is that he has been just one voice, and not always the dominant one, in the babble about Africa, SALT and détente. Of course it is he who decides what is to be done, in some kind of harmony with Congress on the major questions, but that is not to say that Carter's voice has yet been decisive. He has, for example, got himself heavily involved in the cloudy dispute over the extent of Cuban responsibility for the rebel infiltration of the Shaba Province of Zaire, taking the hard-line view.

The Cuban involvement is essentially peripheral, not an issue that should occupy much of the American President's attention. Yet it does, as the administration goes on trying to prove that, without the intervention in Africa of our tiny Caribbean neighbor, none of these unpleasant things would be happening. (By all accounts, the testimony of Admiral Turner of the CIA before the House Intelligence Committee on June 5 was less than conclusive—photographs of Cuban ships in Angolan ports and a pastiche of circumstantial accounts of the training of Shaba's rebels are what the House committee was offered, lacking the evidentiary value of the "Cuban cigar butt" on Zairean soil, in the sarcastic comment of Defense Secretary Brown.) Cuba's role, in the Washington perspective, is as the twister of the lion's tail, an almost intolerable affront to great-power dignity.

The voice that has emerged most clearly, and loudly, from the discord within the administration is that of Zbigniew Brzezinski. The National Security Adviser has adopted a strident tone as a way of differentiating himself from the rest of the tenors, and particularly from the Secretary of State. Vance is generally portrayed by the "do-something" faction as an accommodator, even a compromiser, on the large issues that define our confrontation with the Communists in this period that Brezhnev in Prague described as "chilly" or "lukewarm war." Secretary Vance seems, however discreetly, to doubt the wisdom of a convulsive reaction to the events in Africa, to question the timing of waving the "China card" in front of the Russians—which was the aim of Brzezinski's visit to Peking—and he persists in the vigorous pursuit of a SALT agreement before Brezhnev leaves the scene and that chance fades.

Brzezinski, on the other hand, is apparently afflicted with fewer of these scruples. He lacks even the "nuances" so dear to the heart of his envied predecessor, Kissinger, in his strictures on the Soviet Union. Kissinger now sneers at "the ridiculous myth of the invincible Cubans," though he does not say how "one overcomes" it, while his successor takes a hard, cold line against what he might well call, again, "worldwide communism" on all its fronts.

Of all the voices in the Carter chorus that of U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young is perhaps the clearest and most sensible, especially on Africa. In an interesting interview in U.S. News and World Report (June 12), Young differentiates between the need for "concern" about developments in Africa and a reaction of "panic," of which, he says, "I'm afraid." He takes the long view of the African problem as it affects the West, knowing that the continent is in for a long period of turbulence and that there are no quick ways around that.

He points out that the American connection with Africa is "much more economic than it is strategic." As an illustration of that concept, he responds to a question about a proposal from one faction within the Carter administration for a "covert operation by the CIA to bleed the Cubans in Angola" with the brief comment that "you bleed the Cubans and you destroy Gulf Oil in Angola." (Here he clearly has in mind not the welfare of that particular corporation but the fact that the Cabinda oil field operates by Gulf provides much of Angola's foreign exchange, and that this asset is guarded by Cuban troops from destruction by the warring guerrilla factions in Angola.) As for the prospects for SALT, which Carter maintains is not on the back burner or in the deep freeze because of Russian aggressiveness, Young simply notes that a new strategic arms limitation treaty "is very definitely in our interest."

Does the President truly agree with that view or does his speech contain so many hedges and obscure "linkages" that nothing is yet clear? Coherence of United States policy may have been approached at Annapolis but it is yet to be attained.

**THE FBI's WILDEST DREAM**

By now the FBI's campaign against Martin Luther King has been devastatingly documented.

The Church Committee told us how the bureau used every intelligence-gathering technique at its disposal to obtain information about the "private activities" of Dr. King and his advisers to "completely discredit" them.

We have learned through release of the Freedom of Information Act documents and other revelations how the FBI—responding to the late J. Edgar Hoover's obsession—tried to destroy King's marriage and perhaps attempted to drive him to suicide by threatening to release a tape recording made from microphones hidden in his hotel rooms.

