

CHANGING AN IMAGE IN
TURBULENT TIMES: STRATEGIES OF THE 1969
BLACK PANTHER PARTY

THESIS

Presented to Graduate Council of
Southwest Texas State University
In Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements

For the Degree

Master of Arts

By

Herod King Ellison

San Marcos, Texas
May, 2001

COPYRIGHT

by

Herod King Ellison

2001

To my mother, family and friends

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the Great Spirit who brought me to this wonderful place and time. From my humble beginnings, I could not have conceived all that I have accomplished in this life. All that I am, and all that I will ever be, must be attributed to he who knew me and loved me before I was born.

I must thank my Thesis Committee who showed me that real teachers still exists and that they are still pouring out knowledge for those whose cups are willing to receive it. Kudos to Dr. Ann Burnette whose support and guidance played an integral role in my educational development in communication. I would also like to thank Dr. Ramona Ford, an infinite well of knowledge and a true asset to the completion of this project. Lastly, I would thank my Thesis Director, Dr. Roseann Mandziuk who has had the most significant influence on the completion of this thesis. The foundation that she provided, her input, and encouragement despite her busy schedule made all of this possible. Thank you all again!

Herod King Ellison, March 8, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	THE PANTHERS RECONSTRUCTING AN IMAGE... 1	
	Introduction	
	Significance	
	Other Studies on the Black Panthers	
	Methodology	
	Preview of Chapters	
II	UNDER SEIGE: THE PANTHER'S DILEMMA..... .27	
	The Making of a Movement	
	Hard Times for the 1969 Vanguard of the Revolution	
	COINTELPRO: Targeted for Destruction	
	In the Line of Fire: Panther Exigencies	
	The Party's Leadership under Pressure	
	Conclusion	
III	THE POINT OF ACQUISITION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE RHETORIC OF FRED HAMPTON AND CONNIE MATTHEWS..... 63	
	Unveiling the meaning within the message	
	Section A: Fred Hampton's speech, "You Can Murder the Liberator, But You Can't Murder the Liberation."	
	Section B: Connie Matthews's speech, "The Struggle is a World Struggle."	
IV	A RHETORICAL DILEMMA: A STUDY OF THE RHETORIC OF PANTHER LEADERS, ELDRIDGE CLEAVER AND RAY "MASAI" HEWITT.....105	
	Section C: Eldridge Cleaver's open letter to Stokely Carmichael	
	Section D: Ray "Masai" Hewitt's speech to the Revolutionary Labor Conference	
V	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....138	

WORKS CITED.....	163
APPENDIX.....	172
A. “You Can Murder a Liberator, but You Can’t Murder Liberation” by Fred Hampton	
B. “The Struggle is a World Struggle” by Connie Matthews	
C. “An Open Letter to Stokely Carmichael” from Eldridge Cleaver	
D. “The Black Panther Party and Revolutionary Trade Union” by Ray “Masai” Hewitt	

CHAPTER I
CHANGING AN IMAGE
IN TURBULENT TIMES: RHETORICAL STRATEGIES
OF THE BLACK PANTHER PARTY
FOR SELF DEFENSE

Introduction

This study seeks to examine the rhetorical strategies that the Black Panther Party for Self Defense used in 1969. In particular, it will look at the strategies employed within several speeches and a letter that the Black Panthers used in an attempt to regain the support of the conservative black community, other radical groups, and white liberals, such as those in the Students for a Democratic Society. The speeches were written and delivered during the time that FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover had accelerated operation COINTELPRO, the government's counterintelligence program designed to discredit and destroy the leaders of the Black Nationalist movement in America in 1969 (Blumenthal 34). Marcus Garvey, organizer of the Universal Negro Improvement Association in 1920, started the Black Nationalist movement in the United States (Chambers, *Chronicles of Black Protest* 165). Garvey's movement reached its zenith during and after World War I, a period in America when Woodrow Wilson told "darker"

jokes to friends around the White House, Warren Harding came out publicly for segregation, and returning black doughboys were roughly and sometimes bloodily reminded of their place (Goldman, *Report from Black America* 173).

This study will examine the speech of Fred Hampton, Chairman of the Chicago Black Panther Party, delivered on April 27, 1969, and Connie Matthews's speech at the Vietnam Moratorium demonstration at San Jose College, October 15, 1969. It will also examine a speech by Ray "Masai" Hewitt, the Minister of Education of the Black Panther Party, delivered at the Revolutionary Labor Conference. Lastly, this study will examine a letter from Eldridge Cleaver, who was the Minister of Information for the Black Panther Party, to Stokely Carmichael, who was the Prime Minister of the Black Panther Party published in Philip S. Foner's *The Black Panthers Speak* (104). These rhetorical documents are the most relevant to this study because they illustrate how the Black Panther Party attempted to reach out to the various groups after Hoover increased the level of harassment of operation COINTELPRO.

Significance

There are several reasons these 1969 speeches of Hampton, Matthews, Hewitt and the letter from Cleaver to Carmichael have rhetorical significance. First, an analysis will enable critics to see how subordinate groups, locked outside of the social, economic, and political system, employ messages to garner support for their cause. According to Richard T. Schaefer, a subordinate group's members

have less control or power over their own lives than do members of a dominant or majority group (5). Second, an analysis will allow critics to examine the choices of rhetorical strategies used by the Black Panther Party for Self Defense to address the problems confronting the Party. Third, it will allow critics to see how the individual members of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense attempted to redefine or create a new image in the minds of Americans. Fourth, this thesis could serve as a model by illustrating the consequences of what happens to subordinate groups who do not work within an established system and could provide insight into better rhetorical strategies. Finally, examining the rhetoric and the Black Panther Party members' choice of strategies will provide insight into the success or failure of their rhetorical choices.

Other Studies on the Black Panther Party

Books and journal articles relating to the subject of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense fall into three categories. The sources are either historical (studies written about the Black Panther Party for Self Defense), documents (articles written by the Black Panther Party), and/or rhetorical criticisms (studies of some aspect of the Black Panther Party, i.e., the dialectics of repression). The largest body of work on the Black Panther Party consists of the autobiographies, biographies, and the court trials of their members (Smith 6).

Most of the books written about the Black Panther Party fall into the historical category. Bobby Seale's book, *Seize The Time: The Story of the Black*

Panther Party and Huey P. Newton, talks about his experience as a child in Texas and later talks about how he met Huey P. Newton. Bobby Seale's book is his personal experience as the Chairman of the Black Panther Party in 1969.

Earl Anthony's book, *Picking Up The Gun*, also starts at the inception of the Black Panther Party and gives his own personal account of what happened within the Party while he was the Deputy Minister of Information. Anthony's book emphasizes the factionalism within the Black Panther Party and the problems the Party had with other radical groups.

Ward Churchill and Jim Vander Wall's book, *Agents of Repression: The FBI's Secret Wars Against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement*, offers an interesting historical perspective on the Black Panther Party and the American Indian movement. This book illustrates the FBI's long history of targeting black organizations and the leaders of the Civil Rights movements in America. From files gathered through the Freedom of Information Act, Churchill and Vander Wall's book reveals the tactics used to destroy the Black Panther Party. The FBI's tactics ranged from assassinations, bogus mail, disinformation, eavesdropping, and harassing arrests, infiltrators, and agent provocateurs. This book also shows how similar tactics were used to destroy the American Indian Movement. These books are important to the research in that they will be crucial in helping to recreate the climate that influenced the rhetoric of the Black Panther Party, especially in 1969.

Ward Churchill and Jim Vander Wall's book entitled *The COINTELPRO Papers* is a collection of documents supporting their allegations that the FBI

sought to destroy the Black Panther Party. The COINTELPRO documents also show that the FBI targeted others who fought for Civil Rights (i.e., equal treatment under the law), such as the American Indian Movement, Puerto Rican Independentistas, and Feminists. Virtually all of the documents used in Churchill and Vander Wall's *COINTELPRO Papers* proved the allegations that were made in their first book, *Agents of Repression: The FBI's Secret Wars Against the Black Panthers Party and the American Indian Movement*. In one example Churchill and Vander Wall state that the FBI was responsible for provoking violence between the United Slaves (a Black Nationalist organization) and the Black Panther Party for Self Defense. This was illustrated in an FBI memo dated November 25, 1968. The FBI produced and distributed cartoons all over Southern California depicting the United Slaves Organization as a large cobra killing two members of the Black Panther Party and threatening the others, all of whom were depicted as chickens (131).

Another book that talks exclusively about the history of the Black Panther Party is Jennifer B. Smith's book, *An International History of the Black Panther Party*. Focusing on the national history and the international history of the Black Panther Party, Smith's book examined how the Black Panther Party in America affected Nova Scotia and other international communities. Through her extensive examination of documents in *The COINTELPRO papers* of Ward Churchill and Jim Vander Wall, Jennifer Smith points out how the FBI sought to destroy the Black Panther Party and its members along with those involved with the Civil

Rights Movement, while at the same time ignoring white supremacists groups like the KKK and the Neo-Nazis (7).

The second category of books and journal articles written about the Black Panther Party are primary documents. These documents were written and produced by the members of the Black Panther Party. Philip S. Foner's book, *The Black Panthers Speak*, is a composite of essays, letters, editorial statements, newspaper articles, poems and speeches from various members of the Black Panther. Foner's book also contains definitions. For example, in May 1967 the Black Panther Party gives its definition of a "PIG." According to the Black Panthers, a "Pig" is an ill natured beast who has no respect for law and order, "a foul transducer who's usually found masquerading as a victim of an unprovoked attack" (Foner 14). Bobby Seale's definition of a "PIG" is a police officer that violates the constitutional rights of a person (The Black Panther 3). Foner's book also lists the party's rules and their "Ten Point Platform and Program." This book contains the ideology of the Black Panthers Party (Foner 122).

G. Louis Heath's book, *The Black Panther Leaders Speak*, contains a chronology of the official Black Panther newspaper. Heath's book also lists a national roster of the various members in the organization, along with their titles. The book also contains a list of political prisoners of the United States Government, which includes members of the Black Panther Party and the National Committee to Combat Fascism (Heath 55). Heath's book contains essays and a list of activities and programs sponsored by the Black Panther Party,

such as national free health clinics, liberation schools, petitions for community control of police, and breakfast programs for children.

The Committee on Internal Security in the House of Representatives compiled another book that contains many of the documents written by the members of the Black Panther Party. The 141-page document is a collection of statements by essential figures in the Black Panther Party and it lists every member or anyone affiliated with the organization. The Committee on Internal Security's documents also lists supporters of Black Panther Party, such as the Students for a Democratic Society, the Progressive Labor Party, the Republic of New Africa, the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, and the American Serviceman's Union, just to name a few. These documents also list the Black Panther Party's international supporters, including the Korean Democratic Lawyer Association, Solidarity Committee for Third World People's Liberation Struggle in Scandinavia, and the French Federation of Black African Students. These documents contain many violent cartoon captions published in the Black Panther Paper. They also contain many photographs of the essential figures involved with the Black Panther Party. Documents such as these provide excellent support materials for the contextual analysis and insight into the implicit meaning within the speeches that I will analyze in later chapters.

The last category relating to the subject of the Black Panther Party is composed of studies focused on rhetorical criticism. For example, John A. Courtright's article, "Rhetoric of the Gun: An Analysis of the Rhetorical Modification of the Black Panther Party," investigates how the constant scrutiny

by many law enforcement agencies forced the Black Panther Party for Self Defense to modify their militant rhetoric (250). This study analyzes the organization's weekly newspaper, *The Black Panther Inter-Communal Newsletter* (251). Courtright conducted a content analysis in order to identify the ongoing changes in the rhetoric of the Black Panther Party (255). A content analysis involves identifying and examining messages contained in a text (Frey, Botan, Friedman, and Kreps 212). Courtright's analysis examined the Black Panther Party for Self Defense's newsletters from the periods before, during, and after the rhetorical change had taken place (256). More specifically, his study examined the newsletters from October of 1968 to April of 1972 (257). In Courtright's study, the content analysis revealed that before June 1970 the density of aggressive symbols (i.e., violent rhetoric) in the Black Panther Internal-Communal Newsletter was much higher than after this date (263). His study also revealed that as the police continued to thin the ranks of the Black Panther Party, the intensity of aggressive symbols decreased dramatically (264). Courtright's study examines the rhetorical strategies of the Black Panther Party by examining how often they employ aggressive symbols in their newsletter and when the rhetorical change occurred. It does not take into consideration, however, the implicit and explicit meanings within these texts, as my study will explain in a later chapter.

Patricia Edwards Bowman's thesis, *The Rhetorical Strategies and Tactics of the Black Panther Party as a Social-Change Movement*, looks at the role of rhetoric in the development and career of a social-change movement (10). A

social movement (e.g., NAACP, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and CORE, Congress of Racial Equality) must perform a number of persuasive functions (Stewart, Smith and Denton 65). Social movements must transform perceptions of reality, transform perceptions of society, prescribe courses of action, mobilize the discontented, and sustain the movement until victory is achieved (Stewart, Smith and Denton 65). Patricia Edwards Bowman's study is concerned with the rhetorical phenomena, verbal and nonverbal, which were generated by the Black Panther Party as a social-change movement (21). Her study examines the Black Panther Party from a historical, sociological, and rhetorical framework with various theoretical perspectives to give more insight into the rhetorical development of the party (183). Using newspapers published by the Black Panther Party and excerpts from the speeches of Huey P. Newton, Eldridge Cleaver, Bobby Seale, and Fred Hampton as primary sources, Bowman analyzes the verbal strategies and tactics of the Party (21). Bowman's selection of speeches centers on significant events that affected the rise and decline of the Black Panther Party as a social-change movement (22). She selected the nonverbal rhetorical strategies and tactics of the Panther Party from issues of *The Black Panther*, *The New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal* and press coverage from other newspapers (21-22). Bowman cites confrontation as an example of a nonverbal rhetorical strategy (i.e., Panther guards lifting their guns into firing position and police quickly turning away) (99). Bowman's study provides insight into the overall effectiveness of the rhetorical choices of the Black Panther Party (183).

A study that more closely resembles the kind of analysis that I will conduct is Wayne Brockriede and Robert L. Scott's chapter in their book *The Rhetoric of Black Power*, "Stokely: Two Speeches on Black Power." Brockriede and Scott's study examines the rhetorical strategies that Stokely Carmichael used in his rhetoric (114). Their study also looked at what accounted for the predominantly negative response Carmichael and his message received (114). Brockriede and Scott's study examines and interprets the information contained within Carmichael's speeches as well as the situation surrounding the delivery (e.g., the environment, response, and reasons for creating the speeches, etc.). Their analyses provide the closest paradigm for the kind of study that I will conduct on the rhetoric of Black Panther Party. Most rhetorical studies examining the discourse on the Black Panther Party focus on the rhetoric of "Black Power." The term "Black Power" was misunderstood from the beginning of the movement. Neither Roy Wilkins of the Los Angeles chapter of the NAACP, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, nor the media sought to clarify the term's ambiguity (Brockriede and Scott 112). Instead, they chose to emphasize the belligerent and divisive thrust of the term by suggesting adroitly that it was simply "Black racism" (Brockriede and Scott 112). According to Brockriede and Scott, Carmichael's "Black Power" slogan has three major implications, the first being personal pride in being black, the second being responsibility to other blacks, and the third being the power as a group to deal with outsiders (116).

In a later chapter, this thesis will illustrate the events in 1969 that helped to shape the rhetoric of the Black Panther Party and examine the events that

contributed to their selection of strategies. It is important to see how the events of 1969 affected the rhetoric of the Black Panthers as a social-change movement because it will allow the critic to determine whether or not they made the best rhetorical choices while under fire from FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's operation COINTELPRO.

Methodology

In this thesis, I will apply the rhetorical theory of Charles J. Stewart, Craig Allen Smith, and Robert E. Denton, Jr. to the rhetoric of the Black Panther Party in order to illuminate the effectiveness of their rhetorical strategies. The thesis will also explore how the Black Panther Party attempted to (1) transform the perception of reality, (2) alter the perception of society, (3) prescribe what must be done, who must accomplish the task and how the task must be accomplished, (4) mobilize for action, (5) and sustain their movement (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 44).

According to Stewart, Smith, and Denton, for a social movement to attain legitimacy essential for bringing about social change, it must employ both coercive and confrontational strategies (132). According to Herbert Simons, legitimacy is characterized as the perception by receivers that the source has a right to exact obedience from them (244). Stewart, Smith, and Denton's notion of coercive or common ground strategies emphasizes similarities, shared experiences, and a common cause with target audiences (135). They state that

movements are wise to identify with the moral symbols, sacred emblems, heroes, founding fathers, and revered documents of society rather than to attack them as many movements are prone to do (135). Confrontational rhetoric, according to Stewart, Smith, and Denton, is essential for a movement to gain legitimacy because it chips away at four powers enjoyed by the establishment: reward, control, identification, and moral suasion (140). Stewart, Smith, and Denton argue that confrontational rhetoric clearly distinguishes the social movement from institutions by polarizing the competing forces and revealing the ugliness of a situation and social order that needs remedy (140). Examining when a movement attains legitimacy will allow the critic to determine how effective the rhetorical choices of the Black Panther Party were at bringing about social change. This notion of movement legitimacy will provide insight into other questions about the Party such as, whether they were successful at distinguishing their Party from the opposition and, how successful they were at revealing the ugliness of the American system of government and institutional racism.

A social movement must fulfill several functions. Herbert Simons cites three functions for social movements and lists them under three broad headings (3-4). According to Simons, a social movement must (1) attract, maintain, and mold workers (i.e., followers) into an efficiently run unit, (2) secure adoption of their product by the larger structure (i.e., the external system, the social order), and (3) a social movement must react to the resistance generated by the larger structure (3-4).

According to Stewart, Smith, and Denton, Bruce Gronbeck's list of functions for social movements is a more inclusive list of persuasive functions (44). Gronbeck provides six functions for social movements listed in chronological series of stages (99). The first stage is Defining: Somebody or some group takes the first step; a problem is defined and a solution is urged. The second stage is Legitimizing: Legitimizers can lend positive authority, a regional or national presence to a budding movement. The third stage of a social movement is In-gathering: The movement builds a power base, a group of adherents ready to talk, march, and fight for the cause. The fourth stage is Pressuring: The movement also mounts a campaign urging reform or revolution. The fifth stage is Compromising: After direct confrontation, usually some sort of compromise must be worked out. The last stage of Gronbeck's functions for social movement is Satisfying: Leaders must be able to return to the masses of their movement, proclaiming victory, even if only partial gains have been made (99). Although Gronbeck's list of functions is a more inclusive list and was specifically used to study Black Action Movements, it leaves out the stage of how a movement must redefine itself or alter its self-perception. According to Stewart, Smith and Denton, Gronbeck's study is best suited for examining a social movement's campaign or action in which a single social movement organization has attempted to fulfill all six functions in a fairly brief time (44).

Building upon the foundations of Simons and Gronbeck, Stewart, Smith and Denton developed a more inclusive scheme of interrelated general and specific functions that emphasize the importance of audience perception (44). The first

stage includes transforming perceptions of reality. According to Stewart, Smith and Denton, to transform the perceptions of reality one has to consider altering perceptions of the past, altering the perception of the present and altering the perception of the future (44). The second stage includes altering the perceptions of society. According to Stewart, Smith and Denton, altering society's perceptions involves altering the perceptions of the opposition and altering self-perception (44). The third stage involves prescribing courses of action, which involve prescribing what must be done, who must accomplish the task, and how the task must be accomplished (44). The fourth stage of Stewart, Smith, and Denton's list involves mobilizing for action, which includes organizing the united and discontented, pressuring the opposition, and gaining sympathy and support from opinion leaders or legitimizers (44). The last stage of their list involves sustaining the social movement, which includes justifying setbacks and delays, maintaining viability of the movement, and maintaining visibility of the movement (44). Stewart, Smith, and Denton's list, which emphasizes the importance of the audience's perceptions, is the most useful list for my thesis because it includes altering self-perception and my study will examine how the Black Panther Party attempted to change their image of violence. Their list of functions is also useful because it allows the critic to determine what alternative rhetorical choices the Party could have used to enhance their image and regain the support of the public.

Stewart, Smith and Denton's chapter on the language strategies of social movements focuses on the use of slogans, obscenity and ridicule in the rhetoric of

social movements (182-198). They first illustrate how slogans can aid in transforming the perceptions of reality and society (Stewart, Smith and Denton 183). The example used to illustrate how slogans can transform the perceptions of reality is shown in the slogan, “Abortion: the American Holocaust” as viewed by the pro-life movement (Stewart, Smith and Denton 183). Stewart, Smith and Denton cite another example of how slogans are used to transform the perceptions of reality in a statement from members of an anti-war movement. The slogan states, “War is not healthy for children and other living things” (Stewart, Smith and Denton 183). To illustrate how slogans can transform the perceptions of society, Stewart, Smith and Denton cite an example of an Anti-Vietnam war chant, “Hey, hey LBJ, how many kids have you killed today?” (184). Countercultures used the slogan, “Don’t trust anyone over thirty” (Stewart, Smith and Denton 184).

Stewart, Smith and Denton’s chapter also demonstrates how slogans are used to aid in prescribing courses of action. Examples cited include, “Free the Wounded Knee 300, Ban the Krugerrand” (a South African gold piece sold in America), and the anti Vietnam War slogan, “Make love not war ” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 184-185). The chapter demonstrates how slogans are used to mobilize groups for action. The first example urged buyers to, “Boycott Chiquita bananas” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 185). Another example cautioned, “Don’t buy Red Coach Iceberg lettuce” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 185). Antinuclear power advocates urged, “Occupy Seabrook” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 185).

The second part of Stewart, Smith, and Denton's article on language strategies of social movements explores the use of obscenity in the language of social movements. Obscenity may be verbal or nonverbal or a combination of both, and usually appears as adjectives that constitute indecent words, phrases and actions (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 187). According to Stewart, Smith, and Denton, there are several important rhetorical characteristics of obscenity as observed by Michael Hazen (188). The strength of obscenity lies in the linking and comparative process (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 188). Verbal obscenity makes comparisons with those things that are at the heart of a culture's values and these values are important to society (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 188). According to Michael Hazen, sex, body functions, and religion are at the heart of how we perceive ourselves and our relationship to the world and verbal obscenity draws its strength from the culture's definition of what is proper (Stewart, Smith and Denton 188). Accordingly, verbal obscenities violate social norms and expectations and the more obscene the language, the greater the violations against social norms and the potential impact on the audience (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 188).

The third part of Stewart, Smith, and Denton's chapter on the language strategies of social movements concerns the persuasive functions of obscenity. Social movements can use obscenity to alter the perceptions of reality (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 188). Stewart, Smith, and Denton's example depicts anti-war protesters resorting to obscenities and public sexual acts to communicate their belief that sex is natural, creative, and exhibits love, while war is unnatural,

destructive, and exhibits hatred (188). They cited another example in Jerry Farber's popular and highly controversial essay, "The Student as Nigger" (188). Farber's essay was designed to influence the way that the readers viewed the education system, particularly universities (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 188). Farber wrote, "In California state colleges the faculties are screwed regularly and vigorously by the Governor and the Legislature." For the students "There is a kind of castration that goes on in the schools" (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 188).

Stewart, Smith, and Denton also illustrate how social movements alter the perceptions of the opposition using obscenity. This is accomplished by heaping obscenities upon their perceived devils to discredit and humiliate them (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 189). According to Stewart, Smith, and Denton, the use of obscenity enables social movements to define and stereotype the opposition as vile, hypocritical, impotent and stupid (189). In short, the opposition is viewed as obscene (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 189). They look at how obscenities that discredit and humiliate the opposition enhance the self-concept of the protesters (189). According to Richard Gregg, author of *The Ego-Function of the Rhetoric of Protest*, "By painting the enemy in a dark hued imagery of vice, corruption, evil, and weakness, one may easily convince himself/herself of his/her own superior virtue and thereby gain a symbolic victory of ego-enhancement" (82).

Another important language strategy of social movements examines how obscenity aids in prescribing courses of action (190). In one example, Stewart, Smith, and Denton cite Abbie Hoffman's statement, "Revolution for the hell of it" (190). Hoffman says, "They know something's up, something's going on down

there, something's happening, some change coming on in this country... We won't tell'em what it is. What do you want to tell them for? Don't you tell'em shit never" (Stewart, Smith and Denton 190). According to Stewart, Smith, and Denton, the labor movement also was establishing, defining, and affirming their selfhood by engaging in a rhetorical act against their employers (190). In another example the leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, H. Rap Brown cites a strategy for confusing enemies of "Black Power" (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 190). Brown says, "If white folks say gray suits are fashionable, you go buy a pink one" (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 190).

Obscenity also is used for mobilizing a movement into action. According to Stewart, Smith, and Denton, obscenities can enhance the credibility of movement leaders because they have the nerve to shout what others only feel (191). One example cited is that the Black Panthers' obscene vilification of police expressed the private feelings of many black Americans (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 191). Obscenity can contribute to the cohesiveness of a social movement by creating a sense of interpersonal identification among protestors and potential sympathizers and legitimizers (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 191). Accordingly, there also are five problems associated with using obscenities within social movements. The first consists of keeping focused on the end for which the social movement is fighting and being careful of using tired old words and slogans which might prompt others to turn off (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 192). The second problem is that the attention that is gained through obscenity is short-lived (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 192). Third, since obscenity is the most extreme form of verbal

aggression, the social movement cannot become more radical without resorting to actual violence (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 193). The fourth problem associated with the use of obscenity in social movements is that verbal and nonverbal obscenities are socially unacceptable and therefore are primarily used by minorities both in society and social movements (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 193). The last problem associated with the use of obscenities in social movements is that obscenities may produce violent reactions from the establishment that members do not anticipate (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 193).

The fourth part of Stewart, Smith, and Denton's chapter on social movements involves the uses of ridicule. According to Ron Roberts and Robert Kloss, ridicule is a form of humor usually employed by social movements and countermovements to demean the status of another individual or group; they claim that "Ridicule has been used with some success in keeping people in their place" (154). Stewart, Smith, and Denton state that the purpose of ridicule is to mock or make fun of; to make fun of is to exaggerate every real or alleged fault or weakness; to exaggerate every fault and weakness is to distort, deform, and uglify; to distort is to make someone or something appear absurd, laughable, or outrageous; and to make outrageous is to dehumanize (194). Stewart, Smith, and Denton also address six levels of ridicule, whereby ridicule may be placed along a continuum of severity or virulence ranging from making of a person, group, place, thing, action, or idea for being (1) inconsistent, (2) illogical, (3) inept, (4) silly, (5) monstrous, and (6) inhuman (194). An example of ridiculing a group for inconsistencies is illustrated in a cartoon during the Vietnam War which depicts a

heavily armed and bomb-laden President Johnson telling a young black protester, “You’re setting a bad example with your violence” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 194). Another example shows a cartoon depicting the anti-apartheid movement of the 1980s, illustrating a South African police officer beating a black citizen while the South African Prime Minister lectures, “How many times do I have to tell you? We won’t talk to any black leader who doesn’t renounce violence” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 194).

The second level of ridicule gets more personal while mocking a group’s ideas, actions, and statements as illogical, irrational, and unreasonable (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 195). Stewart, Smith, and Denton’s example depicts an Anti-Vietnam war poster and bumpersticker which reads, “Join the army; travel to exotic, distant lands; meet exciting, unusual people and kill them” (195). Another cartoon depicting Native Americans and colonists at Thanksgiving portrays a colonist walking away from three Indian braves, one of whom is saying, “They’ve shot twenty-nine of our braves, polluted all the rivers, killed most of the game, and raped the chief’s sister. Now he wants us to drop over next Thursday for turkey dinner with all the fixings” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 195). The third level of ridicule gets increasingly personal as they make fun of the opposition as inept, stupid, or senseless (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 196). Stewart, Smith, and Denton’s example depicts a cartoon of Columbus landing in the new world being met by male and female natives; the male comments to the female, “That’s a laugh...This guy thinks we’re Indians” (196). Another native American cartoon depicts an overweight and well-dressed white couple standing before the

Washington monument telling three native Americans: “If you don’t like it here in America, why don’t you go back where you come from?” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 196).

The fourth level of ridicule attacks the opposition as silly, trivial, or comical. For example, a cartoon depicting a placard-carrying group of students marching down the street while a well-dressed older couple looks on has the woman saying to her husband, “I don’t think it’s anything intellectual, dear—they’re from the university” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 196). The fifth level of ridicule attacks the opposition as monstrous, bizarre, and grotesque (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 196). An example is illustrated in an anti-capitalist depiction of an incredibly gross and bloated male in a suit saying, “Starvation’s God’s way of punishing those who have little or no faith in capitalism” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 196). Another example is depicted in an anti-pro-life cartoon featuring two ugly, dirty-old-men carrying protest signs reading “Outlaw Abortion” and “Keep Em Barefoot and Pregnant,” with a caption, “If we can’t outsmart them commies, we gotta outnumber em” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 196-197). The sixth level of ridicule attacks the opposition as inhumane and brutish (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 197). For example, males are “chauvinist pigs” and “rats,” American nazis are “cancers”; women’s rights activists are “bra-burners and libbers”; and black males are “bucks” (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 197). Stewart, Smith, and Denton’s chapter on the language strategies of social movements concludes with the three functions of ridicule (197). According to Stewart, Smith, and Denton, ridicule:

(1) Polarizes the social movement and the opposition by depicting an ideal devil for the movement or countermovement to confront, for it is the epitome of evil that creates a need for urgent action and long-term commitment to the cause. (2) Reduces the worth of the opponent while giving the persuaders of the social movement feelings of power, control over their environment and lives, and superiority, (3) Challenges the five powers of legitimacy by characterizing adversaries “as ungenuine and malevolent advocates” (198).

This chapter on the language strategies of social movements is important to the thesis because it will allow the critic to examine how the Black Panther Party used slogans, obscenity, and ridicule in their rhetoric. It is important to this thesis to examine how the Party used slogans to transform the perceptions of reality in an attempt to make their messages more powerful. Stewart, Smith, and Denton’s strategies of obscenity will provide insight as to whether or not the Black Panther’s use of obscenity was more of an asset rather than a hindrance to their movement. Their theory might also point to the problems associated with using obscenity as well as illustrating how the Black Panther Party used ridicule in their speeches. Stewart, Smith, and Denton’s *Persuasion and Social Movements* illustrates the kinds of strategies necessary for bringing about social change and will provide some insight as to what other rhetorical options the Black Panther Party could have exercised. The strategies described by Stewart et al., will also be useful in illuminating how the Black Panther Party for Self Defense attempted to alter society’s perception of the establishment with their use of slogans, obscenity, and ridicule.

Other studies that will be useful in explaining the rhetorical strategies of the Black Panther Party are the theories of Robert Scott and Michael McGee. Scott’s theory is critical to my thesis because it will illuminate the characteristics of Black

Power rhetoric and allow the critics to see how Black Power rhetoric works.

According to Robert Scott, violent rhetoric associated with militant advocates of Black Power has three characteristics (134). The first characteristic is that we hear what must be interpreted as the advocacy of violence (Scott 134). The second characteristic of violent Black Power rhetoric Scott argues is that the rhetoric is substantially justificatory (134). In other words, black violence is justified as a response to prior white violence (Scott 134). According to Robert Scott, black violence is self-defense, a reaction to racism around the world (134). It is readily identified with guerilla action to overthrow imperialistic colonialism and it is congruent with the corrupt status quo in America (Scott 134). The third characteristic of violent Black Power rhetoric is that the rhetoric has to maximize the slender hope that may exist for relatively peaceful, constructive working-out of the cry for Black Power (Scott 134). Robert Scott also states that whites must see the fundamental justification as real (134). According to Robert Scott, a strong sense of scene also permeates militant Black Power rhetoric, and critics should try to see the scene as the Black Power militants see it (139). The “scene” is one of the elements of theorist Kenneth Burkes’s dramatic pentad (xv).

Kenneth Burke defines a scene as the background of an act, the situation in which the act occurs (xv).

Michael McGee’s theory is important for my analysis of the rhetoric of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense because it allows the critic to examine the different ways in which one could approach an analysis of language strategies. Theorist Raymond Williams defines language as always being implicitly and

explicitly a definition of human beings in the world (21). Martin J. Medhurst, another theorist on language strategies, states that language used within a speech can speak to two levels of audiences with its explicit and implicit use of argument (205). Michael McGee states that there are two ways to think about languaging strategies (Brock 74). First, he states that one may contextualize the advocate's choice of one argument over another, perhaps merely to describe an event, but more likely to judge whether or not it was a right and proper choice and/or to say what ought to be done in future confrontations with similar context (Brock 74). Second, McGee states that one may textualize the advocate's choice of one tactic and not another, reading the choice to see what meaning might be latent in the claim that "such and such maneuver" will and ought to make society move (Brock 74). Bernard Brock, states that the "we" in McGee's words creates "ideographs," slogan-like terms signifying commitments (72). In other words, each member of the community is socialized, conditioned to the vocabulary of ideographs as a prerequisite for belonging to the society (Brock 72). The "we" in McGee's theory is important to my thesis because it will allow the critic to observe a meaningful moment in movement rhetoric when the movement changes (72).

In my analysis of the rhetoric of the Black Panther Party of 1969, the term "Rhetoric of violence" will be used in place of Robert Scott's term "Black Power rhetoric." This thesis will examine the strategies that the Black Panther Party used to persuade their audiences to join them in their fight for human rights for all black Americans. This thesis will illustrate how the Black Panthers created these messages to garner support from the conservative members of the black

community, liberal whites (i.e., Students for a Democratic Society), and other radical groups. More specifically, the thesis will explore the kinds of languaging strategies that the Black Panther Party for Self Defense used to mobilize support for the Party and to speak to multiple audiences.

Preview of Chapters

A close examination of the rhetorical strategies of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense, while under fire from J. Edgar Hoover's counterintelligence program operation COINTELPRO, makes for an interesting illustration of how the Party tried to enhance its credibility and its image that the Party would defend themselves against an oppressive government and terrorist groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and Neo-Nazis. It is important to see how the Black Panther Party for Self Defense tried to redefine itself in an attempt to regain the public's support which had been damaged by the Party's rhetoric of violence and its altercations with the local police. Chapter 2 of the thesis recreates the climate that helped to shape the rhetoric of the Black Panthers in 1969. More specifically, it looks at the events that influenced their rhetoric. Chapter 3 contains an analysis of the rhetoric of the Panthers. Using the theories of black power rhetoric and social movement expressed in chapter one, the thesis examines the rhetorical strategies, both implicit and explicit, within the texts of the Black Panthers. Chapter 4 concludes the thesis with an analysis of the rhetorical strategies employed by the Black Panther Party in its attempt to mobilize support for the Party by examining the

impact of the use of the “Rhetoric of violence.” It also discusses the possible implications of using the “Rhetoric of violence.”

