

Providing a reliable source of Agricultural credit in the United States predates the war of independence as the first cooperative credit system was organized in New London, Connecticut in 1732.

¹The history of Secretaries of Agriculture proclaiming the importance of small family farms goes back to Issac Newton, the first commissioner of US agriculture, reporting to President Abraham Lincoln, that Haciendas brought down Rome.² The message to the country was pretty clear; small family farmers were the foundations of the American Republic. In 1916 the Federal Farm Loan Act established a federal Land Bank (FLB) in each of 12 districts across the country, along with hundreds of National Farm Loan Associations (NFLAs) to serve as agents for the FLBs. These FLBs were the first component of what eventually came to be known as the Farm Credit System (FCS).

(Ref Footnote 1).

During the Great depression of the 1920's and 30's the US government implemented the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 in an attempt to save the farms of individuals delinquent on their loans by extending repayment schedules and offering emergency financing. (Ref Footnote 1). The Farm Credit Act of 1933 established the Farm Credit System creating two new types of institutions, which expanded the lending authorities of the FCS so it could now provide credit for all types of agricultural activities.

(Ref Footnote 1).

In 1971 the Farm Credit Act gave the FLBs and NFLAs more flexibility to lend to production agriculture, and authorized lending to commercial fishermen and rural homeowners. (Ref Footnote 1). The 1970s saw lowered trade barriers couple with record Soviet purchases of American grain result in a sharp increase in

¹ History of FCA and the FCS Farm Credit Administration
https://www.fca.gov/about/history/historyFCA_FCS.html

² US Congress, House of Representatives, Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1862 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1863).
<http://naldc.nal.usda.gov/naldc/download.xhtml?id=CAT40000906&content=PDF>

agricultural exports. Farm incomes and commodity prices soared.³The removal of restrictions on the FLBs coupled with increased lending by other entities for farmland purchases led to rising land values. Conveniently low interest rates fueled by USDA lending from an unrestrained capital budget provided an unlimited source of fuel to a farming bubble. This bubble fueled by Government lending was exacerbated by US Agricultural policies enticing farmers to purchase new equipment for productivity increases, to expand their farming operations and to get big or get out all to the detriment of small family farms.

Between 1970 and 1976 U.S. Wheat output grew 59 percent, corn by 51 percent, rice by 38 percent, and peanuts by 25 percent. While prices for all these commodities also increased, foreign demand remained heavy throughout the decade. Exports rose strongly, especially for corn, which more than tripled overseas shipments between 1970 and 1976. Between 1971 and 1981 U.S. Farmers secured for themselves over 100 million of the 160 million metric tons of world trade growth for the decade. (Ref Footnote 3)

Unlimited USDA capital providing low interest rate loans, expanded lending by the USDA coupled with Agency encouragement for expansion and productivity increases and the increased profitability of export crops encouraged farmers to enlarge their operations by adding inputs and buying more land. Farmers expanded production taking on substantial new debt to finance expansions. Land prices tripled between 1972 and 1980. The amount of land devoted to exports rose from 72 million acres in 1970 to 137 million in 1980 a 90 percent increase and 39 percent of all harvested U.S. acreage. (Ref footnote 3). Indeed the 1973 Federal Farm Bill “markedly increased the discretionary power of the Secretary of Agriculture to manage commodity programs to meet changing economic circumstances and directed

³Agricultural Issues Leading to the Uruguay Round: Page 16.
<http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/1913105/ages8923b.pdf>

him to encourage farmers to “Produce to their fullest capabilities”
“⁴

From the 1950’s through the 1970’s the U.S. Government promoted the expansion of farms, increasing productivity and providing funding to create a giant Government promoted, encouraged, policy supported, and funded Sub Prime Farm Loan Bubble in U.S. Farm Agriculture all to the detriment of Small Family Farms while growing, expanding, and subsidizing large scale Agribusiness with loans and commodity pricing support. Ethnic farmers were particularly hard hit because they were typically smaller operations and as a smaller subset of small family farms the impact was proportionately severe. ⁵

