NEGRO YEAR BOOK

An Annual

ENCYCLOPEDIA *of the* NEGRO

1931-1932

MONROE N. WORK
Director Department of Records and Research
Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute
EDITOR

TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE, ALABAMA
NEGRO YEAR BOOK PUBLISHING CO.

DIVISION IX

THE NEGRO AND POLITICS

Negro Policemen

The demand is growing, especially by the Negroes themselves, that in the districts of cities where the Negro predominates, Negro policemen should be used. It is urged that this would be a means, not only of reducing crime, but likewise of preventing racial friction. The experience in connection with the use of Negro policemen seems to bear out these claims.

The following cities employ one or more Negro policemen: Boston, Cambridge, Everett, New Bedford, Melrose and Lynn, Massachusetts; Bridgeport, Hartford and Waterbury, Connecticut; Buffalo, Utica, New Rochelle, New York City and Yonkers, New York; Atlantic City, Cape May, Elizabeth, Patterson, Plainfield, Trenton, Hackensack, Newark and Jersey City, New Jersey; Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chester, Uniontown, Duquesne, Erie and Sharon, Pennsylvania; Wilmington, Delaware; Easton, Pocomoke City and Baltimore, Maryland; Washington, D. C.; Charleston and Wheeling, West Virginia; Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Steubenville, Toledo, Xenia and Youngstown, Ohio; Detroit and Grand Rapids, Michigan; Evansville, Indianapolis, Richmond, Muncie and Terre Haute, Indiana; Brooklyn, Chicago, Cairo, East St. Louis and Robbins, Illinois; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Coffeyville, Topeka, Kansas City and Wichita, Kansas; Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota; Des Moines, Iowa; Omaha, Nebraska; Louisville, Kentucky; Knoxville and Memphis, Tennessee; Sarasota and Tampa, Florida; Sedalia, St. Louis, Jefferson City and Kansas City, Missouri; Austin, Beaumont, Houston and Galveston, Texas; Muskogee, Oklahoma City, Tulsa and Okmulgee, Oklahoma; Denver, Colorado; Spokane, Seattle and Tacoma, Washington; Los Angeles and Oakland, California.

Negro policewomen are being used in the following cities: New York, Buffalo, Washington, Philadelphia, Atlantic City, Pittsburgh, Toledo, Indianapolis, Detroit, Chicago, Des Moines, San Antonio, Los Angeles, and Petersburg, Virginia.

The following cities have Negro probation officers to work in connection with the juvenile courts: New York City, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Toledo, Ohio; Kansas City, Missouri; Des Moines, Iowa; Louisville, Kentucky; Indianapolis and Gary, Indiana; Richmond, Virginia; Atlanta, Augusta, Columbus and Savannah, Georgia; Huntsville, Montgomery, Birmingham, Selma, Tuscaloosa and Mobile, Alabama; Los Angeles, California; and Baltimore, Maryland.

Political Appointments

Mrs. Fannie Barrier Williams was appointed a member of the public library board of Chicago. Other appointments were: Mrs. Alice McNeil to the District of Columbia school board; Mrs. Emmett J. Scott, to the District of Columbia board of public welfare; Mrs. Irene C. Moats, to the advisory council of the West Virginia state board of education; H. C. Russell of Kentucky, to be a specialist in Negro education in the United States Bureau of Education at Washington; Ambrose Caliver, (Civil Service examination), to be a specialist in education, United States Bureau of Education at Washington; Charles P. Howard, attorney, Des Moines, appointed Polk County, Iowa, sanity commissioner; Howard E. Young, pharmacist to the jail board of Baltimore; J. Wm. Clifford, a former federal narcotic agent, a United States customs inspector at New York City; James A. Jackson, business specialist Domestic Commerce Division, Department of Commerce at Washington. As a result of the resignation of the county treasurer to run for the position of state treasurer, John M. Wright, first deputy county treasurer, was made treasurer of Shawnee County, Topeka, Kansas; Noah D. Thompson to be one of the fifteen members of the Municipal Housing Commission of Los Angeles; James Ivan Lindell to the position of chairman of one of the surveying squads of Los Angeles; Charles Fred White to be a member of the Pennsylvania state athletic commission; E. W. B. Curry, Springfield, Ohio, assistant chief of the division of probation and parole of the department of public welfare of the State of Ohio; Walter P. McClane, Cambridge, Massachusetts, to be a state insurance examiner; Matthew W. Bullock, Boston, special assistant attorney general of Massachusetts; Thomas L. Jones, assistant district attorney, the District of Columbia; George B. Jones, assistant to the circuit attorney of St. Louis; Richard L. Baltimore, assistant United States district attorney, southern district of New York; Washington Rhoades, assistant United States district attorney for the Philadelphia district; Hubert T. Delaney, assistant United States district attorney for the southern district of New York; Harry J. Capehart, assistant United States district attorney for the southern area of West Virginia; Francis F. Giles, Brooklyn, assistant United States district attorney; George Edgar Hall, New York City, assistant United States district attorney; Julian D. Rainey and James G. Wolff, Boston, to be assistant corporation counsels; Patrick E. Prescott and George Lawrence, Chicago, to be assistant corporation counsels and William H. Temple to be assistant city attorney; Herman E. Moore, Chicago, one of the attorneys for the Cook County forest preserve in charge of condemnation proceedings; John W. Robinson, Gary, Indiana, to be assistant state's attorney; J. C. Robertson to be a commissioner of the Richmond, Virginia Circuit Court, first Negro ever named to such a position there, appointment made on recommendation of Negro attorneys of Richmond; Nathan K. McGill, Chicago, special counsel for Cook County; Daniel M. Jackson, Chicago, member of Illinois commerce commission; James A. Cobb to be a judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia to succeed the late Judge Robert H. Terrell; Dr. Chester C. Ames to be junior associate in the department of urology on the staff of Detroit receiving hospital; Dr. W. Harold Amos, Yonkers, New York, to the clinical staff of the bureau of child hygiene in the health department; Dr. Samuel E. Johnson to be a health officer and sanitary inspector for colored and white alike in Lexington, Kentucky; Dr. A. Porter Davis, to be assistant health director, Kansas City, Kansas; and Dr. Louis T. Wright, New York City, to be police surgeon, position carries with it the rank of inspector in the police department.