CHAPTER II
UNDER SIEGE:
THE PANTHER'S DILEMMA

The violence of the nineteen sixties enacted upon Africans Americans by hostile whites during the Civil Rights movement provided the climate that gave birth to the more radical group of Blacks, the Black Panther Party for Self Defense (Garrow 490-500). The Kerner report, a report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, reported that “white racism” was the principal cause of the disturbance that rocked the nation in 1967, and that the United States was headed toward two communities, “one black and one white, separate and unequal” (62). The report established that the “racial attitude and behavior of white Americans toward black Americans” was the fundamental factor underlying the racial unrest (62). The purpose of this chapter is to recount the violent atmosphere within which the Black Panther Party for Self Defense would create their 1969 rhetoric. In rhetorical criticism, a critic examines the factors that influence the rhetorical choices in the artifact. This chapter illustrates how violence directed toward the Black Panther Party for Self Defense escalated in 1969 under FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover’s COINTELPRO. The events that helped shape the rhetoric of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense in 1969 are

described as well as the events that contributed to the selection of specific strategies employed by the Black Panther Party for Self Defense.

The ruling exigence facing the Black Panthers were the problems including police brutality and government persecution, caused by their rhetoric of violence (i.e., the Panthers would use violence against anyone who would use violence against them). In other words, the Panthers, being a minority within an oppressive, violent, racist society, made the mistake of threatening violence in retaliation, thereby bringing the wrath of the government down on the Party. According to Lloyd F. Bitzer, author of the “Rhetorical Situation,” an exigence is an “imperfection marked by urgency; it is a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than it should be” (6). For the Panthers, the obstacle to be overcome in 1969 was the government’s wrath, which manifested itself as the violent persecution of the Black Panther Party and its members. The government’s wrath was exacerbated by the Party’s early rhetoric from 1966 to 1968.

One example of this kind of inflammatory rhetoric that created the exigence for the Black Panther Party for Self Defense was illustrated in the July 3, 1967, issue of *The Black Panther*, the Party’s newspaper. Huey Newton’s Executive Mandate number one, which was delivered on May 2, 1967, at Sacramento, California State Capitol building, declared that the Black Panther Party “believes that the time has come for black people to arm themselves” (U.S. House of Representatives 25). Huey P. Newton, *The Black Panther Party’s*

Minister of Defense, in a statement issued in July 1967, recommended the following weapons for the Black Panther Party:

Army 45—"Army 45 will stop all jive"
 Carbine—"Carbine will stop a war machine"
 12 gauge magnum shotguns with 18 in. barrel. "Buckshots will down the cops"
 357 magnum pistol—"357 will wind us heaven"
 P 38—"P 38 will open prison gates"
 M 16—"And if you don't believe in lead, you are already dead"
 (Committee on Internal Security 25).

In this paragraph Huey Newton is telling Panther members the types of weapons they need to secure so that they might effectively arm themselves in the fight against police brutality and government oppression.

Another example of the Party's inflammatory rhetoric was illustrated in the July 20, 1967, issue of *The Black Panther*. In an address to "200 black brothers and sisters ranging in age from 14 to 30," Black Panther Party Chairman Bobby Seale stated that, "Now if declared: we want to exercise Black Power, we do not go out and have a lay-in... The only thing that we can do now, brothers and sisters, is to get our guns organize, for get the 'ins' and shoot it out (U.S. House of Representatives 11). Bobby Seale is stating that the old ways of nonviolent protest were unsuccessful and that black Americans had to take more extreme measures if they wanted to end police brutality in their communities and government oppression.

Similarly, on June 10, 1968, *The Black Panther* newspaper stated that Eldridge Cleaver, Black Panther Minister of information, denounced the Chief of Police Charles R. Gain in Oakland, California, and other police in general. He declared that the black community was keeping a list of names of policemen who

were “going to be hunted down like the dogs they are and will receive the justice that Adolf Eichman (a Nazi war criminal) got...” (U.S. House of Representatives 13). In other words, Cleaver was saying that the Black Panthers would see to it that the police officers that were killing and brutalizing members within the black community would be punished for their crimes. This type of violent language with the Panthers encouraging black Americans to arm themselves against a racist society that caused the FBI to increase its harassment of the Party through its counter intelligence program. These are just a few examples of the Panthers’ inflammatory rhetoric that caused the exigence confronting the Party. Another obstacle that the Black Panther Party for Self Defense had to overcome was society’s racist attitude and resistance to black economic power. The racist attitudes and resistance to the economic progress of Blacks resulted in violence whenever persons of color violated the socially accepted rules in America in 1969 (e.g., organizing their communities, seeking better education for their children, and wanting autonomy within their communities).

The Panthers’ militant rhetoric caused serious problems for the Party, and the FBI, under J. Edgar Hoover, used the Panthers’ rhetoric against them by creating a negative image of the Party in the media (Churchill and Vander Wall 118). The negative portrayal of the Black Panthers in the media was responsible for alienating potential supporters for the group, including conservative black Americans, liberal whites, and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). This alienation of Panther supporters caused by COINTELPRO, the FBI’s campaign to

smear the image of the Party in the media, was the second obstacle to be overcome by the Black Panthers.

The Making of a Movement

Before describing the specific circumstances that affected the rhetoric of the Black Panther Party in 1969, a brief background about the general climate in America is important to illustrate why the Party formed and why the Panthers increased their use of violent rhetoric. The years prior to 1969 were marred by violence and brutality. Violence and injustice directed toward Americans of African descent during the nineteen sixties was so prevalent that the circumstances prompted author Truman Nelson to write a book based on recordings of mothers and children who were the victims of the incidents he describes. Nelson's 1965 book, *The Torture of Mothers*, lists several accounts of police brutality in Harlem, New York (4-12). Nelson's book also contains supported allegations of court-appointed attorneys attempting to persuade the mothers of the boys to get them to confess to a lesser charge that would let the boys off with a sentence of one to five years imprisonment (Nelson 103). Another book by Paul Chevigny entitled, *Police Power: Police Abuse in New York City*, sponsored by the New York Civil Liberties Union, deals with the subject of police brutality against the citizens of New York ("New Book Tells of Abuse of Police Power" 11). Data from the 1969 Chevigny study reveals that 441 complaints of police abuse were brought to the attention of the New York Civil Liberties Union between March 1, 1966 and July 31, 1967 ("New Book Tells of

Abuse of Police Power” 11). According to Chevigny, staff attorney for the New York Civil Liberties Union, defying authorities (e.g., taking down a badge number or verbally criticizing a police officer’s behavior) would often result in a summons or summary corporal punishment, in other words, “police brutality” (98-112). Brandeis University’s Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence reported that “race-related disorders rose from 259 cases in 1967 to 724 in 1968” (3-4).

In 1968, three black students were killed and South Carolina law enforcement officers wounded several others over the protest of segregation at a local bowling alley (Hornsby 131-132). A lawsuit was filed against the owners of the bowling alley charging them with violating the Civil Rights Act of 1964. An action also was filed against South Carolina’s Orangeburg hospital facilities for segregation and discrimination concerning in 1968 the treatment of sick and injured African Americans (Hornsby 132). Attempts to indict and prosecute the officers involved were unsuccessful (Hornsby 132). Also, in 1968, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., leader of the Civil Rights movement, was assassinated in Memphis, Tennessee. A week of racial rioting in at least 125 cities in the nation followed his assassination (Hornsby 132-133). In May 1968, a mistrial was declared in the Mississippi murder trial of Ku Klux Klan leader Samuel H. Bower, Jr., one of thirteen men indicted in the fire-bomb slaying of black civil rights leader Vernon Dahmer in 1966 (Hornsby 135).

This violence perpetrated against African Americans during the turbulent 1960s provides an important backdrop for the rise of the Black Panther Party for

Self Defense and provides insight about why their violent rhetoric increased. The violence also added to the growth of their membership and facilitated the increase of other black militant groups throughout the country. The Black Panther Party for Self Defense relied heavily on the writings of Malcolm X, and it was Malcolm's emphasis on self-defense and the concept of gaining freedom "by any means necessary" that set the tone for the movement (Foner xvi). Franz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* was the most influential book in the early foundation of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense (Anthony 2). Fanon states: "Violence is a cleansing force. It frees the native from his inferiority complex and from his despair and inaction; it makes him fearless and restores his self-respect" (Anthony 2). According to Earl Anthony, author of *Picking Up the Gun: A Report On the Black Panthers*, Fanon's statement was for the panthers "like a road map to the revolution" (Anthony 3). Along with the Black Panther Party's growing membership, the philosophies of Fanon and Malcolm X led FBI director J. Edgar Hoover to label the Party in 1969, "The biggest threat to American internal security" (O'Neill 187).

Hard Times for the 1969 Vanguard of the Revolution

This segment of the thesis will recreate the climate of persecution in 1969 under which the Black Panther Party structured their rhetorical strategies to address the problems inflicted on the Party by COINTELPRO (persecution by federal agents and local police). 1969 was a turbulent year in America; small-

scale violence escalated as some frustrated African Americans responded to the police brutality with armed clashes in June (“Guerrilla Summer?” 16). Racial violence erupted in scattered localities around the nation as a long hot summer simmered to an end (Aldridge 1). The heated Indian summer opened with the arrest of some 500 Blacks and Puerto Ricans who clashed with Whites and the police in such places as Hartford, Connecticut; Parkersburg, Pennsylvania; Camden, New Jersey; Ft. Lauderdale, Florida; Charlotte, North Carolina; and Arlington, Virginia (Aldridge 1). As hostilities toward police rose, police often overreacted in response. For example, in Detroit police invaded a crowded church with guns blazing in search of a sniper (“Guerrilla Summer?” 16). In 1969, police and FBI agents began raiding militant headquarters in an attempt to deal with the snipers, ostensibly to look for weapons and sometimes to harass the members (“Guerrilla Summer?” 16). As a more militant movement swept the country, militant black students’ protest erupted on college campuses.

In Texas in the month of August, militant black students took over the National Student Association in El Paso. About 20 black students marched up to the podium while 800 delegates were in session, ripped out a telephone on the platform, flung the microphones to the floor, and climbed a 15-foot wall to take control of the public address system in the auditorium (“Militants Rip Up Student Confab” 22). Outbreaks of protests and violence were so prevalent that a new President-elect Richard Nixon had problems finding someone who would insure his inauguration against riots (Chapman 10). Nixon, elected without substantial support of African Americans, made only three top-level appointments of Blacks

to the Washington bureaucracy, perhaps signaling that matters of Civil Rights (i.e., equal treatment under the law) would be different under the new administration (Hornsby 135). In some organizations, such as the Jewish Defense League, support and sympathy for the Civil Rights of African Americans had waned (Wilkins 16).

COINTELPRO: Targeted for Destruction

On January 1, 1969 FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover issued a warning on terrorism by the “New Left” in the *Los Angeles Times* (“Hoover Warns on Terrorism by New Left” 26). He cautioned that the growth of black extremist organizations constituted “a potential threat to the internal security of the nation” partly because of the expansion of foreign influences within these groups (“Hoover Warns on Terrorism by New Left” 26). Hoover said the growth of these extremist groups added to the FBI’s work and the racial intelligence field. He noted that the Black Panther movement, with Stokely Carmichael playing an active role, “had grown tremendously and that its members were armed and taught from the works of Mao Tse-tung” (“Hoover Warns on Terrorism by New Left” 26). Additionally, he stated that Stokely Carmichael continued to travel extensively throughout the country and that his speeches were replete with statements calling for guerrilla warfare by the black community (“Hoover Warns on Terrorism by New Left” 26).

Hoover needed more information on the Black Panther Party for Self Defense and the other extremists groups, so on January 24, California Governor

Ronald Reagan introduced a bill to authorize wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping by law enforcement agencies into the California Assembly (“Reagan Wiretapping Bill Given to Assembly” 2). The introduction of Governor Reagan’s wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping bill set in motion a trend that would later come to haunt the Nixon administration, conveying the notion that “as California goes so goes the nation.”

Conservative Whites saw the Panthers as hordes of Blacks rising up to “take over America” under their green, black, and red banner (McKissack and McKissack 256). Jerris Lenard, President Nixon’s Assistant Attorney General, characterized the Black Panthers as “nothing but hoodlums” and insisted that the Federal government had to get them (Foner 264). Nixon’s Vice President Spiro Agnew called the Panthers a “completely irresponsible, anarchist group of criminals” (O’Neill 187). At the local level of government, the president of the Cleveland Fraternal Order of Police typified the attitude of many law enforcement authorities when he stated, “The country doesn’t need the Black Panther Party, and to my way of thinking they should be wiped out” (Foner 264). However, the Black Panther Party for Self Defense saw themselves differently. They saw themselves as freedom fighters for black people in America. Many black people feared the police and knew very well that the police would not hesitate to take their lives, as in the case of the “ Hunters Point revolt” in San Francisco where Mathew Johnson and many other young blacks were shot to death by the police (Anthony 37). The Panthers believed that they were the “vanguard of the

revolution” and they used aggressive rhetoric to show that they were serious about their role within the radical movements (Blumenthal 34).

To deal with the growing membership of the Black Panthers around the country, the Justice Department organized a special task force in 1969 to suppress the Party called COINTELPRO, the government’s counter intelligence program (O’Neill 187). Operation COINTELPRO, the brainchild of thirty-year FBI veteran William C. Sullivan (Hoover’s top assistant), and Charles D. Brennan, (Chief of Division 5), focused on the students, Chicano, American Indian, and the black movements (Blumenthal 33). The FBI operation set out to destroy the Black Panther Party. In a memo to W. C. Sullivan dated September 27, 1968, requesting “positive suggestions as to actions to be taken to thwart and disrupt the Black Panther Party,” the FBI formulated the scope of the proposed counterintelligence program (Churchill and Vander Wall 124-125). According to Sullivan’s memo, “no action was to be taken against the Black Panther Party without prior bureau authorization” (Churchill and Vander Wall 125).

Therefore, the harassment, police brutality, factionalism, negative press image, and escalating violence against the Black Panther Party were sanctioned by and were a part of the FBI’s COINTELPRO operation. Sullivan’s memo is important because it illustrates the FBI’s direct involvement with the repression and destruction of the Panther Party. Pressure from the counterintelligence program (COINTELPRO) on the Black Panther Party took the form of attacks on their image, economic discrimination, government harassment, and escalating police violence against the Party and violence instigated against the group by rival

Black Nationalist groups. COINTELPRO actions resulted in factionalism, the deaths and imprisonment of various members and the resignation of an essential figure from within the Panther Party.

Hoover's COINTELPRO operation had five goals. The first goal of Hoover's program against what he called Black Nationalist hate groups was to "prevent the rise of a Messiah who could unify and electrify the militant Black Nationalist movement" (Blumenthal 33). The second goal of the program was to "prevent violence on the part of Black Nationalist groups." Hoover's second statement meant, "FBI agents have to pinpoint potential troublemakers and neutralize them before they exercise their potential for violence" (Blumenthal 34). The third goal of the COINTELPRO operation was to prevent the long-range growth of militant Black Nationalist organizations, especially among youth (Blumenthal 34). The fourth and fifth goals of COINTELPRO were listed in Book III of the *Final Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities* (United States Senate). According to the report, the fourth goal was to prevent groups and leaders from gaining "respectability" by discrediting them to the "responsible" Negro and White communities, and to Negro radicals (21). The final goal of COINTELPRO was to prevent the "coalition of militant Black Nationalist groups," which might be a first step toward a real "Mau Mau" (a true black revolution).

In the Line of Fire: Panther Exigencies

This discussion illustrates the pressures experienced by the Black Panther Party due to COINTELPRO in 1969. The objective of COINTELPRO was to get the Panthers off the street at all cost and detain them for any possible reason (Churchill and Vander Wall 6). An important aspect of COINTELPRO was that FBI and police agents needed little or no evidence to make an arrest (U.S. Senate Final Report of the Select Committee 220). The FBI launched a four-prong attack against the Black Panther Party in 1969. First, COINTELPRO harassed leaders and members of the Party by: (1) Orchestrating violence against the Party by agitating strained relationships between the Panthers and another Black Nationalist group, (2) Using the media to damage the image of the Panthers, (3) Harassing supporters of the Party, and (4) Infiltrating the Party.

The first incident of police harassment occurred on the 2nd of January, 1969 when three persons who said that they were members of the Black Panthers were accused of bombing and machine gun attacking the Jersey City's 5th Precinct police station on November 29 ("Jersey City Terrorists Bomb Police Station" 5). Jersey City Mayor Thomas J. Whelan asked Gov. Richard Hughes and the New Jersey investigation commission for a probe of the Black Panthers ("Jersey City Terrorists Bomb Police Station" 5). The first example of the FBI's COINTELPRO-provoked violence against the Black Panther Party, which culminated in the second incident of harassment of the Party, was an incident that occurred on January 18 when two members were killed.

The FBI orchestrated the violence that occurred between the Panthers and the United Slaves, a rival Black Nationalist group. The *Los Angeles Times* stated

that two Black Panther students, John Jerome Huggins, 23, and Alprentice (Bunchy) Carter, 26, were slain in a University of California at Los Angeles Hall on January 18 (Drummond and Reich 1). Two days later, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that the two members of the Black Panther Party had been shot to death at the end of a meeting concerning a proposed Black Studies Program at UCLA (“One of Suspects in Slaying of Panthers at UCLA Gives Up” 1). Two members of a rival group called the United Slaves (a Black Nationalist group) led by Ron Karenga, a former student of UCLA, were responsible for the shootings (“One of Suspects in Slaying of Panthers at UCLA Gives Up” 1). The assailants had fled the building during the confusion. David Hillard, the Black Panther Party’s Chief of Staff, praised the two Panther members who were slain in the UCLA hall and warned that the Panthers would arm themselves against black provocateurs and white policeman (Drummond 3). Hilliard told the press that there were many enemies within the assemblies of the black people and “Pigs” (police who violated the Constitutional rights of the people) were only a facade that acted as a distraction (Drummond 3). About three hours after the fatal shooting at UCLA, police officers arrested 17 members of the Black Panther Party at the home of one of the slain Panther members, John Jerome Huggins (Drummond and Reich 1). On the night of the shooting, no members of Black Panthers’ rival group, the United Slaves, were arrested (“One of Suspect in Slaying of Panthers at UCLA Gives Up” 5). At a press conference, Black Panther officials charged that the slayings were political assassinations by a pseudo Black Nationalist designed to

halt the unification of black Americans (“One of Suspects in UCLA Deaths Turns Self In” 5).

COINTELPRO took advantage of the factionalism between the Black Panther Party and the United Slaves. According to Ward Churchill and Jim Vander Wall, authors of *Agents of Repression*, the split between the Black Panther Party and Karenga’s organization, United Slaves, was exacerbated by the FBI and resulted in the deaths of Black Panther members John Jerome Huggins and Alprentice (Bunchy) Carter (41-42). “Black propaganda,” the tactic used by FBI agents, refers to the fabrication and distribution of publications (leaflets, broadsides, etc.) on behalf of targeted organizations/individuals designed to misrepresent their positions, goals or objectives in such a way as to publicly discredit them and foster intra/inter-group tensions (Churchill and Vander Wall 41-42). According to Churchill and Vander Wall, the FBI produced and distributed a series of cartoons attributed to the Black Panther Party and Ron Karenga’s United Slave organization with each side supposedly caricaturing the other in extremely negative fashion (42-43). FBI orders were issued to capitalize on the differences between the Black Panther Party and United Slaves in a memo dated November 25, 1968, that stated:

In order to fully capitalize upon the Black Panther Party and US differences as well as to exploit all avenues of creating further dissension in the ranks of the Black Panther Party, recipient offices are instructed to submit imaginative and hard-hitting counterintelligence measures aimed at crippling the Black Panther Party for Self Defense (Churchill and Vander Wall 41).

The November 25, 1968 memo illustrates the FBI’s direct involvement in causing the deaths of the two Panther members. Another FBI memo in Book III of the

final report of the *U.S. Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities*, dated May 26, 1970, revealed that that the FBI had information from local sources stating that the Black Panther Party's members were physically afraid of the United Slaves members because of their propensity toward violence and took premeditated precautions to avoid confrontation (188-189). According to the memo reviewed by the Select Committee, the FBI was to insure that the United Slaves knew of the times and location of the Panther activities in order that the two organizations, "might be brought together and thus grant nature the opportunity to take her due course" (189). Another memo reviewed by the Select Committee revealed that the FBI was successful in exacerbating the factionalism between the Panthers and the United Slaves. It was later revealed Ron Karenga, leader of the United Slaves organization, was financed, armed, and encouraged to attack Black Panther Party members by the Los Angeles police department (Tackwood 105-106). The results of the FBI's efforts accomplished the fourth and fifth goals of COINTELPRO. The leaders and members of both groups were distrusted by a large number of citizens within the Black community and the warring groups were prevented from forming a coalition (193-194). The Panthers' credibility as a civil rights group was severely damaged. Huey Newton, Minister of Defense for the Black Panther Party, was subjected to continuous COINTELPRO harassment stemming from a manslaughter conviction in 1967. According to Hugh Pearson, author of *The Shadow of the Panther*, the FBI followed Newton everywhere and bugged his telephones and apartments (225). On January 23, 1969, the *Los Angeles Times*

reported that Newton, one of the founders of the Black Panther Party, was denied bail during appeal of his manslaughter conviction in connection with the killing of an Oakland policeman in an incident that occurred October 28, 1967 (“Black Panther Leader Newton Denied Bail” 2).

Other forms of COINTELPRO harassment faced by the Black Panther Party were arrest because of the fear of hijacking, violation of probation, mistaken identity, and conspiracy to buy and possess automatic weapons. On February 23, four members of the Black Panther Party were removed from a San Francisco bound airliner at O’Hare International Airport in Chicago and taken into custody by police because the crew feared that the Panthers would attempt to hijack the plane in mid air (“3 Arrested as Hijacking Suspects” 8). In another incident, the Panther’s Minister of Education, George Mason Murray, was ordered to jail for six months for violating his probation on a previous conviction when police found a gun in his car (“Panther Murray Gets 6 Months Jail Term” 19). In still another incident, the members of the Black Panther Party were allegedly in the wrong place at the wrong time. Henry Wood of the *Chicago Tribune* reported that Black Panther leader Bobbie Rush and four other members were held in connection with a shootout with members of the Robins community because of a case of mistaken identity in Chicago (10). The Black Panthers were mistaken for members of the Black Stone Rangers street gang who had previously shot at a local drug store in the Robins community (Wood 10). In an April 12 incident in Chicago, federal agents and Chicago police arrested four Black Panther organization members and charged them with conspiracy to buy submachine guns and possession of

automatic weapons after federal undercover officers agent sold them seven hundred dollars worth of illegal weapons (“Agents Seize 4 Panthers in Sale of Guns” 21).

Economic discrimination also was practiced against members, sympathizers, and supporters of the Black Panther Party (Jones 20). The *Chicago Tribune* reported that the first Black President of a Chicago junior college, Dr. Charles G. Hurst, Jr., was pressured to fire Rufus C. Walls, Deputy Minister of Information of the Illinois chapter for the Black Panther Party (Jones 20). Dr. Hurst had hired the Panther leader as a security guard for the junior college (Jones 20). According to Dr. Hurst, the white press and white authorities, Richard S. Jalovec, Chief of the Special Prosecutions Unit under State’s Attorney Edward V. Hanranhan, were trying to pressure him into firing Rufus Walls (Jones 20). The effects of COINTELPRO’s economic discrimination was evident in its attempts to alienate supporters of the Panther Party and to create the impression that the Panthers were not the group to be affiliated with. COINTELPRO used similar pressure tactics when the FBI targeted the Panthers’ breakfast program at a Catholic Church in San Diego in 1969 (U.S. Senate Final Report of the Select Committee 210). COINTELPRO’s objective was to prevent a Catholic Priest, Father Frank Curran, from using the church as a serving place for the Panther breakfast program (U.S. Senate Final Report of the Select Committee 210). In a FBI memo dated August 29, 1969, COINTELPRO put a plan together to halt the Panther breakfast program at the Catholic Church. The memo stated that:

Telephone calls were to be made from “Parishioners” objecting to the use of their church to assist a black militant cause. Two of the callers were to

urge that Father Curran be removed as Pastor of the church and one was to threaten suspension of financial support of the church if the activities of the Pastor were allowed to continued. Fictitious names were to be used in the event a name was requested by the Bishop... (U.S. Senate Final Report of the Select Committee 210).

A month later, Father Curran had been transferred from the San Diego Diocese to “somewhere in the State of New Mexico for permanent assignment” (U.S. Senate Final Report of the Select Committee 211). These are the kinds of pressures experienced by supporters of the Black Panthers.

The FBI also made efforts to promote criticism of the Panthers in the mass media, in other words, to show the Panthers in an unfavorable light (U.S. Senate The Final Report of the Select Committee 213). In an FBI memo dated August 5, 1968, from the book entitled *The COINTELPRO Papers*, the Bureau established the counterintelligence media techniques used to shape the news and damage the image of the Black Panthers (Churchill and Vander Wall 118-119). The FBI enlisted the aid of professionals within the media to accomplish their attacks on the Panthers’ image (Churchill and Vander Wall 119). On a television station in Miami, Florida a professional newsman acting on the orders of the FBI selected Panther members for a interview and the Panther members, according to the memo, were chosen for their inability to articulate or their simpering and stupid appearance (Churchill and Vander Wall 119). The newsman reported that the Panthers were in favor of violent revolution without explaining why and further reported that they, personally, would be afraid to lead a violent revolution, making them appear to be cowards (Churchill and Vander Wall 119). This bias also is illustrated by the headline of the *Chicago Tribune* with a cartoon showing

Fidel Castro running in one direction and a Black Panther running in another direction and the caption, “It only takes a small percent to start a revolution”(“It Only Takes a Small Per Cent” 1). The illustration depicted the Black Panthers as violent revolutionaries, bent on overthrowing the government, when their desired image was the image of self-defense (Committee on Internal Security 10).

Another attack on the image of the Black Panther Party was exhibited in the April 27 and 29 editions of the *Chicago Tribune*. On April 27, the *Chicago Tribune* ran a story entitled, “Foreign Reds and Black Violence,” admonishing the Nixon administration to take action against student revolts and black groups such as the Black Panthers, the Progressive Labor Party and the Students for a Democratic Society (28). On April 29, the *Chicago Tribune* headline featured another cartoon showing a Black Panther member holding a gun stating, “I’ve got this gun for self-protection”(“Some Logic” 1). Below this cartoon is another cartoon illustrating a white bandit holding a gun on a defenseless white citizen using the same phrase that the Black Panther member used (“Some Logic” 1).

COINTELPRO harassment took the form of disrupting a rally to free Huey Newton, the Black Panther Party’s Minister of Defense (“San Francisco” 7). The *Chicago Tribune* stated that police used tear gas and fired shots into the air to break up a Black Panther rally in the black Fillmore district of San Francisco (“San Francisco” 7). The rally was held to free Huey Newton, co-founder of the Black Panther Party, who was imprisoned for manslaughter in connection with the shooting of an Oakland policeman in October 1967 (“San Francisco” 7). Five Black Panther members were arrested in Chicago for allegedly beating and

torturing a black woman from whom they sought a rifle with an infrared scope for night shooting (“Woman Beaten, Tortured; Five Panther Seized” 4). William O’Neal, 25, James E. White, 23, Wilmer Angrum, 19, David Valentine, 17, and Richard Powell, 22 were charged with aggravated battery, armed robbery, and conspiracy to commit murder (“Woman Beaten, Tortured; Five Panthers Seized” 4). *The Final Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities* revealed that the FBI employed strategies to portray the Panthers as bullies towards women and children in the black community; this alleged incident in which four Panther members were arrested for beating and torturing a woman is an example of the kind of strategies employed (193). While Black Panther members White, Angrum, and Valentine were charged with aggravated battery, armed robbery, and conspiracy to commit murder, no charges were filed against FBI infiltrator and agent provocateur William O’Neal who was also involved in the incident.

William O’Neal was the Panther Chief of Security for Fred Hampton (Blumenthal 38). O’Neal, a drug dealer and key informer for the FBI inside the Chicago Black Panther Party, drugged Panther leader Fred Hampton on the December night that Chicago police and FBI agents assassinated him and Mark Clark (Blumenthal 37-38). O’Neal told Chicago police Sergeant Stanley B. Robinson that the raid on the Panthers the night of Hampton’s death was unnecessary because he had drugged him before the raid (Blumenthal 37). Robinson was convicted in the murder of two men in a murder for hire gang (Blumenthal 37). According to Sergeant Robinson, O’Neal used much of his

salary as an informer for the FBI to buy the drugs (Blumenthal 37). O'Neal's statement that the Black Panthers had many weapons before the raid on the Panthers' headquarters contradicted the case made by the police agencies involved in the raid (Blumenthal 38). According to the FBI, they had no knowledge of Panther weapons earlier than two weeks before the raid (Blumenthal 38). O'Neal stated that Roy Mitchell, the FBI control agent in Chicago, knew since March the number weapons the Panthers had and that their number of guns was not important unless the Panthers acquired a trainload of weapons (Blumenthal 37). The FBI was also aware that O'Neal sold drugs in that black community but blithely ignored it because, according to police Sergeant Robinson, criminality was the acceptable cost of preserving the law (Blumenthal 37). Robinson's statement illustrates that authorities were willing to use any means necessary to get the Black Panthers off the streets, even if it meant breaking the law.

On a Sunday in June, fifteen persons suffered gunshot wounds when violence erupted between blacks and police in Sacramento, California; many of the gunshot victims were police, when during an outbreak of violence they stormed Panther offices (Caldwell 23). Police allegedly ran through the streets beating and shooting Blacks without provocation in their attempt to close down a park near the Black Panther headquarters (Caldwell 23). According to reporters, violence erupted when police attempted to sweep people from the park (Caldwell 23). Authorities applied pressure to Panther supporters and sympathizers by disrupting their activities and police pressure on the group resulted in violence

(U.S. Senate Final Report of the Select Committee 210-213). Thirteen police were wounded and 37 persons were arrested in this incident (“37 Arrested, 13 Policemen Wounded” 28).

The pressure of COINTELPRO resulted in other problems for the Party. On August 2, the *New York Amsterdam News* printed a story about Al Carroll, the Black Panther Defense Minister of Harlem, stating that “through a reliable source the Panthers have learned that the police were planning a roundup of their members on the pretext that the Panthers were allegedly planning to blow up the Tombs prison in New York where 13 Black Panther members were being held illegally” (“Panthers Sizzling at Cops” 1). In response, Carroll said that “we are here to serve the people” and that “we are feeding more than 800 youngsters every morning before they go to school and that the police are bent on smashing the Black Panther Party” (“Panthers Sizzling at Cops” 1).

The pressures of COINTELPRO also exacerbated ideological differences between Black Panther leaders Stokely Carmichael and Eldridge Cleaver. The FBI initiated a split between the most prominent Black Nationalist extremist groups, SNCC and the Black Panthers (Churchill and Vander Wall 126). The FBI structured a plan in 1968 to make Stokely Carmichael, leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and honorary Black Panther Party Prime Minister, appear to be a CIA informer (Churchill and Vander Wall 126). The FBI accomplished the task of creating mistrust between the two parties in two ways: (1) by having a carbon copy of an informant’s report supposedly written by Carmichael to the CIA carefully deposited into a car of a close Black Nationalist

friend; and (2) by informing a certain percentage of reliable criminals and racial informants that they heard from a reliable source that Carmichael was a CIA agent (Churchill and Vander Wall 126). The FBI's COINTELPRO plan was successful because Carmichael's loyalty was in question. Newton stated that they had no proof but they had some evidence that Stokely Carmichael was operating as a CIA agent (Newton 191). The pressure brought about by the evidence planted by the FBI contributed to Carmichael's resignation as a member of the Black Panthers. He resigned his post in July over ideological differences with Eldridge Cleaver, Minister of Information for the Black Panther Party ("Stokely Meets Cleaver Abroad" 2). Carmichael believed that the Black Nationalist movement must be stronger before it made an alliance with Whites and Cleaver believed that cooperating with Whites was favorable when it worked to the advantage of Blacks ("Stokely Meets Cleaver Abroad" 2). It was believed that ideological differences caused the split between the two leaders within the Black Panther Party but in reality it was the combination of ideological difference and the false evidence planted by the FBI (COINTELPRO).

As police violence escalated against the Panthers, party members retaliated in self defense. On July 31, a 30-minute gun battle with police at the Black Panther headquarters in Chicago left five policeman injured and three Panther members arrested, with both sides accusing the other of firing first ("News of the Week, Chicago" 2). A month later, Black Panther Chairman Bobby Seale was picked up in California and charged with the Connecticut murder of Black Panther member Alex Rackley ("Bobby Seale Says It's a

Frameup” 1). A transcript of a statement by George Sam, Jr., a former Panther member, stated that Seale participated in the Rackley slaying in New Haven, Connecticut (“Bobby Seale Says It’s a Frameup” 1). Seale alleged that after he gave his speech at Yale University in New Haven on May 19, he left early the next morning, a day before the alleged murder (“Seale” 46). According to Huey Newton, author of the book *To Die for the People*, George Sams was an agent provocateur of the FBI who murdered Alex Rackley, and was then dumped by the FBI (224). Jennifer B. Smith’s book, *An International History of the Black Panther Party*, states that George Sams was an FBI informant who was responsible for the torture and murder of Alex Rackley (99).

As the pressures of COINTELPRO increased, Panther members were incarcerated without a reduction in bail (“Panthers Lose Appeal” 3). Also, two essential leaders of the Chicago Black Panther Party, Fred Hampton and Mark Clark, were killed December 4, and police brutality and harassment of Party members continued. On September 20, thirteen Black Panther members in New York were jailed on charges of conspiracy, attempted murder, and possession of weapons in an alleged plot to blow up downtown department stores over the Easter holidays (“Panthers Lose Appeal” 3). The Panther members were refused a reduction in bail, and had to remain in jail (“Panthers Lose Appeal” 3). Plans were made in New York in the month April to hold daily demonstrations around the Criminal Courts building in protest of members who were arrested, indicted, and scheduled to be tried for charges related to plotting to bomb department stores, railroad locations, and police stations (Matthews 26). Panther lawyers

argued that police were holding Panther members in custody, violating a clause in the 14th Amendment that states that pre-trial incarceration of those who cannot afford bail violates due-process (Fraser 32). The Panthers were under indictment since April 2 (“Panthers Lose Appeal” 3).

Another incident of COINTELPRO occurred in June. Chicago police raided a Black Panther headquarters and took into custody, without resistance, eight Panther members, including two women (Palmer 79). After this Chicago raid, the FBI or police conducted, in rapid succession, raids on Panthers in Des Moines, Indianapolis and Denver (Palmer 79). In Chicago, just four days into the month of December, Panther Chairman Fred Hampton and Panther leader Mark Clark had been killed in the early morning police raid of an apartment on the west side (Halverson 7). Within 24 hours of the West Side incident, Chicago police carrying a search warrant raided the south side apartment of Illinois Panther “Deputy Defense Minister” Bobby Rush (Halverson 7). Later in Kansas City, Missouri, police used clubs to subdue and arrest four members of the Black Panther organization who attempted to force their way into the office of Police Chief C. M. Kelly (Halverson 7). The Panthers had been demanding entrance to a press conference called by Chief Kelly to reply to published charges against him and other police by the Black Panthers (Halverson 7). In Los Angeles, on December 8, a gunfight between the police and Black Panthers erupted at the headquarters of the Black Panther Party when police tried to enter with a search warrant (“Panther Clash Darkens Mood in Los Angeles” 20). Three hundred police officers had surrounded the area, sealing off four square miles and arresting

eight men and three women for possessing twenty-five fully automatic weapons (“Panther Clash Darkens Mood in Los Angeles” 20). Three officers and two Blacks were wounded; one of the Blacks was a pregnant woman (“Panther Clash Darkens Mood in Los Angeles” 20).