We have read portions of one incredible FBI memorandum after another, including one from the bureau's Domestic Intelligence Division which concluded that his "demagogic speech" at the August 1963 March on Washington established him as the "most dangerous and effective Negro leader in the country."

But perhaps the most menacing memorandum is one which until now has been quoted only in fragments, a memorandum written within days after Time named Dr. King as its Man of the Year. On January 8, 1964, according to the Church Committee report, Assistant FBI Director William Sullivan sent a memorandum about King to another Hoover assistant, Alan Belmont. The Church summary: "The FBI decided to 'take him off his pedestal,' 'reduce him completely in influence,' and select and promote its own candidate to 'assume the role of the leadership of the Negro people.'"
rage will increase and might this not lead in time to the demand for "a man on horseback" to take charge and perform the miracles it expects?

Of course, middle-class taxpayers are right to be disgusted with the present state of affairs and tough action is indeed needed, but the kind that may eventually emerge may be less than benign. It may be desirable to force the adoption of measures similar to Proposition 13. But although their grievances are real, middle-class homeowners are looking in the wrong direction. Social services are essential, this is an increasingly complex society and the needs of the poor cannot be ignored forever while corporations continue to rake in profits and federal funds are wasted on senseless defense spending.

Today's politicians are not alone responsible for this state of affairs; it reflects the follies and extravagances of thirty years of cold war. Years ago Thomas Mann pointed out that it was during the inflation that the Germans forgot to rely on themselves as individuals and learned to expect everything from "politics" and "the state"—from destiny. "Inflation," he wrote, "is a tragedy that makes a whole people cynical, hard-hearted and indifferent." The circumstances are different, but the effects of inflation are not dissimilar here: witness the lack of morale, the extent of corporate corruption at high levels, the shoddy behavior of too many politicians, the wastage of federal funds, and the hard-boiled way—to cite a single example—in which New York City schemes to pay its bankers and lenders while civic facilities decay and the city's poor pick food from garbage cans. The vote on Proposition 13 does indeed flash a message; for it also carries a warning that should, but probably won't, be heeded. CAREY McWILLIAMS

The Uncertain Trumpet

President Carter had to make a speech that attempted a coherent view of United States foreign policy. The past month has been marked by a degree of incoherence on issues great and small that is extraordinary even for an administration whose thrust, or drift, has always been hard to discern. But the message sent out over the white-capped heads of the midshipmen at Annapolis was hardly one to reassure the passengers on this ship of state that we will be on a steady course for very long or even that we are on the right heading now.

It was a sort of tough straddle, a mixture of hard and soft lines and therefore fuzzed. Its attempt to reconcile the splits in his own entourage (reflected with astonishing accuracy in Moscow's instant reaction) leaves the Carter policy in its usual state of ambiguity. It was moderate only in that it was bound to disappoint his administration's own clashing factions, both doves and hawks.

The President had not been exactly mute on all these issues even before the Annapolis address. In fact, he has been speaking up all the time, but the remarkable thing
Aside from two or three partial paragraphs, we were not told what the rest of the memorandum said, and more intriguing, just who it was the FBI was grooming to replace the charismatic and prophetic Dr. King. But these questions were overlooked in the preoccupation with the FBI's arrogant assumption that it knew best, that it had the sensitivity, intelligence, capacity and/or mandate, not to mention the authority, to nominate and elect the next leader of black America.

A few weeks ago the FBI released, under the Freedom of Information Act, another memorandum, this one dated December 1, 1964, from bureau functionary J.A. Sizoo to Sullivan, which on the surface appeared to suggest that the FBI and a black leader had worked together in an attempt to eliminate the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. Rumors floated that the leader was Roy Wilkins. What the rumors ignored is the nature of such FBI memorandums which were routinely written not so much to report the truth as to please the Director, to make a record, to compromise the interviewee. My own reading of the document accords with that of Tom Wicker, who concluded that in November 1964, the executive director of the NAACP, Roy Wilkins, “intervened with the bureau to stop its attacks on Dr. King, which Mr. Wilkins felt were damaging the civil rights movement,” and that the bureau tried to use this intervention to destroy not only the reputation of Dr. King but that of Mr. Wilkins as well.