Negroes in the Diplomatic and Consular Service

William J. Yerby, Consul at Oporto, Portugal; James G. Carter, Consul at Calais, France; William H. Hunt, Consul at St. Michales, Azores; and Clifford R. Wharton, Consul at Las Palmas, Canary Islands.

Negroes Holding Federal Offices—James A. Cobb, judge, municipal court, Washington, D. C.; William C. Heuston, assistant solicitor for the Post Office department; David E. Henderson, assistant attorney general of the United States; Walter L. Cohen, collector of customs, New Orleans; Charles W. Anderson, collector Internal revenue, third district of New York City, and Jefferson S. Coage, recorder of deeds, District of Columbia.

Members of Congress

Oscar DePriest, Negro, and former Chicago alderman, was elected Congressman from the first Illinois District to the Seventy-first Congress, 1929-1931. He was the first Negro Congressman since 1901 when George H. White from North Carolina retired after serving four years.

NEGRO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS
1868-1901

SENATORS

Revels, Hiram R., Mississippi, 1870-1871; Bruce, Blanche K., Mississippi, 1875-1881.

REPRESENTATIVES

Fortieth Congress (1868-1869)—Menard, J. H.,* Louisiana; Forty-first Congress (1869-1871)—Long, Jefferson, Georgia; Rainey, Joseph H., South Carolina; Forty-second Congress (1871-1873)—Delarge, Robert C., South Carolina; Elliot, Robert B., South Carolina; Rainey, Joseph H., South Carolina; Turner, Benj. S., Alabama; Walls, Josiah T., Florida; Forty-third Congress (1873-1875)—Cain, Richard H., South Carolina; Lynch, John R., Mississippi; Rainey, Joseph H., South Carolina; Ransier, A. J., South Carolina; Rapier, James T., Alabama; Walls, Josiah T., Florida; Forty-fourth Congress (1875-1877)—Haralson, Jeremiah, Alabama; Hyman, John, North Carolina; Lynch, John R., Mississippi; Nash, Charles E., Louisiana; Rainey, Joseph H., South Carolina; Smalls, Robert, South Carolina; Forty-fifth Congress (1877-1879)—Cain, Richard H., South Carolina; Rainey, Joseph H., South Carolina; Smalls, Robert, South Carolina; Forty-seventh Congress (1881-1883)—Lynch, John R., Mississippi; Smalls, Robert, South Carolina; Forty-eighth Congress (1883-1885)—O'Harra, James E.,

North Carolina; Forty-ninth Congress (1885-1887)—O'Harra, James E., North Carolina; Fifty-first Congress (1889-1891)—Cheatham, H. P., North Carolina; Langston, John M., Virginia; Miller, Thomas H., South Carolina; Fifty-second Congress (1891-1893) Cheatham, H. P., North Carolina; Fifty-third Congress (1893-1895)—Murray, George W., South Carolina; Fifty-fourth Congress (1895-1897)—Murray, George W., South Carolina; Fifty-fifth Congress (1897-1899)—White, George H., North Carolina; Fifty-sixth Congress (1899-1901)—White, George H., North Carolina.*

Members of State Legislatures

During 1925-1929 the following Negroes were elected members of state legislatures: California legislature, to Senate, F. M. Roberts, editor, re-elected; Illinois legislature, to Senate, A. H. Richards, lawyer, re-elected; to House, G. W. Blackwell, lawyer, W. B. Douglass, lawyer, re-elected; H. B. Gaines, lawyer, C. E. Griffin, re-elected; G. T. Kersey, re-elected; W. E. King, lawyer, re-elected; W. J. Warfield; Kansas legislature, to House, W. M. Blount, physician; Missouri legislature, to House, G. M. Allen, lawyer; J. A. Davis, lawyer; L. A. Knox, lawyer; W. M. Moore, business man, re-elected; New Jersey legislature, to House, J. L. Baxter, F. S. Hargrave, physician; Nebraska legislature, to House, T. L. Barnett, A. A. McMillan, physician; J. A. Singleton, dentist; New York legislature, to House, L. Perkins, lawyer; F. E. Rivers, lawyer; Ohio legislature, to House, E. W. B. Curry, minister; P. B. Jackson, lawyer; Pennsylvania legislature, to House, W. H. Fuller, lawyer; West Virginia legislature, to House, H. J. Capehart, lawyer, re-elected; E. H. Harper, re-elected; T. E. Hill.

First Negro Members of a State Legislature—Edward G. Walker and Charles L. Mitchell, who were elected in 1866 to the Massachusetts House of Representatives from Boston, were the first Negroes in the history of the race to sit in the legislature of any state in the Union.