While the U.S. Government fueled farm growth and expansion it began simultaneously to dampen U. S. Agricultural markets with free trade agreements. In 1975 with FATT negotiations the United States proposed cutting tariffs on all products including agriculture. Then in 1977 President Ford concluded the multilateral trade negotiations (MTN) significantly expanding agricultural trade. (Ref footnote 3) The end of the U.S. Agricultural boom “halted abruptly in the 1980s as interest rates rose, the dollar appreciated, and commodity prices fell. From 1979 to 1983, the agricultural sector suffered an absolute as well as a relative decline that was largely unanticipated by agricultural borrowers

⁴ A Time to Choose USDA Summary report on the Structure of Agriculture Page 3 Bob Bergland.
<https://ia802506.us.archive.org/15/items/timetochooesumm00unit/timetochooesumm00unit.pdf>

⁵ Note the report A time to Choose indentified and studied the demise of small family farms but did not offer any conclusions it was related to discrimination. The 1997 USDA Civil rights action team also identified discrimination against small farmers separate and distinct from ethnic discrimination see A Time to ACT 1998 by Dan Glickman Section IV
<http://www.ratical.org/corporations/linkscopy/report.html>

and lenders.”⁶ Russia’s invasion of Afghanistan exacerbated the decline by prompting the Carter administration’s January 1980 Grain embargo to Russia eliminating a significant U.S. Agricultural market.

“By the early 1980s, tight money and high interest rates had burst agriculture’s speculative bubble. The federal government estimated that farmland value dropped by nearly 60% in some parts of the Midwest between 1981 and 1985. Many farm operators found it impossible to retire their debts as fast as their asset values declined. Record harvests led to over production, which in turn resulted in a glut of farm commodities, forcing prices down. In addition, the decision by President Jimmy Carter to enforce a grain embargo as a means of punishing the Soviet Union for its invasion of Afghanistan cost the American farmer a crucial overseas market. Subsequently, the Soviets diversified their agricultural suppliers in order to limit the effects of a future embargo. And though prices fell, American farm products were still costlier than those of competitors on the international market; federal price supports kept prices artificially high enough so that farmers in Argentina, Australia, Canada and Europe were able to seize more of the market than ever before. The strong dollar of the Eighties combined with the economic stagnation and financial straits of purchasing nations also hurt American agricultural exports, which declined by more than 20% between 1981 and 1983, while real commodity prices plummeted 21% during the same period.

In the high times of the 1970s, the number of "middle level" farmers -- those whose income ranged from \$40,000 to \$500,000 a year -- had increased by an astonishing 250%. Numbering 675,000 by 1985, they were the hardest hit by the debt crisis. The small farmers (grossing under \$40,000 a year and deriving much of their income from non-farm employment) had not incurred large debts,

⁶ Brookings institute The Farm Debt Crisis and Public Policy 1986
http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Projects/BPEA/1986-2/1986b_bpea_calomiris_hubbard_stock_friedman.PDF

while the large farmers (those who grossed in excess of \$500,000 a year) were financially able to weather hard times. As he watched profits decline by 36% between 1980 and 1988, the middle level farmer who had aggressively indebted himself in the Seventies faced grave financial peril during the next decade. By early 1984, in the depths of the crisis, farm indebtedness had risen to \$215 billion, double what it had been in 1978, and fifteen times the 1950's level. According to Emmanuel Melicher, Federal Reserve senior economist, more than one-third of America's commercial farmers were in serious trouble. For the first time in history, the total of interest payments on farm loans exceeded total net farm income. Farm foreclosures rose dramatically, and the crisis had a ripple effect, negatively impacting the manufacture and sale of farm machinery, seed and fertilizer. Rural banks went into receivership. Rural communities suffered in other ways; as more and more farmers were forced out of business, small town enterprises saw their profits plummet. In 1986, the Minnesota Agriculture Department calculated that every farm loss wiped out three non-farm jobs. Many described the farm crisis of the Eighties as the worst since the Great Depression.”⁷

“Delinquent loans had increased substantially, hitting 7.5 percent of total loans at small agricultural banks by mid-1985.

