

OH 8129

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Oral History Office

REVEREND FRANK WILLIAMS

Interviewed by Michael Louis

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

July 22, 1976

Washington, D. C.

Interviewee: Rev. Frank Williams
Interviewer: Michael Louis
Place: Washington, D. C.
Date: July 22, 1976
Transcriber: Jean Herbert

I; Side 1: 1

I. Rev. Williams, I believe we can begin this interview with some information about yourself. What brought you to take an active role in civil rights in Baltimore?

A. Well, I guess, I've always had a deep interest in acquiring rights for myself, and also for those I've been privileged to serve as minister. I grew up in South Carolina, where I saw gross abuse of human beings, particularly the blacks. And even then I resolved that if I ever got the chance, I would be a participant in bringing rights to my people.

And, in Baltimore I had the privilege of meeting Miss Lillie Jackson who was really, a source of inspiration to me. It may be that I've come later to see and to appreciate the thrust she made and impact she made on my life. It wasn't as obvious at the offset as it is to me now.

I. Would you say that she started you really on the civil rights struggle in Baltimore? Mrs. Jackson?

A. In Baltimore, yes. I had an affinity for that and shared lightly in the thrusts that were being in Washington where I served before I went to Baltimore. So having gone to Baltimore, it was intensified with Mrs. Jackson drawing us into an active and participating role in the N.A.A.C.P.

I. What year was that? When did you come into Baltimore?

A. I went to Baltimore in 1949, and I served a church in East Baltimore, Christ United Methodist Church in East Baltimore. That is located on the corner of Chase and Washington Streets.

I. What was the nature of the struggle at that time, in

1949, do you remember?

A. Well, at the offset, when I went into Baltimore, it was not overt as the expression grew later. I think the main thrust of it in Baltimore, as I came to know it, was largely through the N.A.A.C.P. with Mrs. Jackson as its chief spokesman, shared in it by her daughter, Mrs. Mitchell. I think she was the most outspoken and articulate person announcing the struggle at the time, and maybe the leverage behind the N.A.A.C.P., but she was a good representative of it.

I. What was the main thrust then? Was it in demonstrations, can you remember or court cases?

A. As I can recall, it was, but they had not taken on such proportions as they did later, I think particular places were being picketed. Like the University of Maryland, which had denied entry of blacks. That is, some of the schools there located in Baltimore. And some of the eating places, and I think a store or two. These were the initial ones, as I can recall.

I. In 1949, what would you say was the role of somebody like McKeldin in the civil rights' struggle in Baltimore?

A. This has been kind of an enigma to me, because McKeldin's role has never been clear. I can hear McKeldin speak, and beyond articulation, I really don't know what he did, at least he spoke with a rather clear voice. And I guess if what a man says gives others hope, that measure of hope, I guess, at its earliest moments came through the way he spoke. I do not know whom he involved in his administration. I'm not able to identify this with a name or a face. It isn't so clear to me. I do know, I think that while he was in office, there was a breakthrough with an election of ^a black Senator who was Harry Cole, Senator Harry Cole.

The man had many gifts, and I think largely his personality drew people to him. Again, I can't pinpoint things that he did for us, except lifting some hope by what he said.

I. Are you saying that he was a man of more words than action?

A. This would be my appraisal, be my appraisal. I don't know quite how right this would be, and it may be that those who operated nearer to him, and who would know the inside of his administration and the areas that he influenced, might know much more about this than I. But, from where I stood, there were a lot of words, and little action.

I. Well, starting from your vantage, would you see any difference between the time he was the Mayor and the time he was Governor?