Now, however, The Nation has come into possession of the original January 8, 1964 memorandum from

---

**To:** Mr. A.H. Belmont  
**Date:** January 8, 1964

**From:** Mr. W.C. Sullivan  
**Subject:** Samuel Riley Pierce, Jr.  
280 Park Ave.  
New York 17, NY  
Attorney-at-law

---

**We know that Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King (deletion) represents a very real security problem to this country. In addition to (deletion), Dr. King, as we know, for some time now has been (deletion). Apart from the security factor, he is a disgrace to the Negro people of this country because of his (deletion) while at the same time purporting to be a minister of the gospel. Obviously he has the capacity to deceive people very successfully. This was made evident most recently by his being selected by Time magazine as the Man of the Year.

Further, we know that he has been able to cleverly deceive both very important Protestant and Catholic organizations, securing thereby support from them which gives him added stature. It should be very clear to all of us that Martin Luther King must, at some propitious point in the future, be reaped to the people of this country and to his Negro followers as being what he actually is—a fraud, demagogue and moral scoundrel. When the true facts concerning his activities are presented, there should be enough, if handled properly, to take him off his pedestal and to reduce him completely in influence so that he will no longer be a security problem and no longer will be deceiving and misleading the Negro people.

When and if it can be and will be done, obviously much confusion will reign, particularly among the Negro people. There will be embarrassment, frustration, confusion, resentment, et cetera. Because of this and the emotional reaction that will set in, it is not unlikely that movements like the Nation of Islam could benefit greatly. Further, other ridiculous developments similar to the Old Father Devine and Daddy Grace organizations may appear. The Negroes will be left without a national leader of sufficiently compelling personality to steer them in the proper direction. This is what can happen, but need not happen if the right kind of a Negro leader could at this time be gradually developed so as to overshadow Dr. King and be in the position to assume the role of the leadership of the Negro people when King has been completely discredited.

For some months I have been thinking about this matter. One day I had an opportunity to explore this from a philosophical and sociological standpoint with (deletion), whom I have known for some years. As I previously reported, (deletion) is a very able fellow, (deletion), and one on whom I can rely. I asked (deletion) to give the matter some attention and if he knew any Negro of outstanding intelligence and ability let me know and we would have a discussion. (deletion) has submitted to me the name of the above-captioned person, (deletion).

Enclosed with this memorandum is an outline of (deletion) biography which is truly remarkable for a man so young, having been born (deletion), 1932. On scanning this biography, it will be seen that (deletion) does have all the qualifications of the kind of a Negro I have in mind to advance to positions of national leadership. I won't go into all his accomplishments and qualifications in this memorandum, for it will only take a minute or two to scan the enclosed biography.

On first blush I know it can be said it is not the concern of the Bureau what happens to the Negroes when Martin Luther King has been dethroned. This can be done in a very short-sighted view. It is our concern if large numbers of them go into the Nation of Islam and other extremist groups with which we are concerned as an investigative agency. It is our concern if the Communist Party would be able to capitalize upon this confusion. Further, from a positive and constructive standpoint it would be of great advantage to have a Negro leader who is truly brilliant, honorable and loyal to this country who would not be able to capitalize upon this confusion. Further, from a positive and constructive standpoint it would be of great advantage to have a leader who would lead the Negro people in the proper direction. This is what (deletion) should be able to do.

I want to make it clear at once that I don't propose that the FBI in any way become involved openly as the sponsor of a Negro leader to overshadow Martin Luther King. As far as I am concerned, this is not an issue at all. But I do propose that I be given permission to explore further this entire matter with (deletion) and another person known to (deletion) and myself who could be helpful. If this thing can be set up properly within the Bureau in any way be coming directly involved, I think it would be not only a great help to the FBI but would be a fine thing for the country at large. While I am not specifying at the moment, there are various ways in which the FBI could give this entire matter the proper direction and development. There are highly placed confidants of the FBI who might be very helpful to further such a step. These can be discussed in detail later when I have probed more fully into the possibilities.