The Party’s Leadership under Pressure

The leaders of the Black Panther Party had their own problems with police arrest stemming from COINTELPRO. The police arrest of Panthers leaders ranged from charges of assault with a deadly weapon to forceful entry to the California Legislature. A book entitled *U. S. House of Representatives Hearings Before The Committee On Internal Security House Of Representatives: Ninety-First Congress Second Session* listed the arrest records of the Panther leaders, excluding the minor traffic arrests and cases that were not adjudicated (U.S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5055). According to book III of the *Final Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities*, the FBI encouraged local police to raid the homes of Panther members with little or no evidence of violations of State or Federal laws (U.S. Senate 220). The FBI’s counter intelligence strategies included patterns of police harassment, where black leaders were brought up on spurious charges. According to the Churchill and Vander Wall book, *The COINTELPRO Papers*, key black activists were repeatedly arrested, “on any excuse,” until, “they could no longer make bail” (6).

Co-Editor and Distribution Manager of the Panther newspaper, Andrew Eugene Austin, faced his share of problems with COINTELPRO in Oakland and San Francisco. Austin was charged with assault with a deadly weapon in Oakland, California, on June 29, 1968, and was sentenced to 18 months probation on a guilty plea. On May 31, 1970, Austin was arrested in San Francisco on charges of making obscene statements in public (U.S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5055). The charges were reduced to disturbing the peace and Austin was sentenced to one day in jail (U.S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5055). The police charge of making obscene statements in public is an example of COINTELPRO harassment and this incident aids in creating a criminal past for the Party leaders, which in turn hurts the Party's credibility and image as advocates for civil rights for black Americans. Being arrested for what the police terms making obscene statements in public violates the first Amendment to the U. S. constitution, which states that Congress shall make no laws abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press (Garrahy and McCaughey 496).

Leroy Eldridge Cleaver, Minister of Information for the Black Panthers, was arrested on May 2, 1967, with other Black Panther Party members for participating in the forceful entry of the California State Legislature at Sacramento, California, but was released on instructions of the district attorney (U. S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5055). On April 6, 1968, Cleaver was arrested for allegedly participating in a shoot-out with officers of the Oakland Police Department. He was charged with two counts of attempted

murder and two counts of assault on a police officer (U. S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5055). Cleaver, a fugitive, fled the United States in November while facing a return to prison in California for parole violation ("Cleaver in Cuba" 23). According to Cleaver's account of the alleged shootout in his book, *Eldridge Cleaver: Post-Prison Writings and Speeches*, Cleaver was relieving himself by the side of the road when police stopped and put the spotlight on him (87). The police then shouted for him to walk out into the middle of the street with his hands up, and do it quickly (Cleaver 87). As he raised his hands and complied, an officer on the passenger side of the police car began shouting and firing his gun before Cleaver cleared the front of his car, then other police began shooting (Cleaver 87). According to Cleaver, he had no gun, but a young Panther member named Bobby Hutton did. As the Panthers ran from the police gunfire, one of the Panther members, Warren Wells, was hit (88). Police continued firing in the direction of Cleaver and Hutton until Hutton fired back, providing enough time for them to run inside a basement of a house nearby (Cleaver 89). With Cleaver and Bobby Hutton trapped inside a shed, police filled the basement with gunfire and tear gas until they surrendered (Cleaver 89). By this time, the police and the gunfire had attracted a crowd who were shouting at the police officers to stop shooting (90). As Cleaver and Hutton emerged from the basement with their hands in the air, a group of police officers began beating and cursing at them (Cleaver 92). According to Cleaver, the police pointed to a squad car parked in the middle of the street and then told them to run for it, but Cleaver, who was shot in both the leg and his foot, told them that he could not run

(93). Police allegedly shoved Bobby Hutton forward and as he began to walk toward the car, police opened fire, killing him (Cleaver 93). This story is significant because it illuminates the severity of the problems confronting the Panther leaders. Cleaver also was falsely arrested for his involvement in the alleged forceful entry of the California State Legislature. He was arrested but released with all of the charges dropped when a judge discovered that Cleaver was there as a reporter, with the proper credentials for *Rampart Magazine*, a liberal alternative magazine featuring poems and stories focused on the youth movement in America (Cleaver 98).

Donald Lee Cox, Panther Field Marshal, was arrested in Oakland, California, for curfew violations and carrying a concealed weapon (U.S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5056). The curfew charges were dropped and a plea of guilty was entered concerning the concealed weapons charges. On April 28, 1969, Cox was arrested on charges of battery against a police officer in San Francisco (U.S. House of Representatives of Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5056). On May 16, 1969, a motion of the district attorney dismissed the charges. The dismissed charges concerning the alleged battery of a police officer and the police arrest of Donald Cox for a curfew violation also point to the FBI's attempts to find any excuse to arrest Panther leaders.

Emory Douglas, Panther Minister of Culture and Revolutionary Artist-Layout for the Panthers, received 10 days in the county jail in Sacramento, California and two years' probation for his participation in the Black Panther invasion of the California State Legislature in Sacramento on May 2, 1967 (U.S.

House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5057). In August 1969, Douglas was arrested by the San Francisco Police Department for battery against a police officer and was given a one-day suspended sentence and a one-day probation (U.S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5057). On April 14, 1970, Douglas was arrested in New Haven, Connecticut, for contempt of court and sentenced to six months in jail. With the objective of trying to get anything against the Black Panthers in order to get them off the streets and to build a criminal record, the police were reduced to issuing one-day suspended sentences and one-day probation sentences as in the case Emory Douglass, Minister of Culture and Revolutionary Artist-Layout.

Ray "Masai" Hewitt also had his share of questionable charges brought against him. The examples are evident in the type of sentencing he received and the charges being dismissed. Raymond "Masai" Hewitt, Panther Minister of Education, was arrested September 10, 1968, in Los Angeles, California, for possession of a loaded weapon in a motor vehicle (U. S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5057). He received a ninety days suspended sentence and twelve months probation. On May 21, 1969, he was arrested in Los Angeles on a conspiracy to riot charge but the charges were dropped (U. S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5057). Hewitt was arrested in Chicago on February 24, 1969, on charges of threats to take a plane to Cuba and these charges were also dismissed (U.S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5057).

Two other situations of police harassment that are in line with the FBI's memo of harassing key figures within the Panther Party are evident in the case of the two brothers within the movement, David and Roosevelt Hilliard. David Hilliard, Panther colonel and Chief of Staff, was arrested January 1, 1968, in Oakland, California, for giving false information to a police officer. On April 15, 1970, he was held in contempt of court in New Haven, Connecticut, and sentenced to two months in jail (U. S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5057). Roosevelt "June" Hillard (David's brother), Panther Assistant Chief of Staff, was arrested August 11, 1969, in Berkeley, California, for possession of narcotics but the charges were dismissed (U. S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5058). David was arrested for giving false information to Oakland police, while his brother Roosevelt was arrested on charges of possessing narcotics; Roosevelt's drug charges were later dropped. If the police had charges that would stick against these Panther leaders they would have remained in jail based on the orders of the FBI (Churchill and Vander Wall 6).

Huey Percy Newton, Minister of Defense for the Panthers, was arrested on May 22, 1967, for drawing and exhibiting a firearm or deadly weapon, using profane language, and displaying a dangerous weapon (U. S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5058). He received five days in the county jail for each of the following accounts: brandishing a weapon, disorderly person, and possessing a deadly weapon (U. S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5058). On June 4, 1967, Newton was charged with

resisting arrest in Richmond, California and received a sentence of 60 days (U.S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5058). Police tried to kill Huey Newton in an October 1967 incident that left Newton wounded, one police officer dead and another officer seriously wounded (Anthony 34-37).

Bobby George Seale, Chairman for the Panthers, was arrested for his participation in an incident in which the Panthers forcefully entered a session of the California Legislature bearing weapons (U. S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5059). On May 23, 1968, Seale was charged with bringing firearms into jail and received a three-year suspended sentence and three years probation (U. S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5059). On March 25, 1969, Seale was arrested on charges of conspiracy to violate the federal anti-riot act as a result of his alleged participation with the Conspiracy 8 and the disruption of the 1968 Democratic convention (U.S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5059). The Conspiracy 8 included Bobby Seale, members of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (MOBE), the Youth International Party (Yippies), and two other men who were involved in the protest (Layman 270). The individuals indicted in the conspiracy were David Dellinger, Rennie Davis, Tom Hayden (MOBE), Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman (Yippies), John Froines (College Professor), Lee Weiner (Graduate Student), and Bobby Seale (National Chairman of the Black Panthers). Bobby Seale was sentenced to four years in jail for repeated counts of contempt of court because of his misconduct during the Conspiracy 8 trial in Chicago on October 19, 1970 (U. S. House of

Representatives Committee Exhibit No. 20B 5059). The conspiracy charges against Seale were dismissed at the request of the U.S. District Attorney (U.S. House of Representatives Committee Exhibit NO. 20B 5059). The FBI's arrest of the leaders of the Black Panther Party for any reason illustrates how the police were recreating the Panthers' image.

A close examination of the arrest records of the leaders of the Panthers revealed that just about every member of the Party had charges that were either reduced to a lesser charge or dropped completely. The police reduction in charges and the dismissal of other charges illustrates a pattern of harassment in line with the FBI's memo that stated that key black activists were to be arrested for any reason, or any excuse (Churchill and Vander Wall 6). The collection of arrest records of the Party's leaders depicts the Panthers as violent criminals and not an activist group trying to defend themselves against an unjust society. These portraits of the Panthers damage their image, and thus, alienate the Party from their supporters and other activist groups. With the Panther's image in shambles, and the new public perception of the Party via the media, the FBI could now justify their systematic extermination of the Party's members. These were the exigencies confronting the Black Panther Party in 1969; the rhetorical strategies they used in an attempt to restore their image are the focus of the chapter three.

Conclusions

There were a myriad of problems facing the Black Panther Party for Self Defense in 1969. They had to deal with the problems of factionalism brought about by ideological differences from Panther leaders within the Party. The second problem facing the Black Panther Party was the problem of harassment and ever-escalating violent persecution of the Party by both the federal agents and the local police. In addition, state and local officials were pressuring persons or organizations who openly supported or who were affiliated with the Black Panther Party or other Pro-Black groups. The last problem facing the Panthers was what to do about the negative press image that painted a different kind of portrait of the Party and proved ultimately damaging to their credibility and legitimacy as a Civil Rights activist group. In summary, the image of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense was shattered because of the following: negative press, police and Panther violence, factionalism among Party leaders, the resignation of an essential figure in the movement, the exile of a prominent leader and the imprisonment of a prominent leader. All of this misfortune is attributed to the Black Panther's inflammatory rhetoric in their self-defense and the response of operation COINTELPRO, the F.B.I.'s program designed to destroy black leaders whom the government felt could unify and electrify the militant Black Nationalist movement.

All of these situations influenced the rhetorical choices made by Panther members and leaders in 1969: Fred Hampton, Connie Mathews, Ray "Masai"

Hewitt, and Eldridge Cleaver. The Black Panther Party, under siege by Hoover's COINTELPRO, had to regain the support of the public. The Panthers' rhetoric was too inflammatory for conservative Blacks such as those in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), thereby alienating a large group of supporters (Wilkins 16). White groups' participation within the Black Panther Party was now hindered by new ideological differences from within the Panther Party ("Stokely Meets Cleaver Abroad" 2). Regaining the support of the conservative members within the black community and the support of Students for a Democratic Society, as well as trying to appeal to liberal Americans who believed in human rights guaranteed by the Constitution, was the big task set before the Black Panther Party for Self Defense. How the Panther leaders would construct their rhetoric would mean the difference between the survival or total annihilation of the Party. The following chapters will explore the rhetorical strategies that the Black Panthers used in an attempt to regain the support of the public.

CHAPTER III
THE POINT OF ACQUISITION:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE RHETORIC OF FRED HAMPTON
AND CONNIE MATTHEWS
Section A: Hampton's Speech,
You Can Murder the Liberator, But You Can't Murder
the Liberation

Fred Hampton and Connie Matthews's speeches were linked together in this chapter by their commonalities. Both speeches were: (1) informal, (2) designed for a less educated multiracial audience, (3) expressed a high level of urgency, and (4) employed rhetorical strategies that enhanced the Party's credibility.

With his audience consisting of black and white street gang members, conservative Blacks, and liberal Whites, Fred Hampton created a message that invited his audience to take part in the liberation of America's poor and black communities. His clarification of the Party's position on race, illustrations of the Party's contributions to the black community, and expressions of fearless commitment to the struggle of black people enhanced the Panthers' image to young radicals who were frustrated with the old conventional ways of attaining civil rights in America. Hampton's forceful informal style and urgent delivery demonstrated his direct

attempt to increase membership within the Panthers' ranks. Fred Hampton's speech, like Connie Matthews's speech, invited the audience to get involved with the movements that were attempting to liberate oppressed black people in America. More specifically, both Hampton's and Matthews's speeches made direct attempts to gain public support for their movement. Their message was that all Americans should be involved in the liberation of oppressed people in the United States. Fred Hampton graduated from high school in Maywood, Illinois, in 1966 and had a sterling academic record, three varsity letters, and a Junior Achievement award (Blumenthal 36). He was a natural leader chosen in 1966 by the Maywood, Illinois, chapter of the NAACP and his abilities were evident as he increased the youth division of the NAACP to five-hundred strong (Blumenthal 36). His prominent position with the NAACP attracted the enmity of local authorities and he was once beaten and arrested for attempting to stop a fight between a black girl and a white girl (Blumenthal 36). The Maywood mayor, later indicted for embezzlement, never approved of Hampton's activism and neither did the police (Blumenthal 36). Hampton coined several terms later used by Jesse Jackson such as, "The Rainbow Coalition" (Hilliard and Cole 229). During the short time that Hampton was a member of the Panthers he was charged with twenty-five criminal violations and convicted for the robbery of 210 popsicles, which carried a sentence of two to five years in prison (Blumenthal 36). Hampton was later killed on December 4, 1969, as he slept in a drug-induced state. According to Deborah Johnson, Hampton's live-in girlfriend, police entered the room firing bullets into the mattress on which Hampton slept stating, "He's barely alive, or He'll barely make it" (Blumenthal 35). Then two more shots were fired and someone stated that, "He's as good as dead now" (Blumenthal 35). The drugs were

slipped into Hampton's soft drink by FBI agent provocateur William O' Neal (Blumenthal 36-38).

This analysis, using the language strategies from the methodology described in chapter one, will illustrate how Fred Hampton, the Deputy Chairman of the Chicago Black Panther Party, adapted his message to garner support from poor inner city blacks and street gang members. More specifically, this analysis will explore the kinds of language strategies that Hampton used to mobilize community support, prescribe a course of action, and attempt to change society's perception of the Black Panther Party. It will look at the kinds of language strategies Hampton used to speak to multiple audiences, justify the party's setbacks, and explore the overall theme. The analysis will also reveal that meaningful moment within the Black Panther Party's movement when the rhetoric changed. Michael McGee refers to this moment as the moment when the "we" occurs (Brock 72). This analysis will illustrate the slogan-like term that Hampton uses to signify the Black Panther Party's commitment to the multiple audiences. Also, it will illustrate his use of slogans, obscenity, and ridicule within the text and examine the tone of Fred Hampton's speech, "You Can Murder a Liberator, But You Can't Murder Liberation," delivered on April 27, 1969.

The tone of Fred Hampton's speech is urgent and he employs unique strategies to gain support for the Party. He has the task of trying to regain the public support damaged by Black Panther Prime Minister Stokely Carmichael's preference for Black Nationalism, which alienated their white liberal support, and COINTELPRO which has presented a different image of the Party to Americans, damaging the support of conservative Blacks.

The first strategy that Hampton uses in his speech to establish the tone is evident in his introduction:

What we are basically going to be talking about today is what the pigs is doing to the Panthers all around the country. We are going to have to talk about what we are going to have to do about the repression that they are putting on the Black Panther Party. We are not worried about getting off it—let's try to deal with it.

The introduction to Hampton's speech illustrates that the Panthers have a legitimate concern about COINTELPRO, the government's persecution of the Panther Party. The FBI had accelerated their persecution of the Panthers by killing and imprisoning many of their members, while those who could escape were living in exile. Hampton needed to regain the support of the community that was damaged by the Party's rhetoric as mentioned in chapter two. The second paragraph addressing the tone of Hampton's speech is demonstrated in his effort to persuade Panther supporters to get on the Party's bandwagon. He states:

The Black Panther Party is the vanguard party. You better get on the Black Panther Party. If you can't get on, goddamit you better get behind. If you can't get behind goddamit, you better get behind somebody else so you'll at least be able to follow indirectly, motherfucker. We ain't asking you to go out and ask no pig to leave us alone. We know that the pigs fuck with us cause they know we're doing something. (Hampton 143)

The urgency expressed in Hampton's speech is obvious in this paragraph and it is evident in the number of times that he asks the people in the audience to join the Panther cause. The examples are cited in the second, third and fourth sentences. In the second sentence Hampton states, "You better get on the Black Panther Party." In the third sentence he stated, "If you can't get on goddamit you better get behind." The last example in the fourth sentence states, "If you can't get behind, you better get behind somebody else so you'll at least be able to follow indirectly, motherfucker" (Hampton 143). This statement also implies that it is not important that the audience members join the Panthers but that

they should join some organization that is actively involved in the struggle for black human rights. The examples and the language that Hampton uses speak directly to poor Black and street gang members within the community. He points out that the Panthers are leading the way for Civil Rights opportunities for Blacks in America and they had better get involved in order to secure their future. This argument is supported in the statement that the Panthers are the vanguard party. In this short paragraph, Hampton asked for public support three times. The implicit message in Hampton's speech is that the Panthers are doing their part as an advocate for oppressed black people, but those who are oppressed are obligated to take steps to help themselves.

The second strategy used by Fred Hampton attempts to change society's perception of the Party. The first example of Hampton's strategy to enhance the credibility of the movement is found in paragraph 2, where he argues that when there was a problem within the black community, the Black Panthers took the initiative to resolve it. Hampton states:

It was Huey P. Newton who taught us how the people learn. You learn by participation. When Huey P. Newton started out what did he do? He got a gun and he got Bobby and Bobby got a gun. They had a problem in the community because people was being run over— kids were being run over—at a certain intersection. What did the people do? The people went down to the government to redress their grievances and the government told them to go to hell: "We are not going to put no stoplights down there UNTIL WE SEE FIT." What did Huey P. Newton do? Did he go out and tell the people about the laws and write letters and try to propagandize 'em all the time? NO! Some of that's good, but the masses of the people don't read—that's what I heard Huey say—they learn through observation and participation. Did he just say this? NO! So what did he do? He got him a shotgun, he got Bobby and he got him a hammer and went down to the corner. He gave Bobby the shotgun and told him if any pig motherfuckers come by blow his motherfuckin brains out. What did he do? He went to the corner and nailed up a stop sign. No more accidents, no more trouble. (Hampton 138)

In an attempt to enhance the credibility of the Panthers, Hampton cites the contributions

that the Party made to the black community when that community was in duress. He describes how when black kids were being killed at a certain intersection Panther leaders Huey P. Newton and Bobby Seale went down to the corner and put up a stop when the city refused to take any action. The city fathers stated that “We are not going to put no stoplight down there until we see fit.” In his paragraph, he illustrates how a few people got together and solved a big problem affecting the black community. The empowerment strategy that Hampton uses argues that if more people worked together, they could accomplish a lot more and that is why it is important that the public get behind the Party. Hampton also employs a tough-talking language strategy in this paragraph in an attempt to recruit gang members and young frustrated Blacks. The first example in the sentence that explains how Huey Newton got a gun and he got Bobby Seale and Bobby got a gun and together they solved a problem in the community. This tough talking strategy was also demonstrated in the last part of the paragraph that describes how Huey got a shotgun, he got Bobby and he got him a hammer and went down to the corner where he gave Bobby the shotgun and told him “if any pig motherfuckers come by blow their motherfuckin brains out.” The language strategy that Hampton uses appeals to the machismo of the Panther hard-liners, gang members, and young black males who were angered and frustrated by the weight of oppression and racism. Another example illustrating how Hampton attempted to change society’s perception of the Party is demonstrated in paragraph three, in reference to the Panthers’ Breakfast for Children program. He states:

Our Breakfast for Children program is feeding a lot of children and the people understand our Breakfast for Children program. We sayin’ something like this—we saying that theory’s cool, but theory with no practice ain’t shit. You got to have both of them—the two go together. We have a theory about feeding kids free. What’d we do? We put it into practice. That’s how people learn. A lot of people don’t know how serious the thing is. They think the children we feed ain’t

really hungry. I don't know five year old kids that can act well, but I know that if they not hungry we sure got some actors. We got five year old actors that could take the academy award. Last week they had a whole week dedicated to the hungry in Chicago. Talking 'bout the starvation rate here that went up 15%. Over here where everybody should be eating. Why? Because of capitalism. (Hampton 139)

In this paragraph, Hampton ridicules capitalism to make his point that the Panthers are taking the responsibility for feeding the hungry children, which is something that Capitalism either will not or cannot do. He ridicules the federal government for not seeing to it that such a prosperous nation would feed its hungry children, stating that if the children that the Party is feeding are just acting as if they are hungry, then they should receive an academy award for their acting. This strategy shows the federal government as uncaring and insensitive to the needs of its citizens. The Panthers' theory about feeding hungry children was that the youth that the Panthers were feeding would surely feed the revolution (Heath 121). In other words, by feeding the children the Panthers were enhancing their image with in the black community and increasing their membership and when the children grew up they would be loyal members of the Party.

Another example where Hampton attempted to change society's perception of the Party was found in paragraph seven, where Hampton states:

When people got a problem they come to the Black Panther Party for help and that's good. Because, like Mao says, we are supposed to be ridden by the people and Huey says we're going to be ridden down the path of social revolution and that's for the people. The people ought to know that the Black Panther Party is one thousand percent for the People. (Hampton 140)

In this paragraph, Hampton implies that the Black Panthers are true communists, and like true communists, they are dedicated to serving the people. Also, the implicit message here is the question: which government were Americans going to support, one that does nothing but brutalize and harass Americans or one that supports and respects the human rights of all Americans?

In another example, Hampton addresses the Women's Liberation Movement and the Progressive Labor Movement's objections to Panthers' position as the "vanguard of the revolution" (Kifner 25). In paragraph twenty-two Hampton compares the plight of the Panthers with the Progressive Labor Movement in order to illustrate what happens to those who are making real positive changes within the black community. This comparison argues that the Panthers are the vanguard party and the government's persecution of the Panthers proves it. Hampton states:

You don't hear there was a raid on PL's office last night. You ain't never heard that. When you hear of PL busted in New York, PL's leader in jail with no bars, PL leader run out of the country, PL leader shot 18 times while he was running with his back turned and hands tied up, PL leader gets breakfast for children for 1800 people a week. You ever hear it? Ya never heard it. I want to hear it. If you do hear it, it'll be because of the Black Panther lead. I'm not putting all these things out and saying PL doesn't know 'em. But I'm saying that when people write something like this, a lot of people don't understand it. And I wanted to take the time to explain it. (Hampton 144)

In this paragraph, Hampton implies that the Progressive Labor Movement (a radical group believing in old-fashioned Stalinist principles) was not doing much for the black community and if they had been, they would be facing government persecution equal to the Panthers. The Progressive Labor Movement made a strong bid to take over the Students for a Democratic Society at a convention in Chicago on June 20, 1969 (Kifner 25). The delegates (i.e., Panthers, SDS, Progressive Labor Movement, and the Women's Liberation Movement) were split during discussions and caucuses over the question of the Women's Liberation Movement (Kifner 25). It was at the Chicago convention that the Panthers denounced the Progressive Labor faction as "counter revolutionary" (Kifner 25). Hampton is arguing that the Progressive Labor Movement is not being persecuted. Thus, Hampton uses a redefining strategy to change society's perception of the Party. The Panther/Progressive Labor Movement comparison is important in this paragraph because it clarifies for the audience that the Panthers were the vanguard Party, based on

the evidence that the government had singled them out for destruction and no other party was facing such persecution. The message appealed to Panther hard-liners, young black youths and SDS who were against the Progressive Labor Party's attempted takeover of SDS. Paragraph twenty-three acknowledges that the Panthers had made some mistakes, but that the Party had learned from their mistakes. In his references about the Progressive Labor Movement Hampton states:

There are some things that PL says that are valid. Don't misunderstand me. We don't get mad because in some way or another PL is trying to better the Black Panther Party by trying to criticize it. But I just want to let you know, ain't nothing all right and ain't nothing all wrong. We're not all right—though we trying to get that way. We make mistakes but we understand that we gonna make some more mistakes. And we gonna try and correct these mistakes and we gonna try and keep on moving. (Hampton 144)

In this part of his speech, Hampton is saying that the Party has made some mistakes, but that they meant well, and that the Panthers have since learned from their errors. In addition, he is saying that the Panthers will continue in their quest to free black Americans from oppression and police brutality. Hampton's admission that the Panther Party's actions had been less than perfect attempts to enhance the Party's credibility by implying that one has to be doing something in order to make mistakes. He enhances the Party's credibility by stating that "we're gonna make some more mistakes and we're gonna try and correct these mistakes and we're gonna try and keep moving on." This message speaks to conservative Blacks, white liberals and young Blacks interested in joining the Party. The statement implies that everyone makes mistakes but that everyone must be given the chance to find the errors of their ways and redeem themselves. Hampton's admission allows him to bond with his audience on an emotional level.

Paragraph nine also allows Hampton to bond with his audience on an emotional level, where he argues that even the justice system was biased toward black Americans.

Alluding to a situation where members of the Black Panther Party were arrested and retained on bogus charges (charges that COINTELPRO used to get the Panthers off the streets as described in chapter 2) Hampton states that:

Mickey White was in that bullshit with Nathaniel Junior and Merrill Harvey. Last week when they went to court even the judge in court said, you all gonna get a fair trial whether you deserve it or not. These are the types of actions we are confronted with. Mickey White is in solitary confinement and doesn't get to come out of his cell for anything at any time. And he might be in that cell for the rest of his life. His bond is \$100,000. That's \$10,000 cash. (Hampton 141)

In this paragraph, Hampton implies that America's legal system was even biased against Blacks and that for black Americans getting a fair trial was impossible. What this statement says to members of society is that America, when dealing with black people, violates its own rules, especially the rights of black citizens to have a fair trial with a non-biased judge, and jury.

In paragraph sixteen, Hampton assumes the persona of the late Dr. Martin Luther King when he refers to Dr. King's, "I've Been to the Mountaintop speech." Referring to the rate at which the movement must grow to organize itself against police brutality and government oppression, he states:

While we take it we must be sure that we are not missing the people in the valley. In the valley we know that we can learn to understand the life of the people. We know that with all the bullshit out there, you can come to consider yourself on the mountain top. I may even consider myself one day on the mountaintop. I may have already. But I know that in the valley there are people like Benny and there are people like me, people like Mickey White and people like Huey P. Newton and Bobby Seale. And that below the valley are people like Bobby Hutton, people like Eldridge Cleaver. We know that going into the valley is a dangerous thing. We know that when you go out to the valley you got to make a commitment. (Hampton 142)

Hampton's argument is that before Americans can be concerned with the plight of black America and make a move to eliminate government oppression and police brutality within the black communities, they must be completely educated and organized in the ways of revolution. With his reference to the "Mountaintop" Hampton argues, like Dr. King, that he had seen a better future for black people, but like Dr. King, he might not

live to see that future fulfilled. In addition, he implies that the future that awaits black Americans will be based on their commitment to take a stand against injustice. The implicit message within this paragraph is that the Panthers, just like Dr. King, were struggling to gain simple human rights.

Hampton's rhetoric also illustrates how the Panthers attempted to reach out to the public and change the public's perception of the Party. Referring to mistakes that the Party had made allows Hampton to show how they had changed. For example, in paragraph eighteen, he states:

We used to run around yellin 'bout Panther Power—the Panthers run it. We admit we made mistakes. Our ten point program is in the midst of being changed right now, because we used the word “white” when we should have used the word “capitalist”. We're the first to admit our mistakes. We no longer say Panther Power because we don't believe the Panthers should have all the power. We are not for the dictatorship of the Panthers. We are not for the dictatorship of Black people. We are for the dictatorship of the people. (Hampton 143)

Hampton says that the Panthers have made mistakes, but they now realize that the struggle confronting black America was not one of race but that it is a class struggle. The ten-point platform and program of the Black Panther Party is a list of basic demands of what black Americans want and what they believe the government owed them after slavery (Foner 78). The Panthers changed the wording in their “Ten Point Plan” from “white” to “Capitalist.” For example, demand number three of the ten-point platform that was dated February 2, 1969, stated that “we want an end to the robbery by the white man of our black community” (Foner 247). In the second paragraph of the Panthers' amended ten-point platform they cited three levels of oppression that exist in virtually every country which they blamed on the overt “capitalistic” exploitation of minorities (Foner 78). This platform was amended October 18, 1969 (Foner 80). The redefining strategy that Hampton uses implies that Panthers were not the black racists that the media

portrayed them as.

Paragraph four also shows how Hampton ridicules the authorities in his attempt to change society's perception of the Party:

What'd the pig say? He say, "Nigger—you like communism?" "No sir, I'm scared of it." "You like socialism?" "No Sir, I'm scared of it." "You like the breakfast for children program?" "Yes sir, I'd die for it". Pig said, "Nigger, that program is a socialistic program." "I don't give a fuck if it's Communism. You put your hands on that program motherfucker and I'll blow your motherfucking brains out." (Hampton 139)

In this paragraph, Hampton's illustrates how people are supporting the Panther's Breakfast for Children program because it is the right thing to do and that more people should support the Party. Also significant in this paragraph is the language attributed to the "pigs." The pigs' statements reflect on the establishment and the message communicated is that poor Blacks supporting the Panthers' Breakfast for Children Program are communists or socialists. In this paragraph, the Pigs are seen as unreasonable, indicating that Blacks should starve to death rather than become a communist or socialist. In short, the pigs reflect the attitude reflected in the phrase, "better dead than red."

Hampton also uses ridicule in his attempt to change society's perception of the opposition. Using sarcasm, Hampton belittles Chicago's attempt to solve the hunger problem in the city. He stated, "Last week they had a whole week dedicated to the hungry in Chicago. Talking 'bout the starvation rate here that went up 15%. Over here where everybody should be eating. Why? Because of capitalism" (Hampton 139). In this sentence, Hampton ridicules the fact that, with all of the wealth that Capitalism generates, all it can afford is just one week to feed America's hungry while the Panthers feed hungry children every day. Another example of Hampton ridiculing his opposition is

demonstrated in paragraph six, where he addresses the local police tactics of spying on the members of the Panther Party. He states:

They come here and hide—they so uncomfortable they sitting on a taperecorder, they got their gun in their hair—they got to hide all this shit and they come here and do all this weird action. All they got to do is come up to 2350 West Madison any day of the week and anybody up there'll let them know, let the motherfucker know: Yes, we subversive. Yes, we subversive with the bullshit we are confronted with today. Just as subversive as anybody can be subversive. And we think them motherfuckers is the criminals. They the ones always hiding. We the ones up in front. We're out in the open, these motherfuckers should start wearing uniforms. They want to know if the Panthers are goin' underground—these motherfuckers IS underground. You can't find 'em. People calls the pigs but nobody knows where they at. They're out chasing us. They hiding—can't nobody even see 'em. (Hampton 140)

In this paragraph, Hampton describes how the Chicago police have guns and tape recorders hidden everywhere in an attempt to catch the Panthers breaking the law. He ridicules the police by stating that they are sitting on tape recorders, hiding guns in their hair, and conducting all sorts of covert actions in an attempt to get the Panthers.

Hampton's use of ridicule appeals to potential young radical recruits both Black and White who would be amused by the police's frustration in trying to apprehend the Panthers. The implied message in this paragraph is that the government does not have to spend all of the taxpayer's money on high tech surveillance equipment when all they have to do is come to a black neighborhood and anybody will tell them that the Panthers are subversive. In addition, Hampton implies that anyone in the neighborhood could tell the police why the Panthers were subversive. He argues that the Panthers were subversive because, like many black Americans, they are subjected to police brutality, murder, racism and economic oppression within their communities. The Panthers believed that those subjecting Blacks to this sort of treatment were the criminals, not those trying to break the yoke of oppression. This message also appeals to young Blacks, white liberals, and conservative Blacks because it justifies the Panthers' actions. Also,

Hampton uses ridicule to demonstrate that the police were so busy trying to get the Panthers that when there is a real problem where citizens needed a police officer, they could not find one.

Another example of Hampton's use of ridicule to change society's perception of the opposition is shown in paragraph twenty-one, which describes the Progressive Labor Movement's lack of involvement within the black community:

The PL motherfuckers talking that bull-shit, couldn't even find things to criticize. They was so far in the ground. What was they doing? Organizing groundhogs, educating groundhogs, arming groundhogs and teaching groundhogs revolutionary political power. (Hampton 143-144)

In this paragraph, Hampton's use of humor and ridicule implies that if the Progressive Labor Movement was doing anything in the black community no one is aware of it. Hampton depicts the Progressive Labor Movement as being so far underground that they have not accomplished anything that the public could see. The statement speaks to Panther hard-liners and poor people living within the black community. Hampton's language also is humorous to the Panther hard-liners because they are under constant pressure from authorities and police because they making a difference within the community. The statement is also humorous to poor Blacks within the community because when they needed help, they would go to the Black Panther Party not the Progressive Labor movement because they did not exist within the black community.

Hampton employed ridicule to prescribe a course of action. This is demonstrated in the first paragraph, where Hampton belittles the government's treatment of a Black Panther leader and American Imperialism:

We got to talk first of all about the main man. The main man in the Black Panther Party, the main man in the struggle today—in the United States, in Chicago, in Cuba and anywhere else—the main man in the liberation struggle is our Minister of Defense, and yours too, Huey P. Newton. He's the main man because the head of the imperialist octopus lies right in this country and whoever

is dealing with the head of the octopus in this country is the main man. He's in jail now. We must tell the world that Huey P. Newton was tried by the pigs and they found him guilty. He was tried by the people, who found him not guilty, and we say let him go, let him free, because we find him not guilty. This is our relentless demand. We will not let up one day, we will not give up the struggle to liberate our Minister of Defense, Huey P. Newton and we will continue to exert pressure on the power structure and constantly bombard them with the people's demand that Huey P. Newton be set free. (Hampton 138-139)

This paragraph addresses Stewart, Smith and Denton's sixth level of ridicule, attacking the government as inhumane and brutish. Hampton referred to the United States government as the head of an imperialistic octopus that has unjustly jailed Huey P. Newton, Minister of Defense of the Black Panther Party. Hampton uses the metaphor of an octopus in his attempt to illustrate the damaging effects of American imperialism, implying that while the octopus's tentacles were deadly and could choke the life from its victims that there might be a chance of escape. However, the head of the octopus was more deadly because it can see its victims and there was less chance of escape, moreover, the head of the octopus could devour its victims. Hampton's octopus metaphor speaks to every member in the audience who believes that race and class discrimination were wrong and that actions must be taken to stop the spread this inhumane practice. This octopus analogy for American imperialism created a bond between Hampton and his audience. The prescribed course of action in this paragraph is to get Americans to exert pressure on the government and force them to free Huey Newton.

