

THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Oral History Office

PARREN J. MITCHELL  
Member of Congress

Interviewed by Susan Conwell

The Governor Theodore McKeldin-Dr. Lillie May Jackson Project  
An inquiry into the Civil Rights activities  
of  
two Maryland leaders  
during  
the mid-twentieth century

OH 8170

August 12, 1976

Baltimore, Maryland

6/20/76

McKeldin-Jackson Project  
Interviewee: Parren J. Mitchell  
Interviewer: Susan Conwell  
Date: August 12, 1976  
Place: Federal Building, Suite 1018  
Transcriber: Garnette Brant  
Cassette I Side 1:1

I: I think the best place to start is if you could just give me a quick run-down on your background and how you first got interested, shall we say--it's a euphemistic question-- in civil rights or how you first became active. I know that there's a story that your brother tells about a lynching that he witnessed.

A: Yes. That was part of it. I love my brother very much as most people know, and to see him that evening at supper, that my family ate all together, to see him not be able to eat because of that; and the thing, I guess, that upset me most was --really, I didn't know what a lynching was. I was a little child. But whatever the thing was that had hurt him so badly, the fact that he was hurt, I guess, really started sparking my interest in this.

Then years ago, it must have been in the late thirties or early forties, there was something in Baltimore known as the City Wide Young Peoples Forum. I remember my brother Clarence taking me there, and I was young. But it was a fascinating experience to see black artists and black educators come and lecture, sing. Out of that City Wide Young Peoples Forum, as you know, came the first challenge to the segregation at the University of Maryland Law School, the Donald Murray Case. One of the participants in that Forum was Thurgood Marshall. A whole host of new level of leadership came into the city as a

result of that City Wide Young Peoples Forum. Although I was very young at that time I was old enough to understand exactly what was being said in terms of the discrimination, the racism.

As a result of that, I remember one of my first picketing ventures was at Ford's Theater when at that time black people could only sit in their third balcony, and I remember night after night being there on that picket line, and the actual ugliness, the hostility on the part of some of the whites that crossed the picket line; oh, who were just annoyed because we were there, and then the encouragement that came from some of the others. From that point on it was just one thing after another. Once you got into it, events were breaking fast, and that's the way it happened.

I: Wasn't Dr. Jackson fairly active in supporting and encouraging the City Wide Young Peoples Forum at the time?

A: Oh, yes. She was the prime mover behind almost every forward looking thing in civil rights at that time. Again, I can recall when I was very young going to the NAACP rallies, and they were always dramatic and exciting and she generally spoke toward the end of them, and she always just turned the crowd on. The people gave up their money willingly, because of two things: Because she was a dynamic personality and, secondly, they could see the result of the NAACP effort. They could see either the fight on or some things being changed. So, once you get in it you lose a kind of time perspective. I can't remember what I did next, what rally was next, what picket line was next, but I know that from that point on I was knee deep in it.

I: Was Dr. Jackson also encouraging or helpful when you filed suit against the University of Maryland? This was later, of course.

A: Yes. It was an NAACP sponsored court suit, but, quite frankly, no one in my family suggested that I make that move. Of course, everyone in my family, including Dr. Jackson, was very supportive once I made it. But we're a very curious family. We generally make our own decisions, and then almost inevitably the family rallies around. I had not told anyone that I was going to file a suit against the University of Maryland until I made up my mind to do it and it was filed. Then, at that point everyone was with me. Just to illustrate it further, when I first ran for Congress, my family called me up and said, "Why didn't you tell us you were planning to...?" But, certainly to the extent that she represented the NAACP, she was the NAACP. To that extent, obviously, she was supportive of breaking down segregation.

I: I guess, when you say she was the NAACP she also had the support of such prominent leaders as Carl Murphy as well? Right? What kind of relationship did they have from your perspective?

A: Brother-Sister. It was just that close. As I understand it, Carl Murphy saw the necessity for an NAACP. Obviously he could not run an NAACP, and he saw the qualities that Lillie Jackson had and just backed her all the way.

I: During the fifties--I'll try and stick to a chronology, even, it's not possible....

A: You weren't even born during the fifties.

I: I was born during the fifties. I just don't remember half of them. That was at the time McKeldin was then Governor and from what I gather this was also the time when the NAACP, and I guess the Urban League and a few other organizations tried to band together in a sense and fight segregation at different levels. Did you participate in that at all? In the desegregation of beaches, integration of swimming pools, these movements?

