State NAACP Delegates Go to Work on Congressmen, See Some Good Done

Reports Before Mobilization Group Show Civil Rights Bills Can Be Enacted Now

WASHINGTON (NNPA) — After various State delegations had reported on the results of interviews with Senators and Representatives from their respective States, three members of Congress last Tuesday afternoon explained to the National Emergency Civil Rights Mobilization problems facing civil rights legislation.

A. Philip Randolph, co-chairman of the National Council for a Permanent FEPC, presided at the session in the Interdepartmental Auditorium at which Reps. Jacob Javits, of New York, Republican, and Ray J. Madden of Indiana, and Adam C. Powell of New York, both Democrats, were the speakers.

A total of 2,526 delegates were reported to have registered by Tuesday afternoon, with 600 more expected before the three-day conference closed.

The Interdepartmental Auditorium was filled to capacity with persons standing in the aisles and the back of the building.

Grumbling Over Screening

As the session went on, considerable grumbling was heard over the screening of delegates. A delegation was to meet with Roy Wilkins, acting secretary of the NAACP and chairman of the mobilization, to protest the screening.

Mr. Javits told the audience that fair employment practice legislation is now "an essential element" in United States foreign policy.

Advocating a coalition of liberal Democrats and progressive Republicans to insure passage of FEPC legislation, Mr. Javits said such a coalition would have "superior voting power" over the coalition of Southern Democrats and conservative Republicans.

A Two-Party Affair

Mr. Randolph described the mobilization as "wholly non-partisan or bi-partisan." He said that both the delegates and the speakers were of both parties, and that the strategy of the mobilization was "to unite Republicans and Democrats back of FEPC."

"If all Republicans and Democrats in the North support FEPC legislation," he declared, "we can pass it despite the opposition of Southern Congressmen."

Mr. Madden, a member of the House Rules Committee, explained the resolution offered by Eugene Cox (Dem., Ga.), which would repeal the rule giving the chairmen of House legislative committee the right to bring up legislation on the floor if the Rules Committee failed to act within 21 days after a committee has favorably reported a bill.

Sees Act in Short Time

The proposed change would give the Rules Committee power to determine what legislation the House would consider.

"I do not believe the Congress will take a step backward and accept Cox's resolution," Madden said.

The Indiana Congressman also predicted that "civil rights will be an actuality within a very short time."

Mr. Powell, sponsor in the House of the anti-poll tax and FEPC bill, said that neither anti-lynching nor anti-poll tax legislation was any longer a problem.

"The problem the enemies of progress do not want us to solve," he said, "is the problem of FEPC, which will guarantee economic rights for the minorities of the nation."

Will Replace Dixiecrats

Reporting earlier for the Georgia delegation, George M. Wanamaker, an observer for the American Veterans Society of Atlanta, predicted that Negro voters will get rid of Senators Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell and replace them with more like-minded men.

Mr. Wanamaker, also an observer at the mobilization because Emory University had not yet approved the NAACP Council, which had been set up only last week.

The Rev. Robert Johnson, president of the NAACP State Conference of Illinois, said the Illinois delegates did not feel that Sens. Scott Lucas, the Majority Leader, and Paul Douglas, the junior Senator from their State, had taken the stand about mobilizing that they should have taken.

Some of us feel that there was just a little bit of deception on their part," the Rev. Mr. Johnson said.

Nearly Ends in Row

From other sources it was learned that the interview with Senators Lucas and Douglas initially ended in a row when the two attempted to explain that it was midnight impossible to get cloture and break up a filibuster on FEPC.

Attempting to explain his vote on the Bricker amendment to the housing bill last year, which would have forbidden race discrimination and segregation in public housing, his position on the Langer civil rights amendments to the oleomargarine bill that is now pending, Senator Douglas is said to have asked the delegation what they would do if they were in his place.

"What would you do if you were a colored man in this country?" Cliff Johnson, of Chicago, was quoted as asking Senator Douglas. The interview ended abruptly, with Mrs. Irene McCoy, of Chicago, thanking the two for the consideration.

There were approximately 250 delegates in the Illinois delegation.

Mrs. Osma Scurlock, a representative of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Indianapolis, said the Indiana delegation was to see Sens. Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner, Republicans, the next morning. There were 78 persons in the Indiana delegation.

Iowans' Reaction Favorable

Reporting for the Iowa delegation, Luther T. Glanton Jr., of Des Moines, said Sen. Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Republican, had said he would support cloture and an FEPC bill providing for voluntary compliance.

He reported that Sen. Guy M. Gillette, Democrat, had said he would support the Administration's FEPC bill and the anti-lynching bill but would not vote for a bill to abolish poll taxes because he believed such a measure unconstitutional.

The Rev. Edward A. Freeman, president of the Kansas City, Kan., Branch of the NAACP, reported that Rep. Errett P. Scrivener, Republican, was non-committal but had promised to study the civil rights proposals, while Rep. Albert M. Cole, also Republican, had given a favorable response.

Some For, Others Against

Reporting for the Massachusetts delegation of 19, Mrs. Thelma Keitley, of Springfield, said Rep. Foster Furcolo, Democrat, was for civil rights all the way, and that Rep. Donald W. Nicholson, Republican, said he would not vote for FEPC.