Another example of a similar strategy is shown in paragraph four where Hampton implies that people should support the Panther's Breakfast for Children Program. Referring to the police as "pigs," Hampton is saying that the authorities are against a program that feeds hungry children and any government that is against feeding the hungry is an inhumane government and must be changed. Hampton also depicts the "Pigs" as referring to black supporters of the Panther's "Breakfast for Children Program"

as “Niggers.” In this paragraph the police accuse black supporters of the Breakfast program of being communist. The Pigs said “Nigger—you like communism! well you support the Panther’s Breakfast for Children Program and that program is a socialistic program” (Hampton 139). Pigs, according to Bobby Seale are policemen that violate the constitutional rights of oppressed people (*The Black Panther* 3). Hampton’s use of language (i.e., the words pigs and Niggers) establishes a bond, an us against them mentality between the Panthers and Blacks within the community; it also creates a connection between the Party and liberal white sympathizers. In other words, these violators of the constitutional rights of black Americans have the audacity to accuse Blacks of being communist when it is they who are violating human rights. The implicit message in Hampton’s statement, “I don’t give a fuck if it’s Communism. You put your hands on that program motherfucker and I’ll blow your motherfucking brains out,” (Hampton 139) states that people who believe in humanity must get involved and help change this system.

In paragraph five, Hampton employs another strategy that uses ridicule to prescribe a course of action. Referring again to the Breakfast for Children Program, he said:

They say you got to crawl before you can walk. And the Black Panther Party, as the vanguard party, thought that the Breakfast for Children Program was the best technique of crawling that any vanguard party could follow. And we got a whole lot of folks that’s going to be walking. And then a whole lot of folks that’s gonna be running. And when you got that, what you got? You got a whole lot of PIGS that’s gonna be running. That’s what our program’s about. (Hampton 140)

In this paragraph, Hampton is saying that once Americans, sharing the same philosophy, get behind and support the Panthers’ Breakfast for Children Program, the system will change. Those who were against the program will be forced to change for economic reasons. The last part of the paragraph ridicules the police and authorities when Hampton

says, “You got a whole lot of pigs that gonna be running.” This use of ridicule functions to provide hope for the movement. The statement implies that once everyone is united in and educated about the struggle then the government will change and there will be no place for those supporting the old regime.

Another strategy employed by Hampton is the use of obscenity to change society’s perception of the Party. His strategic use of obscenity is evident in paragraph four which was quoted earlier. In this paragraph, Hampton created a negative image of the authorities by referring to the officers as “pig,” and he has the authorities harassing a supporter of the Panthers Breakfast for Children Program. The harassment is evident in the terms that the police officer used to describe the black supporters of the Panthers Breakfast for Children Program. In this paragraph, the officer called the black supporter of the Breakfast for Children programs a nigger and a communist. Both of the terms were derogatory, since the American of African descent was neither and it was equally offensive for the police officer to belittle a program that took the initiative to feed starving children in America. These terms were not only offensive but also inflammatory to poor Blacks in the community who were still facing economic discrimination and had problem feeding their families. The terms were also offensive to conservative Blacks and liberal Whites who believed that no child should go to bed hungry. The second example of Hampton’s employment of obscenity in his attempt to change society’s perception of the Party is demonstrated in paragraph seven, which addresses the mainstream press:

They write a lot of articles, you know, niggers’ll run up to you in a minute—when I say niggers I mean white niggers and black niggers alike—niggers’ll run up to you and talk that shit about, Man, I read in the Tribune today. Well you say, Man, fuck it right there. If you didn’t read it in the BLACK PANTHER paper, in the MOVEMENT—then you ain’t read shit. (Hampton 140)

Here, Hampton is addressing the false information printed about the Party in the mainstream press, as discussed in chapter two. Hampton refers to “niggers,” both Black and White, in this paragraph to describe those who were less informed about the Party’s activities and his reply was that if you did not get your news from the Panthers then you do not know what is going on. The implicit message is that *The Black Panther* is the only newspaper that can be trusted to tell the truth about the Party.

Hampton also employs the rhetorical strategy of obscenity to prescribe a course of action. Referring to the Panther’s Breakfast for Children Program in paragraph four, he stated, “I don’t give a fuck if it’s Communism. You put your hands on that program motherfucker and I’ll blow your Motherfucking brains out” (Hampton 141). The implicit message in Hampton’s statement is that it does not matter if a program that feeds starving children is Communist, Socialist or otherwise; feeding starving children is a humane thing to do. The statement also implies that anyone who is humane would not stand by and let children starve to death. In this argument, everyone who believes that children should not be allowed to starve should support the Panther’s Breakfast program and their cause.

Hampton uses two rhetorical strategies to reach out to the public for help. The first strategy that Hampton uses to gain public support is an emotional appeal. His statement addressing Panther members who were killed, imprisoned or in exile for their participation in trying to liberate the black community expresses the seriousness of their struggle. The second strategy that Hampton employs attempts to deflect the negative image that the Panthers acquired in the media which depicted the Panthers as a black racist organization. Hampton had to dispel this image in order to gain the support of

liberal Whites and conservative Blacks. First, Hampton requests that supporters join the Panthers in their quest for human rights. In paragraph seventeen he states:

A lot of people think the revolution is bullshit, but it's not. A lot of us think that when you get in the revolution you can talk your way out of things, but that's not true. Ask Bobby Hutton, ask Huey Newton, ask Eldridge Cleaver, Mickey White and Dennis Mora. Ask these people whether it's a game. If you get yourself involved in a revolutionary struggle then you've got to be serious. You got to know what you're doing. You got to already have practiced some type of theory. That's the reason we ask people to follow the leadership of the vanguard party. Because we all theorizing and we all practicing. We make mistakes, but we're always correcting them and we're always getting better. (Hampton 143)

In this paragraph, Hampton explains how serious the Panthers are about the revolution and he alludes to the many Panther leaders who have given their lives and those who are suffering in prison to illustrate the seriousness their cause. He also makes a plea to the public to join the Panthers in their struggle. He describes the seriousness of their problem with a metaphor using the word "game." Referring to Panthers members who were imprisoned, killed, and in exile Hampton states, "Ask these people whether it's a game." Hampton's game reference implies that there are serious consequences for those who fight for human rights and that this is a battle that is best fought by many.

Hampton uses the class argument in paragraph eleven to gain public support. In this paragraph, Hampton clarifies the Party's position on race and their attempt to deflect the media's image of the Panthers as a "black hate group" :

When the Black Panther Party stood up and said we not going to fight racism with racism US said "NO, we can't do that because it's a race question and if you make it a class question then the revolution might come sooner. We in US ain't prepared for no revolution because we think that power grows from the sleeve of a Dashiki." (Hampton 141)

Hampton argues that the Panthers were not a Black Nationalist group like the United Slaves [US] organization. He states instead the Panthers' belief that the problem facing black America was a class struggle and not a race struggle. This strategy appeals to the listener's sense of fair play. The implicit message is that anyone who believes in equal

treatment under the law without regard to race, color, or religion should support the Black Panthers because they are trying to gain human rights for black Americans. Hampton also employs the argument that the Black Nationalist group US thinks that power grows from the sleeve of a Dashiki in order to disassociate themselves from that group's ideology.

Hampton employs another deflective strategy as he redefines the term subversive.

In addition, he justifies the Party's reason for being subversive. He states:

All they got to do is come up to 2350 West Madison any day of the week and anybody up there'll let them know, let the motherfucker know: Yes, we subversive. Yes, we subversive with the bullshit we are confronted with today. Just as subversive as anybody can be subversive. And we think them motherfuckers is the criminals. They the ones always hiding. We the ones up in front. We're out in the open, these motherfuckers should start wearing uniforms. (Hampton 140)

By redefining the term subversive, Hampton attempts to justify the Panthers' reasons for wanting to overthrow the government. This redefinition strategy gains sympathy and support for the Party by suggesting that anyone would be subversive if they were subjected to same types of constant government harassment. Hampton's redefining strategy speaks directly to hard-line Panther members, young black males and young white radicals who have experienced police harassment. Hampton's justifiable reasons for wanting to overthrow the United States government were simple and implied. He implies that the Panthers were subversive because they were being killed, persecuted unjustly, and denied their constitutional rights. In addition, Hampton implies that the Black Panthers have been singled-out because they were standing up for their constitutional rights. Hampton's statement also implies that all of the government's persecution of the Panthers is being done covertly.

Hampton also attempts to mobilize the community into action by explaining five

different strategies throughout his speech to accomplish this task. The first of these strategies appears in paragraphs nine and ten:

Mickey White was in that bullshit with Nathaniel Junior and Merrill Harvey...Mickey White is in solitary confinement and doesn't get to come out of his cell for anything at anytime. And he might be in that cell for the rest of his life. His bond is \$100,000. That's \$10,000. Cash.

Mickey White is a proven revolutionary. He's not nobody we THINK is going to be a revolutionary. He's not nobody we trying to make a revolutionary. He's a proven revolutionary. All of you have to understand that Mickey White is a Panther in ideology, he's a Panther in word and he's a Panther in deed. He's a Panther that understands it's a class struggle—not a race question. You have to understand the pressures the Black Panther Party goes through saying this. You can see the pressures the Black Panther Party goes through by making a coalition with whites. (Hampton 141)

Here Hampton states that Mickey White, a proven Panther revolutionary, now needs the help of the people. He implies that all that the public has to contribute is \$10,000 in cash and they can get him out of jail. The urgency of Hampton's implicit message is stated in this part of the speech is expressed in the type of confinement to which Mickey White was subjected. According to Hampton, White was in solitary confinement and "doesn't come out of his cell for anything at any time." This strategy tries to mobilize the community to raise the money and get Mickey White out of jail. Similar strategies are found in paragraphs twelve and thirteen, where Hampton names other jailed Panther members in need of financial support. Hampton states:

We got a whole lot of people being busted and you don't even know about all these people. There's one here you definitely have to know about and that's our Deputy Minister of Defense—Bobby Rush. Our Deputy Minister Bobby Rush was busted on some bullshit with a gun thing. He's got three gun charges. He's been convicted of one with a six month lead. He's out on appeal now. I know a lot of you people say, well goddamn, you got a Mickey White defense fund, an Eldridge Cleaver defense fund, a Merrill Harvey defense fund, a Nathaniel Junior defense fund, a Huey Newton defense fund, a Fred Hampton, Jule, Che, and Chaka defense fund—and I just can't keep up with all these defense funds. But since we are the vanguard party we try to do things right, so we got one defense fund so you don't get mixed up on what name to send it to. We'll decide who it goes to. You can just send it to Political Defense Fund, 2350 West Madison. If you want to send something to Breakfast for Children, you can send it to 2350 West Madison also, and you can earmark that money to go to the Breakfast for Children program.

We got Mickey on our mind tonight—and everybody knows we got Huey P. Newton on our mind tonight. We got every political prisoner in jail on our mind tonight. Eldridge Cleaver—all of these people either dead, or in exile or in

jail. A lot of people understanding this will lose real faith in the vanguard by not understanding what we're talking about. (Hampton 141-142)

These two paragraphs demonstrate that the Black Panther Party was under siege with many of its members dead, imprisoned, and in exile. Hampton also states that the Panthers need the financial support of the public if they are going to continue their struggle for the civil rights of black Americans. Paragraph seventeen employs a similar type of strategy by recalling the names of the individuals who have either died, or were forced out of the country, or were imprisoned. Hampton, referring to the Party's persecution by the government, states:

Ask Bobby Hutton, ask Huey Newton, ask Eldridge Cleaver, Mickey White and Dennis Mora. Ask these people whether it's a game. If you get yourself involved in a revolutionary struggle then you've got to be serious. You got to know what you're doing. (Hampton 143)

Hampton states that the Black Panthers knew that taking a stand for the rights of black people in a country that oppresses people of color would be dangerous. He also implies that the Panthers were still committed to the struggle in spite of the loss of their lives and their freedom. For the listener, Hampton's statements raised the question: With all that we have given, our lives, our hope, and our freedom, all that we are asking for is your support. Won't you support the Party?

The final passages where Hampton attempts to mobilize the community into action are the last part of paragraph eighteen and paragraph nineteen. He states:

We are not for the dictatorship of the Panthers. We are not for the dictatorship of Black people. We are for the dictatorship of the people.

The difference between the people and the vanguard is very important. You got to understand that the people follow the vanguard. You got to understand that the Black Panther Party is the vanguard. If you are about going to the people you got to understand that the vanguard leads the people. After the social revolution, the vanguard party, through our educational programs—and that program is overwhelming—the people are educated to the point that they can run things themselves. That's what you call educating the people, organizing the

people, arming the people and bringing them revolutionary political power. That means people's power. That means the people's revolution. And if you're not about being involved in a people's revolution then you got to do something. You got to support the people's revolution. (Hampton 143)

The significant part in paragraph eighteen is the statement where Hampton describes who the Panthers believe should direct government policy. The last sentence stated that the people should dictate government policy. The significant part of paragraph nineteen is the third sentence that states that the Panther Party is the vanguard and the vanguard leads the people. Hampton's argument is that the public should follow the example set by the Panthers. For example, they should acknowledge that the problem facing black Americans was not a race problem but a problem of class and that this problem must be resolved by black and white people. The implicit theme within this paragraph was that all of the people must work together and support the Party; as the last sentence in the paragraph states: "You got to support the people's revolution." With this phrase, Hampton makes another attempt to mobilize the community into supporting the Party.

In another part of his speech, Hampton employs a justification strategy (i.e., a strategy justifying one's actions) explain the lack of support from white liberal groups caused by the Party's ideological differences, as discussed in chapter two. In paragraph eighteen, Hampton stated:

We used to run around yellin 'bout Panther Power—the Panthers run it. We admit we made mistakes. Our ten point program is in the midst of being changed right now, because we used the word "white" when we should have used the word "capitalist". We're the first to admit our mistakes. We no longer say Panther Power because we don't believe the Panthers should have all the power. We are not for the dictatorship of the Panthers. We are not for the dictatorship of Black people. We are for the dictatorship of the people. (Hampton 143)

Hampton implies that Whites are no longer barred from membership in the Black Panther Party since the Panthers have come to realize that the problems Blacks were confronted

with were class problems, and not problems of race. This justification strategy appeals to the Blacks and Whites who had formed coalitions and had worked together under the leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King. The justification strategy tells white liberals and conservative Blacks that the Panthers had realized that there were mistakes made and that the Party has changed.

Hampton employs another justification strategy in an attempt to explain why the Panthers made the mistakes. Hampton states in paragraph twenty-two:

I say that we're the first group to come above ground where the people can follow you and see you. And if you make a mistake it's better than not even being at all. When I made that mistake I made it for the people, and I correct it for the people. You don't hear there was a raid on PL's office last night. You ain't never heard that. (Hampton 144)

In this paragraph, Hampton argues that the only reason that the Black Panther Party's mistakes were so visible is that their Party is no longer underground. He implies that the Progressive Labor movement and other radical groups are underground. Therefore, the Progressive Labor movement was not being subjected to the same type of treatment that the Panthers receive; hence, the Panthers are the only legitimate group.

Hampton also uses slogans to transform the perception of reality and to mobilize the community into action. Hampton first uses a slogan in the introduction of his speech, "All Power to the People" (Hampton 138) which signified the Black Panthers' commitment to liberate black Americans from an oppressive government. Hampton uses another slogan in paragraph five. His slogan, "You got to crawl before you can walk" (Hampton 140) signified that the Panthers are not just talking about revolutionary change, they are doing something about it. For example, Hampton cites the Party's Breakfast for Children Program as the best technique making the community aware of what they can

do when the people organize. In paragraph fourteen, Hampton's phrase, "If you kill a few, you get a little satisfaction, but when you kill them all you get complete satisfaction," (Hampton 142) symbolized the Party's dedication to eliminate government oppression and police brutality within the black community.

Two examples in Hampton's speech illustrate his strategic use of slogans in his attempts to mobilize the community in to action. The first example is demonstrated in paragraph eleven:

When the Black Panther Party stood up and said we not going to fight racism with racism US said "NO, we can't do that because it's a race question and if you make it a class question then the revolution might come sooner. We in US ain't prepared for no revolution because we think that power grows from the sleeve of a Dashiki." (Hampton 141)

Hampton employs three slogans here to convey his message. The first slogan that Hampton uses, "You can't fight racism with racism," is implied. With this slogan, Hampton encourages his listeners not to be violent toward all white people because some white people were willing to help Blacks in their struggle for autonomy within their communities. The second slogan is also implied in this section. In the second sentence Hampton refers to the US organization's belief that power grows from the sleeve of a Dashiki. Hampton's instead implies that real power does not grow from the sleeve of a Dashiki but instead, real power comes from the ability to unite all the people against a common enemy. Hampton argues that the people must come together, they must be united in their fight to eliminate police brutality and government oppression, because as long as one group's rights are denied, the rights of others are in jeopardy. The third slogan that Hampton uses in paragraph eleven refers to Eldridge Cleaver's statement to the US organization about fighting fire with fire. Hampton quoted Cleaver stating,

“Eldridge Cleaver told them, even though you say you fight fire with fire best, we think you fight fire with water. You can do either one, but we choose to fight with water” (Hampton 141). In this statement, Hampton again hammers the point that the Panthers’ way of working with Whites to achieve their goal was the best way and that other groups should follow. Hampton’s reference to Cleaver functions as a unification strategy to show solidarity within the Party. This unification strategy forms a closer bond with the members of the Party, also creates this sense of belonging which invites those outside the Party (i.e., young Blacks, white liberals and conservative Blacks) to join.

In paragraph twenty-five, Hampton employs seven different slogans in his attempts to mobilize the community into action. The objective in this paragraph is to demonstrate that the Panthers are not the racist organization as portrayed by the media. Some of the slogans also are used in other parts of Hampton’s speech. In his attempts to dispel the negative image created by the media Hampton states:

Kill a few and get a little satisfaction. Kill some more and you get some more satisfaction. Kill ‘em all and you get complete satisfaction. We say All Power to the People—Black Power to Black People and Brown Power to Brown People, Red Power to Red People and Yellow Power to Yellow People. We say White Power to White People EVEN. And we say Panther Power to the vanguard Party and we say don’t kill a few and don’t kill some more. As a matter of fact we rather you didn’t move until you see we ready to move, and when you see we ready to move you know we not dealing with a few, we not dealing with some more. You know that when we get ready to move we dealing from complete—that’s what we’re after—total, everything, everybody—complete satisfaction. (Hampton 144)

The first of the seven slogans that Hampton employs focuses on the phrase, “kill’ em all and get complete satisfaction” implies that every person working together can eliminate the problems confronting black America. Hampton’s power salute to all of ethnic groups in this paragraph demonstrates his argument that the Panthers were not a black hate group. Hampton’s theme of people working together creates an argument that the public should get behind and support a Party that is inclusive and working to procure the rights

of all Americans. The other slogans, “All power to the people, black, white, brown, red, yellow,” etc., drives home the notion that all Americans need to get on the bandwagon and support the Party. In the last sentence of the paragraph Hampton’s phrase, “that’s what we’re after—total, everything, everybody—complete satisfaction” again illustrated the inclusiveness of the Panther Party.

Fred Hampton used several strategies in his attempt to regain public support for the Panthers. He used a redefining strategy to change the public’s perceptions about the Party that were damaged by the government’s media campaign against the Panthers. Hampton also used a strategy of redefining terms to support his cause and justified the Party’s actions. He used ridicule to alter society’s perceptions of the Party and their opposition. Hampton’s uses of emotional appeals and deflection strategies both functioned to enhance the Party’s image. His strategic use of the class argument clarified the Party’s position on race and aided his attempt to garner public support. Hampton’s use of slogans accomplished the task of uniting the members of his audience as well as clarifying the Party’s position on race. Lastly, he employed a justification strategy to explain to white liberals and conservative Blacks that the Party had learned from their mistakes and would continue to grow with the aid of the public. The combined strategies all culminated in an attempt to garner the support of the public.

Section B: Connie Matthews

The Struggle is a World Struggle

Connie Matthews delivered her informal speech before an audience consisting of white, middle-class, college students. Like Hampton, Matthews made an urgent attempt to regain the support of the public. Her strategies and direct style made no secret of what her purpose was at the Vietnam Moratorium demonstration at San Jose State College.

Connie Matthews was the International Coordinator for the Black Panther Party (Heath 11). Matthews was from Jamaica and she was authorized to speak for the Party after the Panthers had toured and lectured in Communist China, North Vietnam, and Cuba (Smith 75). She co-represented the Panthers through the Solidarity Committee for Third World Peoples' Liberation Struggle, where her duties along with Panther member Skip Malone, were to carry out demonstrations of support, raise funds, and inform the people of Scandinavia about poor black and oppressed peoples' revolutionary struggle from the Panthers' vanguard position (Smith 75). They pressured America from abroad to stop harassing and jailing members of the Black Panthers (Smith 75). She assisted in educating Scandinavia about the Panthers and their struggle by writing open letters to newspapers and staging demonstrations. Matthews and Malone organized demonstrations in front of the U.S. embassies, handing out leaflets at May Day demonstrations, and protesting the jailing of Huey Newton. She raised money for the Panther Party and contacted a variety of Europeans in many different countries to raise awareness about the Party's issues of racism in America and the plight of Huey Newton and other jailed Panther members (Smith 75). Eldridge Cleaver sent Connie Matthews from Algeria to work as Newton's secretary, where she was to send him firsthand information about what was going on at the Panthers' headquarters (Pearson 229). The tone of Connie Matthews's speech, delivered at the Vietnam Moratorium demonstration

at San Jose State College before an all white student body of liberal supporters on October 15, 1969, was urgent. Matthews employs several strategies in an attempt to alter the students' perceptions of reality. In the first paragraph, she attempts to educate the San Jose State College students about America's response to the world's condemnation of U. S. atrocities committed in Vietnam. This type of strategy transforms the perceptions of reality by altering the perceptions of the past (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 44). In this paragraph, Matthews states:

I wonder whether you people really do understand what's going on. I have to ask myself this question because in 1967 there was a World Tribunal which was held in Roskilde in Denmark and there the world condemned the United States for the atrocities committed in Vietnam and found her guilty of war crimes and the United States said—Later for the World, because we rule the World. It was announced on the news that there would be demonstrations tomorrow against the war and Nixon said this morning that it makes no difference to his strategy in Vietnam. (Matthews 154)

In this paragraph, Matthews states that America does not answer to anyone because it believes it is superior to other nations. In addition, the paragraph implied that the methods of protest used by white radicals such as marches and demonstrations were meaningless and that they needed to find a different approach if they were serious about stopping the war in Vietnam.

Several examples of this consciousness-raising strategy also are found in paragraph five, which addresses the white radicals' lack of enthusiasm for the plight of black people in America:

I am now saying to you here, that I do not think you are trying hard enough, I don't think you understand fully what's going on. I think you need to get out of your bag and your safe complacency in these colleges. I think you need to go and work in those communities, but before you go into the communities and propagate the wrong ideology, arm yourselves with the right ideology, understand what the struggle is about. It is the oppressed against the oppressor. You middle-class people, because I do not believe that any of you here are capitalists, there are

only about 300, you are definitely in a vacuum and you are going to have to take sides at some stage or other and make sure that you take the right side, because if you don't you are not going to have any place to go, because the people must win. (Matthews 157)

In this paragraph, Matthews tells her audience that they do not understand the complexity of the times. She argues that they do not fully understand what the movements were trying to accomplish and that they did not know how to aid the struggle for human rights. She states that she is aware of their willingness to help, but that they simply do not know how to help. In addition, Matthews offers a solution as to what they can do to gain a clearer understanding of the problems. Matthews argues that once the student activists start to work in the communities then they will understand the problems and the need to be equipped with a solution.

Another consciousness-raising strategy is found in the beginning of paragraph five. Matthews stated:

You can see what has been going on in Chicago and I can tell you that the so-called mother country radicals have been a disappointment. I was in Court there and they don't take this thing seriously. They do not understand that the trial in Chicago the outcome, will set the precedence in the United States as to whether the people have any freedom or not. They seem to think this is all a big joke, with Abbie Hoffman doing somersaults in Court and all that kind of bulls--t. Now, I am saying you have had what is known as group freedom and you are trying to find individual freedom. We are all one people, this is all one country, in fact in the whole world we are all one people, so until everyone has known what group freedom is you are not going to be able to exist in your hippie and yuppie societies with individual freedom. (Matthews 157)

Matthews argues that the white radicals do not understand the seriousness of the government harassment and persecution of Blacks in America, and cites Abbie Hoffman's courtroom antics in the "Conspiracy eight trial" as an example. In addition, she argues that as long as justice to black Americans was denied, justice for white Americans also was in jeopardy. This idea is expressed in the last part of this paragraph.

Matthews states that until everyone in America has group freedom, the radicals' hippie and yippie societies will not be allowed to live as individuals. This type of strategy attempts to alter perceptions of the future by stating what the future will be like for the radicals if they do not get serious about the liberation of black people.

The last example expressing urgency in Matthews's speech, found in paragraph five, concerns the statement about the government's repression of the Black Panther Party:

And I am saying that over the last six months Nixon has launched a massive repression against the Black Panther Party that is unheard of. I have spoken in other countries, like France, Germany or even England, people find it hard to believe that Americans, like you can sit here and watch this sort of thing happening and you do nothing about it. Chairman Bobby Seale, at the beginning of his trial in Chicago was sick, and he wasn't allowed to have a doctor, he has no lawyer, he has no rights he is unable defend to himself, because Charles Garry, his lawyer, is lying on his back in the hospital right here in California, and because he is a Black man it doesn't matter. He shouldn't have anyone to defend him. (Matthews 157)

In this paragraph, Matthews attempts to alter the audience's perceptions of the past. Her statement, "Over the last six months that Nixon had launched a massive repression against the Black Panther Party that was unheard of," draws attention to the past altercations between the Panthers and police and argues that the Panthers had been singled out for persecution. She argues that the constitutional rights of the Panthers were being violated and cites the government's mistreatment of the Panther's Chairman Bobby Seale in the Conspiracy 8 trial as an example. In addition, the implicit message in the paragraph is that America's allies were shocked that Americans just stood by and watched while their Constitutional laws were being violated. Hence, she argues that the students were blind to the realities in their own country.

Matthews employs several other strategies in her attempt to transform the perceptions of reality. In paragraph six, she speaks about the unrelenting spirit of the Vietnamese people in their quest for autonomy:

The Vietnamese are a good example of the people being victorious. Because with all of America's technology and her greatness she has been unable to defeat the Vietnamese. Every man, woman and child has resisted. You want to see what is going on in Vietnam. All the men have had to go to the front and you should see how those women and children safeguard their villages. It is probably very difficult for you in the middle of all this to see it clearly, but this is why you have the greatest responsibility. The people who understand what is wrong, because it has to come from within as well as from outside. (Matthews 158)

In the first part of this statement, Matthews creates the image of how the poorly equipped Vietnamese were trying to defend themselves against the superior technological power of America and that every man, woman, and child was involved in their struggle to maintain autonomy. She implies that radicals in America need to look to the Vietnamese revolutionaries as a model of resistance. The second part of the paragraph implies that it was wrong for America to be involved in a war in Vietnam, and killing people who only wanted to rule themselves. In addition, the last part of the statement implies that because the American government had no real reason for being in Vietnam and that the people in America should force them to withdraw their troops. In short, the people in America should have a government that represents and reflects the views of the people.

The final strategy that Matthews uses to transform the perceptions of reality by altering views of the past is found in paragraph seven. Matthews provided the interpretation of why African slaves were brought to America: "They did not bring Black people over from Africa as slaves because we were Black. They brought Black people over so capitalism could thrive. When capitalism reached its highest form—imperialism—they had to define methods to keep the divisions" (Matthews 159). In this

paragraph, Matthews recalls history, as told from the perspective of an American of African descent. She states that Whites brought black slaves to America so that capitalism could thrive, and she implies that after capitalism matured and America no longer needed the slaves to maintain the economy, the country then took measures, such as discrimination based on race, class and sex, to keep the former slaves and other oppressed people in the country divided.

Matthews also uses several rhetorical strategies to prescribe a course of action. This type of strategy looks at what must be done, who must accomplish the task, and how the task must be accomplished. Matthews employs the first strategy of this type in the second paragraph:

Now, I am not trying to negate or to diminish the efforts that you are making in holding these demonstrations. What I am trying to say to you is that the time has come when we have to move in another direction. We have to understand that by peaceful demonstrations, by trying to negotiate, that we are not going to get anywhere. We have to understand that the struggle at this moment is world struggle, it's a world proletarian struggle; two things—the oppressed versus the oppressor. You have to understand that we must stop talking in terms of countries, we have to talk about internationalism because the United States has now gone to the moon, they will go to Mars, they will go to Venus next, so that it is not just a question anymore of the planet earth. (Matthews 154)

Matthews argues that the Panthers have the solution to the struggle that Americans were facing. She states that peaceful demonstrations were not working because the protesters' focus was wrong and they needed to realize that the struggle was worldwide. In addition, the protesters had to realize that the struggle was a struggle of the oppressed versus the oppressor. In short, she argues that Americans interested in changing the system through peaceful protest and negotiations should join the Black Panthers because they were the vehicle for change.

In addition, Matthews' mobilization strategy was demonstrated in paragraph four where she identified the enemy and the types of people who were crucial for the movement's success:

Now, you know the Black Panther Party started off and we said that we understood that this thing was a class struggle. We understood that there are Black people who are pigs and we understood that there are White people *who* are pigs. What we are trying to say is that we want a United Front of all ethnic oppressed groups, regardless of race, color, creed or what have you, because the ultimate aim is to overthrow this establishment. (Matthews 156)

Matthews' argues that the Panther Party was the solution to the problems facing America's oppressed people. Her message is that the Panthers were not the racist organization that the media portrayed them to be and that in the very beginning the Party sought after multiracial memberships. She depicts the existence of both black and white oppressors in her attempt to support her class argument, as illustrated in the statement, "we understood that there are Black people who are pigs and we understood that there are White people who are pigs." In addition, she states that the Panthers believe that it would take a united front of all ethnic oppressed groups to resolve this type of government oppression.

A similar strategy attempting to mobilize the students into action also is apparent in the last part of paragraph four:

You have got to get hip to this thing, because you are the ones who are going to be the leaders and the establishment tomorrow, you are going to be the bank managers, members of the administration and all the rest of it and you have got to get hip to the fact that you cannot allow this thing to continue. You have got to get hip to the fact that what the Black Panther Party wants is to take the wealth from out of the hands of the few, and it is only controlled by 250 people who run the world. (Matthews 156-157)

Matthews argues that the white radicals should know that the struggle confronting the oppressed groups in America was a class problem because they were going to be the establishment of tomorrow. Therefore, they should want to resolve this problem if they

believed in what they were protesting against. Her choice of language in this paragraph distinguishes the Party's rhetoric from the establishment, creating a bond between the peers of her generation and the Panthers. Her attempt to bond with the students is illustrated the phrases, "You have got to get hip to this thing and you have got to get hip to the fact that what the Black Panther Party wants is to take the wealth from out of the hands of the few." Matthews, speaking the language of her generation, implies that she and the Black Panthers were just like students, and what they wanted was their constitutional rights respected.

Matthews utilizes another strategy that prescribes a course of action in paragraph five, where she admonishes members of the white radical group to chose wisely the correct side in the struggle against oppression:

You middle-class people, because I do not believe that any of you here are capitalists, there are only about 300, you are definitely in a vacuum and you are going to have to take sides at some stage or other and make sure that you take the right side because if you don't you are not going to have any place to go, because the people must win. (Matthews 157-158)

The first part of the paragraph argues that while the white radicals were not capitalists, they also were not "true" supporters of the Black Panther movement. Clearly, Matthews argues that if the white radical group did not choose to ally themselves with Panthers then they were a part of the problem and not the solution. She indicates that the students were insulated from the harsh realization of what was really going on in America and she admonishes them that they had better choose to be on the side of the people because the people were going to win.

Paragraph seven exhibits another strategy that Matthews uses that prescribed a course of action. In this paragraph, she solicits support for a petition:

We have a petition for community control of police, and those of you who are not

familiar with it, get yourself familiar with it, because this is one of the ways in which we are trying to get the power back into the hands of the people. Here on your colleges you have these demonstrations and you go about saying that you don't want this and you don't want that, and you want this and you want that, and then you sit down and you say you have won. You haven't won anything because you must realize that the people who control the colleges are the same people who were put there because they have power in the communities. So your job is in the communities. The two things are tied up together. Don't try to put them in compartments. I think the time has come for all you young people here in the United States to take a look at yourselves. Look inside first. Try and grasp what the Black Panther Party is trying to do, try and understand how many lives we have lost, because we are trying to educate you. We are the Vanguard because of 400 years, of sweat, blood and tears. (Matthews 158)

Matthews argues that the students needed to support the Panthers' petition for a community advisory committee for the police. She implies that the students' demonstrations were unsuccessful because those who control the forces of power within the community also control the levels compromise on college campuses (i.e. the level of the students demands). In other words, until those who control the power structure change significantly, there would be no real change. This argument is evident in her statement "You haven't won anything because you must realize that the people who control the colleges are the same people who were put there because they have power in the communities." She employs a consciousness-raising strategy when she asks the students to take a look at themselves, to look inside first and try and grasp what the Panther Party was trying to do. With this statement, she implies that the Panthers had more in common with the students than the establishment, and, because the students were not of their parents generation, they should be concerned about the number of young people that have lost their lives trying to secure freedom for those alienated from the system. The last part of the paragraph argues that the Panthers were the party best equipped to address the problems of oppression because black Americans have experienced four hundred years of persecution in the country.

Matthews demonstrates her last strategy that prescribed a course of action in

paragraph seven. She states:

What I am trying to say is, educate yourselves, in turn educate your people, the people in the communities. Whenever you go out you talk about it. You talk about the whole thing, the reason why they divided us up into ethnic groups, into races, because as Fanon has said--capitalism and racism--one is cause and the other effect. (Matthews 158-159)

Matthews argues that the students needed to go out into the communities, carry with them the Panthers' philosophy, and thus educate the community as to why Americans were divided up into ethnic groups and races. She implies that it was important that the students educate themselves and go out into the community and talk about the real issues affecting America (i.e., the class problem). She indicates that by the students educating themselves and going out in to the communities and talking about the issues of class they would in turn educate the public on the real issues.

Matthews also attempts to alter the perceptions of the opposition in her speech.

The fourth paragraph demonstrates the first example of this kind of strategy. She states:

Sartre said that Europe, the dying mother of capitalism, gave birth to a monster, imperialism, and this is the United States of America. You have to understand that what the Black Panther Party is doing is for you and for the rest of the world. Now you have to rally behind the Black Panther Party and to support the Black Panther Party. It's o.k. when a bunch of niggers get out on the streets and say we hate all White people. Nixon endorses this, Nixon endorses Black capitalism, because he knows that what he is going to do is to get a few so-called elite Black people and create yet another division and this is why I am glad I am talking to a group of students and the thing that I notice is that there are over 400 Black students here at San Jose State and that none of these students thought that the war in Vietnam has anything to do with them or else they would be in this goddamned room. (Matthews 156)

Matthews attempts to alter the perception of the opposition by arguing that America was the monster created from the dying mother of European capitalism. She also implies that President Nixon endorsed any type of system that would prevent black and white Americans from unifying and realizing that the race problem in America was really a class problem. Her focus on this negative trait of capitalism clearly implies that the

government was for anything that would keep Americans divided. She implies that this division was the strength of capitalism and that was why it had to be abolished. In addition, she chastises Blacks at San Jose State for not attending her lecture. The implied message is that because the struggle for Blacks in America was a class struggle, Blacks, more than anyone, should be present.