A. Not much. I think he embraced the same style. He was saying the same things. And I guess my appreciation/^{for him}stemmed from the fact, that I think he was saying the same thing in both places, among whites and among blacks. I'd been among some mixed audiences where he spoke, and I think they were significant audiences, and at least at that time, he said the same things. What gave me a lack of appreciation for the Governor was when, I don't recall the name of the person who committed the crime. It was a murder, and the police began systematic denial of our rights, and they came into the black community, ^{broke} into several homes, and they never really stopped. We did challenge them, and attempted to get the federal government involved with a threat. But, during this time, we appealed to the Governor. I think he might have been out of office at the time, but he was a man of influence. We tried to get him to speak to the question, and to bring to bear on it whatever his influences might have been, but he didn't move.

I. He didn't move?

A. No, he didn't move. And so this led me to question some of the former things/articulated by him. ^{that I'd heard}

I. That was around what period, can you place that in any...

A. I guess this was in the early 60's.

I. In the early 60's?

A. Yes, between the early and mid-sixties. I cannot, since the time is passed, I cannot pinpoint it, but those who are around Baltimore still would be able to say just what exact time this was. But, I think the man was out of office. But, the question was a vital one for we were being terrorized right across the length and breadth of the black community by an onslaught of the police. And now, as I look back, even if we had appealed to the federal government, we discover that they were involved in the same kind of search and seizure as the Baltimore police. So it may be that it was just a country-wide thrust leading possibly toward a police state.

I. So essentially, you are telling me that the Governor, although he was supposed to have been frequenting the black churches yet at a time like this he wouldn't come out?

A. He gave us no relief, absolutely none. And this led me, really to question the depth of his sincerity. And for his regard for law, for definitely the law was being broken. And the tranquility of the black community was expendable, it seemed as far as he was concerned. But, we got no relief from anybody, for that matter. Eventually, the persons who were involved were apprehended. But, the black community suffered police brutality.

I. Let me ask you just ^{one} more question on this. So, would you agree to the view that some people claim that he was little more than a political opportunist? Others say, "Well, no, he

was sincere." Do you?

A. I don't think it was solely political opportunism. You see, this is what gets me here in a bind. I think there was something basically sincere about the man. I don't know whether it plummeted to the depth that would enable him to come out on my side in the face of strong opposition, as we were getting from the white community, as led by the police.

I don't know whether it was that deep. But, I do think that the Mayor had, Governor had, some strong convictions about some things, not deep enough, as I said before, to lead him to put himself on the line for me, and others like me. But, I have always had the feeling that it was deeper than just opportunism. If I had to place him over against others whom I know now to have manipulated us, simply for opportunistic things, I wouldn't put the Governor in that class. I think I would put him on a level a bit higher.

I. Are you suggesting other Governors since?

A. Well, in the case of Mr. Agnew, we met him at Gwynn Oak Park when we were arrested on July 4, back in '62 or '63, I think.

I. '63.

A. '63. And then following that, we had dealings with him in working out a kind of civil rights program for the county, of which he was Governor, where it was not really civil rights, it was just toward the opening of Gwynn Oak Park and others like it in that county, so that all people would have the right to the services they were offering to the larger public. Well now, we worked with Mr. Agnew through that, and subsequently when he became a candidate for Governor, we led Mr. Agnew through the black community by hand. And at that time, it was on a name-calling

basis, and he made some commitments to us, as we opened the doors of the churches to him, gave him access to black audiences, created situations where he could speak, and personally involved ourselves in active campaigning for him, for his candidacy right through the black community. And shortly after he was elected, we went down to indicate to him that we had functioned meaningfully for him, and asked him for some of the things that we'd talked about prior to his election, which things he immediately denied us. And systematically, as the heat of the struggle rose, and I think it might have risen to its apex prior to the outburst, you know, when Martin King was killed, when Rapp Brown went to Cambridge. We met with him then, and he violently lectured us, as he played a tape of Rapp Brown's speech, which emanated in some citizens who had known the old schoolhouse in Cambridge should have been razed fifty years ago, it was ignited and burned, and some other properties were burned. And, as a result of that, some people died. One man down there, died, I think he took his life, and all this was to be regretted. But, Rapp Brown, as we told him, said no more about the Cambridge situation than any other black, any black could have said the same thing and would have been right. And Rapp was right, but he took umbrage at that. Then, when it came to a high peak of emotional intensity, when there was this civil outburst, he, as we met to talk with him about it, he upbraided us, and spoke down to us. And we walked out, at that time. And this was, I guess the parting of the ways with us and Agnew, and we knew that we had done violence to our black people when we helped to elect him.