Members of City Councils

Negroes were members of city councils during 1925-1929 as follows: Wilmington, Delaware, J. O. Hopkins, re-elected and W. J. Winchester; New Haven, Connecticut, A. Modiste and J. P. Peaker; Murphysboro, Illinois, Berter Bates; Chicago, Illinois, L. B. Anderson, re-elected and R. R. Jackson, re-elected; Gary, Indiana, S. R. Blackwell, W. E. Burrus, W. Hardaway and A. B. Whitlock; Nicholasville, Kentucky, J. Williams; Annapolis, Maryland, C. Bell, D. Garver, C. A. Oliver, C. S. Spriggs; Bowie, Maryland, D. L. Washington; Baltimore, W. T. McGuin and W. S. Emerson; Springfield, Massachusetts, A. H. Tavernier, re-elected; Buffalo, New York, J. R. Taylor; New York City, J. C. Hawkins, re-elected and F. R. Moore, re-elected; Campbell, Ohio, H. R. Parish; Cleveland, Ohio, R. S. Brown, L. N. Bundy, T. W. Fleming, C. George, E. J. Gregg and L. O. Payne; Urbana, Ohio, J. A. Brown and H. Otey, re-elected; Youngstown, Ohio, W. S. Vaughn, re-elected; Kimball, West Virginia, R. E. Black and J. W. Moss. In 1929, Arthur Johnson was re-elected mayor of Miles Heights, Ohio. The majority of the voters of this town are white. E. W. Henry was appointed a police court judge in Philadelphia in 1925 and elected to the office for the full term of six years in 1927. James A. Cobb was appointed, in 1926, by the President of the United States as a judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia and was re-appointed in 1930.

*Served one year.

Women in Politics

Negro women were active in politics in city, state and national elections. Mrs. Alice Lathon of Tulsa, Oklahoma, was a candidate for Justice of Peace. Mrs. Mary Brown Martin was elected a member of the Cleveland, Ohio, board of education. Mrs. E. Howard Harper was appointed by the Governor of West Virginia to succeed her husband, who died on December 21, 1927, as a member of the legislature of that state. This was the first time a Negro woman was a member of any legislature in this country. For the first time in the history of American politics two Negro women, Mrs. Mary C. Booze of Mound Bayou, Mississippi, and Mrs. George S. Williams of Savannah, Georgia, gained the distinction of membership on the Republican National Committee. The following women were alternate delegates to the 1928 National Republican Convention: Mrs. Sarah Watson King, Atlanta, Georgia; Mrs. Mamie Pringle, Savannah, Georgia; Mrs. H. B. Cardoza, Bennings, D. C.; Mrs. Mary C. Booze, Mound Bayou, Mississippi; Mrs. Annie E. Mhoon, Jackson, Mississippi; Mrs. Myrtle Cook, Kansas City, Missouri; Mrs. Bessie Mention, Princeton, New Jersey and Mrs. Daisy E. Lampkin, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Resolutions Expressing Dissatisfaction with Republican Party

Negroes attending the National Republican Convention at Kansas City held a meeting on June 14, 1928. The reason for this meeting being that the following resolutions, which were presented to the platform committee of the Republican National Convention with the request that these resolutions or the substance thereof be made a part of the platform of the Republican party, were refused.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, viz, the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, are being openly and flagrantly violated in this, to-wit: That the colored citizens of the United States are being deprived of life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness, and

Whereas, an anti-lynching bill has been repeatedly defeated, and

Whereas, there appears to be a disposition and concerted effort on the part of the lily-white element of the Republican party to eliminate the colored citizen by discrimination, intimidation and chicanery; and

Whereas, there has been discrimination, on account of race and color in the classified service under the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Laws in respect to appointments where positions have been won by competitive examination; and

Whereas, segregation and discrimination in governmental departments in Washington, D. C., are still being practiced, now therefore, it is

Resolved, that we, the undersigned committee, appointed at an open meeting of delegates to the Republican National Convention at Kansas City, Missouri, to encouch the following plank in its platform:

First, to protect the colored citizens in all their rights, civil and political.

Second, for a strict enforcement of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, in letter and in spirit.

Be it further resolved, that the Republican party go on record as protecting all citizens alike in the strict enforcement of the civil service laws of the United States.

The committee: Ernest G. Tidrington, Indiana; Geo. W. Lee, Tennessee; Orlando J. Smith, Minnesota; Chas. P. Howard, Iowa; M. Lewis, Illinois; G. A. Gilmore, Texas; A. J. Carey, Illinois; Oscar DePriest, Illinois; C. H. Calloway, Missouri; Mrs. Grace Wilson Evans, Indiana; S. D. Redmond, Mississippi; James M. Burr, Texas; P. H. Crutchfield, Louisiana; J. Finley Wilson, District of Columbia; Fred Dabney, Missouri and W. C. Hueston, Indiana.

National Negro Voters League

The second cause of the meeting was the precedent established by the Republican party at this convention in what is known as "The Texas case." This case presented in brief the question of whether party managers had the right to call conventions to select delegates to the Republican National Convention in state conventions as a whole, or to follow the previously established rule of selecting some by district and some at large. It being made clear that to establish the rule of selecting all in state conventions bars the Negroes in the southern states from participation in these party matters and certainly prevents them from becoming delegates to party national conventions.