Agricultural bank earnings are down and bank failures are up. In 1983, seven insured commercial agricultural banks failed; in 1984 and 1985, the figure rose to thirty-two and sixty-eight, respectively. Agricultural banks accounted for 41 percent of the insured commercial banks that failed in 1984; in every quarter since, they have accounted for more than half of total bank failures. Agricultural banking in general has become substantially more fragile. In 1984, more than 20 percent of total agriculture loans outstanding at banks were to borrowers with a debt-equity ratio in excess of 70 percent and a negative cash flow. The government-sponsored Cooperative Farm Credit System (FCS)

⁷ The Eighties Club “The Midwest Farm Crisis of the 1980's”
<http://eightiesclub.tripod.com/id395.htm>

has suffered similar portfolio deterioration and now faces an imminent threat of insolvency, though legislation passed by Congress in 1985 provides for stopgap assistance from the federal government. Total outstanding farm loans likely to default have been estimated at between \$80 billion and \$100 billion. Until recently, the major source of the U.S. farmers' trouble during the 1980s has been severe national and international economic shocks: increased foreign farm output, an overvalued dollar, and high U.S. interest rates. But U.S. farm credit markets have now become yet another source of trouble as they propagate the shocks in the farm sector.”⁸

U.S. Farm credit markets came under pressure from the USDA as the new Reagan administration responded to farm loan delinquencies in August of 1981 by setting a reduction goal of 23% for each state's farm loan portfolio and continued the policy into 1983⁹. This policy decision effectively restricted credit availability to farmers and expedited foreclosures to meet reduction goals. During the 1980's “farm prices declined, and, as the dollar appreciated, exports fell sharply. Farm incomes, and with them farmland values, fell at rates unprecedented in the postwar period. The drop in income, coupled with the high levels of debt acquired during the expansion of the 1970s, has led to a sharp decline in the ability of farmers to meet their debt obligations and to the corresponding rise in farm bank failures.”¹⁰

In the late 70's and early 80's farmers across the country began having problems and suffering delinquencies on farm loans with the FmHA. By Jnuary of 1983 52.4 percent of FmHa loans were

⁸ See reference for footnote 6.

⁹ .See A. HIGBY, H. HOFF, E. SEVERNS & J. HANSEN, FMHA FARM LOAN HANDBOOK 57 (1982) An Agricultural Law Research Article by Karen Kubovec McIlvain 1984 Originally published in Washburn Law Journal. http://nationalaglawcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/bibarticles/mcilvain_analysis.pdf

¹⁰ See reference for footnote 6 paragraphs 444-445

delinquent.¹¹ The problem high interest rates, bumper crops, and recession low commodity prices.

In 1982 and 1983 the USDA was presented with several significant lawsuits by farmers from across the country, these suits *Matzke v. Block*, 542 F. Supp. 1107 (D. Kan, 1982), *Curry V. Block*, 541 F. Supp. 506, 509-11 (S.D. GA. 1982), and *Coleman v. Block*, (D.N.D. 1984) all presented similar allegations against FmHA. Farmers alleged the Secretary of Agriculture and the FmHA Mismanagement of FmHA supervisors decreased farmers ability to farm by terminating funds to farmers for necessary living and operating expenses, subjecting farmers to a biased and unconstitutional appeals process, and accelerated delinquent loan accounts and made demand for payment without affording due process of law under the Fifth Amendment. Furthermore, Farmers alleged the Secretary and the FmHA refused, and are refusing to implement the provisions of 7 U.S.C.A. §1981a (West Supp.1982) (loan moratorium and policy on foreclosure). As a result, plaintiffs these farmers may lose the tools of their trade, their home places or their livestock because of government foreclosure and liquidation of FmHA secured property. In short, their livelihoods were at stake and FmHA had refused to allow the farmers' applications for deferment of loans under §1981a.¹² There were significant numbers of complaints coming into the administration and among ethnic groups complaints alleging discrimination.