I think this was when he came into prominence, and when Nixon took notice of this strong-armed man.

I. Yes, that really projected him on the national scene.

A. Right. And as the Lord would have it, projected him out of the national scene.

I. As you mentioned Cambridge, we sort of go backwards. Who were the groups most actively involved in the Cambridge riots?

A. I don't remember the groups, but I know the thrust was being led by Gloria Richardson. She is a native of Cambridge, part of a very prominent family there, the Sinclair family. I think it's the Sinclair family. And Gloria, right on through the struggle gave good sane leadership. Sometimes, she was not as far out as some of the younger people wanted her to be, but as things unfolded, she was in pace, and she gave good leadership and direction to the thrust.

I. What group was she associated with? Was it the N.A.A.C.P. or....

A. She was with the N.A.A.C.P. A lot of those groups converged and were brought together in giving almost a united front to the struggle, but I don't think it was called exactly that. And for the life of me, I can't recall..but I do know the N.A.A.C.P. was involved in it, all the way, and contributed to, and supported the thrust.

I. Let me just go back again. Of a number of demonstrations in which was featured, I think perhaps Gwynn Oak was one of the most prominent, could you just give me a brief idea of the background of events that brought it to a climax?

A. Gwynn Oak was highlighted, and we were not the first to go to Gwynn Oak. There were some others who had gone, and had been turned back, manhandled. And it had come to a kind of na-

tion wide attention, and I remember on that fourth of July, some of the national leaders came to Baltimore.

I. Who invited them? Was it the Alliance?

A. No, I was the president, but I don't think the Alliance did it. With this coming to the attention, now it may be that the Alliance functioned in the invitation, I'm almost certain that the Alliance did function in it. Robert Newbold, a Presbyterian had invited the stated clerk of the Presbyterian church, Mr. Carson Blake, came. Bishop Corrigan of the Episcopal church came. These persons came from New York, and there were others who came from places in between. And Rabbi Morris Lieberman, of Baltimore, the Hebrew Congregation there, I think the Baltimore Hebrew Congregation. And the clergymen and some lay people, Civic Interest Group - there was a group, C. I. G. (Civic Interest Group), the Interdominational Ministers Alliance. I think the N.A.A.C.P., and some "hangers-on", wherever the excitement went, you got that.

But, I think these two people along with the local people, these that I mentioned...

I. Now, which two people?

A. Bishop Corrigan and Carson Blake, the stated clerk of the United Presbyterian Church, and there were a couple other national personages whose name I can't recall now. And as local person, Rabbi Morris Lieberman and some of the white clergy and the black clergy. They met at the church I was serving then, that was at Metropolitan United Methodist Church in Baltimore, on Carrollton Ave. and Lanvale Street. And after we met there, and talked about what we were going to do, and the commitment to be arrested, we went on off and made our protest. Policemen

met with us there and asked us not to do so, asked us to leave, because it seemed that they didn't want to really arrest us. Now, on that occasion, nobody was manhandled. They gave you the option to go or get on the bus to go to be incarcerated. And we got on the bus.

And then the next day following our release, we went back. We wanted to go to jail. Well, after that second day, they refused to arrest us. We intended to be arrested as long as they would arrest us.

I. They refused to arrest?

A. They refused to, and they refused to indict us. They refused to hold us for bail. We didn't have any to put up. Each time we came before...well, the last time we came before the judge he said, "Well you've got to go out of here. We're not going to hold you." Well, it was at this point that Agnew set up the meeting.