Matthews employs a similar strategy to alter the perception of the opposition in the last part of the same paragraph:

This seems absurd, but there are only about 250 to 300 big capitalists in this country. They are ones who put who they want in power, they are the ones who control and rule the world and say what should be done in this country and for that matter the world. Now the future rests with you people who are here today. (Matthews 157)

Matthews argues that it was wrong for a few people to have most of the wealth in America. In addition, the implicit message is that this wealthy few also selected who they wanted to put in positions of authority, as well as determined which direction the country, and the world, should move. In her statement, "Now the future rests with you people who are here today," she implies that the students must aid the Panthers in creating an America which works for all Americans and not just the elite few.

The last strategy of this type portrays Nixon as a kind of Svengali, a hypnotist with great control over his subjects, who can control the ways in which the students think. Matthews states:

And they should understand that those Vietnamese are fighting and dying for them. Now, to get back to the point, Nixon believes that by brainwashing you students, because you are the ones who are going out tomorrow to continue what Nixon has brainwashed you into believing everything is o.k. You have got to get hip to this thing, because you are the ones who are going to be the leaders and the establishment of tomorrow, you are going to be the bank managers, members of the administration and all the rest of it and you have got to get hip to the fact that you cannot allow this thing to continue. (Matthews 156-157)

Matthews's statement implies that America had no real justification for its war in Vietnam and that the students should not trust the country's agenda because it involved world domination. She argues that the small country of Vietnam was just trying to defend itself from the domination of a world super power. She also argues that America's attempts to dominate other countries were wrong and that every country had the right to live under the government of their own choosing. Matthews, in the last part of the paragraph, states that the students must not allow America's attempt to rule the world to continue, and she entreats them that they have the power to change America's course because the students are the administrators, bankers and establishment of the future. The implied message is that because the students have a clearer sense of justice than those within the establishment, they should work with the Panthers in order to obtain freedom and equal opportunity for everyone. In addition, Matthews states that because the students were the future of America the power of change was in their hands; because the Panthers Party had the answers to America's problems, the students must join them to insure a just future.

Matthews also includes a strategy that attempted to alter the public's perception of society. In the last part of the second paragraph Matthews states:

And you want to take a trip around the world and visit some of the countries I have visited to see what American imperialism has done. Eldridge Cleaver, our Minister of Information, in his last article from exile, which is in the last issue of our newspaper (there are some copies here) has stated that the oppression in the United States, and the way that people live in ghettos here is as if you have been placed in silk sheets compared to what American imperialism has done in the other countries of the world. (Matthews 154-156)

Matthews attempts to altered perceptions through a comparison regarding the destructive power of American imperialism. Matthews argues that when one compares the

oppression and the poverty of Blacks in America with the damage that American imperialism had caused around the world that one might think that the oppressed Blacks living in the ghettos of America were living like royalty. Matthews's comparison helps her audience to see how urgent her message is and how important it is that they join the Black Panthers in their struggle to eliminate American oppression and American imperialism around the world.

A similar attempt to alter the perceptions of society is evident in paragraph seven of Matthews' speech. Revising the traditional historical view of America's rise to greatness, Matthews states that "This so-called United States of America was built up at the expense of genocide of 50 million Indians and you people have romanticized it and called it Cowboys and Indians" (158). In her statement about the genocide of 50 million Indians emphasizing America's its romanticism of that period, Matthews argues that at one time all white people were brainwashed into thinking that the genocide of indigenous people was the right thing to do. In addition, she argues that now some of them knew better and that they must act against this kind of agenda. Matthews uses this self-empowerment strategy to get the students to see how important they are to the future of America by implying that they can not afford to continue their old ways of protest which accomplish nothing. She argues that America was given birth through violence. In other words, the United States destroyed the people who lived in this country, took their land, and built its economy on the pain and the misery of others.

Another strategy that Matthews uses attempts to mobilize her audience to action. She attempts to organize the united and discontented to pressure the opposition in order to gain sympathy and support from opinion leaders or legitimizers. The first example of

this strategy is in the last line of paragraph four where she states, “Now the future rests with you people who are here today” (157). With this line, Matthews implies that the students who were in the audience needed to organize, go out into the communities, and join the Panthers in their struggle to free those who are oppressed people in America.

Two similar statements that attempt to mobilize the radical students into action are found in paragraph eight:

If you have been watching the stock market and the world monetary fund system, they have told you that the German market is floating. There are no changes. While the German mark is floating the dollar has decreased and watch—over the next six months or so what will happen. You are the ones who are going to feel it most. Not the poor oppressed people, because they have nothing anyway. But you in the middle, who think you have something have those bills and those \$20,000 houses, you are the ones who are going to find out that the mortgage or interest or whatever you are going to have to pay back is about twice what you thought originally. (Matthews 159)

Matthews employs a fear tactic to in her attempt to mobilize the students into action. She argues that the US dollar has decreased in value and the middle class are going to feel the economic crunch as they never have before. In addition, she implies that the students had better take steps to try to circumvent the impending economic doom of middle class America. She also argues that the poor would survive as they always have but those Americans who had grown accustomed to a certain lifestyle, such as these students, would suffer the most.

Matthews makes her last attempt to mobilize the students into action in the last segment of paragraph eight: “Get yourself hip to all this, do some research, you students, get with it and educate your people because the Panther Party is out there in the front but we can’t stay out the front forever” (159). Her statement implies urgency. Matthews argues that if the students were going to take a stand that they had better get organized and do it soon because the Panthers might not be around much longer.

Matthews uses only one strategy that contains ridicule in her attempt to mobilize

the students into action. She states, “We will stay until everyone of us is killed or imprisoned by these racist pigs, but then someone will have to take over. So don’t let us all die in vain” (159). The words that demonstrates her use of ridicule were the words racist pigs which fit Stewart, Smith, and Denton’s definition of this strategy. Matthews used the words in this paragraph to attack her opposition, portraying them as inhumane and brutish.

The last of the rhetorical strategies examined in this analysis was how Matthews uses slogans in her speech. Matthews employs the slogan, “Power to the people,” at the beginning and at the end of her speech. The slogan symbolizes the purpose of the movement. The slogan is also an example of what Michael McGee referred to as the “WE” moment. Lastly, this slogan signifies the Panthers’ commitment to give more power to all of the people.

As expected, the analysis revealed that Connie Matthews indeed, attempted to regain public support for the Black Panther Party. She employed nine rhetorical strategies in her attempt to persuade her audience to join the Panthers in their task of rebuilding America. Her rhetorical strategies attempted to raise the consciousness level of the students, attempted to alter the student’s perceptions of reality, prescribed a course of action, altered the student’s perception of the government, and altered the student’s perception of society. She also used slogans, ridicule and self-empowerment strategies as persuasive tools. Lastly, Matthews carefully structured her rhetorical strategies to accommodate her all-white audience.

CHAPTER IV
A RHETORICAL DELIMMA: A STUDY
OF THE RHETORIC OF PANTHER LEADERS,
ELDRIDGE CLEAVER AND RAY “MASAI” HEWITT

Section C: Cleaver’s Open Letter

To

Stokely Carmichael

The speeches of Eldridge Cleaver and Ray “Masai” Hewitt were grouped by their common elements. Both speeches had four elements in common. Cleaver and Hewitt’s speeches were: (1) semiformal, (2) less urgent in their delivery, (3) developed for a broader, more dispersed audience, and (4) designed to enhance the Party’s credibility.

Eldridge Cleaver’s semiformal published open letter to Stokely Carmichael reached a demographic readership consisting primarily of educated, politically informed white liberals, young black radicals, and conservative blacks. Cleaver, less urgent in his approach than Hampton and Matthews, and frustrated and disappointed with Carmichael’s advocacy of Black Nationalism, attempted to distance himself and the Party from this type of ideology in his attempt to gain support from the public. The rhetorical strategies employed in Cleaver’s open letter to Carmichael attempted to strengthen his argument that the Black Panthers were not a black hate group, as

defined by the FBI's counter intelligence program (COINTELPRO), but an inclusive group who only wanted their Constitutional rights respected.

Cleaver's open letter to Stokely Carmichael, which was printed in the September 1969 issue of *Ramparts* magazine, a liberal publication, illustrates the kinds of rhetorical strategies that the Panthers used in their attempts to regain public support. During the time that Cleaver's letter was published, the Panthers had been wiretapped and terrorized by local, state, and federal agents under the orders of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. Eldridge Leroy Cleaver was convicted of assault with intent to murder and remanded to San Quentin and Folsom prisons where he spent eight years before he became eligible for parole in 1965 (Bigelow 57). He authored a best selling book, *Soul on Ice*, which was published in 1968 (Cleaver 10). Cleaver was granted parole in 1966. He joined the staff at *Ramparts* magazine and served as an editor and a contributor to the magazine (Bigelow 57). In his spare time, he helped to start Black House, a San Francisco cultural center for African American youth, where he met Huey Newton and Bobby Seale, the founders of the Black Panther Party, in 1967 (Bigelow 57). Cleaver was named Minister of Information for the Black Panther Party; he made speeches and sought new members for the growing organization (Bigelow 57).

Stokely Carmichael was credited with the "Black Power" slogan that frightened whites and turned off activists like Dr. Martin Luther King (Bigelow 46). The FBI also had laid the foundation that created the suspicion that Stokely Carmichael was operating as a CIA agent (Newton 191). After Carmichael graduated from Howard University in 1964, he became an organizer for SNCC and participated in the group's drive to register black voters—the first of these well-publicized efforts—in Lowndes County, Alabama

(Bigelow 47). In 1965, Carmichael replaced John Lewis as head of SNCC and began to spread his message of “Black Power” (Bigelow 48). His 1967 book, *What We Want*, advanced the idea that mere integration was not the answer to American racism, and that America formed only a piece of the puzzle (Bigelow 48). Carmichael’s book linked the struggle for African-American empowerment definitively to economic self-determination domestically and the end of imperialism and colonialism worldwide (Bigelow 48). His book described “the need for black communal control of black resources—ultimately, the economic foundations of this country must be shaken if black people are to control their lives—and also delved into the crippling psychological effects of racism” (Bigelow 48). Carmichael began speaking against U.S. imperialism; when he returned to the country in 1968, U. S. Marshals confiscated his passport and it was during this time that the Oakland, California, based Black Panthers made him honorary Prime Minister (Bigelow 49).

In 1969, Carmichael had resigned from his position as the Prime Minister of the Black Panther Party. Ideological differences between Eldridge Cleaver and Stokely Carmichael within the Party resulted in Carmichael’s resignation. Cleaver believed that cooperating with whites was favorable when it worked to the advantage of Blacks and Carmichael believed that the Black Nationalist movement (i.e., a movement whose expressed desire was unity or solidarity among African peoples on the African continent and in the diaspora) needed to be stronger before it made alliances with Whites (“Stokely Meets Cleaver Abroad” 2).

In addition, at the time the letter was published, former husband and wife Panther members Jean and Larry Powell had testified against the Party before the McClellan

Investigation Committee, the Senate investigation committee studying groups considered subversive in America (Pearson 189). Lastly, a newly elected President Nixon appointed James Farmer, a former co-worker of Stokely Carmichael in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee/Congress of Racial Equality union, as Assistant Secretary of Health to aid the President in his efforts to end the racial unrest in the country (Hornsby 135). With all of the rioting that took place in 1964-1967 and the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, it is likely that Nixon appointed James Farmer as an attempt to appease Blacks in America and to defuse black unrest.

Eldridge Cleaver's letter addressed Stokely Carmichael's resignation as Prime Minister of the Black Panthers. Cleaver used six types of rhetorical strategies in his attempt to regain the support of the public for the Black Panther Party. He designed his rhetorical strategies specifically to regain the support of the conservative black community and white liberals who had been alienated by the Party's aggressive rhetoric and Carmichael's Black Nationalist rhetoric. This analysis will examine the rhetorical strategies that Cleaver used both implicitly and explicitly to get at the meanings within the text. In addition, this critique examines whether Cleaver's letter prescribed a course of action, uses ridicule, obscenity, and established whether there was a moment of commitment which Michael McGee refers to as the "We" moment within the letter. The analysis also will establish the tone of his letter, as well as look at the different audiences to whom the letter speaks. Also examined will be how Cleaver attempted to change the perception of society and the Party's attempt to alter the perception of the opposition. The analysis will look for any attempts that Cleaver made to justify the Party's setbacks and delays, as well as his attempts to keep the Party alive. The analysis will examine as

well the attempts made to unify the Party and belittle the opposition. This analysis will examine how Cleaver's rhetorical strategies work together to address the problems of COINTELPRO.

The tone of Eldridge Cleaver's letter to Stokely Carmichael is one of disappointment and frustration. He expresses his sentiments in the opening of his letter:

Your letter of resignation as the Prime Minister of the Black Panther Party came, I think, about one year too late. As a matter of fact, since the day of your appointment to that position—February 17, 1968—events have proven that you were not cut out for the job in the first place. Even then it was clear that your position on coalition with revolutionary white organizations was in conflict with that of the Black Panther Party. But we thought that, in time, even you would be able to shake the SNCC paranoia about white control and get on with the business of building the type of revolutionary machinery that we need in the United States in order to unite all the revolutionary forces in the country to overthrow the system of Capitalism, Imperialism and Racism. (Cleaver 104)

In this introduction to his letter, Cleaver is saying that Carmichael had problems working with white liberals because of ideological differences he had with Whites when he was Chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. According to Judith Clavir Albert and Stewart Edward Albert, editors of *The Sixties Papers: Documents of a Rebellious Decade*, SNCC fired its white staff workers in 1968 and emerged as a national voice for black radicalism (23).

The second example of Cleaver's disappointment with Stokely Carmichael is illustrated in the fifth paragraph, where he refers to how the power structure redefined the term, "Black Power" and used it against the Party:

As a matter of fact, it had been precisely your nebulous enunciation of Black Power that has provided the power structure with its new weapon against our people. The Panther Party tried to give you a chance to rescue Black Power from the Pigs who have seized upon it and turned it into the rationale for Black Capitalism (Cleaver 105). In effects, your cry for Black Power has become the grease to ease the black bourgeoisie into the power structure. (Cleaver 106)

In this fifth paragraph of his letter, Cleaver states that the term “Black Power” was ambiguous, and that Stokely Carmichael had failed to clarify his definition of “Black Power.” Because Carmichael failed in the clarification of his definition, the establishment was redefining the term and using its new definition to lure conservative Blacks away from the Panthers’ struggle to liberate the black community, thereby diluting the strength of the total black community.

A third example of Cleaver’s disappointment appears in the eighth paragraph of his letter where he referred to Carmichael’s unwillingness to form a coalition with white liberals. Cleaver replies, “You are unable to distinguish your friends from your enemies because all you could see was the color of the cat’s skin” (Cleaver 106). This third example in Cleaver’s letter again highlights ideological differences within the Party. Here, Cleaver’s letter implies that Carmichael feels that all white people are evil and that they cannot be trusted. In other words, Carmichael’s belief was not consistent with the ideology of the Party. The statement also implies that Carmichael was a poor leader because he was superficial, meaning that things on the surface, such as skin color, clouded his judgement.

The final example of Cleaver’s frustration and disappointment with Carmichael’s commitment to Black Nationalism appears at the end of his letter in the thirteenth paragraph. Borrowing a quote from Malcolm X., Cleaver states, “Remember what Brother Malcolm said in his autobiography: We had the best organization that the black man ever had in the United States—and niggers ruined it!” (108). The implicit message in Cleaver’s final statement to Stokely Carmichael is that now that the Black Panther Party had the attention of America and the rest of the world, they could put forth an

agenda to liberate blacks and other oppressed people of the world. In addition, he implies that the Panthers were the best vehicle in America most suited to best articulate the cause of black and other oppressed Americans. Lastly, he implies that Stokely Carmichael's commitment to Black Nationalism was hindering the success of the Party. This is illustrated in the phrase, "and niggers ruined it."

The strategies that Cleaver used in an attempt to change society's perception of the Party were necessary in order to persuade his audience to accept his arguments. In paragraph seven, Cleaver lets Stokely Carmichael know that his stand in favor of Black Nationalism is not the way of the Party. This type of strategy blamed the opposition as the cause of the problem:

What you called for instead was a Black United Front that would unite all the forces in the black community from left to right, close ranks against the whites, and all go skipping off to freedom. Within the ranks of your Black United Front you wanted to include the Cultural Nationalists, the Black Capitalists, and the Professional Uncle Toms, even though it was precisely these three groups who were working to murder your shit even before it broke wind. (Remember what Ron Karenga did to your meeting in Los Angeles?). (Cleaver 106)

The implicit message within paragraph seven is that the Panthers had been trying to build a multinational coalition and that Stokely Carmichael had been working against it.

Cleaver implies that Carmichael, instead, had chosen to work with both the enemies of the people and of the Party. In this paragraph, Cleaver mentions three groups who were the enemies of the Panthers. The first group mentioned was the Cultural Nationalists.

This was Ron Karenga's group who expoused Black Nationalism and was responsible for the deaths of two key Panther members as mentioned in chapter two. The second group was the Black Capitalists. The Black Capitalists that Cleaver was referring to were James Farmer of CORE, who had accepted a position as a sub-cabinet officer in the Nixon administration, Floyd McKissick, another former member of CORE who left to

promote black capitalism, assisted by the Chase Manhattan Bank and other institutions, and James Forman, former Executive Director of SNCC and Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Black Panthers who resigned to lead the Black Economic Development Conference which sought a half a billion dollars in reparations for the “Church’s” involvement in the exploitation of Blacks (O’Neill 189).

The professional Uncle Toms that Cleaver refers to in the paragraph were New York Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. and Chicago Congressman William O. Dawson. In his book, *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*, Stokely Carmichael stated that after Dawson became a tool of the downtown white Democratic power structure, the black community no longer had an effective representative who would articulate and fight to relieve their grievances (11). Hugh Pearson’s book, *The Shadow of the Panther*, provided an example of the members of the University of California at Berkeley’s Campus CORE deriding Adam Clayton Powell and William O. Dawson as “Machine politicians,” opportunists and Uncle Toms (87). The last part of the paragraph that states, “Remember what Ron Karenga did to your meeting?” refers to the Black Congress held in Los Angeles, this was a consortium of black organizations such as CORE, the Panthers, SNCC, and the United Slaves (US) who came together in an attempt to form a coalition in 1969 (Pearson 183). Ron Karenga, the host of the conference and leader of US, invited the LA police, who were responsible for the deaths of some members of the Black Panthers, to provide security for the event (Hilliard and Cole 171). The point made in the paragraph is that the members of Stokely Carmichael’s Black United Front were the enemies of the people and of the Panther Party. The Cultural Nationalists and Black Capitalists were the enemy of the people because they

were advocating an agenda based on race and class, while the professional Uncle Toms exploited the masses of people for their own economic gain. This notion of exclusion alienated both the white liberal supporters and black conservatives who believe that a black/white alliance is the best means for eliminating the class problem confronting black Americans and those economically oppressed around the world. In this paragraph, Cleaver is stating that Carmichael's belief that a black united front, without the aid of any other group in America, could solve the problems of discrimination and oppression was not grounded in reality. The last line of the paragraph referring to Ron Karenga's actions at a meeting in Los Angeles implied that all Blacks were not working for the good of the black community. Cleaver again refers to the conference in Los Angeles where Karenga invited the L. A. police to help with security (Hilliard and Cole 170). The problems that the Panthers were having with the police (i.e., COINTELPRO) added insult to an already volatile relationship. He is stating in paragraph seven that the belief that all Blacks can be trusted and that they are all working for the good of the black community is also unrealistic.

The eighth paragraph illustrates another strategy Cleaver used to attempt to change society's perception of the Panthers. In this paragraph, he associates Carmichael with undesirables, whom he refers to as Jackals and the enemies of the black people. By doing so, Cleaver attempts to paint Carmichael in a negative light:

It was this blindness that led you to the defense of Adam Clayton Powell, that Jackal from Harlem, when he came under attack by his brother jackals in Congress. And it was this blindness that led you to the defense of that black cop in Washington, D.C., who was being fucked over by the whites above him in the Police Department for whom he carried his gun as he patrolled the black community. In short, your habit of looking at the world through black-colored glasses would lead you, on the domestic level, to close ranks with such enemies of black people as James Farmer, Whitney Young, Roy Wilkins and Ron Karenga; and on the international level you would end up in the same bag with Papa Doc Duvalier, Joseph Mobutu, and Haile Selassie. Yes, we opposed that shit then and we oppose it now even more strongly, especially since the Nixon Administration

has stolen your program from you and, I think, included you out. (Cleaver 106)

In this paragraph, Cleaver defines the enemies of the black people as politicians who preyed on the misery of Blacks, police both Black and White who terrorized the black community, and dictators whose only concern was their own economic well being. He associates Carmichael with the undesirables in an attempt to illustrate that Carmichael was out of touch with the needs of black America, and thus, portrays the Panther Party as the Party of the people. Rhetorical strategies like these wore away at the credibility of the opposition. Cleaver's selection of words to describe Carmichael and his associates is an attempt to damage Carmichael's credibility. Words like blindness, jackal, and black colored glasses illustrate the flaws in Carmichael's character. In short, the paragraph states that Carmichael's love for everything black (i.e., his habit of seeing the world through black-colored glasses) had led him to support corrupt politicians (i.e., Jackals) who were puppets for the system who seek only to serve themselves. The word "blindness" emphasizes Carmichael's flaw of trusting all Blacks unconditionally. Cleaver's choice of words spoke directly to Panther hard-liners and liberal Whites, implying that everyone else had been able to determine who the real enemies of the people were except for Carmichael; thus he needed to wake up and stop defending the enemy. In short, Carmichael needed to realize that all Blacks were not his friends and that all Whites were not the enemy. Cleaver also implies that Carmichael's belief in "Black Nationalism" on an international level would only lead him down the path where he could find himself as a dictator or an oppressor, leaving black people in a situation much worse than before. On the domestic level, Carmichael might find himself much like black politicians and other highly visible Blacks within the black community who exploited the black community for their own economic gain.

Another example of this strategy that vilifies the opposition is shown in paragraph four:

It is understandable that you can have such fears of black organizations being controlled, or partly controlled, by whites, because most of your years in SNCC were spent under precisely those conditions. But the Black Panther Party has never been in that situation. Because we have never had to wrestle control of our organization out of the hands of whites, we have not been shackled with the type of paranoid fear that was developed by you cats in SNCC. Therefore we are able to sit down with whites and hammer out solutions to our common problems without trembling in our boots about whether or not we might get taken over in the process (Cleaver 105).

This paragraph suggests that Stokely Carmichael was incensed by the notion of having Whites, who were the major cause of racism and violators of the Civil Rights of Blacks, tell black Americans what Blacks need to do to solve the race problem (Kerner Report 62). Also, the paragraph implies that Carmichael was unable to get over his anger and that his anger interfered with his ability to form the kind of coalition that the Black Panther Party needed to wage its war against racism in America.

Paragraph twelve of Cleaver's letter supports his claim that Carmichael was out of touch with the needs of black people and illustrates what was wrong with the philosophy of Black Nationalism:

You speak about an "undying love for black people." An undying love for black people that denies the humanity of other people is doomed. It was an undying love of white people for each other which led them to deny the humanity of colored people and which has stripped white people of humanity itself. It would seem to me that an undying love for our people would, at the very least, lead you to a strategy that would aid our struggle for liberation instead of leading you into a coalition of purpose with the McClellan Committee in its attempt to destroy the Black Panther Party. (Cleaver 107-108)

This paragraph explains the problems associated with Carmichael's way of thinking. Cleaver implies that Black Nationalism was no better than white racism, imperialism, or capitalism. In this paragraph, Cleaver implies that any system that deprived individuals of their humanity based on the color of their skin or class is an unjust system. This

message appealed to both white liberals and Panther hard-liners because it portrayed the Panthers as a party for all of the people and it tells Whites they need not fear the propaganda of the United States media labeling the Panthers as black racists. Paragraph twelve implies that Carmichael is not only out of touch with the Party's agenda, but that he is also forming a coalition with the enemies of the Black Panther Party and the black people.

The Black Panther Party must use rhetorical strategies to prescribe a course of action for the movement to fulfill one of the necessary functions for its survival. The first example of Cleaver prescribing a course of action is implied in the introduction of the letter in the first paragraph. Addressing Stokely Carmichael, Cleaver states:

Even then it was clear that your position on coalition with revolutionary white organizations was in conflict with that of the Black Panther Party. But we thought that, in time, even you would be able to shake the SNCC paranoia about white control and get on with the business of building the type country to overthrow the system of Capitalism, Imperialism and Racism. (Cleaver 104)

The implied course of action that Cleaver prescribes is that Carmichael, instead of being paranoid about Whites controlling the Party, should have enlisted the aid of Whites and others who would be beneficial in their struggle for autonomy. The point is made very clear in another section of his letter. In the tenth paragraph, Cleaver clarifies which groups should be involved in the liberation of Blacks in America. He states:

One thing they know, and we know, that seems to escape you, is that there is not going to be any revolution or black liberation in the United States as long as revolutionary blacks, whites, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, Chinese and Eskimos are unwilling or unable to unite into some functional machinery that can cope with the situation. Your talk and fears about premature coalition are absurd, because no coalition against oppression by forces possessing revolutionary integrity can ever be premature. (Cleaver 107)

In this paragraph Cleaver states that it will take a multiracial group of united

revolutionary-minded Americans to bring an end to the racist culture and government. Also, this paragraph illustrates Cleaver's argument that a unified multiracial revolution was the only way to end racism in America.

Another course of action in Cleaver's letter is found in the eleventh paragraph which refers to the type of indoctrination that this multiracial group of revolutionaries should have. Cleaver states to Carmichael:

You are peeved because the Black Panther Party informs itself with the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, but if you look around the world you will see that the only countries which have liberated themselves and managed to withstand the tide of the counterrevolution are precisely those countries that have strong Marxist-Leninist parties. All those countries that have fought for their liberation solely on the basis of nationalism have fallen victims to capitalism and neo-colonialism, and in many cases now find themselves under tyrannies equally as oppressive as the former colonial regimes. (Cleaver 107)

In this part of his letter, Cleaver argues that only countries grounded in the philosophies of Marxism and Leninist have resisted Western Imperialism and that countries who have fought for their freedom solely on the basis of nationalism have failed. Cleaver states that the countries that fought for their freedom on the basis of nationalism usually found themselves under tyrannies equal to or more oppressive than the former colonial governments. In his attempt to appeal to white liberals and conservative blacks Cleaver states that, like communism, everyone will benefit under the Panthers' prescribed form of government without regard for race or class.

Cleaver also uses obscenity as a strategy in his message in order to alter the image of the opposition.

In paragraph seven, Cleaver uses obscenity to cast doubt on Carmichael's judgement when he mentions that the Cultural Nationalists, Black Capitalists and the professional Uncle Toms were working to "murder his shit even before it broke wind."

In this statement, Cleaver is appealing to Panther hard-liners who believed that the black bourgeoisie were selling out the Panthers before they could get their message out to the people. Paragraph eight contains another example of obscenity that Cleaver uses to cast doubt on Carmichael's judgement. He cites an example of Carmichael coming to the aid of a black officer who had carried his gun for the oppressor but was now being "fucked over" by high-ranking white officers within the police department. This message spoke to conservative blacks, implying that it does not matter how much they try to be a part of the system, because as long as they are black and under a capitalistic government they will never be accepted. The statement also implies that at one point or another, the system will eventually turn against them as it did the black officer.

The first example of ridicule is demonstrated in the second page in the third paragraph of his Letter to Carmichael. Cleaver states:

In many ways your letter struck me as being an echo and rehash of the charges brought against the party by the bootlickers before the McClellan Committee. And since you chose this moment to denounce the party, we—and I am sure many other people outside the party—must look upon your letter in this light. The only point in your letter that I think is really you is the one about coalition with whites, because it has been this point on which our differences have turned from the very beginning. (Cleaver 105)

In this paragraph, Cleaver's comparison of Stokely Carmichael to the "bootlickers testifying before the McClellan Committee" puts Carmichael in a negative light. This comparison portrays Stokely Carmichael as weak and bowing under the pressure to the establishment. Eldridge Cleaver also ridicules Carmichael twice in his letter in order to exaggerate his faults and weakness. In paragraph four, Cleaver mocks Carmichael's ideological differences with the Panther Party. He states:

After all, you are not the only black person out of Babylon who has been victimized by white racism. But you sound as though you are scared of white

people, as though you are still running away from slave-catchers who will lay hands on your body and dump you in a bag. (Cleaver 105)

The second sentence of this paragraph is important because it spotlights Carmichael's weakness. Cleaver creates the image of someone who is not grounded in reality and presents the image of someone who mentally is still living in the past. The image created is a negative image of someone who should never have been given the position of Prime Minister of the Black Panthers and charged with the responsibility of building a united revolutionary force to combat capitalism, imperialism, and racism. Cleaver's references to Babylon and slave-catchers speak directly to his conservative black audience. Because of their similar experiences with slavery, it is likely that many black Americans whose ancestors were former slaves see themselves as the Jews, where God allowed them to be taken into captivity by a cruel and oppressive ruler (King Nebuchadnezzar). Cleaver's reference to slave-catchers tells conservative blacks who had worked with Dr. King and who were interested in forming a coalition with Whites that Carmichael is still afraid of Whites because of what happened to Blacks in the past. The last example of Cleaver's strategic use of ridicule is illustrated in paragraph nine of his letter where he refers to a speech that Carmichael delivered while visiting Africa:

And now you are going to liberate Africa! Where are you going to start, Ghana? The Congo? Biafra? Angola? Mozambique? South Africa? If you are not aware of it, I think that you should know that the brothers in Africa who are involved in armed struggle against the Colonialists would like nothing better than for you to pack up your suitcase full of African souvenirs and split back to Babylon. They have never forgiven the fat-mouthing you did in Dar-es-Salaam when you presumed to tell them how to conduct their business. It seems to me that you are now trapped between the extremes of your own rhetoric. On the one hand, you have cut yourself off from the struggle in Babylon, and on the other hand, you are not about to become the Redeemer of Mother Africa. (Cleaver 107)

This paragraph implies that the people in Dar-es-Salaam were offended by Carmichael's

remarks about what Africa needed to do to liberate its continent. In addition, this segment suggests that the people of Africa felt that Carmichael should go back and liberate his own country. In other words, the paragraph implies that Carmichael needed to clean up his own backyard before he taught someone else how to clean up theirs.

Cleaver's choice of words illustrates his use of ridicule. In the third line of paragraph nine he states that the people of Africa would like nothing better than for Carmichael to pack up his suitcase full of souvenirs and split back to Babylon. The message spoke to Panther hard-liners, implying that the people in Africa did not want Carmichael in their country trying to tell them how to fix their country when he could not fix his own. Another example supporting this argument is demonstrated in the next line of the same paragraph which states the people of Africa had not forgiven Carmichael for all of the "fat-mouthing" he did in Dar-es-Salaam when he presumed to tell Africans how to conduct their business. This statement spoke to every member in Cleaver's audience by showing Carmichael to be aggressive and having no tact in his dealings with people. Cleaver's strategy of ridicule also appears in the phrase of paragraph nine stating that Carmichael cut himself off from the struggle in Babylon and that the people of Africa were not about to let him become their redeemer (Cleaver 107). This statement spoke directly to every member of Cleaver's audience by implying that Carmichael's incompetence as a leader had turned the people of Africa against him because of the flaw in his ideology. The implied message is that Africa, like any other country, could only solve their class-related problems (i.e., racism, exploitation) by working with other countries. The last example of ridicule is demonstrated in paragraph seven which states that Carmichael would unite all of the forces within the black community from left to

right, close rank against the Whites, and go skipping off to freedom. This statement also addresses the fears of Cleaver's multiracial audience, especially Whites, by implying that the Black Panthers were against this all-black attempt to solve America's white-on-black racial problem. The statement attempted to reach out to conservative Blacks by implying that the Panthers were not a racist organization and, like Dr. King, they do not advocate Black Nationalism.

Finally, Eldridge Cleaver uses specific language strategies to persuade his audiences. In this letter, Cleaver was reaching out to conservative Blacks and liberal Whites. This is evident in the first paragraph of the letter's introduction. The first paragraph spoke to Blacks and liberal Whites who believed that it is the duty of all Americans, Black and White, to solve America's problems of race and economic oppression. After all, it was "White Racism" that gave birth to the black radical movements (Kerner Report 62). This argument is evident when Cleaver states that the Panthers needed Carmichael to unite all of the revolutionary forces in the country in order to resolve the problems. In this paragraph, Cleaver implies that America's problems of capitalism, imperialism, and racism are all problems related to class and would best be resolved if all Americans were involved in eliminating the problems. Another example supporting the argument that Cleaver attempted to reach out to conservative Blacks and liberal Whites is found in the line of paragraph one where he states that it was clear that that Carmichael's position on coalition with revolutionary white organizations was in conflict with that of the Black Panther Party (Cleaver 104). Cleaver's statement tells conservative Blacks and white liberals that Carmichael was reluctant to work with Whites because of his paranoia about white control that he acquired while working with SNCC.

This statement attempts to distance the Party from Carmichael's ideology. Cleaver implies that the Panthers' objective was to form a coalition with Whites in their attempt to end the class struggle in America.

All of Cleaver's statements were designed to appeal to a multiracial group who were interested in working together in order to solve a common problem. In the second paragraph, Cleaver clearly states whose responsibility it was to eliminate imperialism, colonialism and racism: "You should know that suffering is color-blind, that the victims of imperialism, racism, colonialism and neocolonialism come in all colors, and that they need a unity based on revolutionary principles rather than skin color" (105). The statement that suffering is colorblind, and that the victims of imperialism, racism, colonialism, and neocolonialism come in all colors, appeals to the multiracial group that Cleaver was trying to attract. In paragraph number four, Cleaver let his audiences know that the Panthers were not a racist organization and that they welcomed the opportunity to work with Whites who shared the same ideology, while Stokely Carmichael's beliefs in Black Nationalism were contradictory to those of the Party's. Cleaver argues:

You have never been able to distinguish the history of the Black Panther Party from the history of the organization of which you were once the chairman—the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. It is understandable that you can have such fears of black organizations being controlled, or partly controlled, by whites, because most of your years in SNCC were spent under precisely those conditions. But the Black Panther Party has never been in that situation. Because we have never had to wrest control of our organization out of the hands of whites, we have not been shackled with the type of paranoid fear that was developed by you cats in SNCC. Therefore we are able to sit down with whites and hammer out solutions to our common problems without trembling in our boots about whether or not we might get taken over in the process. It has always seemed to me that you belittle the intelligence of your black brothers and sisters when you constantly warn them that they had better beware of white folks. After all, you are not the only black person out of Babylon who has been victimized by white racism (Cleaver 105).