In the establishing of this race destroying precedent, many of the Negro delegates following factional leadership voted in the affirmative to the dismay of those who stand for race equality, by party and before the law. After due consideration, it was decided at the above meeting to form an organization to be known as the National Negro Voters League.

The said League should justify its existence as follows:

1. To have for its purposes the full enfranchisement of the American Negro.

2. To ascertain where the Negro stands in the Republican party.

3. To play with pitiless publicity upon those of our race who vote in political conventions and elsewhere against race interests and then seek prominence and priority as the price therefor.

The meeting organized and elected the following temporary officers: J. Finley Wilson, president, Washington, D. C; Chas. P. Howard, secretary, Des Moines, Iowa; W. C. Huestón, chairman of executive committee, Gary Indiana.

These officers were instructed to issue a call for a meeting to be held in the City of Chicago, Illinois, for permanent organization and to agree upon and announce ways and means to carry out the purpose of the League.

Pursuant to this order a meeting of the National Negro Voter's League was held in the City of Chicago, Illinois, on the 24th day of August, 1928.

The League chose a middle course, condemning neither the Republican nor Democratic party. In a resolution, which was adopted by the convention, some of the political ills

from which the Negro suffers were recited, but no means of remedying them were offered.

Promises to Negro in Republican Platforms 1884-1928

"Since June 5, 1884, the Republican party has included in its platform planks of promise to the Negro.

Among the things it promised him are: "Full civil and political rights," 1884; right to cast a "free and unrestricted ballot," 1888, 1892.

Equal justice and enforcement of the "Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments" were promised in 1908.

Lynching was condemned first in the Republican party platform of 1896 as a "barbarous practice." And a federal anti-lynch law was promised in 1920, 1924 and 1928. Rights only of courts to take human life were asserted in 1912.

The Republican plank of 1884 on the Negro contained 57 words, and that of 1888, 122 words.

From that time on these planks have decreased in length until 1912 and 1916 the Negro is not mentioned at all and in 1928—thirty-six words.

In 1888, John R. Lynch, a Negro, for six years a congressman from Mississippi, was temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention, made the keynote speech, and helped make the platform.

In 1920, 1924 and 1928 Negroes sought in vain to place stronger utterances in the party platform.

Republican planks since 1884 on the Negro are as follows:

Chicago, June 5, 1884, candidate for Presidency: James G. Blaine.

We extend to the Republicans of the South, regardless of their former party affiliation, our cordial sympathy and pledge to them our uttermost earnest efforts to promote the passage of such legislation as will secure to every citizen of whatever race, or color, the full and complete recognition, possession and exercise of all civil and political rights.

Chicago, June 21, 1888. Candidate for Presidency: Benjamin Harrison.

Free Suffrage: We reaffirm our unswerving devotion to the National Constitution and to the indissoluable union of the states; to the attorney reserved to the states under the Constitution, to the personal rights and liberties of citizens in all states and territories in the Union, especially to the supreme and sovereign right of lawful citizens, rich or poor, native or foreign born, white or black, to cast one free ballot in public elections and to have that ballot counted. We hold the free and honest popular ballot and the just and equal representation of all our people to be the foundation of government, and demand effective legislation to secure the integrity and purity of elections which are the foundation of all public authority.

Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 9, 1892. Candidate for Presidency: Benjamin Harrison.

The ballot: We demand that every citizen of the United States be allowed to cast one free and unrestricted baliot in all public elections, and that such ballot be counted and returned as cast; that such laws shall be enacted and enforced as will secure to every citizen, be he rich or poor, native or foreign born, white or black, this sovereign right guaranteed by the Constitution.

St. Louis, June 18, 1896. Candidate for Presidency: William McKinley.

Lynchings: We proclaim our unqualified condemnation of the uncivilized and barbarous practice, well known as lynching or killing human beings, suspected or charged with crime, without process of law.

Philadelphia, June 20, 1900. Candidate for Presidency: William McKinley.

Franchise in South: It was the plain purpose of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution to prevent discrimination on account of race or color in regulating the elective franchise. Devices of state governments, whether by statutory or constitutional enactment, to avoid the purpose of this amendment are revolutionary and should be condemned.

Chicago, June 22, 1904. Candidate for Presidency: Theodore Roosevelt.

Negro disfranchisement: We favor such congressional action as shall determine whether by special discrimination the elective franchise in any state has been unconstitutionally limited, and if such is the case, we demand that representation in Congress and in the electoral college shall be proportionally reduced as directed by the Constitution of the United States.

Chicago, June 18, 1908. Candidate for Presidency: William H. Taft.

The Negro: The Republican Party has been for more than 50 years the consistent friend of the American Negro. It gave him freedom and citizenship. It wrote into the organic law the declarations that proclaim his civil and political rights, and it believes today that his noteworthy progress in intelligence, industry and good citizenship has earned the respect and encouragement of the nation. We demand equal justice for all men without regard to race or color; we declare once more, and without reservation, for the enforcement in letter and spirit of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, which were designed for the protection and advancement of the Negro; and we condemn all devices that have for their real aim his disfranchisement for reasons of color alone as unfair, un-American and repugnant to the supreme law of the land.

Chicago, June 18, 1912. Candidate for Presidency: William H. Taft.

The Republican party reaffirms its intention to uphold at all times the authority and integrity of the courts, both state and federal, and it will ever insist that their powers to enforce their processes and to protect life, liberty and property shall be preserved inviolate.

Chicago, June 8, 1915. Candidate for Presidency: Charles Evans Hughes.

No direct reference to the Negro.