I. Yeah, I'll come to that. Why was that change in attitude, they refused to arrest you?

A. I think we were getting too much publicity, and I think there were people converging on this scene to also bear their witness. You see, these things had a kind of a snowballing effect. And there were people all over, who when they found an inflammatory situation where there's a confrontation being had between a civil rights' group and the law, there was a converging of personnel there from everywhere. I think there was just a spirit to join in this kind of fight, and they came uninvited, from people you never knew, but fine people. They'd just come and share with you whether it was hard or soft. And I think these kind of things, as had happened in other places, had just begun to snowball.

converging
More and more people were/on the scene. The papers were highlighting it, and the news was spreading, and they didn't want this.

I. They didn't want too much publicity?

A. Right.

I. What role did the Urban League play in the civil rights in Baltimore? Was it any constructive role?

A. It was, and Furman Templeton was the executive at that time. And he, I guess, was the leading spirit of it then. At least he articulated for the Urban League. He was always out front as far as I know, but there was, I do not recall at any point, where he joined in as a representative, that is at a point of confrontation, where arrests might take place. Now, at other points, where dialogue was embraced, you would find Furman. But, I do not recall at any point, where he joined us.

I. Do you think the League avoided that situation of conflict or confrontation?

A. At least at this level, as far as I can recall. Now maybe someone can do this more accurately than I, but in my mind, but I do know at every point where there was an exchange between us, he was on the supportive end. He supported us, and we had the feeling that the League itself was sympathetic with our stands. We had no reason to question it, as far as I know. But, I just know, at least in my own mind, where we appeared on the scene with our marches and demonstrations, I am not aware^{of.}...now maybe others would deny this.

I. What kind of relationship existed, for instance between the League and Mrs. Jackson and the N.A.A.C.P. if these people would not go out in these situations of conflict, was it that good rapport?

A. I think so. I don't know of any interests articulated by, say Mrs. Jackson that was inimical, or appeared to be inimical to the interests of the League. I think they had their different approaches, and it seems like the League's was more quiet and benign. Well, maybe not benign, but it was, it seemed to be have been through dialogue that they approached problems, and negotiated for a solution. The N.A.A.C.P. would use the media, the streets, whatever, to make known its protests. I don't think the League's stance was quite as overt as that.

I. What about the Civic Interest Group? What do you know about it, or can you tell? Was it a militant group, or what kind of group.

A. Oh, it was a militant group. And it was made up largely of young people. And one person I guess identified with it more than any other was Clarence Logan. And that young man, when he was at it, ignited my fire as much as anybody.

A. As I was saying, I think Clarence ignited my fire as much as anybody, when it came to a heat of commitment, for I saw Clarence through a summer when he gave himself with reckless abandon to the leading of this group. And, I think he did so when he didn't have a job, when things were not well with him, and the kind of dedication I saw in this young man really did things for me. And I don't know, I had a feeling that later on, while he didn't turn in terms of interest, I think he became involved in the labor movement somewhere, and left off that kind of an intensity. But, I think you'd have to give him credit for the type of dedication that he showed intensely at a given period. And then later on, I don't know where he quite faded out, I had a feeling that he needed employment, and had to get himself to it.

I. Now, that you've mentioned the labor movement, did it ^{important} play any/part here in Baltimore, I mean in the civil rights' program?

A. If it did, I don't know beyond some words that might have been said around some tables. Maybe, it may be that they were interested, but for the life of me, I cannot recall anything more than words. But, I don't recall at any point, where they delivered.

I. Did this man, A. Philip Randolph play any kind of role in Baltimore at all? Did he ever come down, do you recall him?

A. No. I do recall his coming to Baltimore a couple of times. He came at the invitation of Troy Brailey, and now Troy was always interested, always somewhere around the movement. And I'm sure he shared with us in the thrust ~~w~~made on the local scene, but I don't remember Philip Randolph coming down to be

with us as such. Whenever he came, he articulated well the cause, there's no joke about that. And I'm sure his sympathies were there. Now, it may be that his overall task was too great for this kind of piecemeal participation, but I don't recall his showing up on the scene at any time. I saw him several times in Baltimore and I think he was at the temple once. He came to speak for labor at Troy's invitation. I saw him here in Washington when the march was on Washington. Beyond that, I don't recall.