¹¹ See reference of footnote 9 at footnote 3. http://nationalaglawcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/bibarticles/mcilvain_analysis.pdf

¹² See Generally *Matzke v. Block*, 542 F. Supp. 1107 (D. Kan, 1982), <http://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/FSupp/542/1107/2284197/> *Curry V. Block*, 541 F. Supp. 506, 509-11 (S.D. GA. 1982) <https://casetext.com/case/curry-v-block> *Coleman v. Block*, (D.N.D. 1984) <https://casetext.com/case/coleman-v-block>

An Agricultural Law Research Article by Karen Kubovec McIlvain 1984 Originally published in Washburn Law Journal. http://nationalaglawcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/bibarticles/mcilvain_analysis.pdf

The first two of these cases set important precedent by establishing farmers had a due process property interest and therefore must be afforded due process. In *Matzke v. Block*, 542 F. Supp. 1107 (D. Kan, 1982) the court ruled in favor of a single defendant Janice Stoss although class action status was considered. In *Curry v. Block*, 541 F. Supp. 506, 509-11 (S.D. GA. 1982) the Court found in favor of a class of defendants for the state of Georgia. However, in *Coleman v. Block*, (D.N.D. 1984) multiple nationwide classes were defined including more than 230,000 farmers, resulting in a case maligned in the courts for more than a decade, and spawning congressional legislation settling and muting the cases in 1987 prompting follow on litigation of *Coleman v. Lyng*, and *Coleman v. Espy* which sought contempt damages for farmers whom FmHA foreclosed on in spite of the *Coleman v. Block* injunction barring them. *Coleman v. Espy* did not receive a final ruling until February 23, 1993 and established farmers seeking damages for due process violations would need to seek suit individually under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA).

These five cases were the precursor, impetus, framework, and catalyst for the USDAs creation of a criminal RICO enterprise seeking to avoid legal liability for denial of farmers due process property interest rights. The precursor *Matzke*, *Curry*, and *Coleman* solidified court precedent farmers had a property interest requiring the government to provide due process with regards to farm loans. *Coleman* provided impetus by creating multiple classes of some 230,000 potential litigants presenting FmHA with a significant legal liability. A framework was defined with the establishment of a due process right, the reality of precedent on deference in *Curry*, and the protection of sovereign immunity and potential vulnerability through the FTCA in *Coleman v. Espy*. The Catalyst because precisely two weeks to the day after the court decision in *Coleman v. Espy* just three weeks after newly elected President William Jefferson Clinton announces his comprehensive economic plan "A vision of Change for America" including recommendations for reducing the deficit

including reductions at the USDA then President Clinton pulls the nomination of Judge Edward J. Damich to the Copyright Royalty Tribunal arguably, presumptively to be the design, implementation, and legislation architect of the RICO called the Agricultural Reorganization Act of 1994.

Historical records are filled with circumstantial evidence for justification of bipartisan support for this Act of Treason. The most notable of which is the role both parties played in creating the Sub Prime farm loan bubble in the 1960's and 70's and the disastrous result commodity price supports, credit restrictions, and policy decisions played in the collapse of the 1980s along with the legal liability aftermath that ensued. The depth of these is so voluminous it warrants, at minimum, a chapter in a true history book but Ronald Reagan reflected on this fact in his remarks when signing the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 when he said: ¹³

“unfortunately, in the past our nation's farmers have had to contend not only with the usual, God-given variables, such as the weather, but with other uncertainties and hardships that were manmade right here in Washington.”