A: Oh, yes. I remember quite well the terrible situation we had with the desegregation of the pools, and that, as you know, went on for quite a period of time, went on really up to the time when I served as the Director of the Human Relations Commission for the State. I recall one Sunday afternoon going out to Baltimore County and sitting down with Josh Cockey and representatives of the county government to try to get that facility desegregated. The same thing was true with ~~Gwynn~~ Oak Park.

I: Can you tell me a little more about what you were doing at the time? How it worked out?

A: No. I can't. I really can't. You know, that's twenty some years ago and a lot has gone on in my life. I remember one time we were marching--what was the real tough swimming pool in the city? I can't even think of the name of it. But a group of us were marching one Saturday; the small kids and everybody else just banded together and decided we would go over there and those kids were going to get in that pool, and it got kind of rough. But I was not in a leadership role during that time, in certain.....It was just a matter of using my body, of using

whatever ability I had to pull some other people into the movement.

I: Do you have any idea how funds were raised? Say, in this period and later?

A: Constantly through the NAACP. Constantly. A part of the genius of Dr. Jackson was that she always kept something going. If there was not a mass rally by the NAACP, then she instituted the "Living Dolls" where the little children got awards and that kind of thing. There was always something and it was always a money raising kind of activity that succeeded. Sharp Street Church, at least once a month there was an NAACP function with funds being raised. In fact, as you know, under her leadership the Baltimore Branch generally sent more money to New York than any other Branch.

I: Yes, that's right. What kind of relationship did she and McKeldin have at this period? A lot of people have said that, I mean, you can get a different view on a politician depending on who you talk to and what kind of relationship they had with him. Some people have said that he acted pragmatically when it came to civil rights, and others said that this was really what he believed. In the term of his Governorship, I gather he had a close relationship with Dr. Jackson.

A: Very close.

I: How would you characterize his role in that period other than making appointments, first in many different fields?

A: There's no doubt in my mind that--there's no doubt that he was sincere. I don't think he was primarily motivated by political considerations. Now, I got to know him much better

when I served under him, and I'm just convinced that he recognized segregation and discrimination as being just something evil and wrong.

I: Did he come out in support of demonstrators or, I mean, I know that he went many times to different places, to Sandy Point and to different beaches and to different areas to try and calm things down when they got rough.

A: I mean, I think his presence was always considered as support. He was well thought of by the black ministers throughout the state, obviously was held in high esteem with the NAACP with Dr. Jackson, and even if he came for other reasons--and I'm not saying that he did--but even if he came for other reasons, his mere presence there would be interpreted by many of us as support. Certainly no one would have thought of him as being the kind of guy who was there to thwart what we were trying to do.

I: How did he come to appoint you in 1963?

A: It was very strange. I did not seek that position. Apparently a group of black leaders in the city decided that they wanted me to take that position. Once again, I don't think that my family was consulted on this. But once that other group had arrived at the decision, obviously my family was totally supportive, and I think the then Mayor recognized that it might be feasible and sensible to appoint someone who had that kind of broad based support in the black community.

I hesitated for almost a week before I took that job. I wasn't sure that I wanted it, but that's how it came about.

Then I was glad that I did take it. Fortunately for me, Mayor McKeldin never really treated me as the Director of an Anti-Poverty Program per se; I really became a part of his Cabinet.

I: Could you tell me who that group of black leaders was and were they people who at the time were very close to McKeldin, or were they people that he sought out as recognized leaders of the community?

A: I don't think they were people who were necessarily close to him. For example, involved in that was Walter Carter. Reverend Vernon Dobson was another involved. I think that Martin Jenkins at Morgan was a part of that group. There were about fifty some people who had apparently met without my knowledge and kicked this issue around and said, "O.K., you take it. You go with it." And they translated that, too. Furman Templeton was in that group.

I: Now, in other words, was it Dr. Sands who had resigned? Was that his name. I can't recall.

A: No. He was with the State Commission. It was--well, there's Carter, wasn't it?

I: Yes.

A: Walter Carter.

I: And so they met, in other words, and McKeldin heard of the meeting...?

A: No. They went to him.

I: Then went to him?

A: They went to him and said, "The position has got to be filled and we're recommending one person. One person only."