I. I understand that he was instrumental in organizing that March on Washington, that the N.A.A.C.P. and CORE was reluctant to take part in that march, is that correct?

A. At least this is what I heard. You said that Phillip Randolph was reluctant?

I. No, no, no, the N.A.A.C.P. and CORE at first were reluctant in having a march.

A. I heard this. How true this is, I do not know. I think things happened at that level, and I think all of this took place around New York, and I'm not privy to that knowledge.

I. But not on the local level?

A. I don't think that happened on the local level. It seems that all of those national organizations were claiming their rightful place in the sun, and I don't think anyone wanted to be subordinate to any other, unless they should lose. I think this is what was said, and eventually they got together. But, that in-fighting or dialogue, I heard this, but I don't know the variety of it.

I. Okay, let me turn back the questions again. You were chairman of the Ministerial Alliance Conference at some time,

what was the Alliance trying to achieve?

A. Well, I think we were trying to embrace an extension of the gospel we preached which we believed, and articulated then and now, too - that the church is interested in the whole man. We went out for jobs. We believe that people, regardless of color have a right to whatever was open to the public, that this would be open to blacks too. We are part of the public. So, we went out for that.

We were interested in the schools. And we had confrontations of the board of directors of the Baltimore Public Schools, so it was a general thrust in all directions.

I. Was it any different from the N.A.A.C.P., or was it just another organization of..

A. Now, how do you say this. I have a feeling that we had some leverage that the N.A.A.C.P. didn't. The N.A.A.C.P.'s strength drew out of the support of the black ministers and their churches for this organization. This is where they got the money. This is where they got the troops, this is where they got the support. The Ministers' Alliance decided that we had strength of our own, not separate and apart from, we didn't plan this, but we felt that the people were looking to us for leadership, not contrary to the N.A.A.C.P., but in consonance with and if need be, separate and apart from. But, not...but our thrust was not different. We supported the N.A.A.C.P., yet we felt that we had a role to play, and that we could go and say to management that we have these kind of troops behind us who are using your product.

I. So, you would say, at certain points, that the Alliance was really the thrust of the civil rights' movement?

A. I think so. Yes. And unless you should infuriate the

N.A.A.C.P., and this is not to do that, but there was a point when I think the Alliance in Baltimore was the dominant thrust for the movement.

I. What point was that, pre-1960, or?

A. During.

I. During the 1960's?

A. Yes, when the effective boycotts, when we participated, put our bodies on the line, the demonstration on Route 40, along.. and at that time Stokely Carmichael and one of the city councilman, oh what's his name...Julius Hobson. Hobson, he's a member of the city council here in Washington, but he would come to Baltimore, now it seems that Julius was involved in CORE, at that time. And Stokely, student in the nonviolent movement, and met at churches and there we'd leave and go to Route 40, which was the big route between New York and the South, between...well, from the Delaware Bridge right on through Baltimore. Well, there was discrimination there, and I think it was epitomized when one of the African ambassadors was refused service.

I. That was when?

A. That was back in the 60's, early 60's. And we then felt that we did not want this on our state, and we joined together to open restaurants, eating places, sleeping accommodations along that route. And it was toward this end that we traveled.

I. Did you have any friction, say with Mrs. Jackson and the NA.A.C.P. for playing such a prominent role, I mean moving ahead of the N.A.A.C.P.?

A. It might have been. I'm not aware of any overt, for at a point before we began, Mrs. Jackson would ask questions: "What are you ministers doing?", and needled us into doing. I cannot

say whether she wanted this action to take place within the bounds of and under the aegis of the N.A.A.C.P., but it emanated in our functioning apart from the N.A.A.C.P.

