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**Evers ‘Lost’ After Shooting**

**Los Angeles, California** — Charles Evers sits in his hotel room near the site of the assassination of his brother, the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., earlier today. His face is wrapped in bandages, and the press conference taking place behind him, along with the many other activities going on around him, is a stark contrast to the events of the past few days.

**BY JOHN CREIGHTON**

**Poor People March to Federal Agencies**

Washington, D.C. — The Poor People’s Campaign this week staged daily marches and protests at different government agencies. The marches were aimed at highlighting the need for action on a variety of issues, including poverty, unemployment, and discrimination.

**BY JOHN CREIGHTON**

**Still 800 Miles To Go**

**Minneapolis, Minnesota** — Traffic was light on I-94 Friday afternoon, as the MSCF (Mimeograph Service Center for Blacks) ended its 800-mile drive from Washington, D.C., to Minneapolis. The MSCF, a nonprofit organization, has been on the road for the past few weeks, spreading its message of peace and understanding.

**BY JOHN CREIGHTON**
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**$32 for $42 in Stamps**

**Is It Such a Bargain?**
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EDITORIAL OPINION

Picketing the Court

A few more incidents like last week's throw-throwing hit at the U.S. Supreme Court building could mean disaster for the Four-Pound teaches.

The rock-throwing stuff is bad on the P.M. But even if it was actually thrown at the Supreme Court building, it would be bad news for the Court.

In the first place, it's almost certain that the Supreme Court will not serve

a few of the cases from Washington charging delinquency before it—before a series of

cases from Washington charging delinquency before it—before a series of

these cases.

Because the most crucial of the litigation cases from Washington charging delinquency

are being given fiscally rights "in context" with other citizens, it is time that the

people in this country get a chance to see the operations of the Court.

The most crucial of the litigation cases from Washington charging delinquency

are being given fiscally rights "in context" with other citizens, it is time that the

people in this country get a chance to see the operations of the Court.

That was said, so the Court has the final yard, and all the opportunity to get its

sightings to the public with the help of the public's counsel.

In deciding these disputes, the Court is concerned only with the law

and conditions of the people involved, rather than with the amount of

the people involved, rather than with the amount of

one's income.

For Faculty Integration

"C-Day" in Jefferson

NEW ORLEANS, La.—A school board to be established here by June 30 will
take over the operation of schools in two predominantly Negro

areas.
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evident since the 1940's.
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People Are Welcome

Livingston Park Zoo, Jackson, Miss.

Photos by Jim Peppler
Miss Pettway Goes to the Prom, Rural Family Gets a New Stove

BY ESTELLE PERRY

HOLLY SPRINGS, Miss. -- Mrs. Lillie Mae Pettway said she didn’t regret sending her children to school, even though her sharecropper husband didn’t have the money to send them. She earned it slowly, “the best thing I ever learned,” she said. “I just did the best I could.”

“My husband made us.” Mrs. Pettway, 69, is a teacher who has taught for 50 years and has 8 children. She is a member of the local community, and has been involved in many community projects.

She said that her husband was a sharecropper and she was a teacher. She has been teaching for 50 years and has 8 children. She is a member of the local community and has been involved in many community projects.

Law Alone Cannot End Racism, Attorney Tells Tuskegee Group

BY MARY E. ALLEN

TUSKEGEE, Ala.--“The American system thus far has failed in very important respects,” said Samuel W. Allen, dean of the Center for Law and Social Action Services.
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Appeals Judge Agrees With Dallas Farmers

BREWER DODGES HITS DEATH-PENALTY RATING

High Court Displeases Brewer

The U.S. Supreme Court, in a 7-2 decision, ruled last week against the state of Texas in the capital case of 27-year-old John P. Ronald of Dallas, who was sentenced to death for the 1966 murder of a public servant. The court agreed with the appeals court that the state had violated the 9th and 14th Amendments when it refused to assign a death penalty to the state for murder, saying that it would not be done.
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The U.S. Supreme Court, in a 7-2 decision, ruled last week against the state of Texas in the capital case of 27-year-old John P. Ronald of Dallas, who was sentenced to death for the 1966 murder of a public servant. The court agreed with the appeals court that the state had violated the 9th and 14th Amendments when it refused to assign a death penalty to the state for murder, saying that it would not be done.

The court said that the state's refusal to assign a death penalty was unconstitutional, and that the state had no right to do so. The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convicted of murder.

The court also said that the state had no right to refuse to assign a death penalty to Ronald, because he had already been convi
The Freedom Quilting Bee

The Freedom Quilting Bee is a handcrafted quilt composed of prisoners working together or at home. Each quilt is sewn by a group of prisoners, family members, or friends. The quilts are sold to raise money for various civil rights organizations.

Alabama Christian Movement For Human Rights

The Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights (ACM) is a civil rights organization founded in 1946. It was established to address issues of racial discrimination and segregation in Alabama, working to achieve equality and justice for all citizens.

ACM vice-president for the past 10 years, Bernice King, who concluded the meeting last Sunday—said it was hard to know how many of the many observations that were made during the week will lead to meaningful changes. "We've been to many meetings and we've heard a lot of talk about change," she said. "But now it's time to put those talks into action."

Gettin’ Better All the Time

By Michael S. Lotterm

BIRMINGHAM, Ala.—Hundreds of people gathered last Saturday for the 12th annual celebration of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights. It marked the 50th anniversary of the first ACM meeting in 1946.

The event attracted people from all over the state, as well as from other parts of the country. ACM members, including Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., were on hand to share their experiences and to encourage others to continue the struggle for civil rights.

The ACM was founded in 1946 by civil rights activists who sought to address the issue of racial discrimination in Alabama. Since its inception, the organization has worked to promote equality and justice for all citizens, and has played a significant role in the civil rights movement.

Despite facing many challenges along the way, the ACM remains committed to its mission and continues to work towards a more just and equitable society.