In this paragraph, Cleaver again is reaching out to a multiracial group of followers. He explains that Carmichael had a problem forming a coalition with Whites, due to years that Carmichael spent in SNCC under the control of Whites. In the same paragraph, Cleaver clearly states the position of the Panthers. Since the Panthers' experience of working with Whites was different, the Panthers were neither fearful of Whites nor did they have any problem working with Whites. In short, the message is that the Panthers were not a racist organization, and that Carmichael's position on race was in conflict with that of the Panther Party. Also, this paragraph illustrates Cleaver's rhetorical attempt to speak to the black community as a whole. This strategy appears in paragraph four of the letter where he criticizes Carmichael for belittling the intelligence of Blacks. The implied message is that black Americans did not need Stokely Carmichael to tell them about the evil of the white man because many of them had had similar experiences. This segment of Cleaver's letter appealed to black Americans, both liberal and conservative, who did not like anyone telling them what to do or how they should live.

A segment of Cleaver's letter also spoke directly to the hard-line Panther members who believed in a united front of all nationalities working together to defeat a common enemy. The first example is found in the second paragraph of Cleaver's letter:

But when you see the squalor in which people live as a result of the policies of the exploiters, when you see the effects of exploitation on the emaciated bodies of little children, when you see the hunger and desperation, then these terms come alive in a new way. Since you've made this trip yourself and seen it all with your own eyes, you should know that suffering is color-blind, that the victims of Imperialism, Racism, Colonialism and Neocolonialism come in all colors, and that they need a unity based on revolutionary principles rather than skin color (Cleaver 105).

What this statement said to Carmichael is that he should know better. He had been around the country, had seen the world, has seen the hunger and the desperation, and

knew that the victims of imperialism, racism, and colonialism came in all colors. The implicit message to Carmichael is that, with everything he had seen and all that he knew how could he still insist on making Black Nationalism the primary issue? The paragraph implies that the poverty, hunger and desperation referred to in the letter were not a matter of skin color, but of class struggle. The language that Cleaver uses expressed an emotional message designed for Panthers hard-liners. He creates these emotional images with words like “squalor,” “exploiters,” “emaciated bodies,” “hunger,” “desperation” and “suffering” with all of the terms culminating to illustrate the evils of imperialism, racism, colonialism and neocolonialism. Many poor Blacks, oppressed people, and Panther hard-liners identified with the anger, degradation, and the pains of oppression expressed in Cleaver’s letter.

The second example that spoke to the hard-line Panther members is found in the seventh paragraph of Cleaver’s letter:

In February 1968, at the Free Huey Birthday Rally in Oakland, California, where you made your first public speech after returning to the United States from your triumphant tour of the revolutionary countries of the Third World, you took the occasion to denounce the coalition that the Black Panther Party had made with the white Peace and Freedom Party. What you called for instead was a Black United Front that would unite all the forces in the black community from left to right, close ranks against the whites, and all go skipping off to freedom. (Cleaver 106)

In this paragraph, Cleaver implies that Carmichael was obstructing the Panthers’ efforts to build a coalition that would aid the Party in their cause. He also is implying that the Peace and Freedom Party, a group of white liberal radicals, were trying to help the Party. Alternatively, he argues that the black alliance that Carmichael was trying to form with groups like Ron Karenga was going to hurt the Panther cause in every way possible. In the tenth paragraph of his letter, Cleaver elaborates on the importance of building a

coalition with Whites, and in doing this, he affirms to his followers that he had not strayed from his platform:

The enemies of black people have learned something from history even if you haven't, and they are discovering new ways to divide us faster than we are discovering new ways to unite. One thing they know, and we know, that seems to escape you, is that there is not going to be any revolution or black liberation in the United States as long as revolutionary blacks, whites, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, Chinese and Eskimos are unwilling or unable to unite into some functional machinery that can cope with the situation. (Cleaver 107)

In this paragraph, Cleaver makes the implicit argument that there would be no liberation for black people in America or anywhere else in the world unless every oppressed person united against the oppressor. Cleaver strategically uses the pronouns, “you,” “they,” “us,” and “we” in his attempt to convince his audience of Carmichael’s incompetence as a Panther leader. His clever use of pronouns in this paragraph helps to convey the message that clear lines had been drawn in this battle for human rights and it was “us” against “them.” The message was that everyone seemed to understand this concept except Carmichael.

The thirteenth paragraph of Cleaver’s letter issues a warning to Stokely Carmichael and contains the last strategy that he used to symbolize the Party’s platform. Cleaver states:

Well, so long, Stokely, and take care. And beware of some white folks and of some black folks, because I assure you that some of both of them have teeth that will bite. Remember what Brother Malcolm said in his Autobiography: “We had the best organization that the black man has ever had in the United States—and niggers ruined it!” Power to the People. (Cleaver 108)

In this closing paragraph, Cleaver again makes an argument about the importance of the class struggle when he tells Carmichael to beware of Black and Whites. Cleaver implies in this paragraph that people are just people, and that there are good and bad people

within all of the races. The last phrase in Cleaver's letter, "Power to the people," signifies what theorist Michael McGee refers to as the "We" moment symbolizing the Panthers' commitment to serve the People and to end the class struggle as stated in chapter one. This "We" moment is important because it solidifies the bond between members within the movement by increasing the notion that it's us against them.

The analysis of Eldridge Cleaver's letter revealed that Cleaver was frustrated and disappointed with Stokely Carmichael's advocacy of "Black Nationalism," which was in conflict with the Panther Party's platform. In addition, the analysis explored three problems Cleaver associated with Stokely Carmichael. Carmichael resented white control. He also wanted a unified force of all black revolutionaries to tackle the race problem in America. Finally, the ambiguity of his term "Black Power" caused problems for the Party. Cleaver's letter also provided insight into why he believed that the Black Panther Party was the best vehicle to liberate black America. In addition, the analysis examined the rhetorical strategies that Eldridge Cleaver used to affect his message in his attempt to regain the support of the public, such as his use of ridicule, obscenity, and the prescription of the courses of action within the text. Cleaver's arguments culminated in that moment of commitment that showed that the Panthers were still dedicated to their cause. Cleaver's use of explicit and implicit messages within his letter provides insight as to how one may structure their rhetoric for the best effect when a movement is in crisis. Lastly, the analysis revealed how Cleaver clarified the Panther position on race and proposed that "Class Struggle" was the real problem confronting black America. It was through this declaration that Cleaver attempted to reach out to white liberals and conservative Blacks. In other words, Cleaver argued that the race problem confronting

America's Blacks was systemic of an existing class problem and it was in the best interest of all Americans to resolve this dilemma because a class problem affects everyone.

Section D: Ray "Masai" Hewitt
Panther Minister of Education's
Speech To The
Revolutionary Labor Conference

Ray "Masai" Hewitt's semiformal speech, like Eldridge Cleaver's letter, spoke to a broader, more educated audience. Hewitt spoke to a group of workers who approved of Socialism as the correct paradigm for working class people. His arguments attempted to demonstrate that the Black Panthers had successfully implemented Marxist and Leninist principles and thereby they had earned the right of leadership. Hewitt, like Eldridge Cleaver, had to convince his multiracial audience that the Black Panthers were a party for all of the people and that they were equipped with the correct ideology to handle the task of organizing the labor force. Hewitt's rhetorical strategies attempted to generate support for the Black Panther Party by illustrating how the Party had earned the leadership position in the workers' movement. Both Hewitt and Cleaver referred to America as Babylon to illustrate America's unjust treatment of people of color in America and abroad and both proposed the principles of Marx and Lenin as the solution to the problem.

Raymond “Masai” Hewitt, the Panther Minister of Education, replaced George Mason Murray, the first Panther Minister of Education in 1968 (Pearson 178). Hewitt was a leader of the Panthers in Los Angeles before he joined the national staff (Heath 143). He was part of the Marxist-Leninist group in Los Angeles and brought a more detailed analysis of the applications of communist theory to the Panthers (Pearson 178). He traveled across the country giving political education classes to new chapters of the Black Panthers (Hilliard 226). He also accompanied Bobby Seale on an extended trip to Scandinavia (Heath 143). Hewitt delivered his speech before an audience of black workers, liberal white workers, and white radical workers (e.g., the Progressive Labor Party and the Socialist Workers Party) at a Revolutionary Labor Conference. There is little known about the time and the place of this conference but the Black Panthers’ call to a Revolutionary Conference for a United Front Against Fascism was published in May, 1969 and the Conference was scheduled to be held from July 18-21, 1969 in Oakland, California (Heath 127).

The tone of Hewitt’s speech is like an academic lecture, a discourse providing information about a subject. His experience in lecturing political education classes was evident in his speech. The first example of this tone is illustrated in paragraph one.

Hewitt states:

Now that the workers made some attempts that failed, does not mean that the analysis of the class struggle no longer applies. There’s many attempts now-a-days to apply any other kind of analysis, religious analysis, race analysis, all kinds of idealism and metaphysics are being applied to the struggle of the workers including sell-outs, bootlicking, ass kissing, back stabbing. (Hewitt 249)

His choice of words indicates the kind of audience that he was addressing. The significant words in the paragraph were, “analysis,” “idealism,” and “metaphysics.” The language in this paragraph is designed for liberal and radical white workers with some

level of education.

Another example indicating the tone of Hewitt's speech is found in paragraph two. In this paragraph, he expresses his confidence in the Party's abilities to get things accomplished for the working class:

The Panther Party has already implemented in some areas, concrete revolutionary Marxist-Leninist principles, put them into practice to make the workers a class for itself, to make the workers a strong political organ for themselves. Without revolutionary theory, this is impossible. To think that correct revolutionary principles are going to drop out of the sky, or that they're born innate in the mind really borders on the ridiculous. As students say, into a television set. (Hewitt 249)

This paragraph highlights the kind of approach that Hewitt uses to persuade his audience in supporting the Party. In his argument, Hewitt informs his audience of the Black Panther's ability to successfully apply the revolutionary principles of Marx and Lenin and by doing so, Hewitt argues that the Panthers are the Party that should lead this revolution. In other words, the Panthers should lead this revolution because they have proven that they understand the principles necessary to bring about change for the labor movement. This paragraph refers to the Marxist-Leninist principles as the revolutionary theory necessary to bring about effective change. This is not the kind of language or issues that would take precedence in the speech if Hewitt were addressing people from the community. The language would be more geared to address police brutality, poverty, and unemployment, the issues which directly affect the people within the community. Instead, the tone in this paragraph indicates that Hewitt is addressing an audience that is in favor of Marx and Lenin principles. The implied message in this paragraph is that the Black Panther Party with the principles of Marx and Lenin, has the solution to the problems facing the labor movement. This paragraph implies that if the labor movement wants to be effective then they must support the Panthers' program. This paragraph

attempts to sell the Panther Party's effective use of the Marxist and Leninist principles to the workers at the conference.

Hewitt employs the strategic use of three slogans within his speech. All three slogans are in the early portion of the discourse. In paragraph one Hewitt first uses the slogans, "Power to the people, definitely all power to the workers," to show the Party's dedication and commitment to the plight of the labor movement (249). In the same paragraph, he uses the slogan, "Make the workers a class for itself instead of a class in itself," to symbolize that the workers need to organize and become a strong political force. He implies that if the workers joined the Panthers and adhered to the Party's doctrine, then the workers could become that strong political force.

Paragraph three contains the last slogan that Hewitt used which provides a solution to the problems facing the workers. The last slogan in this paragraph stated that "Only the workers can free the workers" (Hewitt 249). With this statement, he attempts to empower the workers. What Hewitt implies is that the workers must take the initiative, put their racial differences aside, and become an organization that would be a powerful voice for workers. Hewitt uses this type of strategy to mobilize the workers into a unified work force.

Hewitt employs another strategy in his attempt to mobilize the workers. This type of strategy addresss the consequences that the workers were facing for not being racially united in their attempt to gain better working conditions. In the fourth paragraph he states:

The vanguard position is objectively earned through struggle and usually organizations or people who earned the vanguard position, only find out about it when they realize that they're wearing out the steps in the jails and the courts. The jail house doors are getting rusty from slamming and opening and slamming and

opening. There won't be any alternative for the workers except to become a strong militant revolutionary political force. (Hewitt 249-250)

This paragraph implies that most people do not realize that they are in trouble until it is too late and by that time they are already wearing out the jail houses and courtrooms. In addition, the paragraph implies that if the workers do not put their racial differences aside and become a militant revolutionary political force, the workers' rights were not going to be taken seriously. This argument was supported in another line of the same paragraph that states, "And we say that for all the workers the first point of demarcation which seems to have been forgotten in this country, is that there has to be a correct recognition that the primary struggle is the class struggle" (250). The implied message in this paragraph is that the Panthers are not a racist organization and that they believe that the primary struggle in America was a class struggle, not one of race. The implied message is a subtle attempt to gain support for the Panthers and their ideas within the labor movement.

Another attempt to mobilize support for the Panthers is also illustrated in the fourth paragraph. Hewitt states:

Another thing that we would like to make clear in the very beginning, is that we do recognize the need for a degree of self-determination of self-rule for militant Black workers. This is not in any way to endorse racism. The Party has a very clear line on that point. But there is a need among Blacks, who are the most oppressed and exploited people within the confines of this Babylon they call America to have self-rule, this is not independent rule, independent of others, located geographically together, but self-rule. And there's also an equal need for these Blacks to work in very close working coalition and close communication with their class brothers, regardless of color, regardless of whether you're for or against intermarriage, whether you want to live in Beverly Hills or Watts or Oakland or Washington, D.C., it doesn't make any difference. (Hewitt 250)

This paragraph speaks to the white workers in the labor movement. In an attempt to win white supporters in the labor conference, Hewitt implies that because Blacks have been

oppressed and exploited more than other people within this system they desired autonomy, but he also argues that Whites should not be alarmed because this is not an attempt at independent rule but at self-rule. Hewitt, like Eldridge Cleaver, refers to America as Babylon, a wicked place where the human rights of the powerless are of little or no concern and only the rich and powerful rule. His reference to Babylon speaks to white liberals who have some knowledge of religion and who believe in the biblical scripture that states “Do unto other as you would have them do unto you.” Hewitt’s Babylon reference speaks also to black Americans who, after having to endure much hardship in the United States, turn to God for hope. Hewitt is careful to guard the image that the Panthers are not a racist organization. He states in the paragraph that the Panthers in no way endorsed racism. In the last part of the paragraph he makes the point that it did not matter whether white workers approved or disapproved of blacks’ and whites’ relationships but it was important that they worked together to resolve a common problem.

The second type of rhetorical strategy that Hewitt uses attempts to alter the worker’s perception of unions in America. This strategy also is found in paragraph four:

The need is for a constant maintenance of a correct class line. And there’s some unions that profess this in lip-service and then they take it as far as their local community, say Los Angeles, or the San Francisco area. Then these same unions that claim to be workers unions, forget one of the basic Marxist-Leninist principles, which Lenin put down, is that the interest of the local proletariat should be subordinate to the interest of the world proletariat. That’s the advent of unionism there, they start selling out their working class brothers all around the world, even on the other side of the city. (Hewitt 250)

This paragraph implies that in the past, workers’ unions had claimed to represent all of the workers, without regards for color, but they fell short. In addition, the paragraph implies that while the workers’ unions might make the life easier for some working class

Americans, they sell out many working class Americans (i.e., people of color), and exploit the labor forces around the world. The last part of this paragraph speaks directly to the black workers in the conference. In the last part of the paragraph Hewitt attempts to get the workers to see that the unions were not representing them and that the Panthers had the answers to the problems facing the workers of the world. Hewitt states that the unions sellout the working class and that the unions do not adhere to the Marxist-Leninist principles which stated, “the interest of the local proletariat should be subordinate to the interest of the world proletariat” (Hewitt 250).

Hewitt also uses a strategy that attempts to alter the perception of the Black Panther Party. Referring to how the labor unions had sold out the workers, Hewitt states, “The Black Panther Party is against this kind of separatism, opportunism, individualism, this very subjective approach to a problem that is in reality a world wide problem” (250). In this statement, Hewitt implies that the division of workers and worker exploitation would not happen under the leadership of the Panthers following the principles of Marx and Lenin, leaving a positive impression of the Party. In this paragraph, he argues that under the Panther’s leadership everyone would be treated equally.

Paragraph four also reveals that Hewitt uses obscenity to alter the perceptions of reality. In this paragraph Hewitt states:

So when we talk about self-rule this does not negate the need for a very close working coalition with class brothers, because the main problem in the United States is not the race contradictions but the class contradictions. Its made that way by the royal fucking that the working class gets in this country. This is not the exclusive right of any ethnic group in this country. But racism does exist to such a high level in this country, that the people have to deal first on a level that goes from step by step, taking it from a lower to a higher level. (Hewitt 250-251)

Hewitt implies that the upper class was constantly taking advantage of the lower class in this country, but that black Americans had an added problem to deal with. Poor working

class Blacks in America were being taken advantage of by both the upper class and the lower class workers. This strategy spoke to black Americans in the audience, letting them know that while the problem facing black Americans was a class problem, race compounded the problem. Hewitt uses obscenity to appeal to black and white radicals in the audience who believed that the labor of black Americans and lower class Whites had been exploited.

Hewitt employs one strategy in his attempt to alter the perceptions of society.

This example is found in paragraph five:

Racism is institutionalized to a degree that has never been institutionalized in the history of mankind, I mean it's bounced off telestar and shot around the world. They pipe it under the ocean in cables, it's in the comic books, it's in Sunday papers, it's in television and radio. So it is rampant idealism to try to ignore this. (Hewitt 251)

In this paragraph, Hewitt illustrates the many ways in which racism was perpetuated in America and abroad. He implies that the negative images of racism are beamed around the world via satellite, teletype, comic books, television and radio. In this paragraph Hewitt uses ridicule to alter the audience perceptions of society with his statements that racism was bounced off telestar and shot around the world. With this statement he implies that American imperialism is a world wide problem. He supports his argument with continued ridicule which he uses in the last part of the paragraph. Referring to racism, Hewitt states that "They pipe it under the ocean in cables, it's in the comic books, it's in the Sunday papers, it's in television and radio." With this statement, Hewitt connects with his audience, making light of how desperate those in power were to maintain economic control over people of color. In addition, this paragraph implies that technology is making it easier for those who are in power to maintain their power over the workers regardless of their reasons.

The last strategies that Hewitt employs prescribe a course of action and each strategy is found in paragraph five. The first strategy of this type is located in the introduction:

Another point of clarification is the role of the white radical workers. The white radical workers are the ones best suited to fight racism, ignorance and the political backwardness that exists in the whole community. We definitely cannot expect any working brothers from the Panther Caucuses or DRUM or other Black revolutionary groups to go among the white workers when racism is still rampant. It would be like myself and these four brothers here going down to clean up the white folks in Mobile, Alabama. Not only would it probably be sheer suicide, it would be lunacy, it would be an apolitical move, but there is a role. (Hewitt 251)

The course of action that this strategy prescribes is that white radicals should go into their own communities and fight racism instead of going into the black communities to work, because Blacks could not do the reverse. Blacks could not enter white communities without endangering their lives. This danger to black Americans was evident in the violence that the Civil Rights workers faced while trying to get the government to enforced the laws protecting their Constitutional rights. In his statement, "The white radicals are the ones best suited to fight racism, ignorance, and the political backwardness that exists in the whole community," Hewitt argues that there is a role for white radicals in the Panthers' goal to educate the public about America's class dilemma (251). The implied message is that the Panthers and the white radicals must work together in order to educate black and white Americans about the class problem.

Another example citing a course of action in Hewitt's speech is found in the segment of paragraph five that addresses the responsibilities of the working class. He states, "For another the purpose of the working class as a whole can best be served by each going into his own community, because this mosaic that's passed off as a melting pot, this ethnic mosaic is a mixed-up mess" (251). With this statement, Hewitt provides a

correct analogy of race relations in America. He infers that race relations in America are more like a mosaic, concluding that America is made up of diverse elements instead of a melting pot where all of the races are blended together. Hewitt's metaphorical use of the melting pot and the mosaic supports his argument that white supporters of the Panthers need to educate Whites in their communities and black supporters need to educate Blacks in their own communities about the class struggle. This message also speaks to working class individuals who may have problems with racial differences and might have problems with people who are unlike themselves coming into their communities and telling them what to do. In short, the paragraph tells the white working class members go into their communities and educate their people about America's class problem and how it can be resolved, while the black workers will do likewise.

The last strategy Hewitt used that prescribed a course of action was demonstrated in paragraph six, where he introduces the Black Panthers' 10-point Platform. He states:

Another thing that has to be understood is that if we get away from unionism, then the working class group, the group that professes to be for the worker is going to have to have a very concrete and practical platform and program. And I would say that the Black Panther Party's 10-point Platform and Program exemplifies the type of program that a revolutionary group needs. We're not going to confine ourselves just to the factory and divorce the factory from the community, that's a metaphysical approach, and that's not our theory. (Hewitt 251)

The course of action that Hewitt prescribes is that the workers accept the Panthers' 10-point platform as the solution to the union problem. He states that if the working class got away from unionism they would need a concrete and practical platform and program to guide them, and the Panthers had such a program. In this paragraph, Hewitt attempts to gain support for the Black Panthers and their program.

The analysis of Raymond "Masai" Hewitt's speech revealed the type of rhetorical

strategies that he used to gain public support for the Party. He attempted to sell his audience on the Panthers' effective use of the Marxist and Leninist principles. This study revealed his effective use of slogans, ridicule, and mobilization strategies. The analysis also looked at the strategies that Hewitt used to alter the workers' perception of the unions and of the Party. It examined his effective use of obscenity as rhetorical tool to create solidarity between the Panther Black Party and the workers. Lastly, the analysis examined Hewitt's strategic use of metaphors as a persuasive tool and the strategies that he used to prescribe a course of action.

This study concluded that Ray "Masai" Hewitt used slogan, ridicule, mobilization strategies, obscenity, and metaphors to persuade his audience to support the Black Panther Party's approach in combating the labor problems in America. By using these types of rhetorical strategies, Hewitt attempted to regain the public support that had been damaged by COINTELPRO.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This thesis examined the speeches of Panther leaders Fred Hampton, Connie Matthews, Ray “Masai” Hewitt and a letter from Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver to reveal their rhetorical attempts to regain public support while confronted with the government’s counter intelligence program, COINTELPRO. The thesis looked at the effects of COINTELPRO on the Black Panther Party’s rhetoric of 1969. Using the rhetorical theories of Charles J. Stewart, Craig Allen Smith, Robert E. Denton Jr., Robert Scott, and Michael McGee, this thesis looked at the rhetorical strategies employed by the Black Panthers in their attempt to regain the support of the public. This study used Charles J. Stewart, Craig Allen Smith, and Robert E. Denton’s five functions for analyzing the Panthers rhetoric. Stewart, Smith, and Denton stated that a movement must: (1) transform the public’s perception of reality (2) alter the perception of society, (3) prescribe what must be done, who must accomplish the task and how the task must be accomplished, (4) mobilize for action, and (5) sustain their movement (44).

The thesis also examined the Panthers’ use of obscenity, ridicule, and slogans in conjunction with the five functions to give their messages more impact. In addition, the thesis looked at the five problems associated with using obscenity. For

example, the first problem associated with obscenity is keeping focus on the end for which the social movement is fighting, and keeping the slogans fresh, so that the old slogans don't turn off followers and potential followers (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 192). The second problem is that the attention gained through obscenity is short-lived (Stewart, Smith and Denton 192). The third problem associated with obscenity is that obscenity cannot become more radical without resorting to actual violence (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 193). The fourth problem with obscenity is that obscenity is socially unacceptable and primarily used by minorities (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 193). The final problem associated with using obscenities is that obscenities may provoke violent reactions from the establishment that members do not anticipate (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 193). The study also looked at the six levels of ridicule whereby ridicule is placed along a continuum of severity or virulence, making a person, group, place, thing, action, or idea (1) inconsistent, (2) illogical, (3) inept, (4) silly, (5) monstrous, and (6) inhuman (Stewart Smith and Denton 194).

Robert Scott's theories provided three characteristics for determining Black Power rhetoric. Black Power rhetoric: (1) must be interpreted as an advocacy of violence, (2) is substantially justificatory, and (3) has to maximize the slender hope that may exist for relatively peaceful, constructive working-out of a cry for Black Power (Scott 134). Michael McGee's theory examined the ways that language analysis can be conducted. He listed two ways that one may conduct a language analysis: (1) one may contextualize the advocate's choice of one argument over another, to describe an event, but more likely to judge whether or not it was a right and proper choice and/or to suggest what should be done in future confrontations with similar contexts and (2) one may

textualize the advocate's choice of one tactic and not another, reading the choice to see what meaning might be latent in the text (Brock 74). In addition, Michael McGee's theory allowed the critics to see how the Panthers used this slogan-like term signifying commitments which he refers to as the "we" moment (Brock 72).

Summary

The informal style of Fred Hampton's speech, "You Can Murder a Liberator, but You Can't Murder Liberation," is forceful, defiant, and speaks to the generation of his time. For example, on the subject of being subversive, Hampton stated, "Yes we're subversive with all the bullshit we are confronted with today; we're the ones who are out in the open and these motherfuckers should start wearing uniforms" (Hampton 140). His use of symbolism and sarcasm enhanced his message by creating sympathy from his audience and pointing out the flaws of his opposition. For example, Hampton drew a comparison with Dr. Martin Luther King using his statement about the difficulty of being on, or having been to the "mountain top" (Hampton 142). An example of Hampton's sarcastic humor is illustrated in his comments about an underground movement called the PL (i.e., Progressive Labor Party). He stated that the PL was so far underground that they must be organizing, educating, and arming groundhogs (Hampton 143-144).

Hampton designed his forceful message for young activists of all races as well as conservative Blacks. For example, Hampton clearly discussed the pressures that the Panthers faced from United Slaves (a Black Nationalist group) for forming a coalition with Whites (Hampton 141). Hampton's clarification of the Panthers' position on race

appealed to those conservative Blacks who marched with Whites during the early Civil Rights movement. The choice of language in Hampton's speech suggests that his audience was predominantly young, radical, multiracial, and perhaps even less educated because of the many expletives used within the speech. For example, Hampton, referring to the police persecution of the Panthers, stated "A lot of people think this revolution is bullshit, but it's not" (Hampton 143). His explicit language appealed to young people in 1969 who were tired of the old, conventional, divisive ways of the establishment.

All of the rhetorical strategies, both implicit and explicit, that Hampton employed attempted to win support for the Black Panther movement. For example, Hampton described the Panthers' contributions to the Black community in an attempt to gain support (Hampton 138-139). In another example, Hampton showed that when Black people in the community needed help, the Panthers supported their cause (Hampton 140). In addition, a final example in Hampton's speech illustrated that the reason the FBI had increased their persecution of the Black Panthers was that the Panthers were indeed leading the way for Civil Rights within the black community (Hampton 144). Fred Hampton used a range of rhetorical strategies within his speech in his attempt to regain the support of the public.

The tone of Hampton's speech revealed a high level of urgency. Throughout his speech, he attempted to persuade members of the audience to get involved in the liberation of black people in America. For example, the tone of Hampton's speech was established in the introduction where he stated, "We are going to have to talk about what we are going to do about the FBI's repression of the Panthers" (Hampton 138). Another example establishing the urgent tone of Hampton's speech was cited in paragraph twenty

where Hampton stated, “You better get on the Black Panther Party. If you can’t get on, goddamit, you better get behind”(Hampton 143).

Hampton employed tough-talking language strategies that compared the plight of the Black Panthers to the plight of other social movements. The strategies ultimately enhanced the Panther Party’s credibility and allowed Hampton to echo Dr. Martin Luther King in his attempt to win community support. Fred Hampton also employed a deflective strategy, which deflected the Party’s negative press image, a redefining strategy, which redefined the government term subversive, making the term favorable to the Panthers, and a justification strategy, which justified the Party’s reason for being subversive in his attempt to enhance his messages and to gain support from the community.

Connie Matthews’s speech, “The Struggle is a World Struggle,” is similar to Fred Hampton’s speech in that her style is also informal and the language that she used expressed her informality. For example, referring to the college students at San Jose State she stated, “You got to get hip to the fact you cannot allow this thing to continue. You got to get hip to the fact that what the Black Panther Party wants is to take the wealth from out of the hands of the few” (Matthews 157). Another example highlighting Matthews’s style was illustrated in paragraph five when she referred to Abbie Hoffman’s courtroom antics. For example, Matthews stated, “they seem to think this is all a big joke, with Abbie Hoffman doing somersaults in court and all that kind of bullshit” (Matthews 157). The last example of Matthews’s informal style was illustrated in her statement about the Jewish holocaust: “Think about this shit. Six million Jews were murdered and people sat by and didn’t believe it was happening” (Matthews 158).

Connie Matthews's speech revealed that her audience was made up of white middle class college students from San Jose State. The example indicating the ethnic make up of Matthews's audience was demonstrated in the fourth paragraph of her speech that stated, "There are over 400 black students here at San Jose State and none of these students thought that the war in Vietnam has anything to do with them or else they would be in this goddamned room" (Matthews 156). In another part of her speech the class status of the students was revealed when she argued, "You middle-class people, because I do not believe that any of you here are capitalists, there are only about 300, you are definitely in a vacuum and you are going to have to take sides at some stage or other and make sure that you take the right side..." (Matthews 157).

Similar to Hampton's speech, Matthews's speech also attempted to garner support for the Black Panther Party. Connie Matthews's speech employed nine rhetorical strategies in her attempt to reach out to the public. Her arguments that the Black Panthers had been singled out for persecution by the federal government, and that the Panthers' constitutional rights were violated while Americans just stood by and watched, served as a reminder that when one group's constitutional rights were violated, the other groups' rights were in jeopardy (Matthews 157). Matthews's argument was an admonition to the white college students at San Jose State. In another of her arguments Matthews stated that every man, woman, and child was involved in Vietnam's struggle to defend itself against America, "the super power," implying that the radicals in America should look to the Vietnamese revolutionaries as a paradigm of resistance (Matthews 158). She implied that until everyone was serious about changing the system of government there would be no real change. Matthews's condemnation of Abbie Hoffman's courtroom antics in the

“Conspiracy eight trial” revealed that white radicals did not fully understand the seriousness of the government’s repression of the Black Panther Party (Matthews 157). Matthews’s class argument revealed that the Black Panthers recognized that race was only a symptom of the real problem confronting black America, and that “class” was the real problem (Matthews 156). In other words, if white people exploit poor black people and black people exploit poor black people then that was an indication of a much larger problem than racial oppression.

The tone of Connie Matthews’s speech, like that of Fred Hampton’s speech, expressed a high level of urgency. The focus of her entire speech was to gain support for the Black Panther Party and the urgency in Matthews’s speech was evident in the number of times she sought support from her audience and the various types of strategies that she used to gain support.

Matthews used several types of strategies in her attempt to gain support for the Black Panther Party. She employed several conscious-raising strategies. For example, referring to the harsh treatment that Bobby Seale received during the “Conspiracy eight trial” Matthews stated that America’s young radicals did not understand that Bobby Seale’s inability to get a fair trial was setting a precedent in the United States that would jeopardize the freedom of all Americans (Matthews 157). Matthews also used a strategy that altered the students’ perception of the past. For example, she drew attention to the government’s persecution of the Black Panthers in her statement that Nixon had launched a massive repression against the Panthers which was unheard of (Matthews 157). In another example, Matthews redefined the image of government, portraying President Nixon as a person having immense control over the minds of Americans. For example,

she stated, “Nixon believes that by brainwashing you students because you are the ones who are going out tomorrow to continue what Nixon has brainwashed you into believing that everything is o.k.” (Matthews 156). In one segment of her speech, Matthews used guilt as a strategy in her attempt to mobilize the students into action: “We will stay until every one of us are killed or imprisoned by these racist pigs, but then someone will have to take over. So don’t let us die in vain” (Matthews 159).

Eldridge Cleaver’s open letter to Stokely Carmichael is similar to Ray “Masai” Hewitt’s speech to the revolutionary conference, in that both Cleaver and Hewitt’s styles were semiformal and designed for a broader, more educated audience. Because Cleaver’s and Hewitt’s audiences were broader and more dispersed they had to design their messages reach the liberal Whites, conservative Blacks and young black radicals. The first example illustrating Cleaver’s style appears in paragraph eight which stated, “You are unable to distinguish your friends from your enemies because all you could see was the color of the cat’s skin” (Cleaver 106). The second example of Cleaver’s style was demonstrated in paragraph thirteen which stated, “Remember what brother Malcolm said in his autobiography: we had the best organization that the black man ever had in the United States and niggers ruined it” (Cleaver 108). A third example highlighting the style of Eldridge Cleaver was cited in paragraph seven. Referring to Carmichael’s advocacy of Black Nationalism Cleaver stated, “Within the ranks of your Black United Front you wanted to include the Black Nationalists, Black Capitalists, and the Professional Uncle Toms, even though it was precisely these three groups who were working to murder your shit even before it broke wind” (Cleaver 106). The examples used showed Cleaver to be a different kind of black leader. He was not conservative like

Dr. Martin Luther King or Malcolm X.; instead, Cleaver was cool, laid-back, and related more to the young radicals and the progressive thinkers of his time.

The messages in Cleaver's open letter to Stokely Carmichael were specifically designed for an educated, politically aware, white liberal and conservative black audience. The first example illustrating the type of audience for which Cleaver had designed his message was demonstrated in the fifth paragraph which stated, "It had been precisely your nebulous enunciation of Black Power that had provided the power structure with its new weapon against our people" (Cleaver 106). Cleaver's phrase, "nebulous enunciation," which he used to describe Carmichael's ambiguous term "Black Power," indicated the level of intelligence of the audience for which Cleaver designed his messages. The phrase "nebulous enunciation" was not a term that was used by average persons on the streets in 1969. Another example highlighting Cleaver's choice of language was demonstrated in the third paragraph which stated, "You were peeved because the Black Panther Party informs itself with the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, but if you look around the world you will see that the only countries which have liberated themselves and managed to withstand the tide of counterrevolution are precisely those countries that have strong Marxist-Leninist parties" (Cleaver 107). The final example illustrating Cleaver's choice of language appeared in paragraph four which stated, "Because we have never had to wrest control of our organization out of the hands of whites, we have never been shackled with the type of paranoid fear that was developed by you cats in SNCC" (Cleaver 105). The vocabulary that Cleaver used in his letter to Stokely Carmichael was indicative of his much broader audience.

The analysis revealed that Cleaver had to distance himself and the Black Panther Party from Stokely Carmichael's advocacy of Black Nationalism, which the Panthers condemned. To illustrate that the Black Panthers were displeased with Carmichael's advocacy of Black Nationalism, Cleaver drew attention to flaws in Stokely Carmichael's character. For example, in the introduction of his letter Cleaver stated, "Since the day you were appointed to that position—February 17, 1968—events have proven that you were not cut out for the job in the first place. Even then it was clear that your position on coalition with revolutionary white organizations was in conflict with that of the Black Panther Party" (Cleaver 104). Another example was cited in paragraph five, which referred to the government's misuse of Stokely Carmichael's phrase "Black Power," where Cleaver stated that his nebulous enunciation of Black power provided the power structure with its new weapon against the Party (Cleaver 105). He also stated, "The Panthers tried to give you a chance to rescue Black Power from the pigs who have seized upon it and turn it into the rationale for Black Capitalism" (Cleaver 105). In the last example, Cleaver illustrated the kind of organization that Stokely Carmichael was trying to build instead of the multiracial force that the Panthers wanted. Cleaver stated, "What you called for instead was a Black United Front that would unite all the forces in the black community from left to right, close ranks against the whites, and all go skipping off to freedom" (Cleaver 106). Cleaver used these rhetorical strategies to distance himself and the Black Panther Party from Stokely Carmichael's advocacy of Black Nationalism, and in doing so he attempted to regain support of white liberals and conservative blacks.