I. There was a Black United Front, also. Who formed the Black United Front?

A. Of this I am really not aware. The first time that I heard of the Black United Front, it was late in the struggle, and it came after Stokely's "black power" declamation. And that was rather late in the struggle. I don't know of the emergence of a Black United Front. I knew of it here, in Washington, and I know of the call for it in Baltimore. I don't know whether it ever took place under an organized form. Now, I had a sense in myself of hewing in with the black thrust, and it didn't matter to me who led it. But, an organization as such emerging that covered the whole thrust, I'm not aware of this.

I. I understand, in fact I read somewhere that Senator Verda Welcome, she had some committee which discussed bills before the legislature discussed bills. Can you remember what group that was, or were you familiar with the work of Verda Welcome?

A. I am familiar, that is, I knew of her interest. I knew of her support of the struggle. But, here again, I think she worked in a kind of sphere of her own, and it was...we were not at odds. But, Senator Welcome was a politician, and is still, and I think from that stance that enhanced her position, I think she worked. And this was also because she was elected essentially by black people, so it was in the interest of blacks that she worked and behalf of whom she spoke. But, I do not know that it joined hands, as such with us. I never considered her as working against anything, but

I knew that she was a politician.

I. I guess what I'm trying to get at is, ^{that} there you have a number of groups. Now I'm trying to find out what coordinated each of them. Mrs. Jackson, I think was regarded as a prominent figure in that period, ^{were} so/they ever in conflict with some of the ideas, or was she able to coordinate this? Or did they work separate.....what type of rapport existed between all of these?

A. I don't remember, honestly, any real coordination. That is an umbrella group drawing all of us together. I don't recall this. I think the struggle itself made for the union. I don't think without the struggle, and all of us giving ourselves for the same thing, maybe we wouldn't have experienced whatever togetherness. So that whenever one called, there was a compulsion on the part of all of us to respond, without this kind of overall coordination. I don't know that this really existed. Well, you could tell there were factions when the politicians began to run. And you could see, that we were splintered, because they aligned themselves with sponsors that some of the others of us couldn't buy. And so, when that happened, by and large, the Alliance had hands off, because there were some political sponsors and we didn't want to be involved.

I. White?

A. Some white and some black. Jack Pollack, you may know. There's some who could tell you much more about him. Homer Favor could. And little Willie Adams was another. In some ways, I think a fine man, but in other ways involvement in, at least alleged involvement in numbers and gambling and liquor and a lot of other things that didn't make for a kind of thing that

we all felt that we could support. These were the major sponsors. Now in the case of Clarence Mitchell, I think this was sponsorship, at least at that time, of the W.A.A.C.P. and the black, and we functioned meaningfully in the support of his candidacy.

I. That's the Alliance?

A. Yes. Now, Harry Cole was a Senator before I got involved in the movement. Following Harry Cole, there was some persons who aspired to the Maryland Senate. I can't call the man's name. Jack Pollack was his sponsor. Oh, what is his name, I can see the man's face, but I can't call his name. Any of those fellows could bring you up on the name of the Senator who succeeded Harry Cole who had not the gifts of Aaron, or the ability to articulate, nor the interest that we felt of the black community at heart. But, he was Jack Pollack's man, and Jack had money and influence and he was out to make this money elect people for him, and this black Senator was elected. And he elected a few blacks through the City Council in Baltimore there. I know Mr. Dixon was one. I think it was Harry Dixon, but I'm not sure who was under the sponsorship of Pollack in his election to the City Council.

I. Did that tend to divide the black community?

A. Yes, the black community was divided on it, because we didn't feel that Pollack had our interest at heart. Didn't know of Little Willie's interest. We knew of the areas of his involvement, and had a feeling that this was geared for political support, and just didn't support that. And this also made a splintering of the black community. We do know that some people that we supported were taken in by Willie. He had the money, gobs of

money. He had the influence, we had none. We could just marshall people and get votes, but I guess in the real "dog fight" of those people who were elected, looked around for some money too. So some of those that we sponsored, and I feel that we really elected, in the...as the years went on, defaulted, and went over to Willie and other interests.