Reagan additionally commented on the legal liability aftermath although, if you consider signing this credit act eliminated the legal liability to the 230,000 class members of *Coleman v. Block* his statement is rather disingenuous:

“Congress also added other costly provisions that were not necessary to the health of the Farm Credit System. Of principal concern is the additional forbearance provided to producers that have been substantially delinquent on loans issued directly by the Farmers Home Administration of the

¹³ President Ronald Reagan “Remarks on Signing the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987” January 6, 1988
<https://www.reaganlibrary.archives.gov/archives/speeches/1988/010688a.htm>

United States Department of Agriculture.”

Historical records are also filled with circumstantial evidence of countless Senate, and Congressional representatives whose legislative aspirations influenced the design and implementation of this criminal unconstitutional RICO enterprise. Furthermore, evidence suggests numerous public servants careers and personal lives were seriously maligned by the related events. I seriously doubt the truth of all these will ever be told but there are so many puzzle pieces pointing to similar truths to simply ignore them. The countless details of these are too voluminous to warrant discussion here however, since a number of these combine with legal objectives to play a role in the RICO enterprises schematic design and therefore are discussed here briefly.

It's said in jest often; some feats require an ACT of Congress. All legislation becoming law generally requires some bipartisan support in both the House and Senate and a Presidential seal of approval. The legislative aspirations of representatives are well documented in legislative submissions, support and opposition of various legislative acts, and personal passions for various objectives. Regarding the development of USDA's RICO enterprise there are two legislative themes and focus goals prominent beyond those established by the lawsuits outlined above and incorporated into the RICOS ultimate design. These are the environmental passions most notably of 1994 Vice President Al Gore and Congressmen Kiki De La Garza of Texas and the Civil Rights Passions of Congressmen John Conyers, Charles Rangel, and John Lewis along with the prominent leadership of the time in the Congressional Black Caucus Alan Wheat, and former congressman and President Clintons appointed Secretary of Agriculture Mike Espy.

The Environmental Agenda to USDA's RICO enterprise.

As mentioned above the legislative aspirations of politicians are often reflected in the legislation they support. When creating a criminal enterprise inside the US government even if both parties are interested there will be legislative bargains to get legislation

that's essentially an act of treason on the constitution of the United States passed. The Environmental concerns of Al Gore are well documented and the passage of the Agricultural Reorganization Act of 1994 was an early outcome of the Clinton Gore administration so lets look at some of what history tells in the development of this legislation.

- First in 1981 Congressman Al Gore held the first congressional hearings on man made climate change, and co-sponsored hearings on toxic waste and global warming.
- The 1985 Farm Bill "The Food Security Act of 1985" significantly expands the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) with expanded commitment terms from 3 to 15 years, the number of acres allowed as "highly erodible" from 5 to 40 million, and prohibiting any farming or grazing on land enrolled into CRP, effectively removing CRP land from agricultural production.
- In 1988 Scientist warn for the first time Global warming may affect the future viability of American Farming and Al Gore begins to write a book on environmental conservation.
- In 1989 30 Million acres of Farm Land are retired from farming under the conservation reserve program of the 1985 food Security Act.
- June of 1992 Senator Al Gore led the US Senate delegation to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, a conference producing the Statement of principles called UN Agenda 21 for the Sustainable Management of Forests and was adopted by more than 178 Governments including the United States.
- July 1992 Bill Clinton selects Al Gore as his Presidential running mate and Al Gore publishes his book "Earth in Balance: Ecology and the human Spirit"
- October 1994 The **Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994** expanded the **State Loan Mediation Program to include:** wetland determinations, conservation compliance, agricultural credit, rural water loan programs, grazing on National Forest System lands, pesticides, and other issues the Secretary deems appropriate.

The Civil Rights Agenda in USDA's RICO enterprise.