The tone of Eldridge Cleaver's essay expressed disappointment and frustration with Stokely Carmichael's advocacy of Black Nationalism. Cleaver believed that

Carmichael should have resigned a year earlier, since there were early signs of Carmichael's inability to form a coalition with Whites and build the kind of party that the Panthers needed (Cleaver 104). Cleaver was frustrated with the fact that Carmichael insisted on building a coalition with Cultural Nationalists, Black Capitalists, and what he called, "Professional Uncle Toms" who were working against the Black Panther Party (Cleaver 106).

The strategies that Cleaver used to gain public support strengthened his argument that the Black Panthers were not a racist organization and that they were not willing to ally themselves with groups who advocated Black Nationalism. The important strategy in Cleaver's speech showed that Stokely Carmichael was flawed in his judgement about people and his ideology. For example, Cleaver showed that Carmichael's judgement was flawed when he stated that Carmichael defended Adam Clayton Powell who was under attack by his fellow Congressmen and a black police officer who was being taken advantage of by the white officers above him in the police department in Washington D.C. (Cleaver 106). Cleaver implied that Powell and the black officer were considered enemies of black people because they both exploited black Americans for their own economic gain. Illustrating the problems associated with Black Nationalism, Cleaver stated that an undying love for black people that denies the humanity of others is doomed and it was an undying love of white people for each other which led them to deny the humanity of colored people and which has stripped white people of humanity itself (Cleaver 107-108). Cleaver also argued that there was not going to be a revolution or black liberation in America unless every American concerned, regardless of color, participated in resolving the problem (Cleaver 107). Cleaver used these rhetorical

strategies to clarify the Black Panthers' position on race and thereby aid the Party's efforts to gain public support.

Ray "Masai" Hewitt's style of delivery was semiformal and the formality in his speech was expressed in his choice of vocabulary. Hewitt used words like idealism, metaphysics and self-determination, indicating the level of formality of his speech. The formality in Hewitt's speech was also evident in the structure of the sentences that he used to enhance his messages. For example, Hewitt stated that, "What we want to do, we definitely want to put forth the Black Panther Party's correct ideology and try to make the workers a class for itself instead of a class in itself" (Hewitt 249). The example expressed Hewitt's effective use of a slogan, which was part of his style and implied that the Panthers were going to make the workers a class that cared about the safety and wellbeing of the workers. Hewitt used obscenity twice in his speech, which indicated his semiformal rhetorical approach (Hewitt 249-251).

Hewitt presented his semiformal speech before a group of workers who were knowledgeable in the ways of socialism. For example, throughout his speech, Hewitt used words like Marxist-Leninist principles, proletariat, collective and working class when relating to his audience. Hewitt's choice of vocabulary (i.e. socialist messages) was adapted for his audience and indicated his audience's level of education and their knowledge of socialism.

The overall argument in Hewitt's speech was that the Black Panthers had the solution for the socialist workers' movement in America. Hewitt's messages, both explicit and implied, attempted to persuade his audience that the Panthers had earned the right of the vanguard position because their Party was struggling with government

persecution (Hewitt 249). Hewitt's implication was that the government was persecuting the Panthers because they had successfully implemented the principles of Marx and Lenin (Hewitt 249). Hewitt also argued that the Panthers had put their racial differences aside and that if the workers wanted to succeed in their goals of making things better for themselves they had better do likewise (Hewitt 250).

The tone of Hewitt's speech was like a lecture in that he stated his arguments and then supported them with examples. His objective was to sell the Black Panther Party to the worker and that was Hewitt's tone through the speech. Hewitt's speech was not as urgent or direct as Hampton's or Matthews's speeches, but his goal was the same. Ray "Masai" Hewitt's speech was similar to Eldridge Cleaver's in that he attempted to gain the support of the workers by illustrating that the Panthers were an inclusive group attempting to better the conditions for all of the workers, in the same way that Cleaver had to show that the Panthers were a Party for all of the people.

The analysis of Hewitt's speech revealed the type of strategies that he used to mobilize support for the Black Panther Party. The analysis also looked at how Hewitt attempted to prescribe a course of action for the workers, provide a solution to problems facing the workers, signify the Party's commitment to the laborers' problem and attempt to enhance the Black Panther Party's image. In short, the analysis revealed how employment of the rhetorical strategies described by Stewart, Smith, Denton, Scott, and McGee helped the reader understand the speeches of Hewitt's and the other Panther members.

Rhetorical Functions

and Strategies of a Movement Under Siege

What the analysis of these four rhetorical artifacts revealed about rhetoric is that there must be a deliberate attempt to construct messages, both implicit and explicit, in order to be an effective communicator. Creating implicit and explicit messages within a text adds twice the impact, which seems to insure the successful transmission of these messages from the source to the receivers. The thesis also looked at the violent confrontations the Panthers faced from police and authorities in 1969 which contributed to their selection of rhetorical strategies. These violent confrontations set the stage for how the Black Panther Party presented their rhetorical defense. The Black Panthers devised their message as a direct response to the FBI's campaign to destroy their Party. There were five goals of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's counter intelligence program, COINTELPRO. The first goal was to prevent the rise of a messiah who could unify and electrify Militant Black Nationalists, the second goal was to prevent violence on the part of militant Blacks, the third goal was to prevent the long-range growth of this group, and the fourth goal was to prevent black nationalist groups and leaders from gaining respectability within the black community. The last goal of COINTELPRO was to prevent the coalition of militant black nationalist groups. The FBI launched a four-prong attack against the Panthers. First, the FBI orchestrated violence against the Party by exacerbating already strained relationships between the Panthers and black groups with a similar agenda. Second, the FBI used the media to damage and control the Panther attempts to remake their image. Third, the FBI harassed supporters of the Party. Finally, the FBI infiltrated the Black Panther Party.

Fred Hampton takes his message directly to his audience. Hampton deliberately creates a sense of urgency in his speech, telling his audience that the Black Panthers have a problem with police harassment that has to be resolved (138). His strategy to change society's perception of the Party tells his audience that the government has waged war on the Panthers because they were getting positive things done within the black community (138-139). To change society's perception of the Panthers, Hampton admits that the Party had made some mistakes but that they had learned from their mistakes (143). He supports his argument citing the Panther's erection of a stop sign and their Breakfast for Children program as evidence of the Panthers' contributions to the black community (139). He silences the Party's critics, (i.e., the Progressive Labor Party) ridiculing them for not having any visibility within the black community but he refuses to demonize them (143-144). Hampton creates mental images for his audience conveying the seriousness of the Panthers' struggle by referring to members of the Party who were either killed, jailed without bond, or in exile (142).

Hampton's strategic use of ridicule to change society's perception of the Black Panthers depicts the Panthers as citizens helping themselves by feeding the poor in the community and he also depicts the kind of attitudes that supporters of the programs should have (139). In the same paragraph, he depicts the police, ridiculing Blacks for taking steps to resolve the hunger problem within the black community (139). Hampton also uses humor in his speech as he ridicules the police, implying that citizens can't find a police officer when they need one because the police are out harassing the Black Panthers for conducting social work. His strategy for prescribing a course of action implies that the poor and black communities should support the Panthers and their programs for two

reasons: First, because the poor people were benefiting from the programs, and second, because the Panthers have the attention of the government, they could use the Party's platform to have their grievances heard. He used obscenity to prescribe a course of action, and attack the image and credibility of the police and the mainstream press.

Hampton used two deflection strategies. The first deflection strategy he designed was to control the Party's negative media image, depicting the Panthers as a black hate group. The second strategy was a redefining strategy that Hampton used to explain why the Panthers were subversive and to draw sympathy from supporters by justifying their reason (140). Hampton also clarified what the Party's position was as a movement, clarified their position on race, and provided reasons for the declining white support (143). He used slogans to clarify the Party's position on race as well as to signify the Party's commitment to the struggle (144). The rhetorical strategies that Hampton used culminated in his efforts to gain support from the Chicago community.

Connie Matthews created a sense of urgency in her speech by using strategies that transformed the perception of the United States government, mobilizing students to educate themselves and participate in the Panthers struggle and by educating her audience, implying that when the constitutional rights of black Americans were denied in the courts that their rights were in jeopardy (157). Her consciousness-raising strategies conveyed the idea to her audience that by their not taking the struggle of black Americans seriously they were harming their chance for individual freedom in America (157). She transformed the perception of the Vietnamese communist people by illustrating that every man, woman, and child was involved in Vietnam's struggle to remain autonomous, implying that the Vietnamese people were the model for revolutionary resistance.

Matthews transformed her audience's perception of America's history involving the slave trade, stating that Africans were brought over so that capitalism could survive (159). She clarified the real struggle in the world facing people of color as the oppressed versus the oppressor and suggested that the students adapt new ways of protesting in their efforts to combat America's expanding imperialism (154). In paragraph four she identified the enemies of the people as both black and white oppressors and suggested that all ethnic oppressed groups, regardless of race, color, or creed unite and help overthrow this type of government (156). To prescribe a course of action in the last part of paragraph four, Matthews impressed on the students that they were an important component in the battle against the spread of American imperialism because they were going to be the leaders of the future and that the power to change the government was in their hands (156-157). She also suggested that the students choose wisely which sides they were going to be on in the battle against American imperialism, implying that there was no middle ground in the battle and that one was either for or against the spread of imperialism (157-158). Another course of action that Matthews prescribed was that the students, first support the petition for community control of the police, and then go into the communities armed with the Black Panthers' ideology and educate that community (158). She used a consciousness-raising strategy to make the point that the Black Panther Party was the vanguard of this revolution because as black people they had experienced 400 years of maltreatment under capitalism (158).

She altered the students' perception of the opposition with her figures stating that only a few hundred people in America controlled and rule the world and by quoting Sartre who said that Europe, the dying mother of capitalism, gave birth to a monster—

imperialism--to show how powerful and destructive capitalism was to smaller countries (156). Matthews also depicted President Nixon as having brainwashed the students into thinking that America had no problems in order to illustrate her point that the students cannot allow America to continue to exploit the oppressed (154-156). She mobilized the radical students into action with a fear tactic implying that their middle-class families would suffer the most as the U.S. dollar decreased in value, making her point that capitalism as they knew it was in trouble (159). Using one strategy containing ridicule and a slogan in the beginning of her speech, Matthews signified her Party's commitment to rid America and the world of oppression and attempted to gain the students' support (158). Matthews's rhetorical efforts were aimed at gaining the students support at San Jose State College.

Cleaver's text revealed how he transformed his audience's perception of Stokely Carmichael's credibility by pointing out how Carmichael's unclear definition of Black Power, his inability to form coalitions with Whites, and his advocacy of Black Nationalism damaged the Party's ability to gain support for their cause. He also manipulated his audience's perception of Carmichael by linking him with politicians and dictators who used Blacks for their own economic gain, such as Adam Clayton Powell, Roy Wilkins, Papa Doc Duvalier and Joseph Mobutu (106). Cleaver also pointed out the problems associated with Black Nationalism and illustrated why it does not work (107-108). The analysis revealed that Cleaver targeted three groups in his open letter to Stokely Carmichael. He fashioned his message to attract white liberals, conservative Blacks and young black radicals. Cleaver used obscenity to highlight what he believed was Stokely Carmichael's irrational judgement (106). He used ridicule to convey the

notion that Carmichael could not help Africa with its armed struggle against colonialists because he was not equipped with the correct revolutionary principles of Marx and Lenin (107). All of Eldridge Cleaver's rhetorical efforts aided his attempts to distance himself and the Black Panther Party from Stokely Carmichael's advocacy of Black Nationalism and to regain the support of liberal Whites and conservative Blacks in his attempt to end the government's oppression of the Party.

The analysis of Ray "Masai" Hewitt's speech revealed that his speech was less urgent than Hampton's and Matthews's speech although his objective was similar. The analysis revealed that Hewitt's objective was to sell the idea that the Black Panthers had the correct ideology and experience implementing the correct revolutionary principles to the workers at the labor conference (249). He used two slogans at the beginning of his speech to illustrate the Party's commitment to aid the workers' labor movement, and a third slogan that Hewitt used attempted to mobilize the workers into a strong organization that would represent itself in labor matters (249). He illustrated the consequences of being divided as a labor force and emphasized the need for Black and White alliances in the workplace and the need for Blacks to have self-rule in his attempt to gain support of the workers party (250). Hewitt altered the perception of the unions in America and of the Black Panther Party to illustrate that the unions only gave lip-service to representing all of the workers without regards for race, color, or creed and the Black Panthers were against this kind of treatment of the working class people (250-251). He used obscenity to alter the perception of reality, highlighting America's working class relations to galvanize the workers and win favor for the Panthers (250). Hewitt strategically used ridicule to show what length capitalism would go through to perpetuate racism in his

attempt to win the support of black workers at the conference (251). He prescribed a course of action for both the black and white radical workers, suggesting that each need to go into their own communities and educate them about the class struggle in America (251). Hewitt designed his message to appeal to Blacks who would endanger their lives attempting to go into southern white communities (251). In the last strategy prescribing a course of action, Hewitt suggested that the workers accept the Panthers' 10-point platform as the solution to the workers' union problem (251). The rhetorical strategies helped Hewitt to persuade the workers to accept the Panthers' 10-point platform as the solution to their union problem, while at the same time gaining support for the Black Panther Party.

The analysis of the Panthers' rhetoric revealed how they, as a subordinate group, adjusted their message to gain national support. The result of the rhetorical strategies used by the Panthers proved to be effective in regaining the support of the public. On June 17, 1969, in Sacramento, California, the Mayor of Sacramento was "shocked and horrified" at the evidence of police misconduct in a police/Panther altercation (Caldwell 23). Much sympathy for the Panthers was created in Los Angeles in the wake of a December 8, 1969, incident where three officers and two Blacks were wounded ("Panther Clash Darkens Mood in Los Angeles" 20). The brutal persecution of the Panthers even brought out cries of sympathy from moderate black leaders who once shied away from any identification with the Panthers ("Police and Panthers: Growing Paranoia" 14). A police skirmish with the Panthers resulted in a four-hour gun battle where police dynamited the roof of the Black Panthers headquarters in Los Angeles, just four days after Chicago police had killed Fred Hampton and Mark Clark in a morning raid ("Too

Late for the Panthers?" 26). These incidents prompted an unprecedented outcry from liberals with impeccable credentials such as Whitney Young, Jr. of the Urban League, attorney Joseph L. Rauh, Jr. of Americans for Democratic Action, and Adlai Stevenson III, the Illinois State Treasurer ("Too Late for the Panthers?" 26). Stevenson, also a U.S. senate candidate, called for an investigation of the police action against the Panthers ("Too Late for the Panthers?" 26). The NAACP Legal Defense Fund and the American Jewish Congress set up a committee to look into the question of alleged police harassment of the Panthers ("Too Late for the Panthers?" 26). The Chicago and Los Angeles confrontations with the police produced substantial community support for the Panthers and in Los Angeles nearly 600 thousand people massed on the steps of city hall to back the Panthers' right to survive ("Too Late for the Panthers?" 27). In short, the Panthers were able to regain some support from the public.

The study revealed that when dominant members within a society violently lash out against minorities within its system in an attempt to oppress the subordinate groups, the media coverage of these events will increase the public awareness of the plight of the minority and the constant coverage of the persecution of the minorities will help shape public opinion in favor of the minorities. Another important aspect revealed by the study showed to what length the dominant members of society will go to maintain their exploitation and economic control of subordinates within their system. The government violated the Black Panthers' First, Fourth, Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights to the Constitution in an attempt to silence their dissenting voices. A system that violates its own laws in an attempt to silence subordinates is presumed corrupt. For example, when the public had learned that the Constitutional rights of Dr. Martin Luther

King via the media had been violated, (i.e., wiretapping Dr. King without authorization) former Attorney General Ramsey Clark asked that the FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, to retire from his position (Herbers 1). FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's violation of the constitutional rights of civil rights groups like Dr. Martin Luther King and the Black Panthers led to his eventual removal from office.

Implications

The rhetorical strategies that the Black Panther Party used to create their messages could serve as a paradigm for movements that are under siege. The most effective strategies that the Panthers used were: (1) they clarified their struggle, (2) they identified their enemies, (3) they structured their arguments for multiple audiences, (4) they admitted that mistakes had been made, (5) they chastised their critics, but did not demonize them (6) they addressed attacks on their image, (7) they highlighted their involvement within the community, (8) they proposed concrete solutions to resolve problems, (9) they asked that the community assist them, and (10) they identified supportive roles for their audience. The rhetorical strategies were effective because they illustrated that the Black Panthers were focused, and that they knew that the struggle was a class struggle and not a struggle of race. They knew that the enemies in this class struggle were the oppressors and they were aware of police brutality and false representation. The strategies were effective because they illustrate that the Panthers were honest enough to admit that mistakes had been made and they clarified their position on race. The Panthers' strategy of chastising their critics without demonizing

them cleared the way for reconciliation with their critics. The Panthers' rhetorical strategies were effective because they demonstrated that the Panthers asked for public support because they had a plan. Their plan was evident in the proposed 10-point platform that the Panthers offered as a solution to many of the problems confronting the black community and the roles that the Party identified for their supporters.

The Panthers used five rhetorical strategies that were least effective in conveying their message and hindered their attempts to regain the support of the public. First, the Panthers demonstrated their use of obscenity and humor/ridicule to belittle authorities; by using obscenity, humor, and ridicule, the Panthers exacerbated their relationship with the police. Second, they identified their enemies as the federal government and police. Third, the Panthers used pressure and a fear tactic, which could have backfired in their attempt to mobilize their audience into action. Fourth, the Panthers implied that the United States was a monster, perhaps alienating more potential supporters. The last strategy that the Panthers used linked their opposition with public figures and assumed that the public had knowledge of the misdeeds of these public figures. These strategies were least effective because they further agitated the police/Panther relationship and hindered the relationship between the Panthers and potential supporters. Though ridiculing and citing the police and authorities as the enemies of the people, the Panthers increased the authorities' dislike for the Party. The arm twisting and fear tactic that the Panthers used, much like their linking the Party's opposition to international political figures, had the potential of being offensive to members of their audience who may not have shared their view. Future groups under siege must take care to structure their

messages considering all aspects of their rhetoric and examining their rhetoric for negativity (i.e., things that have the potential offend their audience members).

With the foundation provided by these analyses, researchers could examine the effects of the government's counter-intelligence program (COINTELPRO) on the rhetoric of other movements that the government considered subversive in 1969. Researchers could look at how COINTELPRO affected the rhetoric of the American Indian Movement (AIM), the Chicano Movement, and the Women's Liberation Movement in 1969. This study would also be useful in examining the effects of COINTELPRO on the rhetoric of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the Republic of New Afrika, Malcolm X., Martin Luther King, and the rhetoric of Angela Davis (a former UCLA professor who had been dismissed for her affiliations with the Communist Party and the Black Panther Party in Los Angeles).

The foundation provided in this study also could be used to examine the current Israeli /Palestinian crisis in the Middle East. The Palestinians, battling with their inferior weapons (i.e., slingshots and rock throwing) against Israeli technology (i.e., automatic weapons and tanks, planes), appear to fit the criteria of a movement under siege. This type of study would allow researchers to determine the effects of Israeli technology on Israeli/Palestinian land settlements and peace-agreements, and would allow the researcher to examine the deeper meaning, both explicit and implicit, buried within the Palestinian/Israeli land settlements and peace-agreements. Such an inquiry also would be useful in determining the effects of United States' sanctions in countries like Cuba and Libya. Examining this type of rhetoric could determine whether or not U.S. sanctions were effective. Analyses such as these can be used to examine the rhetoric of future

groups alienated from their government, such as the Zapatistas' problem with the government of Mexico (rebels in Mexico fighting for human rights and trying to regain the land of their ancestors). With the foundation of this study of the Black Panthers in 1969, one could examine the rhetorical efforts of any group that was under pressure and thus determine how that group attempted to resolve their crisis. These types of studies could examine the rhetoric of both sides, exploring the notion of sharing power in a superior/subordinate relationship and possibly point to some peaceful resolution.

These types of studies are significant because they examine the rhetoric of movements that are under siege or in crisis. Examining the rhetoric of movements that are under siege could enable researchers to determine which types of rhetorical strategies were more effective and could possibly prevent violence on the part of those who are disenfranchised from the system. The nature of rhetoric implies that as long as individuals are communicating there is always an opportunity for compromise or an attempt to find a peaceful resolution to conflict. Once communication breaks down and acts of violence are committed, the acts of violence lessen the opportunities for peace and increase the difficulties for negotiation and thereby increase the opportunities for more violence. In short, the Panther study illustrated that violence and the rhetoric of violence only begets more violence. Che Guevera stated:

Wherever death may surprise us it will be welcome, provided that this, our battle cries, reach some receptive ears; that another hand reach out to pick up the gun, that other fighting men come forward to intone our funeral dirge to the staccato of machine gun fire and new cries of battle and victory.

(qtd. in Cleaver 92)

Works Cited

- “Agents Seize 4 Panthers in Sale of Guns.” Chicago Tribune 12 Apr. 1969: 24.
- Albert, Judith Clavir, Albert, Stewart Edward. The Sixties Papers: Documents of a
Rebellious Decade. New York: Praeger Publisher, 1984.
- Aldridge, Cathy. “Black, Puerto Ricans Suffer in Violent Riots.” New York Amsterdam
News 6 Sept. 1969: 1.
- Anthony, Earl. Picking Up the Gun: A Report on the Black Panthers. New York: The
Dial Press, 1970.
- Baskin, Jane A., Lewis, Ralph G., Mannis, Joyce Hartweg and McCullough, Lester W. Jr.
The Long, Hot Summer?: An Analysis of Summer Disorders 1967-1971.
Massachusetts: Brandeis University.
- Bigelow, Barbara Carlisle. Contemporary Black Biography. Detroit: Gale Research Inc.
1994.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. “The Rhetorical Situation.” Philosophy & Rhetoric 1 (1968): 6.
- “Black Panther Leader Newton Denied Bail.” Los Angeles Times 23 Jan. 1969: 2.
- Blumenthal, Sid. “COINTELPRO: How the FBI tried to destroy the Black panthers.”
Canadian Dimension 6 Oct.: 1975.
- “Bobby Seale Says It’s A Frameup.” New York Amsterdam News 30 Aug. 1969: 1.
- Bowman Patricia E. “The Rhetorical Strategies and Tactics of the Black Panther Party as
a Social Change Movement: 1966-1973.” Diss. North Texas State U. 1974.
- Brock, Bernard L. “Special Report: Social Movements.” Central States Speech Journal
34 (1983): 67-82.

Brockriede Wayne, and Robert L. Scott. "Stokely: two speeches on Black Power." The Rhetoric of Black Power. Ed. J. Jeffery Auer. New York: Harper and Row 1969. 112-131.

Burke, Kenneth. A Grammar Of Motives. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1945.

Caldwell, Earl. "Sacramento Mayor Shocked at Damage by Police to Panther Headquarters." New York Times 18 Jun. 1969: 23.

Chambers, Bradford. Chronicles of Black Protest. New York, Scarborough, and Ontario: New American Library, Inc., 1968.

Chapman, William. "Inaugural Unit Can't Obtain Riot Insurance." Los Angeles Times 1 Jan. 1969: 10.

Chevigny, Paul. Police Power: Police Abuses in New York City. New York: Pantheon Books, 1969.

Churchill, Ward, Vander Wall, Jim. Agents of Repression: The FBI's Secret Wars Against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement. Boston: South End Press, 1988.

Churchill, Ward, Vander Wall, Jim. The COINTELPRO Papers: Documents From the FBI's Secret Wars Against Dissent in the United States. Boston: South End Press, 1990.

Cleaver, Eldridge. An Open Letter to Stokely Carmichael, Written by Himself. 1969. The Black Panthers Speak. Ed. Philip S. Foner. New York: Da Capo Press, 1995. 104-108.

Cleaver, Eldridge. Eldridge Cleaver: Post-Prison Writings and Speeches. New York: Random House, 1969.

Cleaver, Eldridge. Soul on Ice. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968.

“Cleaver in Cuba.” Time 30 May. 1969: 23.

Courtright, John A. “Rhetoric of the Gun: An Analysis of the Rhetorical Modifications of the Black Panther Party.” Journal Of Black Studies 4 (1973-74) 249-267.

David, Hilliard and Lewis Cole, The Autobiography of David Hilliard and the Story of the Black Panther Party. Boston: Toronto; London, 1993.

Drummond, William J. “Black Panther Aide Lauds 2 Who Were Slain in UCLA Hall.” Los Angeles Times 19 Jan. 1969: B3.

Drummond, William J., and Reich Kenneth. “2 Black Panther Students Slain in UCLA Hall: Assailant Escape During Panic; Police Later Raid Victim’s Home, Seize Arms.” Los Angeles Times 18 Jan. 1969: 1.

Foner, Philip S. The Black Panthers Speaks. Philadelphia/New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1970.

“Foreign Reds and Black Violence.” Chicago Tribune 27 Apr. 1969: 28.

Fraser, Gerald C. “Panther Lawyer Files Bail Brief.” New York Times 6 Aug. 1969: 32L+.

Frey, Lawrence R., Botan Carl H., Friedman Paul G., and Kreps Gary L. Investigating Communication: An Introduction to Research Methods. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1991.

Garraty, John A, McCaughey, Robert A. The American Nation: A History of the United States to 1877 Volume One. New York: Cambridge; Philadelphia: San Francisco; Washington: London; Mexico City: Sao Paulo; Singapore: Sydney: Harper & Row, 1987.

Garrow, David J. Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. New York: Quill, 1986.

Goldman, Peter. Report From Black America. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969.

Gregg, Richard B. "The Ego-Function of the Rhetoric of Protest." Philosophy and Rhetoric 4 (1970) 71-91.

Gronbeck, Bruce. "The Rhetoric of Social-Institutional Change: Black Action at Michigan." Explorations in Rhetorical Criticism. Ed. G. P. Mohrmann, Charles J. Stewart, and Donovan J. Ochs. 97-122.

"Guerrilla Summer?" Time 27 June. 1969: 16.

Halverson, Guy. "Panther-Police Clashes: Pattern or Coincidence?" Christian Science Monitor 8 Dec. 1969: 7.

Hampton, Fred. You Can Murder a Liberator, but You Can't Murder Liberation, Written by Himself. 1970. The Black Panthers Speak. Ed. Philip S. Foner. New York: Da Capo Press, 1995. 138-144.

Heath, Louis G. The Black Panther Leaders Speaks. Metuchen New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1976.

Herbers, John. "Clark Suggests Hoover Step Out: Comments in Controversy on Dr. King Wiretapping." New York Times. 21 June 1969: 1

Hewitt, Ray "Masai." The Black Panther Party and the Revolutionary Trade Union, Written by Himself. 1969. The Black Panthers Speak. Ed. Philip S. Foner. New York: Da Capo Press, 1995. 249-252.

Hilliard, David, Lewis, Cole. This Side of Glory: The Autobiography of David Hilliard and the Story of the Black Panther Party. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1993.

"Hoover Warns on Terrorism by New Left." Los Angeles Times 1 Jan. 1969: 26.

Hornsby, Alton Jr. Chronology of African American History: Significant Events and People from 1619 to the Present. Detroit; London: Gale Research Inc., 1991.

"It Only Takes a Small Percent." Chicago Tribune 25 Apr. 1969: 1.

"Jersey City Terrorists Bomb Police Station." Los Angeles Times 2 Jan. 1969: 5 part 1.

Jones, William. "Black Panther Hired as Guard for College Convicted of Beating Bus Driver." Chicago Tribune 16 Apr. 1969: 20.

Kifner, John. "S.D.S. Parley Split as Panthers Score Labor Unit." New York Times 21 June 1969: 25L+

Layman, Richard, ed. American Decades 1960-1969. New York: An International Thomson Publishing Company, 1995.

Matthews, Les. "Panther Backers Get Set." New York Amsterdam News 26 Apr. 1969: 26.

Matthews, Connie. The Struggle is a World Struggle, Written by Herself. 1969. The Black Panthers Speak. Ed. Philip S. Foner. New York: Da Capo Press, 1995. 154-159.

McKissack, Patricia, and Fredrick McKissack. The Civil Rights Movement in America, from 1865 to the Present. Chicago: Childrens Press, 1987, 1991.

Medhurst Martin J. "Eisenhower's 'Atoms for Peace' Speech: A Case Study in the Strategic use of Language." Communication Monographs 54 (1987): 204-219.

“Militants Rip Up Student Confab.” New York Amsterdam News 30 Aug. 1969: 22.

National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder, Supplemental Studies for the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (New York, Washington, London: Frederick A. Praeger), 1968. 62.

Nelson, Truman. The Torture of Mothers. Boston: Beacon Press, 1965.

“New Book Tells of Abuse of Police Power.” New York Amsterdam News 1 Feb. 1969: 11.

“News of the Week: Chicago.” New York Amsterdam News 9 Aug. 1969: 2.

Newton, Huey P. To Die for the People. New York: Random House, 1972.

O’Neill, William L. Coming Apart: An Informal History of America in the 1960’s. New York and Canada: Times Books, 1971.

“One of Suspects in Slaying of Panthers at UCLA Gives Up.” Los Angeles Times 21 Jan. 1969: 1, 5 part 2.

Palmer, L. F. Jr.. “Out to Get the Panthers,” The Nation Jul. 1969. 79.

“Panther Clash Darkens Mood in Los Angeles.” Christian Science Monitor 10 Dec. 1969: 20.

“Panther Murray Gets 6 Month Jail Term.” Los Angeles Times 22 Feb. 1969: 19 part 1.

“Panthers Lose Appeal, Must Remain in Jail.” New York Amsterdam News 20 Sept. 1969: 3.

“Panthers Sizzling at Cops.” New York Amsterdam News 2 Aug. 1969: 1, 43.

Pearson, Hugh. The Shadow of the Panther. Massachusetts: Perseus Books, 1994.

“Reagan Wiretapping Bill Given to Assembly.” Los Angeles Times 24 Jan. 1969: 2 part 1.

Roberts, Ron E, and Kloss, Robert M. Social Movements: Between the Balcony and the Barricade. Saint Louis: The C.V. Mosby Company, 1974.

“San Francisco.” Chicago Tribune 29 Apr. 1969: 7.

Schaefer, Richard T. Racial and Ethnic Groups. 7th ed. New York: Reading
Massachusetts; Menlo Park California; Harlow England; Don Mills Ontario;
Sydney; Mexico City; Madrid; Amsterdam: Longman, 1998.

Scott Robert. “Justifying Violence: The Rhetoric of Militant Black Power.” The Rhetoric of Black Power. Ed. J. Jeffery Auer. New York: Harper and Row, 1969. 132-145.

Seale, Bobby. Interview with the Record-Searchlight. The Black Panther 7 Feb. 1970,
3.

Seale Bobby. Seize The Time: The Story of the Black Panther Party and Huey P. Newton
New York: Random House, 1968,1969, 1970.

Simons, Herbert W. “Persuasion in Social Conflict: A Critique of Prevailing
Conceptions and a Framework for Future Research.” Speech Monographs 39
(1972): 227-247.

Smith, Jennifer B. An International History of the Black Panther Party. New York and
London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999.

“Some Logic.” Chicago Tribune 29 Apr. 1969: 1.

Stewart, Charles J., Smith, Craig A., and Denton, Roger E, Jr. Persuasion and Social
Movements. 3rd. ed. Illinois: Waveland Press, 1994.

“Stokely Meets Cleaver Abroad; Panther Membership Unsettled.” New York Amsterdam
News 2 Aug. 1969: 2.

Tackwood, Louis E. The Glass House Tapes. New York: Avon Books, 1973.

“Thirty-seven Arrested, Thirteen Policemen Wounded in Sacramento.” New York Times

17 Jun. 1969: 28L+.

“Three Arrested as Hijacking Suspects Aboard Chicago Jet.” New York Times 24 Feb.

1969: 8L.

“Too Late for the Panthers?” Newsweek 22 December. 1969: 26-27.

United States Committee on Internal Security House of Representatives Ninety-First

Congress Second Session, The Black Panther Party, Its Origin and Development

as Reflected in its Official Weekly-Newspaper, The Black Panther, Black

Community News Service (Washington: 1970). 10 - 25.

United States House of Representatives Ninety-First Congress, Black Panther Party part

one, Investigation of Kansas City Chapter; National Organization Data, Hearings

Before the Committee on Internal Security House of Representatives (Washington:

Ninety-First Congress 1970). 5055-5059.

United States Senate, Final Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental

Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities Supplementary Detailed Staff

Reports on Intelligence Activities and the Rights of Americans, Book III.

(Washington: United States, 1976). 188-220.

Wilkins, Roy. “Black Power and Jewish Defense League.” New York Amsterdam News

5 Jul. 1969: 16.

Williams, Raymond. Marxism and Literature. New York: Oxford University Press,

1977.

“Woman Beaten, Tortured; Five Panthers Seized.” Chicago Tribune 29 Apr. 1969: 4.

Wood, Henry. "6 in Robin Are Wounded in Gun Melees: 5 Black Panthers Are Held in Incidents." Chicago Tribune 3 Apr. 1969: 10.

Appendices

Appendix A:
You Can Murder a Liberator,
but You Can't Murder Liberation
by Fred Hampton

All power to the people.

What we are basically going to be talking about today is what the pig is doing to the panthers all around the country. We are going to have to talk about what we are going to have to do about the repression that they are putting on the Black Panther Party. We are not worried about getting off it--let's try to deal with it. We got to talk first of all about the main man. The main man in the Black Panther Party, the main man in the struggle today—in the United States, in Chicago, in Cuba and anywhere else the main man in the liberation struggle is our Minister of Defense, and yours too, Huey P. Newton. He's the main man because the head of the imperialist octopus lies right in this country and whoever is dealing with the head of the octopus in this country is the main man. He's in jail now. We must tell the world that Huey P. Newton was tried by the pigs and they found him guilty. He was tried by the people, who found him not guilty, and we say let him go, let him free, because we find him not guilty. This is our relentless demand. We will not let up one day, we will not give up the struggle to liberate our Minister of Defense, Huey P. Newton and we will continue to exert pressure on the power structure and constantly bombard them with the people's demand that Huey P. Newton be set free.