Chicago, June 8, 1920. Candidate for Presidency: Warren G. Harding.

We urge Congress to consider the most effective means to end lynching in this country which continues to be a terrible blot on our American civilization.

Cleveland, Ohio, June 12, 1924. Candidate for Presidency: Calvin Coolidge.

The Negro: We urge Congress to enact at the earliest possible date a Federal anti-lynching law, so that the full influence of the federal government may be wielded to exterminate this hideous crime.

We believe that much of the misunderstanding which now exists can be eliminated by humane and sympathetic study of its causes. The President has recommended the creation of a commission for the investigation of social and economic conditions and the promotion of mutual understanding and confidence.

Kansas City, June 13, 1928. Candidate for Presidency: Herbert Hoover.

We renew our recommendation that Congress enact at the earliest possible date a federal anti-lynching law, so that the full influence of the federal government may be wield to exterminate this hideous crime.

Individuals and Newspapers Bolt the Republican Party

An interesting feature of the 1924 Presidential campaign was that several prominent Negroes left the Republican party and enrolled themselves as Democrats or Progressives. A striking and important feature of the 1928 Presidential campaign was the very large number of prominent Negroes who left the Republican party and enrolled themselves as Democrats. The National Democrats and Republican Campaign Committees had highly organized Negro divisions. These committees, as in the campaign of 1924, sent campaign literature, gotten up especially for Negro voters.

During the 1928 Presidential campaign Negro voting clubs, in support of Smith for President, were organized in Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, West Virginia, Texas, Virginia, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, Kansas, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Colorado and Arizona.

Widespread comment was occasioned by the bolting of colored newspapers throughout the country from the G. O. P. to the Smith camp. Chief among the leading race publications to support Governor Smith for President were: The Chicago Defender, Baltimore Afro-American, Norfolk Journal and Guide, Boston Guardian, Louisville News, Negro World, Washington Eagle, Interstate Tattler, New York Contender, Kansas City American, Gary Sun, Harlem Star, Muskogee Herald, New Jersey Lance, West Indian Times, and Chicago World. The St. Louis Argus, Kansas City Call and other influential colored papers, while not editorially espousing Governor Smith's election said nothing in advocacy of Mr. Hoover.

It is the first time in history that the colored press has supported in such large numbers a Democratic aspirant for the Presidency.

A unique feature of the campaign was that of a white man running for President and a Negro candidate for Vice-President on the same ticket—that of the Interracial Independent Political Party, organized on June 4, 1928.

The Presidential candidate was General Jacob S. Coxey, leader of "Coxey's Army" of 1894, composed of jobless men who marched to Washington to obtain relief. Coxey, who was 74, operates a silica sand company in Ohio and also has oil interests in Oklahoma. The Negro Vice-Presidential candidate was Simon P. Drew, a clergyman and real estate operator of Washington, D. C.

Efforts to Make the Negro a Political Issue

As the 1928 Presidential campaign progressed efforts were made to make the Negro a political issue. A news item circulated in Negro newspapers during the month of September said: "Disclosures that the Ku Klux Klan lily-white Republicans and bolting southern Democrats are using the Negro in their propaganda to discredit Alfred E. Smith have aroused widespread resentment among colored Americans irrespective of party affiliation. Conclusive proof that a plot exists to jointly vilify the Governor and Negroes is apparent on every hand."

A pamphlet was circulated which said that a Negro occupied a position as Civil Service Commissioner under Tammany Hall, and that if Smith was elected the Negro would be made a member of Governor Smith's cabinet.

The Mobile (Alabama) Register, in its issue of October 14, asked:

"Who made the Negro race one of the outstanding issues of this national campaign? Not the people of the South nor can all the blame be put upon either of the major political parties. Both parties are mak-

ing an energetic bid for the Negro vote in certain states where these voters are sufficiently numerous to turn the scales in close contests.

"The truth of the matter is that more Negroes will vote the Democratic ticket this year than ever before in the history of the country. Why has the Negro vote assumed such importance in the national campaign this year? No matter how it happened, or who is to blame for it, it is unfortunate that the Negro should have become an issue in this national campaign. Obviously, the prime reason for the appearance of the Negro as an issue in the campaign is in the fact that the Democratic party, for the first time in its history, is making an appeal for the Negro vote in such states as New York, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Maryland and a few other states where the vote may be of importance in the event of a close vote between the two major parties in November."

"The New Orleans Item regretted that such extraneous stuff as this has been forced into a campaign in which neither the platforms nor the personal statements of the candidates give them any proper place." Speaking of all unnamed southern Democrats who "would have all Democratic speakers warn deserters that if they made common cause with the Republicans they would bring the Negro back into power in Virginia," The Richmond News-Leader said:

"Against the injustice and the unwisdom of such a course, The News-Leader wishes here and now to enter its protest. Why should the South go backward politically? Why should it be the slave of unfounded fears? The Negro has not involved himself in this campaign. He did not make the Volstead Law. He nominated neither Hoover nor Smith. He is Protestant, but he is not anti-Catholic and, manifestly, he is not an ally of the Klan. Prejudice against Smith cannot be combatted with prejudice against the Negro."

Southern White Men and Women Protest Injection of Race Question into Presidential Campaign

In October, 1928, forty-six southern men and women issued the following protest:

The undersigned citizens of the South, some of them supporters of the one Presidential candidate and some of the other, desire unitedly to voice this public protest against the injection of the race question into the present political campaign.