In the 1980's Justice Clarence Thomas joined the advisory board of the Review, creating waves in the African-American community by taking some very unpopular-some would say reactionary-stands as the journal opposed a holiday for Martin Luther King Jr. And questioned the extent, if not the existence, of racial discrimination; and referred to abortion as a plot to "slaughter" blacks. ¹⁴

Congressman John Conyers authored legislation on voter registration, social security, public housing, civil and constitutional rights, small businesses, family farms, education, economic and community development, foreign affairs, defense contracting, and procurement. He authored and spearheaded the drive for passage of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday bill. As the fourth ranking member of the Judiciary committee, Congressman Conyers conducted hearings on civil rights, police violence, white-collar crime, sentencing, grand jury reform, and strong protections for consumers and small business Investors.¹⁵

1981 Justice Clarence Thomas was appointed by President Ronald Reagan to Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights in the United States Department of Education where he hired Anita Hill to assist him.

1982 Justice Clarence Thomas was named Chairman of the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission EEOC by Ronald Reagan and was accompanied by Anita Hill.

¹⁴ Encyclopedia.com Clarence Thomas - http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Clarence_Thomas.aspx

¹⁵ 21st Annual Legislative Weekend annual awards Dinner program September 1991 <http://www.avoiceline.org/document.html?idq=urn%3Autl%3Aavoicedhu-cbc-alc-1991&exhq=CBC+History&themeq=&pageq=2>

1983 November Anita Hill left the EEOC to return to Norman Oklahoma.

1984 Senator Edward Kennedy introduced the Civil Rights Act of 1984 The legislation never passed the Senate although had strong support of Congress it was strongly apposed by the Reagan administration.

1986 Mike Espy became the first African-American to represent Mississippi since reconstruction at the federal level as congressman of the 3rd district.

1988 President Reagan vetoes the Civil Rights restoration act passed by congress to overturn the 1984 Supreme Court ruling, Grove City College v. Bell

1989 The Supreme Court in a series of rulings severely restricts the reach of Federal Anti Discrimination employment laws and remedies available to fight bias. The Move prompts congressional efforts to craft new law overturning the court decisions.

In 1989 John Conyers one of Congresses longest serving members, a founding member of the congressional black caucus, a strong Civil rights advocate, a member of the Congressional judiciary committee on the Courts, Administrative procedures, civil rights, civil liberties sub committees. Introduced HR 40 proposed legislation for four things: "It acknowledges the fundamental injustice and inhumanity of slavery It establishes a commission to study slavery, its subsequent racial and economic discrimination against freed slaves; It studies the impact of those forces on today's living African Americans; and The commission would then make recommendations to Congress on appropriate remedies to redress the harm inflicted on living African Americans." ¹⁶

¹⁶ This Bill has been introduced to Congress every year since 1989 through and including 2016 by representative Conyers. Its obviously an issue representative Conyers covets.

February 1990 Senator Edward Kennedy introduced the Civil Rights act of 1990.

March 1990 Justice Clarence Thomas was sworn in on nomination from President George H.W. Bush as a Federal Judge in the court of appeals for the Columbia district.

October of 1990 Senator Kennedy's civil rights legislation was vetoed by then President George H. W. Bush Ronald Reagan's successor. Commenting "The very commitment to justice and equality that is offered as the reason why this bill should be signed requires me to veto it."

July 1, 1991 Justice Clarence Thomas is nominated by President George H. W. bush to the Supreme Court of The United States.