Now, I was not in that meeting with McKeldin and those people, and, obviously, I didn't know whether he wanted me in there. He didn't know me that well as a person. I don't know whether he'd planned, of options, but I do know that when we finally met, it was cordial and he was quite honest with me. He said, "I'll give you as much free rein as you want to get the job done." I said, "Fine. On that basis I'll take it."

I: Were you disappointed later? Did you find that there were other pressures acting? Did you have...?

A: No. No. That was after. That was one of the most enjoyable parts of my life--fighting a City Council that did not want an Anti-Poverty Program, and I don't think that McKeldin had conceived of me playing an activist role. But when I decided that that was the way it had to be done, he never tried to stop me. No. I enjoyed every bit of it under his regime.

I: And then later you didn't?

A: Well. Then we got a new Mayor. My first impression was that a new Mayor wanted his man in there, although Tommy D'Alesandro and I are close friends and he asked me to stay on. But there would have been a major difference. McKeldin was the consulting, delegating Mayor. He loved to get every idea possible and then say, "O.K. Now this is yours. You run with it." My first conception was that Tommy wanted to be a strong, a very strong independent Mayor, making all the decisions. I just didn't think I'd be happy in that situation. Maybe I would have been. In the ensuing years I've gotten to know D'Alesandro better and better and I like him more and more. I think he's a great guy.

I: Did McKeldin call on you or consult you during the disturbances in the early period in '63-'64 in Cambridge?

A: Yes. You see, during that time I was with the State Human Relations Commission and I just criss-crossed the state. Every night I was in some other part of the state and was quite involved down there in Cambridge. In fact, for a period of two weeks I would leave my office on Preston Street and drive down to Cambridge every night.

He did evolve the same practice that he followed when I worked with him later on heading the Anti-Poverty Program. He just told me, "You do what you think is best to clean this situation up." And I told him that as far as I was concerned there was only going to be one way, and that was for the barriers to fall down. He said, "Well, they should." I don't recall a single instance in which he said, "O.K. You can't do this." Though I was really playing a kind of schizophrenic role, I guess. I was supposed to be mediating, but I would participate in all the demonstrations and the marches, and he never quarreled with that.

I: Who else was working with you to do the mediating? I understand that there are other people who became even more prominent in 1968, Colonel Harris and Gloria Richardson.....in a different role.

A: Yes. Right. The thing could not be mediated by the State. That was clear, primarily because of the political considerations of Eastern Shore Delegates and Senators. Harris was primarily, as I recall his role, he was primarily the person

there to make sure that the violence did not get out of hand. I don't recall him being very much involved in the actual mediating process. Gloria Richardson was quite probably not interested in mediating their problems, and I think she was quite right. You know, there couldn't have been any concessions there. It was not a compromise situation at all. Either you served people or you didn't. As you well know, as a result of that we were able to get the State Wide Public Accommodations Law through and things like that.

I: Do you think that the Public Accommodations Law and the Omnibus Civil Rights Act had any kind of immediate effect?

A: Indeed, yes. It was just so visible. The effect was so, had so much impact that almost in a week's period all protests just stopped. Gosh, I can't remember. One of the restaurants on 50 going down to--is it 50 goes down to the Eastern Shore? Yes. I remember this guy threatening me and the others with a shotgun on his porch. Then I remember right after the Public Accommodations Law, we were graciously served. Not a bit of problem. Now that wasn't--of course there were still pockets of resistance. Some of the restaurants in lower Prince Georges still tried to resist and I used to take them out there, subpoenas to come before the Commission. But I think it was important that the law had been passed and people knew that they were then protected under the law, and they didn't have to be out there.

I: This may come a little later in the period, O.K.? My mind isn't too good on dates. What about the charges of police brutality that came up? I remember one date. It might have been a little later, I think.

A: Yes. It was in the sixties. There had been periodic charges.

I: As I recall, there were a couple of charges, one or two, that came up before '65. And, then, of course, there were ones after that.

A: There have been many. Right after World War II, or during World War II, the charges of police brutality just on Pennsylvania Avenue against servicemen were--this was really a tinderbox situation. I remember the one case that brought everything to a head was a serviceman who had been beaten so badly he had lost an eye. And then periodically this would come up. It really should come up now, but it doesn't.

I think the high point came when the community just got so aroused by police brutality that they forced the then Commissioner of Police Schmidt--he was forced out of office. He, simply condoned it. He never made any attempt to save..... I know that there are good policemen, bad policemen. I'll take care of the bad ones. I'll do something. No. He simply ignored the black community, and as the result of a lot of pressure, he was finally ousted.