It was Huey P. Newton who taught us how the people learn. You learn by participation. When Huey P. Newton started out what did he do? He got a gun and he got Bobby and Bobby got a gun. They had a problem in the community because people was being run over—kids were being run over—at a certain intersection. What did the people do? The people went down to the government to redress their grievances and the government told them to go to hell: “We are not going to put no stoplights down ther UNTIL WE SEE FIT.” What did Huey P. Newton do? Did he go out and tell the people about the laws and write letters and try to propagandize ‘em all the time? NO! Some of that’s good, but the masses of the people don’t read that’s what I heard Huey say—they learn through observation and participation. Did he just say this? NO! So what did he do? He got him a shotgun, he got Bobby and he got him a hammer and went down to the corner. He gave Bobby the shotgun and told him if any pig motherfuckers come by blow his motherfucking brains out. What did he do? He went to the corner and nailed up a stop sign. No more accidents, no more trouble. And then he went back—another situation like that. What’d the people do? The looked at it, they observed they didn’t get a chance to participate in it. Next time what’d they do? Same kind of problem came up. The people got their shotguns, got their nine millimeters, got their hammers. How’d they learn? They learned by observation and participation. They learned one thing. When there is a fire you gather round the fire. Huey got a shotgun and everybody gathered round him and Bobby. They saw what was going on and they had a chance to participate in it. As the vanguard leader he taught the people about the power structure; he led the people down the correct road of revolution. What are we doing?

Breakfast for Children

Our Breakfast for children program is feeding a lot of children and the people understand our Breakfast for Children program. We sayin' something like this—we saying that theory's cool, but theory with no practice ain't shit. You got to have both of them—the two go together. We have a theory about feeding kids free. What'd we do? We put it into practice. That's how people learn. A lot of people don't know how serious the thing is. They think the children we feed ain't really hungry. I don't know five year old kids that can act well, but I know that if they not hungry we sure got some actors. We got five year old actors that could take the academy award. Last week they had a whole week dedicated to the hungry in Chicago. Talking 'bout the starvation rate here that went up 15%. Over here where everybody should be eating. Why? Because of capitalism.

What are we doing? The Breakfast for Children program. We are running it in a socialistic manner. People came and took our program, saw it in a socialistic fashion not even knowing it was socialism. People are gonna take our program and tell us to go on to a higher level. They gonna take that program and work it in a socialistic manner. What'd the pig say? He say, "Nigger—you like communism?" "No sir, I'm scared of it." "You like socialism?" "No sir, I'm scared of it." "You like the breakfast for children program?" "Yes sir, I'd die for it." Pig said, "Nigger, that program is a socialistic program." "I don't give a fuck if it's Communism. You put your hands on that program motherfucker and I'll blow you motherfucking brains out." And he knew it. We been educating him, not by reading matter, but through observation and participation. By letting him come in and work our program. Not theory and theory alone, but theory

and practice. The two go together. We not only thought about the Marxist-Leninist theory—we put it into practice. This is what the Black Panther Party is about.

Subversives

Some people talk a lot about communism, but the people can't understand and progress to the stage of communism right away or because of abstract arguments. They say you got to crawl before you can walk. And the Black Panther Party, as the vanguard party, thought that the Breakfast for Children Program was the best technique of crawling that any vanguard party could follow. And we got a whole lot of folks that's going to be walking. And then a whole lot of folks that's gonna be running. And when you got that, what you got? You got a whole lot of PIGS that's gonna be running. That's what our program's about.

The Black Panther Party is about the complete revolution. We not gonna go out there and half do a thing. And you can let the pigs know it. They come here and hide—they so uncomfortable they sitting on a taperecorder, they got their gun in their hair—they got to hid all this shit and they come here and do all this weird action. All they got to do is come up to 2350 West Madison any day of the week and anybody up there'll let them know, let the motherfucker know: Yes, we subversive. Yes, we subversive with the bullshit we are confronted with today. Just as subversive as anybody can be subversive. And we think them motherfuckers is the criminals. They the ones always hiding. We the ones up in front. We're out in the open, these motherfuckers should start wearing uniforms. They want to know if the Panthers are goin' underground—these motherfuckers IS underground. You can't find'em. People calls the pigs but nobody knows where they at. They're out chasing us. They hiding—can't nobody even see'em.

When people got a problem they come to the Black Panther Party for help and that's good. Because, like Mao says, we are supposed to be ridden by the people and Huey says we're going to be ridden down the path of social revolution and that's for the people. The people ought to know that the Black Panther Party is one thousand percent for the People. They write a lot of articles, you know, niggers'll run up to you in a minute—when I say niggers I mean white niggers and black niggers alike—niggers'll run up to you and talk that shit about, Man, I read in the Tribune today. Well you say, Man, fuck it right there. If you didn't read it in the BLACK PANTHER paper, in the MOVEMENT—then you ain't read shit.

Mickey White

We in the Black Panther Party have another brother I want to take some time to rap about. This brother is constantly on our mind. This brother's name is Michael White—Mickey White. This brother is beautiful. He's being held now in jail for one hundred thousand dollars bail. Some of you who listen to the radio might have heard about brothers in the state chapter, our field secretary of Defense Captain, brother Nathaniel Junior and Brother Merrill Harvey being laid up on some phoney gun charge. We don't say the Panthers don't want guns, but we already got guns and we don't have to go and try and steal or connive to buy any guns from anybody. What they are trying to do is to squash out the Black Panther Party—they're trying to squash out the leadership. Trying to squash out Bobby Rush, the Deputy Minister of Defense. Trying to squash out Chaka and Che, the Deputy Minister of Education.

Mickey White was in that bullshit with Nathaniel Junior and Merrill Harvey. Lest week when they went to court even the judge in court said, you all gonna get a fair trial

whether you deserve it or not. These are the types of actions we are confronted with. Mickey White is in solitary confinement and doesn't get to come out of his cell for anything at any time. And he might be in that cell for the rest of his life. His bond is \$100,000. That's \$10,000 cash.

Mickey White is a proven revolutionary. He's not nobody we THINK is going to be a revolutionary. He's not nobody we trying to make a revolutionary. He's a proven revolutionary. All of you have to understand that Mickey White is a Panther in ideology, he's a Panther in word and he's a Panther in deed. He's a Panther that understands it's a class struggle—not a race question. You have to understand the pressures the Black Panther Party goes through saying this. You can see the pressures the Black Panther Party goes through by making a coalition with whites.

When the black panther party stood up and said we not going to fight racism with racism US said "NO, we can't do that because it's a race question and if you make it a class question then the revolution might come sooner. We in US ain't prepared for no revolution because we think that power grows from the sleeve of a Dashiki." They are armed with rhetoric and rhetoric alone. And we found that when you're armed with rhetoric and rhetoric alone a lot of times you get yourself hurt. Eldridge Cleaver told them, even though you say you fight fire with fire best, we think you fight fire with water. You can do either one, but we choose to fight with water. He said, we're not going to fight racism with racism, we're going to fight racism with solidarity. Even though you think you ought to fight capitalism with black capitalism, we're going to fight capitalism with socialism.

We got a whole lot of people being busted and you don't even know about all these people. There's one here you definitely have to know about and that's our Deputy Minister of Defense—Bobby Rush. Our Deputy Minister Bobby Rush was busted on some bullshit with a gun thing. He's got three gun charges. He's been convicted of one with a six month lead. He's out on appeal now. I know a lot of you people say, well goddamn, you got a Mickey White defense fund, an Eldridge Cleaver deefense fund, a Merrill Harvey defense fund, a Nathaniel Junior defense fund, a Huey Newton defense fund, a Fred Hampton, Jule, Che and Chaka defense fund—and I just can't keep up with all these defense funds. But since we are the vanguard party we try to do things right, so we got one defense fund so you don't get mixed up on what name to send it to. We'll decide who it goes to. You can just send it to Political Defense Fund, 2350 West Madison. If you want to send something to Breakfast for Children, you can send it to 2350 West Madison also, and you can earmark that money to go to the Breakfast for children program.

We got Mickey on our mind tonight—and everybody knows we got Huey P. Newton on our mind tonight. We got every political prisoner in jail on our mind tonight. Eldridge Cleaver—all of these people either dead, or in exile or in jail. A lot of people understanding this will lose real faith in the vanguard by not understanding what we're talking about.

A lot of these people will go up to you in a minute and say, "Why all these people being taken, when haven't they shot it out with some pigs." Well, what do we say? If you kill a few, you get little satisfaction. But when you can kill them ALL you get complete satisfaction. That's why we haven't moved. We have to organize the people.

We have to educate the people. We have to arm the people. We have to teach them about revolutionary political power. And when they understand all that we won't be killing no few and getting no little satisfaction, we'll be killing 'em all and getting complete satisfaction.

Go with the People

So what should we do if we're the vanguard? What is it right to do? Is it right for the leadership of that struggle to go faster than the followers of that struggle can go? NO! We're not going to be dealing in commandism, we're not going to be dealing in no tailism. We say that just as fast as the people can possibly go, that's just as fast as we can take it.

While we take it we must be sure that we are not missing the people in the valley. In the valley we know that we can learn to understand the life of the people. We know that with all the bullshit out there, you can come to consider yourself on the mountain top. I may even consider myself one day on the mountaintop. I may have already. But I know that in the valley there are people like Benny and there are people like me, people like Mickey White and people like Huey P. Newton and Bobby Seale. And that below the valley are people like Bobby Hutton, people like Eldridge Cleaver. We know that going into the valley is a dangerous thing. We know that when you go out to the valley you got to make a commitment.

A lot of people think the revolution is bullshit, but it's not. A lot of us think that when you get in the revolution you can talk your way out of things, but that's not true. Ask Bobby Hutton, ask Huey Newton, ask Eldridge Cleaver, Mickey White and Dennis Mora. Ask these people whether it's a game. If you get yourself involved in a

revolutionary struggle then you've got to be serious. You got to know what you're doing. You got to already have practiced some type of theory. That's the reason we ask people to follow the leadership of the vanguard party. Because we all theorizing and we all practicing. We make mistakes, but we're always correcting them and we're always getting better.

We used to run around yellin 'bout Panther Power—the Panthers run it. We admit we made mistakes. Our ten point program is in the midst of being changed right now, because we used the word “white” when we should have used the word “capitalist”.

We're the first to admit our mistakes. We no longer say Panther Power because we don't believe the Panthers should have all the power. We are not for the dictatorship of the Panthers. We are not for the dictatorship of Black People. We are for the dictatorship of the people.

The difference between the people and the vanguard is very important. You got to understand that the people follow the vanguard. You got to understand that the Black Panther Party is the vanguard. If you are about going to the people you got to understand that the vanguard leads the people. After the social revolution, the vanguard party, through our educational programs—and that program is overwhelming—the people are educated to the point that they can run things themselves. That's what you call educating the people, organizing the people, arming the people and bringing them revolutionary political power. That means people's power. That means the people's revolution. And if you're not about being involved in a people's revolution then you got to do something. You got to support the people's revolution.

Complete Satisfaction

The Black Panther Party is the vanguard party. You better get on the Black Panther Party. If you can't get on, goddamit you better get behind. If you can't get behind goddamit, you better get behind somebody else so you'll at least be able to flow indirectly, motherfucker. We ain't asking you to go out and ask no pig to leave us alone. We know that the pigs fuck with us cause they know we're doing something.

Cause a lot of dudes walk around and write articles about it. I know some revolutionary groups say these niggers are runnin around saying these things—the PL motherfuckers talking that bullshit, couldn't even find things to criticize. They was so far in the ground. What was they doing? Organizing groundhogs, educating groundhogs, arming groundhogs and teaching groundhogs revolutionary political power.

I say that we're the first group to come above ground where the people can follow you and see you. And if you make a mistake it's better than not even being at all. When I made that mistake I made it for the people, and I correct it for the people. You don't hear there was a raid on PL's office last night. You ain't never heard that. When you hear of PL busted in New York, PL's leader in jail with no bars, PL leader run out of the country, PL leader shot 18 times while he was running with his back turned and hands tied up, PL leader gets breakfast for children for 1800 people a week. You ever hear it? Ya never heard it. I want to hear it. If you do hear it, it'll be because of the Black Panther lead. I'm not putting all these things out and saying PL doesn't know'em. But I'm saying that when people write something like this, a lot of people don't understand it. And I wanted to take the time to explain it.

There are some things that PL says that are valid. Don't misunderstand me. We don't get mad because in some way or another PL is trying to better the Black Panther

Party by trying to criticize it. But I just want to let you know, ain't nothing all right and ain't nothing all wrong. We're not all right—though we trying to get that way. We make mistakes but we understand that we gonna make some more mistakes. And we gonna try and correct these mistakes and we gonna try and keep on moving.

So what do we say? Don't get the pigs offa us cause we can stand em. We jail Mickey White, we should let em murder Bobby Hutton, we should let em run Eldridge Cleaver out of the country. Why? Because you can jail a revolutionary, but you can't jail the revolution. You can run a freedom fighter around the country but you can't run freedom fighting around the country. You can murder a liberator, but you can't murder liberation.

Kill a few and get a little satisfaction. Kill some more and you get some more satisfaction. Kill'em all and you get complete satisfaction. We say All Power to the People—Black Power to Black People and Brown Power to Brown People, Red Power to Red People and Yellow Power to Yellow People. We say White Power to White People even. And we say Panther Power to the Vanguard Party and we say don't kill a few and don't kill some more. As a matter of fact we rather you didn't move until you see we ready to move, and when you see we ready to move you know we not dealing with a few, we not dealing with some more. You know that when we get ready to move we dealing from complete—that's what we're after—total, everything, everybody—complete satisfaction.

Power to the people

Appendix B:

The Struggle is a World struggle

By Connie Matthews

Speech delivered at the Vietnam Moratorium demonstration,

San Jose College, October 15, 1969

Power to the people. I have listened to all the speeches that have gone on before me. I have been reading newspapers, reading stuff that the so called radical groups have been putting out and you are talking about the atrocities in Vietnam, you are talking about repression in the United States. I wonder whether you people really do understand what's going on. I have to ask myself this question because in 1967 there was a World Tribunal which was held in Roskilde in Denmark and there the world condemned the United States for the atrocities committed in Vietnam and found her guilty of war crimes and the United States said-Later for the World, because we rule the World. It was announced on the news that there would be demonstrations tomorrow against the war and Nixon said this morning that it makes no difference to his strategy in Vietnam.

Now, I am not trying to negate or diminish the efforts that you are making in holding these demonstrations. What I am trying to say to you is that the time has come when we have to move in another direction. We have to understand that by

peaceful demonstrations, by trying to negotiate, that we are not going to get anywhere. We have to understand that the struggle at this moment is a world struggle, it's a world proletarian struggle; two things--the oppressed versus the oppressor. You have to understand that we must stop talking in terms of countries, we have to talk in about internationalism because the United States has now gone to the moon, they will go to Mars, they will go to Venus next, so that it is not just a question anymore of the planet earth. And you want to take a trip around the world and visit some countries I have visited to see what American imperialism has done. Eldridge Cleaver, our Minister of Information, in his last article from exile, which is in the last issue of our newspaper (there are some copies here) has stated that the oppression in the United States, and the way that people live in the ghettos here is as if you have been placed in silk sheets compared to what American imperialism has done in the other countries of the world.

Now whenever the Vietnamese fight, and they are fighting, and they have won the war, they are fighting for you here. You have to understand this and I use Chairman Bobby Seale's statement--We are in the belly of the whale here--but you have to do your thing because you are helping to enslave those millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America, because you are covertly condoning what the administration is doing. Because power must belong to the people. You are responsible for that administration being in power and just demonstrating and marching and saying--We don't dig this--won't do any good to anyone.

Now, you know the Black Panther Party started off and we said that we understood that this thing was a class struggle. We understood that there are Black people who are pigs and we understood that there are White people who are pigs. What we are

trying to say is that we want a United Front of all ethnic oppressed groups, regardless of race, color, or creed or what you have you, because the ultimate aim is to overthrow this establishment. Sartre said that Europe the dying mother of capitalism gave birth to a monster, imperialism, and this is the United States of America. You have to understand that what the Black Panther Party is doing for you and for the rest of the world. Now you have to rally behind The Black Panther Party and to support The Black Panther Party. It's o.k. when a bunch of niggers get out on the streets and say we hate all White people. Nixon endorses this, Nixon endorses Black capitalism because he knows that what he is going to do is to get a few so-called elite Black people and create yet another division and this is why I am glad that I am talking to a group of students and the thing that I notice is that there are over 400 Black students here in San Jose State and that none of these students thought that the war in Vietnam has anything to do with them or else they would be in this god-damned room. And they should understand that those Vietnamese are fighting and dying for them. Now, to get back to the point, Nixon believes that by brainwashing you students, because you are the ones who are going out tomorrow to continue what Nixon has brainwashed you to believing everything is o.k. You have got to get hip to this thing, because, you are the ones who are going to be the leaders and the establishment tomorrow, you are going to be the bank managers, members of the administration and all the rest of it and you have got to get hip to the fact that you cannot allow this thing to continue. You have got to get hip to the fact that what all the Black Panther Party wants is to take the wealth from out of the hands of the few, and it is only controlled by about 250 people who run the world. This seems absurd, but there are only about 250 to 300 capitalists in this country. They are the ones who put who they want in

power, they are the ones who control and rule the world and say what should be done in this country and for that matter the world. Now the future rests with you people who are here today.

You can see what is going on in Chicago and I can tell you that the so-called mother country radicals have been a disappointment. I was in Court there and they don't take this thing seriously. They do not understand that the trial in Chicago, the outcome, will set the precedence in the United States as to whether the people have freedom or not. They seem to think this is all a big joke, with Abbie Hoffman doing somersaults in Court and all that kind of bulls—t. Now, I am saying you have had what is known as group freedom and you are trying to find individual freedom. We are all one people, this is all one country, in fact in the whole world we are all one people, so until everyone has known what group freedom is you are not going to be able to exist in your hippie yippie societies with individual freedom. And I am saying that over the last six months Nixon has launched a massive repression against The Black Panther Party that is unheard of. When I have spoken in other countries, like France, Germany or even England, people find it hard to believe that Americans, people like you can sit here and watch this sort of thing happening and you do nothing about it. Chairman Bobby Seale, at the beginning of his trial in Chicago was sick, and he wasn't allowed to have a doctor, he has no lawyer, he has no rights he is unable to defend himself, because Charles Garry, his lawyer is lying on his back in the hospital right here in California, and because he is a Black man it doesn't matter. He shouldn't have anyone to defend him. I am now saying to you here, that I do not think you are trying hard enough, I don't think you understand fully what's going on. I think that you need to get out your bag and your safe complacency in these

colleges. I think you need to go into the communities and propagate the wrong ideology, arm yourselves with the right ideology, understand what the struggle is about. It is the oppressed against the oppressor. You middle-class people, because I do not believe that any of you here are capitalist, there are only about 300, you are definitely in a vacuum and you are going to have to take sides at some stage or other and make sure that you take the right side, because if you don't you are not going to have any place to go, because the people must win.

The Vietnamese are a good example of the people being victorious. Because with all of America's technology and her greatness she has been unable to defeat the Vietnamese. Every man, woman and child has resisted. You want to see what is going on in Vietnam. All the men have had to go to the front and you should see how those women and children safeguard their villages. It is probably very difficult for you in the middle of all this to see it clearly, but this is why you have the greatest responsibility. The people who understand what is wrong, because it has to come from within as well as from outside.

We have a petition for community control of police, and those of you who are not familiar with it, get yourself familiar with it, because this is one of the ways in which we are trying to get the power back into the hands of the people. Here on your colleges you have these demonstrations and you go about saying that you don't want this and you don't want that, and you want this and you want that, and then you sit down and you say you have won. You haven't won anything because you must realize that the people who control the colleges are the same people who were put there because they have power in the communities. So your job is in the communities. The two things are tied up together.

Don't try to put them in compartments. I think the time has come for all you young people here in the United States to take a look at yourselves. Look inside first. Try and grasp what the Black Panther Party is trying to do, try and understand how many lives we have lost, because we are trying to educate you. We are the Vanguard because of 400 years, of sweat, blood and tears. But we are not going to start the revolution, it's when you people are educated fully that this thing is going to have to happen, and I am trying to say that if you sit by in this complacency you know what will happen? This so-called United States of America was built up at the expense of genocide of 50 million Indians and you people have romanticized it and called it "Cowboys and Indians." Think about that s—t. Six million Jews were murdered and people sat by and didn't believe it was happening. You sit by now and understand that this is happening right here, and that the power is in your hands, because you are the people so this country belongs to you, so you are the ones who are going to have to stop it and you are going to have to stop it not just by concentrating on one aspect but all facets of what's going on. What I am trying to say is, educate yourselves, in turn educate your people, the people in the communities.

Whenever you go out you talk about it. You talk about the whole thing, the reason why they divided us up into ethnic groups, into races, because as Fanon has said has said—capitalism and racism—one is cause and the other effect. They did not bring Black people over from Africa as slaves because we were Black. They brought Black people over so capitalism could thrive. When capitalism reached its highest form—imperialism—they had to define methods to keep the divisions.

The United States is advancing so rapidly technologically, that most of you will become redundant, you will have no jobs an in fact nothing. The dollar at present is worth

only about 75 cents, and all you people here who live on credit cards, watch it. They have you hoodwinked. If you have been watching the stock market and the world monetary fund system, they have told you that the German market is floating. There are no changes. While the German mark is floating the dollar has decreased and watch-over the next six months or so what will happen. You are the ones who are going to feel it most. Not the poor oppressed people, because they have nothing anyway. But you in the middle, who think you have something, who have those bills and those \$20,000 houses , you are the ones who are going to find out that the mortgage or interest or whatever it is that you are going to have to pay back is about twice what you thought originally. Get your self hip to all this, do some research, you are the students, get with it and educate your people because the Black Panther Party is out there in the front but we can't stay out there in the front forever. We will stay until everyone of us is killed or imprisoned by these racist pigs, but then someone will have to take over. So don't let us all die in vain. Power to the people

--Foner, Philip S. The Black Panthers Speak, 154-159.

Appendix C:
An Open Letter to Stokely Carmichael
Stokely Carmichael, Conakry, Guinea
from Eldridge Cleaver

Your letter of resignation as the Prime Minister of the Black Panther Party came, I think, about one year too late. As a matter of fact, since the day of your appointment to that position—February 17, 1968—events have proven that you were not cut out for the job in the first place. Even then it was clear that your position on coalition with revolutionary white organizations was in conflict with that of the Black Panther Party. But we thought that, in time, even you would be able to shake the SNCC paranoia about white control and get on with the business of building the type of revolutionary machinery that we need in the United States in order to unite all the revolutionary forces in the country to overthrow the system of Capitalism, Imperialism and Racism.

I know these terms are kicked around like lifeless bodies and that it is easy to allow the grisly realities behind them to become obscured by too frequent repetition. But when you see the squalor in which people live as a result of the policies of the exploiters, when you see the effects of exploitation on the emaciated bodies of little children, when you see the hunger and desperation, then these terms come alive in a new way. Since you've made this trip yourself and seen it all with your own eyes, you should now that suffering is color-blind, that the victims of Imperialism, Racism,

Colonialism and Neocolonialism come in all colors, and that they need a unity based on revolutionary principles rather than skin color.

The other charges which you make in your letter—about our new-found ideology, our dogmatism, our arm-twisting, etc.—seem to me to be of secondary importance, because, with the exception, perhaps, of the honorable Elijah Muhammad, you are the most dogmatic cat on the scene today, and I've never known you to be opposed to twisting arms or, for that matter, necks. In many ways your letter struck me as being an echo and rehash of the charges brought against the party by the bootlickers before the McClellan Committee. And since you chose this moment to denounce the party, we—and I am sure many other people outside the party—must look upon your letter in this light. The only point in your letter that I think is really yours is the one about coalition with whites, because it has been this point on which our differences have turned from the very beginning.

You have never been able to distinguish the history of the Black Panther Party from the history of the organization of which you were once the chairman—the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. It is understandable that you can have such fears of black organizations being controlled, or partly controlled, by whites, because most of your years in SNCC were spent under precisely those conditions. But the Black Panther Party has never been in that situation. Because we have never had to wrest control of our organization out of the hands of whites, we have not been shackled with the type of paranoid fear that was developed by you cats in SNCC. Therefore we are able to sit down with whites and hammer out solutions to our common problems without trembling in our boots about whether or not we might get taken over in the process. It has always

seemed to me that you belittle the intelligence of your black brothers and sisters when you constantly warn them that they had better beware of white folks. After all, you are not the only black person out of Babylon who has been victimized by white racism. But you sound as though you are scared of white people, as though you are still sunning away from slave-catchers who will lay hands on your body and dump you in a bag.

As a matter of fact, it has been precisely your nebulous enunciation of black Power that has provided the power structure with its new weapon against our people. The Black Panther Party tried to give you a chance to rescue Black Power from the pigs who have seized upon it and turned it into the rationale for Black Capitalism. With James Farmer in the Nixon Administration to preside over the implementation of Black Capitalism under the slogan of Black Power what value does that slogan now have to our people's struggle for liberation? Is denouncing the Black Panther Party the best you can do to combat this evil? I would think that your responsibility goes a little further than that. Even though you were right when you said that LBJ would never stand up and call for Black Power, Nixon has done so and he's bankrolling it with millions of dollars. So now your old Black Power buddies are cashing in on your slogan. In effect, your cry for Black Power has become the grease to ease the black bourgeoisie into the power structure.

By giving you the position of Prime Minister of the Black Panther Party, we were trying to rescue you from the black bourgeoisie that had latched on to your coattails and was riding you like a mule. Now they have stolen your football and run away for a touchdown: six points for Richard Milhous Nixon.

In February 1968, at the Free Huey Birthday Rally in Oakland, California, where you made your first public speech after returning to the United States from your triumphant tour of the revolutionary countries of the Third World, you took the occasion to denounce the coalition that the black panther party had made with the white Peace and Freedom Party. What you called for instead was a Black United Front that would unite all the forces in the black community from left to right, close ranks against the whites, and all go skipping off to freedom. Whithin the ranks of your Black United Front you wanted to include the Cultural Nationalists, the Black Capitalists, and the Professional Uncle toms, even though it was precisely these three groups who were working to murder your shit even before it broke wind. (Remember what Ron Karenga did to your meeting in Los Angeles?)

You had great dreams in those days, Stokely, and your visions, on the top side, were heroic. On the bottom side, when it came to the details of reality, your vision was blind. You were unable to distinguish your friends from your enemies because all you could see was the color of the cat's skin. It was this blindness that led you to the defense of Adam Clayton Powell, that Jackal from Harlem, when he came under attack by his brother jackals in Congress. And it was this blindness that led you to the defense of that black cop in Washington, D.C., who was being fucked over by the whites above him in the Police Department for whom he carried his gun as he patrolled the black community. In short, your habit of looking at the world through black-colored glasses would lead you, on the domestic level, to close ranks with such enemies of black people as James Farmer, Whitney Young, Roy Wilkins and Ron Karenga and on the international level you would end up in the same bag with Papa Doc Duvalier, Joseph Mobutu, and Haile Selassie. Yes,

we opposed that shit then and we oppose it now even more strongly, especially since the Nixon Administration has stolen your program from you and, I think, included you out.

And now you are going to liberate Africa? Where are you going to start, Ghana? The Congo? Biafra? Angola? Mazambique? South Africa? If you are not aware of it, I think that you should know that the brothers in Africa who are involved in armed struggle against the Colonialists would like nothing better than for you to pack up your suitcase full of African souvenirs and split back to Babylon. They have never forgiven the fat-mouthing you did in Dar-es Salaam when you presumed to tell them how to conduct their business. It seems to me that you are now trapped between the extremes of your own rhetoric. On the one hand, you have cut yourself off from the struggle in Babylon, and on the other hand, you are not about to become the Redeemer of Mother Africa.

The enemies of black people have learned something from history even if you haven't, and they are discovering new ways to divide us faster than we are discovering new ways to unite. One thing they know, and we know, that seems to escape you, is that there is not going to be any revolution or black liberation in the United States as long as revolutionary blacks, whites, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, Chinese and Eskimos are unwilling or unable to unite into some functional machinery that can cope with the situation. Your talk and fears about premature coalition are absurd, because no coalition against oppression by forces possessing revolutionary integrity can ever be premature. If anything, it is too late, because the forces of counterrevolution are sweeping the world, and this is happening precisely because in the past people have been united on a basis that perpetuates disunity among races and ignores basic revolutionary principles and analyses.

You are peeved because the Black Panther Party informs itself with the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, but if you look around the world you will see that the only countries which have liberated themselves and managed to withstand the tide of the counterrevolution are precisely those countries that have strong Marxist-Leninist parties. All those countries that have fought for their liberation solely on the basis of nationalism have fallen victims to capitalism and neo-colonialism, and in many cases now find themselves under tyrannies equally as oppressive as the former colonial regimes.

That you know nothing about the revolutionary process is clear; that you know even less about the United States and its people is clearer; and that you know still less about humanity than you do about the rest is even clearer. You speak about an “undying love for black people.” An undying love for black people that denies the humanity of other people is doomed. It was an undying love of white people for each other which led them to deny the humanity of colored people and which has stripped white people of humanity itself. It would seem to me that an undying love for our people would, at the very least, lead you to a strategy that would aid our struggle for liberation instead of leading you into a coalition of purpose with the McClellan Committee in its attempt to destroy the Black Panther Party

Well, so long, Stokely, and take care. And beware of some white folks and of some black folks, because I assure you that some of both of them have teeth that will bite. Remember what Brother Malcolm said in his Autobiography: “We had the best organization that the black man has ever had in the United States—and niggers ruined it!”

Power to the People

--Foner, Philip S. The Black Panthers Speak, 104-108.

Appendix D:
The Black Panther Party and
Revolutionary Trade Unionism

Speech of Ray “Masai” Hewitt, Minister of Education,
Black Panther Party, to the Revolutionary Labor Conference

Power to the people, definitely all power to the workers. What we want to do, we definitely want to put forth the Black Panther Party’s correct ideology and try to make the workers a class for itself instead of a class in itself. But we know that it’s been tried before. Now that the workers made some attempts that failed, does not mean that the analysis of the class struggle no longer applies. There’s many attempts now-a-days to apply any other kind of analysis, religious analysis, race analysis, all kinds of idealism and metaphysics are being applied to the struggle of the workers including sell-outs, bootlicking, ass kissing, back stabbing.

The Panther Party has already implemented in some areas, concrete revolutionary Marxist-Leninist principles, put them into practice to make the workers a class for itself, to make the workers a strong political organ for themselves. Without revolutionary theory, this is impossible. To think that correct revolutionary principles are going to drop out of the sky, or that they’re born innate in the mind really borders on the ridiculous. As students say, into a television set.

The Black Panther Party is definitely willing to work in cooperation to help put into practice anything that will take the workers to the conscious level and

organize economic and political struggle. We're not talking about rampant unionism, or separatism by occupation, by race, by salary. We're talking about making the workers a political tool, a real political force because the student movement gets a hell of a lot of publicity, what they like to call the militants and the radicals and the so called black militant movement gets a hell of a lot of publicity. But it should be quite clear to anybody that has done a little research and has a reasonable amount of practice that only the workers can free the workers. And that to do this the workers will have to become a strong political force with a party based on correct revolutionary principles to guide them.

Now the vanguard position of any political struggle, is not something that's bestowed by the heavens, or snatched up by some lucky opportunists. The vanguard position is objectively earned through struggle and usually organizations or people who earned the vanguard position, only find out about it when they realize that they're wearing out the steps in the jails and the courts. The jailhouse doors are getting rusty from slamming and opening and slamming and opening. There won't be any alternative for the workers except to become a strong militant revolutionary political force. The students cannot free the workers, the workers cannot free the students. Black folks cannot free White folks, White folks cannot free Black folks. The Black Panther Party has a very clear understanding of these concepts. And we say that for all the workers the first point of demarcation which seems to have been forgotten in this country, is that there has to be a correct recognition that the primary struggle is the class struggle. Once this line of demarcation has been departed from the workers usually become turned on each other, or they become in many cases the champions of reform. With the type of unions that we've had in this country, it's been understandable why this weird phenomenon has

come about. Another thing that we would like to make clear in the very beginning, is that we do recognize the need for a degree of self-determination, of self-rule for militant Black workers. This is not in any way to endorse racism. The Party has a very clear line on that point. But there is a need among Blacks, who are the most oppressed and exploited people within the confines of this Babylon they call America to have self-rule, this is not independent rule, independent of others, located geographically together, but self-rule. And there's also an equal need for these Blacks to work in very close working coalition and close communication with their class brothers, regardless of color, regardless of whether you're for or against intermarriage, whether you want to live in Beverly Hills or Watts or Oakland or Washington, D.C., it doesn't make any difference. The need is for a constant maintenance of a correct class line. And there's some unions that profess this in lip-service and then they take it as far as their local community, say Los Angeles, or the San Francisco area. Then these same unions that claim to be workers unions, forget one of the basic Marxist-Leninist principles, which Lenin put down, is that the interest of the local proletariat should be subordinate to the interest of the world proletariat. That's the advent of unionism there, they start selling out their working class brothers all around the world, even on the other side of the city. The Black Panther Party is against this kind of separatism, opportunism, individualism, this very subjective approach to a problem that is in reality a world side problem. The workers that catch a collective hell and try to deal with it in an individual manner, we see them as suicidal, nonsensical, and very backwards politically. So when we talk about self-rule this does not negate the need for a very close working coalition with class brothers, because the main problem in the United States is not the race contradictions but the class

contradictions. It's made that way by the royal fucking that the working class gets in this country. This is not the exclusive right of any ethnic group in this country. But racism does exist to such a high level in this country, that the people have to deal first on a level that goes from step by step, taking it from a lower to a higher level. There's no need of going into whether or not we think it has to always be like this. No we don't, we hope it doesn't. That the day when the workers will all belong to one working class association, when that day comes we'll all be much happier. But until then that's the way it has to be.

Another point of clarification is the role of the white radical workers. The white radical workers are the ones best suited to fight racism, ignorance and the political backwardness that exists in the whole community. We definitely cannot expect any working brothers from the Panther Caucuses or DRUM or other Black revolutionary groups to go among the white workers when racism is still so rampant. It would be like myself and these four brothers here going down to clean up the white folks in Mobile, Alabama. Not only would it probably be sheer suicide, it would be lunacy, it would be an apolitical move, but there is a role. We find that many times the white mother-country radicals among the workers would like to come into the Black community and do their thing or come in among the Black workers and do their thing. The sentiments are beautiful, but it's not very practical at all. For one thing to assume that the Black workers don't have enough brains to take care of themselves, is really a racist fallacy, the manifestation of a real racist attitude. For another the purpose of the working class as a whole can best be served by each going into his own community, because this mosaic that's passed off as a melting pot, this ethnic mosaic is a mixed-up mess. Racism is institutionalized to a degree that it has never been institutionalized in the history of

mankind, I mean it's bounced off telestar and shot around the world. They pipe it under the ocean in cables, it's in the comic books, it's in Sunday papers, it's in television and radio. So it's rampant idealism to try to ignore this. But it's very foolhardy and politically backwards to ignore the fact that the primary struggle is the class struggle, this goes for Blacks and Whites alike. Now we can start with that basic degree of understanding and we can probably accomplish something.

Another thing that has to be understood is that if we get away from unionism, then the working class group, the group that professes to be for the worker is going to have to have a very concrete and practical platform and program. And I would say that the Black Panther Party's 10-point Platform and Program exemplifies the type of program that a revolutionary group needs. Were not going to confine ourselves just to the factory and divorce the factory from the community, that's a metaphysical approach, and that's not our theory. I think we'll have a question and answer period later on, so I won't try to take up too much of your time. Thank you.

--Foner, Philip S. The Black Panthers Speak, 149-252.