July 11, 1991 The Congressional Black Caucus votes 19 to 1 to oppose the nomination of Judge Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court of the United States. Representative Edolphus Towns, the Brooklyn Democrat who headed the caucus, said that after members reviewed the nominee's civil rights record, the feeling was that "he was not the person to carry on the legacy of Thurgood Marshall." The vote by the caucus, which consists of 26 House members, was the first official act of opposition from a black group.¹⁷

July 17,1991 - "Of all the millions of people in America, surely President Bush can find a qualified nominee (for the Supreme Court) who has not built a career by hurting individual Americans," said Rep. Barbara Boxer (D., Calif.), flanked at a midday news conference by Reps. Edward R. Roybal (D., Calif.), chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, and John Lewis (D., Ga.), a member of the Congressional Black Caucus. As part of a small but growing movement seeking to block Thomas' confirmation, the three Democrats vowed to organize

¹⁷ NYTimes July 12 1991 black Caucus Votes to Oppose Thomas for high court seat.

grassroots lobbying efforts by the politically potent constituencies they said had suffered while Thomas was in charge of the anti-discrimination agency from 1982 until 1990. The National Organization for Women, the Congressional Black Caucus and a Hispanic group, the League of United Latin American Citizens, are already on record as opposing Thomas. Now, with the stakes much higher, Boxer said, "we're going to work for the good of our country to stop this nomination."¹⁸

September 4th 1991 Anita Hill is contacted by Gail Laster from the Senate Judiciary.

September 11-15 1991 Twenty First Annual Legislative weekend of the Congressional Black Caucus In the Program Address to Congressman Alan Wheat a founding member of the CBCF, Chair and congressman from Missouri said "An increasingly hostile Supreme Court has begun to chip away at the legal underpinnings of our nation's anti bias safety net and the current Administration has shown itself willing to play racial politics with legislative safeguards against discrimination."¹⁹

Congressman Mike Espy of Mississippi and chair of CBC said "A conservative majority on the Supreme Court is eroding hard won civil rights and liberties. Yet, the president would increase that conservative majority by replacing Thurgood Marshall, an unquestioned champion of civil rights, with Clarence Thomas."²⁰

September 16 1991 New York Times reports " Still, the variety of groups opposing the nomination are hoping that some senators can still be persuaded to vote against Judge Thomas, and the principal theme they will stress this week will be that he has been used by whites to advance a conservative agenda that will set back progress on civil rights. History of Criticism"

"The supporters of Judge Thomas have argued that traditional

¹⁸ Critics Assail Thomas Role at the Eeoc He wins support of Black group Nunn

¹⁹ See Reference footnote 15.

²⁰ See Reference footnote 15.

civil rights groups like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People oppose him because he is a threat to their monopoly on how to deal with civil rights issues.”

“As a Federal official charged with enforcing civil rights laws in the Reagan Administration, Clarence Thomas was involved in a series of bitter disputes with the principal civil rights groups. He rose to prominence in Republican political circles initially as a sharp critic of most racial-preference employment programs.”

“The campaign mounted by opponents will include members of the Congressional Black Caucus, which has voted to oppose the nomination”

Senator Howell Heflin, an Alabama Democrat on the committee, said “many of Judge Thomas's statements while he was chairman of the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission "appeared to be with the far right.”

September 10, 1991 Clarence Thomas Confirmation hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee begin.

September 24, 1991 Senator John Danforth of Missouri introduces a revised 1990 Civil Rights Bill into the Senate.

October 3, 1991 Governor Bill Clinton of Arkansas announces bid for President of United States.

October 6, 1991 Reports Surface two days before the scheduled Senate vote on Thomas s confirmation that law professor Anita Hill told the Senate Judiciary Committee that Thomas had sexually harassed her. The Senate vote is delayed a week.

October 12, 1991 Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas testify before the Senate Judiciary committee.

October 15, 1991 The U.S. Senate confirms Clarence Thomas by the narrowest margin in the 20th century 52 to 48.

October 21, 1991 Clarence Thomas is sworn in as Associate Justice of

U.S. Supreme Court.

November 6, 1991 Congressmen Alan Wheat of Missouri submits the Civil Rights Bill of 1992 for Congressional approval and the bill is passed.

November 21, 1991 The Civil Rights Act of 1991 is signed into law by President George H. W. Bush.