I: Who administered that pressure?

A: That was the total black community. Primarily, it was and again by the NAACP, but the Urban League, I recall, was quite active in that under Furman Templeton. And the ministers, who always, you know, had a leadership role in our community, were quite active in it.

I: Of course, in the later period, in the more recent period, there have been conflicts regarding strategies and actions to take and ways of perceiving how to do what has to be done.

Did Dr. Jackson run up against these problems before the disturbances in '68 with the Urban League and with ...?

A: Oh, sure.

I: Or did they work together?

A: Well, they always worked together. But there was--you had two philosophical differences, not in terms of personalities but in terms of agencies. I guess we are lucky in that when an issue was really joined, those differences just fell apart and they were able to act together very well. But not on all things. I recall, oh, the many, many criticisms I heard of Dr. Jackson. "She stirs up trouble. She makes hostility between the races." You know--some of the same things they say about me that are not true.

I: Who was directing these criticisms other than in the black communities? I mean, that could have been constant, but were there any particular times when criticism was.....?

A: Oh, yes. In the early forties and in the mid fifties. I recall one meeting with Dr. Pullen who was then State Superintendent of Schools in which there was severe criticism of the NAACP that Lillie Jackson was merely creating tension between the races by trying to desegregate the schools. And you've got to remember that in the black community that it's not a monolithic community. There were always some who felt that it's far better to sit down and talk than to throw a picket line out. That's in all groups.

I: In the more recent period, since the disturbances of 1968 or in that period, how did Dr. Jackson, what kind of attitude did she take toward the more militant groups--the Black Panthers, the Black Muslims, the Soul School, the Breakfast Program, things like that? Well, that's a little, maybe a year or two before the disturbances as well.

A: Yes. I don't recall hearing her condemn any of those groups, but obviously she did not work with them. Many of those groups were totally oriented toward black identity whereas the NAACP's position has always been a position of integration. That was one fundamental difference between that group and Soul School and the other organizations. I know she supported the idea of militancy in terms of picketing and demonstration. I think she had some real concern about when the demonstrations spilled over into violence.

I'm trying to remember whether there was ever a real confrontation between the NAACP and any of those groups, and I just don't think it happened. I think that they recognized the NAACP's position. That group recognized their position and they just never collided.

I: What about the Free Breakfast Program that the Panthers set up here? Did she lend it any support?

A: I don't know. I just don't know.

I: What kind of relationship did you have with these groups at that time?

A: Pretty good, I think. I had no problem going to Soul School and working with the Panthers. It was never a problem for me. In fact, I'll see many of them again on Sunday at

the rally out at Hopkins with Angela Davis. Some of the old crowd will be out there and we'll greet each other as brothers. No, I was very lucky in that sense that I think I was totally accepted by them, and I accepted almost everything that they wanted to do.

I: During the disturbances then did you again play a mediating role or try?

A: No. That was not a mediating situation because there was no one to sit down and talk with. My role primarily at that time was, I immediately moved in terms of food and housing and care for people, and we simply used the Community Action Agency Headquarters for donations of food distribution points. People who were frightened out of their homes, one or two homes that had been burned out. People living above stores--we found homes for them. Like so many other people during that week, I just walked. That was all I could do.

I remember Walter Carter so well. And you know who he was. Just a great human being. About the second or third night we were in East Baltimore in my car and ran into a milk bottle barrage that scared the devil out of both of us, and we just-- I said, "Walter, what shall we do?" He said, "What can we do but sit here?" And we did. And then we finally got out of the car and just yelled, "Hey, Brothers!" You know? And started walking in the area, and it worked out fine. They were kids, 16, 17. They said they were sorry, you know? But, I think the way you handle a situation like that is to just constantly move and talk since there's no group that you can bring in to sit down to talk with. You've got to go out and make individual

small group contacts. Listen. Listen. Most unusual experience.

I: Did you work closely with David Glenn or with Joe Smith in D'Alesandro's office?

A: No. I didn't. I preferred to handle it my way, and I saw only two things for me to do. One was to help take care of people who needed things--take care of them through the Community Action Agency; and the other was to be out there walking, always with somebody, you know, who was identified as not being an enemy.

I: Did you work with the Black United Front at all at the time? I understand pretty much that what they were trying to do was well, just being out there.

