unfamiliar allies. A delighted oil industry reprinted the new statement on energy in newspaper advertisements. The Wall Street Journal proclaimed that blacks finally understood the wondrous workings of a free market. Republicans came scurrying to learn if this was an opening to a long-lost constituency.

A second consequence was a split in the ranks of the civil rights movement. The National Urban League, which had taken the lead in protesting what it regards as President Carter's inadequate response to black needs, broke with the N.A.A.C.P. and held with the White House on energy. Black members of Congress were quick to counter the N.A.A.C.P. position by arguing that deregulation of energy prices would only exacerbate black poverty and unemployment. Other liberals sniffed for sinister connections between members of the N.A.A.C.P. board and agents of the oil industry.

Troubled by the criticism from customary allies, the board and staff of the N.A.A.C.P. are now quarreling about the circumstances of their energy statement and the wisdom of venturing into such unfamiliar political terrain. It would be a pity if they confuse the two questions.

We happen to believe that the N.A.A.C.P. paper on energy was inadequately prepared, poorly reasoned, and, finally, wrong for all Americans. But we applaud the growing recognition by civil rights groups that the great issues dividing the country can, logically, also divide sophisticated black organizations. And we agree with the underlying judgment that blacks, along with the rest of society, will benefit from the spread of black influence to both political parties, in conservative as well as liberal circles, in the business community, the labor

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

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

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

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

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

New Republic: NAACP Energy Policy A Conspiracy

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

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

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

Who Owns The Black Caucus?

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

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

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

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

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