Had either political group alone been responsible for raising this subject we would hesitate to make this statement, lest it be thought partisan. But it is being raised by partisans of both sides who, for the purpose of driving voters into their respective camps, are, in our judgment, reopening the healing wounds of bitterness and hate.

We believe these appeals are both irrelevant and dangerous. It is our hope that no one will be deterred by them from calmly considering the real issues and voting his honest convictions; and certainly that no one will allow them to inflame his mind with antagonism toward our Negro neighbors, who too long have been pawns in the game of politics. Any attempt to influence men and women with an issue so untimely is unworthy of the white man and unjust to all. If taken seriously, it is the sowing of dragon's teeth of which future generations must reap the harvest.

Happily, we believe it will not be taken seriously. We believe our citizenship is too intelligent and too fairminded thus to sacrifice the cause of interracial peace and progress. We, therefore, call upon the leadership of the South—the pulpit, the press, the platform—and upon every right-thinking man and woman among us to disclaim, discourage and discontinue such appeals to prejudice and fear, to the end that the gains of recent years in interracial good-will and understanding may not be sacrificed to the passing interest of a political campaign.

Signers by states:

Alabama:
Dr. Dunbar H. Ogden, Mobile
E. G. Rickarby, Mobile
Dr. H. M. Edmonds, Birmingham
Mrs. J. H. McCoy, Athens.

Georgia:
Robert C. Alston, Atlanta
Robert L. Foreman, Atlanta
Dr. Plato T. Durham, Atlanta
E. Marvin Underwood, Atlanta
Louis D. Newton, Atlanta
Bishop F. F. Reese, Savannah
Bishop W. B. Beauchamp, Atlanta.

Kentucky:
Judge Robert Bingham, Louisville
Mrs. Atwood Martin, Louisville
Col. P. H. Callahan, Louisville
Mrs. Helm Bruce, Louisville.

Mississippi:
Dr. D. M. Key, Jackson
Bishop T. D. Bratton, Jackson.

North Carolina:
Dr. Howard W. Odum, Chapel Hill
Mrs. T. W. Bickett, Raleigh
Dr. W. P. Few, Durham
Dr. W. C. Jackson, Greensboro
E. P. Wharton, Greensboro
Col. Henry N. Varies, Winston-Salem
Dr. W. L. Poteat, Wake Forest
J. B. Ivey, Charlotte
Gilbert T. Stephenson, Raleigh
J. G. Hanes, Winston-Salem

South Carolina:
Walter B. Wilbur, Charleston
Dr. W. J. McGlothlin, Greenville
Dr. E. O. Watson, Columbia
Bishop K. G. Finlay, Columbia
Dr. H. N. Snyder, Spartanburg
W. C. Coker, Hartsville.

Tennessee:
Dr. J. H. Kirkland, Nashville
Dr. James I. Vance, Nashville
Dr. John L. Hill, Nashville
Dr. J. D. Blanton, Nashville

George F. Milton, Chattanooga
Dr. C. B. Wilmer, Sewanee.

Texas:
George B. Dealey, Dallas
A. S. Cleveland, Houston
Dr. George W. Truett, Dallas

Virginia:
Dr. E. A. Alderman, Charlottesville
Dr. R. E. Blackwell, Ashland
Dr. James H. Dillard, Charlottesville
John Stewart Bryan, Richmond.

An Appeal to America Against Making the Negro a Political Issue

On October 25, 1928, thirty-four leading Negroes of the country, Democrats and Republicans, issued "An Appeal to America" against the injection of race prejudice into the Presidential campaign as follows:

The persons whose names are signed beneath are alike in the fact that we all have Negro slaves among our ancestors. In other respects, we differ widely; in descent, in dwelling place, in age and occupation, and, to some extent, in our approach to what is known as the Negro problem.

More especially we differ in political thought and allegiance; some of us are Republicans by inheritance and long custom; others are Democrats, by affiliation and party membership; others are Socialists.

But all of us are at this moment united in the solemn conviction that in the Presidential campaign of 1928, more than in previous campaigns since the Civil War, the American Negro is being treated in a manner which is unfair and discouraging.

We accuse the political leaders of this campaign of permitting without protest, public and repeated assertions on the platform, in the press, and by word of mouth, that color and race constitute in themselves an imputation of guilt and crime.

It has been said, North and South, East and West, and by partisans of the leading candidates:

1. That Negro voters should not be appealed to, or their support welcome by the advocates of just causes.

2. That colored persons should not hold public office, no matter what their character may be, nor how well they do their work, nor how competently they satisfy their constituents.

3. That the contact of white people and black people in government, in business, in daily life and in common effort and cooperation, calls for explanation and apology.

4. That the honesty and integrity of party organization depend on the complete removal of all Negroes from voice and authority.

5. That the appointment of a public official is an act which concerns only white citizens, and that colored citizens should have neither voice nor consideration in such appointments.

These assertions, which sound bald and almost unbelievable when stated without embellishment, have appeared as full-paged advertisements in the public press, as the subject of leading editorials, and as displayed news stories; they have been repeated on the public platform in open debate and over the radio by both Republican and Democratic speakers, and they have been received by the nation and by the adherents of these and other parties in almost complete silence. A few persons have depreciated this gratuitous lugging in of the race problem, but for the most part, this astonishing campaign of public insult toward one-tenth of the nation has evoked no word of protest from the leading party candidates or from their official spokesmen; and from few religious ministers, Protestant or Catholic, or Jewish, and from almost no leading social reformer.