A: Yes. I remember the general who was in command of the National Guard Troops sent into the city. I asked permission to see him, and saw him then in the Armory, and all of his aides were absolutely awe-struck when I said I wanted to issue some passes to certain people. I wanted to get passes for Soul School, Black United Front, Danny Gant, and CORE. There was a hot and heavy session down there, but I finally won, and it made sense. Those were the people who should have been in the streets. And they got their passes.

I: Just out of curiosity, what kind of a role did Walter Lively play in that time?

A: I found Walter to be just tremendously helpful. I recall one night on Gay Street when we were walking together--and he had a tremendous impact on people. You know there were always those who accused him of having been behind, stimulating



the thing. But I have no reason to believe that he was. I just found him to be really a godsend during that time.

I: While you were working on this end of things, how would you characterize the role of David Glenn, Joe Smith, of that whole other side?

A: I can't. Because I was completely divorced from that. I don't know what they were doing, really. Because it was another operation, I suppose, at another level. And it was all I could do to keep up with my part that I had sort of picked out for myself.

I: I'd like to go back just a little bit now, that we're on that subject, but it will just take us back one or two years to the Veney Brothers Case. I wondered if we could talk a little bit about that. I interviewed Tucker Dearing the other day and he was discussing the tremendous support that the NAACP gave to the case and in really bringing it to highlight. I was reminded by your comments about police brutality and people not talking about it as much today.

A: Well, the importance of that case, I think, is best illustrated by the fact that now when something untowards takes place in the black community, they say it's just like the Veney Case. That's how angry people were about that situation. The NAACP did a heck of a job, but here was one time in which the NAACP was just overwhelmingly supported because the people were just that angry. There was no justification. There was no excuse for that kind of thing.

I: Do you think that that helped greatly in effecting changes?

A: Oh, no doubt about it.

I: Do you think that if McKeldin had chosen to run again and had been re-elected that he would have been able to handle the situation in 1968? Do you think he was that kind of a person?

A: Yes. Let me just tell you one or two stories about that guy. He was really fantastic. I said I really became a part of his staff, and I remember going to Washington with him in his great big Cadillac. We went before some Committee of the Senate or the House. The details are vague, and we came back through Washington Boulevard, and at one corner there were a group of eight or ten young white guys that just looked so tough, you know. They really looked like thugs; and we were at the light and we were in the car in air conditioning. It was stifling outside and these guys were just glaring at us. McKeldin said, "Roll the window down." He said, "I want to thank you, my Brothers, you've got your Mayor riding in nice, comfortable air conditioning."

I said, "What is wrong with this man?" He said, "You're supposed to thank the people." He said, "Wait a minute." He told the driver, "Pull over. Pull over." When we went through the light, he said, "Let's get out and go over and thank them." And I went with him and he just completely disarmed those guys. That's the kind of personality that he would have demonstrated during that situation.

Knowing him as I did, immediately after King's assassination, he would have planned four or five vigils and things to pull people in to keep them busy. That's what he would have done.

The other--I was trying to tell you the kind of personality that he was and how that would have helped in that situation. On another occasion we were traveling around the city. This was in a black neighborhood, in the summer, and I don't recall whether it was East Baltimore or West Baltimore, but we got in one area where the corner was just covered with young teenagers, males, and I suppose these were 18-19, etc. I am sure they were shooting crap as we pulled up and as we walked up there. Most of those guys by that time, most of them had gotten to know me and they would yell, "Hey, Parren," or "Brother Parren," or something like that. And McKeldin just moved right into that situation, slapping backs, "Hey, how you fellows doing? Now, I'm going to be walking around in this neighborhood and I want you to be my unofficial bodyguard." And they did. It was gimmickry. Sure, it was. But it worked.

You probably would be better off not putting this in your official records, but I think it's worth repeating, how I assessed McKeldin, particularly toward the end. He over-promised. He couldn't deliver all the things that he promised. We knew that in the black community. I put it very crudely to many people. I say, "You know, we knew that McKeldin was conning us to a certain extent. He knew that we knew he was conning us, and it made for a beautiful relationship." You know? There was always a kind of statement made, "How he gets away with! That's one smooth guy." But it was that kind of understanding that he couldn't deliver everything that he promised. We knew it. He'd stand up there and promise everything, but because of that personality we never really got angry with him. He was just a

good guy. That's all. You know his favorite picture was-- he was on a play lot one time with some black kids, and they were shooting basketball. He said that they told him to shoot and the photographer caught it, and it went right through the hoop by sheer accident, I'm sure. And these kids were just honestly ecstatic around him and that's what the photographer caught. He's up in the air and the kids are up in the air, and that was his favorite picture. O.K. Enough? I'm not even dealing with the details you want.