I. Was that a common practice among interests....

A. Well, it wasn't so common, because elections weren't too common then -- election of blacks were not too common. For the State House nor for the City Council, so that we were really just beginning to get our people into these areas.

I. Well, I probably question...maybe you have answered it in part. I was asking if both Mr. McKeldin and Mrs. Jackson were closely associated with the churches here in Baltimore. Did that in any way enhance them as leaders?

A. I think so. Mrs. Jackson was almost like a preacher. And she knew church language. She knew the black temperament. She knew where the sympathies were. And she knew how to tie into these. And in addition to that, Mrs. Jackson had fought some real battles, and had come out on the big side. And we knew something of her strength, her interest, and did not hesitate to support Mrs. Jackson. And our churches were always open to her. She spoke this kind of language, and on the other hand, Mr. McKeldin was this kind of person, too.

He was almost an evangelist, with an evangelistic fervor about his approach. And with theology interspersed into his appeal. And he had a strong appeal to the church people, so that there wasn't the kind of distrust nor maybe, the incisive look into his stance.

I. Because of his religious tone?

A. Yes, and he did it with a kind of a charming appeal. So that it was hard to put him off.

I. So you're saying then, that part of the thing was that people didn't assess McKeldin as closely as they would have assessed another person, because of his close association with the churches?

A. I think that is part of it. The other thing, is if you'd put him over against alternatives, alternative choices, well he looked "lily white". He was beautiful when you compared him with alternate choices. And strange as it seemed, this was largely true with the whites, because unless you had heavy support, a Republican couldn't be elected. And while they elected a Democratic house and Senate, they had an overwhelming vote for a Republican Governor.

I. So you mean, the whites believed in him also?

A. Evidently. He came through as a kind of a "shining knight. Well, say he would preach against alcohol, and he wouldn't serve it in the State House, regardless of who his guests were. And this was known, and you see this was something to people, when a man in that kind of office, lives up to this commitment. And I think the relationship he bore to blacks, tacit as it was, I think he lived up to that level. Now the depth of his commitment I don't know, but at least a saluting, a speaking, a warm cordial type of thing. If he met you on the street, he could speak to you. I mean this kind of thing, he embraced those techniques.

I think there was some sincerity in the man, and really, the alternatives that I had, I voted for him every time.

I. So, I take it that you are saying that he was a pleasant charming kind of character, but for one in his position, he did

C

C

C

not do all that he could have done at the time. Would that be a fair summary of it?

A. He did not do all that I thought he could have done. The realities of the situation might be vastly different from what I'm thinking. I'm not sure of this. But, he didn't do all that I think he should have done. Now, I don't know what he could have done. I have a feeling that he could have done much more than he did. But, you didn't even have people saying it at the time, and he said it.

I. Which was an advance in terms of the times?

A. Right, of the times, and those were difficult times as I look at it. They were very...they've always been difficult for us. It might have been difficult for him, I don't know. I just had a feeling of drawing away, when I thought even if he could not have done anything about it, if he had spoken to it...

I. You mean, at a crucial time, he wouldn't speak?

A. That's right. He was really on the sidelines then, he was not Governor, he was not Mayor at the time when we wanted him to say a word. He was still thought of in high terms in Maryland. I don't know whether he ever lost a certain kind of stature there, but he didn't come out on the side of the people who were being violated. I think Homer Favor could read the man off to you.

I. He knew him?

A. Well, Homer can see this duplicity from a hundred miles away, and he knows it. And I think he would call it "offhand white racism".

I. That's McKeldin's?

A. Yeah, I think he would say this. You know, I wish you

could have met another person who is dead now - Walter Carter.

I. I have heard a lot about him. Is there anyone that was closely involved with him that.....