Much has been said and rightly of the danger in a republic like ours of making sincere religious belief a matter of political controversy and of diverting public attention from great questions of public policy to petty matters of private life. But, citizens of America, bad as religious hatred and evil personal gossip are, they have not the seeds of evil and disaster that lie in continued, unlimited and restrained appeal to race prejudice. The emphasis of racial contempt and hatred which is being made in this campaign is an appeal to the lowest and most primitive of human motives, and as long as this appeal can successfully be made, there is for this land no real peace, no sincere religion, no national unity, no social progress, even in matters far removed from racial controversy.

Do not misunderstand us; we are not asking equality where there is no equality. We are not demanding or even discussing purely social intermingling. We have not the slightest desire for intermarriage between the races. We frankly recognize that the aftermath of slavery must involve long years of poverty, crime and contempt; for all of this that the past has brought and the present gives we have paid in good temper, quiet work and unfaltering faith. But we do solemnly affirm that in a civilized land and in a Christian culture and among increasingly intelligent people, somewhere and sometime, limits must be put to race disparagement and separation and to campaigns of racial calumny which seek to set twelve million human beings outside the pale of ordinary humanity.

We believe that this nation and every part of it must come to admit that the gradual disappearance of inequalities between racial groups and the gradual softening of prejudice and hatred, is a sign of advance and not of retrogression and should be hailed as such by all decent folk and we think it monstrous to wage a political campaign in which the fading and softening of racial animosity and the increase of cooperation can be held up to the nation as a fault and not as a virtue. We do not believe that the majority of the white people whether North or South believe in the necessity or the truth of the assertions current in this campaign; but we are astonished to see the number of persons who are whipped to silence in the presence of such obvious and ancient political trickery.

You cannot set the requirements of political honesty and intelligence too high to gain our consent. We have absolutely no quarrel with standards of ability and character which will bring to public office in America the very highest type of public servant. We are more troubled over political dishonesty among black folk than you are among white. We are not seeking political domination. But, on the other hand, it is too late for us to submit to political slavery and we most earnestly protest against the unchallenged assumption that every American Negro is dishonest and incompetent and that color itself is a crime.

It is not so much the virulance of the attack in this case. It is its subtle and complacent character and the assenting silence in which it is received. Gravely and openly

these assertions are made and few care, few protest, few answer. Has not the time come when as a nation, North and South, black and white, we can stop this tragic fooling and demand not to be sure, everything that all Negroes might wish nor all that some white people might prefer, but a certain balance of decency and logic in the discussion of race? Can we not as a nation assert that the Constitution is the law of the land and that the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth and Nineteenth Amendments as well as the Eighteenth are still valid; that it is no crime for a colored man to vote if he meets the legal requirements; that it is not a crime to appoint a colored man to office unless he is incompetent; and if he is incompetent, the crime lies in his incompetency and not in his color; that in this modern world of necessarily increasing human contact it is inevitable that persons of different races work together in private and public service; that this contact is not wrong unless the persons are unable to do their work properly or unless their helpful cooperation is proven impossible?

We are asking, therefore, in this appeal, for a public repudiation of this campaign of racial hatred. Silence and whispering in this case are worse than in matters of personal character and religion. Will white America make no protest? Will the candidates continue to remain silent? Will the church say nothing? Is there any truth, any issue in this campaign, either religious tolerance, liquor, water power, tariff or farm relief, that touches in weight the transcendent and fundamental question of the open, loyal and unchallenged recognition of the essential humanity of twelve million Americans who happen to be dark-skinned?

R. R. Moton, principal, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama.
W. E. B. DuBois, editor, Crisis Magazine, New York.
John Hope, president, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia.
Mordecai W. Johnson, president, Howard University, Washington, D. C.
Harry E. Davis, civil service commissioner, City of Cleveland, Ohio.
George C. Clement, bishop, A. M. E. Zion Church, Louisville, Kentucky.
Sallie W. Stewart, president, National Association of Colored Women, Evanston, Indiana.
C. C. Spaulding, president, North Carolina Mutual Insurance Company, Durham, North Carolina.
James Weldon Johnson, secretary, The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York.
Fred R. Moore, alderman, City of New York, editor, The New York Age, New York.
Eugene K. Jones, secretary, the National Urban League, New York.
W. T. B. Williams, field agent, Jeanes and Slater Funds, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama.
Walter White, assistant secretary, The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York.
C. A. Barnett, director, Associated Negro Press, Chicago, Illinois.
R. Nathaniel Dett, head, department of music, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia.
Ferdinand Q. Morton, municipal civil service commissioner, New York City.
Mary McLeod Bethune, president, Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona, Florida.
William H. Lewis, former assistant attorney general of the United States, attorney-at-law, Boston, Massachusetts.
George W. Harris, former alderman, City of New York, editor, The New York News, New York.
E. P. Roberts, physician, New York City.
George E. Haynes, secretary, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York.
Monroe N. Work, director of Records and Research, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama.
John R. Hawkins, financial secretary, African Methodist Episcopal Church, chairman, Colored Republican Voters Division, Washington, D. C.
Reverdy C. Ransom, bishop, African M. E. Church, Nashville, Tennessee.
Archibald J. Carey, bishop, African M. E. Church, Chicago, Illinois.
Channing H. Tobias, secretary, International Committee, Y. M. C. A., New York.
Albert B. George, judge, municipal court, Chicago, Illinois.
S. W. Green, supreme chancellor, Knights of Pythias, New Orleans, Louisiana.
Robert E. Jones, bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church, New Orleans, Louisiana.
Carl Murphy, editor, The Afro-American, Baltimore, Maryland.
F. B. Ransom, manager, Walker Manufacturing Company, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Elizabeth Ross Haynes, member, National Board, Y. W. C. A., New York.
Robert W. Bagnall, field agent, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York.
L. K. Williams, president, National, Baptist Convention, Chicago, Illinois.