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. For the information of the Director.
2. That approval be given for me to explore this whole matter in greater detail, as set forth above.

---

**OK H.**

(See biography outlined enclosed—WCS [penned])

**ADDENDUM**

1/9/64, WCS (deletion)

Mr. (deletion) has been investigated by the Bureau as a Departmental Applicant for the position of (deletion), and derogatory information of any kind was developed. The investigation showed, as does the biography, that he has a remarkably fine record.

W.C. Sullivan

I am glad to see that "light" has finally, though dismally and if dismally delayed, come to the Domestic Int. Div. I struggled for months to get over the fact the Communists were taking over the racial movement but our experts here couldn't or wouldn't see it. H. [penned]
Sullivan to Belmont, the one referred to but never released by the Church Committee on the bureau's attempt to knock King "off his pedestal." The memorandum, reproduced on the previous page, reveals at last the FBI's candidate to replace Dr. King and the revelation is, to say the least, a surprise.

Stokely Carmichael, Bob Moses, Andrew Young, Whitney Young, James Farmer, Thurgood Marshall, Wilkins and the other civil rights leaders of the day don't even rate an honorable mention. After all, Sullivan points out, once King is gone, "The Negroes will be left without a national leader of sufficiently compelling personality to steer them in a proper direction. This is what could happen, but need not happen if the right kind of a national Negro leader could at this time be gradually developed so as to overshadow Dr. King and be in the position to assume the role of the leadership of the Negro people when King has been completely discredited."

Who is the "very able fellow" Sullivan came up with, the "truly remarkable man" (whose birthdate is missyped as 1932, when in fact it was 1922), the man who "does have all of the qualifications of the kind of a Negro . . . to advance to positions of national leadership?"

Samuel R. Pierce, Jr., that's who. Judge Pierce had (and presumably still has) impeccable credentials for the world in which he worked. A member of the Park Avenue law firm of Battle, Fowler, Stokes and Kheel, a former General Sessions judge, Assistant District Attorney in New York County and Assistant United States Attorney, a Republican, the only black member of the Army's Criminal Investigation Division, Phi Beta Kappa and a football star at Cornell, he went on to serve in the Nixon administration as General Counsel to the U.S. Treasury Department, to join the executive board of the Boy Scouts of America and to be the first black to sit on two corporate boards of directors, Prudential Life and General Electric.

Had he ever marched in a demonstration, sat in, written a desegregation brief, signed a civil rights petition? What qualities did the blacks want in a leader and why did Dr. King's noble humility inspire and stir a generation? Who knew, and more important, who cared? Certainly not William Sullivan and Alan Belmont and definitely not their superior, J. Edgar Hoover, who scrawled at the bottom of Sullivan's memorandum: "I am glad to see that 'light' has finally, though dismally delayed, come to the Domestic Int. Div. I struggled for months to get over the fact the Communists were taking over the racial movement but our experts here couldn't or wouldn't see it. H."

One presumes that Judge Pierce—who told me, "I don't know anything about it; this is the first I've heard"—didn't have an inkling of what was on the bureau's mind, that they never approached him nor he them, obviously, and that his "candidacy" was Sullivan's fantasy. And one assumes that between the time of Sullivan's 1964 memorandum and Dr. King's death in 1968, many other "nominees" were put forward for the post of the FBI's black messiah designate. But this much one knows—that an organization which would consider this ultra-establishmentarian corporate lawyer to succeed Dr. King was hopelessly out of touch with the world it was supposed to be monitoring, that the FBI lived by its stereotypes and only adjusted them to fit the Director's prejudices, and that its agent provocateurism when not violent was comic.

J. Edgar Hoover and Martin Luther King are both dead, but our secret police agency lives on, still uncontrolled by new legislation, despite promises of Attorneys General, Presidents and leaders of the Congress. As Coretta King herself wrote, "Martin Luther King, Jr.'s unfinished work on earth must truly be our own."