Mrs. Keitlen quoted Rep. Joseph W. Martin Jr., the Minority Leader, as saying that he will vote for FEPC in some form. She said Mr. Martin had said some Republicans did not feel kindly toward colored people because they had voted for the Democrats and thought they should go to their friends.

She also said Mr. Martin said the FEPC bill could be voted on early if the Majority Leader, John W. McCormack of Massachusetts wanted to bring it up.

Reporting for the Mississippi delegation, Percy Greene, editor of the Jackson Advocate, said his delegation recognized "the futility and impossibility of calling upon the gentlemen from Mississippi on a matter of this importance."

Smith Believed Converted

J. Mercer Burrell of Newark, N.J., said the Jersey delegation had called on Robert C. Hendrickson, Republican, and congratulated him on his forthright stand on civil rights "without any reservation or equivocation."

He said the group had to "convert" Sen. H. Alexander Smith, who had promised to re-examine his thinking and issue a statement in a few days clarifying his position.

The New York delegation was split. Charles L. Keller, president of the Brooklyn Branch of the NAACP, reported that both Sens. Irving M. Ives, Republican, and Herbert H. Lehman, Democrat, were lukewarm.

On the other hand, George Cranmore of the United Automobile Workers (CIO) reported that the stand of Senators Ives and Lehman was "definite and uncompromising" on FEPC.

Charles Lucas, of Cleveland, reported that Sen. Robert A. Taft, Republican, would take the leadership to invoke cloture on FEPC but had said some "amazing things" about the bill itself.

Mr. Lucas quoted Senator Taft as having said that the measure would force white workers off the job and replace them with colored workers, and that he was opposed to such legislation.

He also said the Ohio Senator had said he would support an FEPC bill providing for voluntary compliance but that he had no response to the fact that a voluntary FEPC has had no impact on the Cleveland labor market.

Who's Right and Who's Wrong in Mobilization?

(Continued From Page 1)

ranks which will be a long time healing. Lindsay White, militant president of the Harlem branch of the NAACP, who served notice on the acting secretary of the organization, that he will demand a showdown at the next meeting, also took exception to the manner in which officials of other branches had been given the right to disqualify bonafide NAACP members from a meeting supposedly sponsored by the NAACP.

Other leaders in Pennsylvania and Illinois have registered similar complaints.

Now that the smoke of battle has cleared away, the sponsors under the leadership of Mrs. Lucy Laney Slowe, dean of women at Howard University, are trying to analyze the situation in an effort to learn what went wrong and why.

Having allowed themselves to become drunk with power, and charged with super-patriotism, they turned like headhunters upon their own membership and began to whittle them to pieces, while the real enemy looked on with unsuppressed glee.

Here we saw a group assembled for the purpose of putting down, simply means the abolition of all civil rights because of color—depriving civil rights to others because of their opinions.

This was a classic travesty on reason and common sense.

When intelligence of the impending invasion first reached Capitol Hill, the Dixiecrats threw up their hands and yelled frantically to the Republican allies for lend-lease votes to ward off the onslaught.

No Need for Worry

Imagine their surprise when they peeked over their ramparts and instead of seeing an army of determined and united liberals bearing down upon them, all they saw was a disorganized and confused mass of self-seekers bristling among themselves over who was "right" and who was "right" in the "middle of the road."

Then the Dixiecrat legislators laid down their arms and resumed their chibbage, confident that the liberals would battle but nothing to do with civil rights.

Lindsay White is justified in condemning the national officers of the NAACP for failing to spare members of his own body embarrassment and humiliation.

Sympathize With Him

But Mr. White is wrong in laying all of the blame at the feet of actionists. Roy Wilkins may not deserve, but he certainly needs, his sympathy. If in the school auditorium, he was otherwise tricked into being the dupe of cleverer men, Mr. Wilkins was certainly the one.

Although it was not apparent, due to the initiate, at first, Mr. Wilkins must realize by now that the so-called civil rights mobilization was in fact a mechanism to demobilize the NAACP, weaken its effectiveness and remove it from its position as the only powerful spokesman for the colored people.

Mr. Wilkins felt strongly about trap, baited no doubt by the promise that it be repudiated the leftists he would get fatter cheese.

The only thing that has been accomplished by this assinity is the weakening of liberal forces—the one vote was picked up from the Republican alliance.

Just what were the sinister forces behind this movement? The answer is simple the CIO.

It is no secret that that once militant organization which was once the haven and great white hope of colored labor had been exposed for its destruction of the race

They Compromised Once

It was common knowledge in informed circles that the CIO would not pedal civil rights legislation if the Dixiecrats would help repeal the Taft-Hartley Law.

In purging left-wing unions, the CIO implemented this promise by expelling its most liberal and vocal bodies.

But the expelled unions struck back by exposing the grand strategy.

This caused a split and infuriated the rank and file colored workers and initiated the action and series of double-cross and sell-out revelations among the ranks.

The big shots put their heads together and came up with the Machiavellian scheme to accomplish two purposes.

It was to pacify their own constituents and to sabotage the NAACP by proving that the CIO was not hardening in its attitude.

The second was to credited spokesman for the colored people, Mr. Wilkins felt strongly about the liberals, and even when there were the Communists to use as shipping boys neither party passed any civil rights measures.

By what stretch of the imagination can any sane leader believe that simply by denouncing the Reds that civil rights will become any more palatable to the Dixie diehards?