I: I think we've covered quite a few of the details, sort of sliding along them. One other thing I did want to ask you about, and that was--this is shooting back a little--as to the passage of the Ober Laws and to Capital Punishment. I'll put this in a peculiar way, I guess, but I realize that McKeldin did appoint Judge Carter who promptly took a very firm and discriminatory stand, and yet McKeldin always professed to be against Capital Punishment. How would you assess his attitude, looking back on it and his views toward it, and also Dr. Jackson's views and feelings about it?

A: You know, I just can't remember discussing Capital Punishment with her. I would just assume that she would oppose it, but I don't remember any time discussing that with her. Insofar as the Ober Laws are concerned, I think that McKeldin, for all of his good-heartedness was also still a politician, and remember, this was really the era in which--I'm smiling because we're right back in that same era--we are. We've got to spend a hundred and thirteen billion dollars for defense because the Russians are coming. But it was at that time when the hysteria

had been whipped up, and I think his political sense said, "O.K., you've got to move there." Also, I think that he could foresee the shortness of, he could foresee that certain problems were not going to be of long duration. He said, "O.K., I'll go with this because it's going to fall apart four years from now." That would be my hunch, not based on any discussion particularly that I had with him on this. But he was a politician, and, obviously, he yielded sometimes in terms of the public climate or what appeared to be the climate.

But I would add very quickly, I would not see him, for example, yielding if now suddenly there were a resurgence of overt racism, I don't think he would yield in that area. I honestly don't. I think he'd take a beating rather than yield it. O.K.?

I: Do you have any idea how he reacted to the report on Discriminatory Sentencing of the Supreme Bench that Judge Howard published?

A: No.

I: Or any reaction on the part of the NAACP or had they been helpful at all, or had they done any work of this kind?

A: Yes. Throughout all the years the NAACP had always been hitting on lily-white justice and I don't know--to the best of my knowledge, this was a totally independent thing done by Joe Howard. But it certainly received enthusiastic, the report received enthusiastic support from the NAACP. In fact, when there was an attempt to oust Joe from the State's Attorney's Office because of that report, I know that there was an NAACP

rally at which he spoke. At which Howard spoke.

I: Do you have any idea who was behind the oust attempt?

A: I think it was the then State's Attorney. Who was that? I can't recall who it was at that time.

I: I can't remember it offhand. It's a very familiar name. But there was a rally in support?

A: Oh. Yes.

I: And then later, of course, he ran on the ticket with now Judge Allen and Paul Chester. I've been told that that ticket was in some sense a culmination of real victory for the black community. Is this so?

A: No doubt about it. What Joe Howard did in '68 really then made it possible for me to win in '70.

I: Really? It was that strong?

A: Yes. It was just such a significant breakthrough. I'm not saying that I would not have won, but I'm saying that the upness of the community had reached the point where I felt, you know, you can really go with this.

I: Are there any particular factors that you could point to in this tremendous victory in two years, and then what seems to have been at least some kind of factionalism in more recent years--the last couple of years--the kinds of things that you would look at and...

A: Yes. I think that's inevitable. I think it's a kind of Tammany Hall representing one faction as opposed to another faction. I'm convinced that the Irish--well, we have evidences of it yet, the city.....I think that's just an inevitable part

of the, in politics.

I: Has the NAACP played as strong a role as it did when Dr. Jackson was President?

A: No. No. It hasn't. For many reasons, obviously, you don't get a woman like Lillie Jackson every year. Secondly, the present NAACP has to fight racism and discrimination, which is very smooth. It's a little easier to fight the overt, naked things than it is to fight the more subtle things. Thirdly, at least in theory, there is machinery at the city, state, and federal level to do what the NAACP was doing. So I think all of those things account for the difference between that organization under her and the present organization. That's somewhat true, also, of the Baltimore Urban League. Templeton became a much more militant Urban League type, but he was facing a different problem. Tired now.

INDEX

Veney Brothers' Case 16

Young People's Forum 1-2