Negro Not Mentioned in President's Inaugural Address

President Hoover was criticised because in his inaugural address he failed to mention the Negro. It was pointed out that: "Briefly the President touched upon the whole catalogue of governmental ideals, issues and problems, save the one which through the very force of circumstances is of especial interest to twelve million American citizens. He found it neither necessary nor expedient, as have his party's predecessors, to make special reference to the Negro.

"It is no desire of the Negro to be considered a subject apart from this body politic. Rather it is his strivings that his hopes, interests and aspirations be fused with those of the national citizenship. But born of a peculiarly American psychology are barriers that do actually set him apart in the attainment of the blessings of life, the pursuit of happiness and the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. Until these barriers are lowered it comes as a disappointment to the race group for a President of this great nation, either by

word or act, to feign their non-existence. Every hope of the race, material and spiritual, is inextricably inter-woven into its hope of equal citizenship, and nothing in the realm of government transcends that question in importance to us."

It was pointed out by the Negro newspapers that President Coolidge had failed to fulfill the expectations of Negroes. When he succeeded the late President Harding, it was believed because he was a New Englander that he would give full recognition to the civil and political rights of colored Americans. His five years and seven months in the White House dispelled this belief.

When he came into the Presidency, colored Republicans were smarting under the treatment that had been accorded them by President Harding. There had been a partial removal of the proscriptions, discrimination and segregation that had been put into effect during the Wilson regime. Glowing campaign promises of 1920 had not been kept. There had been only three appointments of colored Republicans to statutory positions, the Rev. Solomon Porter Hood as minister to Liberia; Charles W. Anderson as collector of internal revenue in New York, and Arthur G. Froe as recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia.

Negroes revived their hopes when Mr. Coolidge took the oath of office. They recalled that he had declared for a more general recognition of their constitutional rights, relief for them from all imposition, and the granting of equal opportunities to them.

Aside from the fact that he was President of the United States, the inaugural address of President Hoover was of little interest to us.

We have used every possible stretch of our imagination trying to construe some word or phrase of his address to mean that the new President thought of our group, as we are affected by certain conditions in America today. And, of course, not finding such words or other expressions as we had expected, we very naturally feel disappointed.

It was significantly noticed that Mr. Hoover put much time and emphasis on the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution, committing himself to its enforcement, but it was also noticeable that he did not say a word about the enforcement of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

We don't know whether the President was "dodging the issue" or not, but we do know, at some time, some President of these United States is going to face the issue like a man. Of course, it will take a man of courage and a man probably the size of Lincoln to do it, but it must be done. The denial of one-tenth of the citizens of their common rights under the Constitution cannot forever be ignored by the law enforcement machinery from the President down to the petty officers, and kissing the Bible is a colossal joke unless one believes in God and as such believes in right and is willing to stand or fall by that belief.

The Negro and the Republican Party in the South

Those in charge of the policies of the Republican party have for a number of years been making efforts to build up the party in the South, independent of the control of the Negro. One phase of this policy was to cut down the number of delegates from the South to the national conventions of the party. This was first put into practice with respect to delegates to the 1916 convention. The result was that the number of Negro delegates from the South was cut from 62 in 1912 to 32 in 1916. On June 8, 1921, the Republican National Committee adopted a resolution to further reduce the number of delegates from the South to the National Convention. Under this ruling delegates to the 1924 Convention were to be selected on the following basis:

"1. One district delegate from each Congressional district maintaining therein a Republican district organization and casting 2,500 votes or more for any Republican elector in the last preceding Presidential election, or for the Republican nominee for Congress in the last preceding Congressional election.

"2. One additional district delegate for each Congressional district casting 10,000 votes or more for any Republican elector in the last preceding Presidential election, or for the Republican nominee for Congress in the last preceding Congressional

election, or having elected a Republican representative in Congress at the last preceding Congressional election."

At the meeting of the Republican National Committee on December 12, 1923, the mandate of the 1920 National Convention, fixing the apportionment of delegates from the South on the basis of one delegate for each 2,500 Republican voters, was reversed, and the old apportionment of one delegate for each Congressional district was restored; that is, the basis of apportioning delegates for the 1924 and 1928 National Republican Convention was practically the same as that for 1920.

The number of Negro delegates, 27, reached low water mark at the 1920 Convention. Augmented by Negro delegates from a few northern states, the number of Negro delegates increased to 39 in the 1924 Convention and 49 in the 1928 Convention. There were also 55 Negro alternate delegates to this latter Convention making their total representation, 104 in the 1928 National Republican Convention.

Names of Negro Delegates and Alternates to the 1928 Republican National Convention

ARIZONA—Alternate at-large: John D. Washington, Phoenix.

ARKANSAS—Delegates: 5th district, S. A. Jones, Little Rock. Alternates: 5th district, A. C. Logan, Little Rock; 6th district, H. H. Phipps, Hot Springs.

COLORADO—Alternate at-large: Joseph D. D. Rivers, Denver.

FLORIDA—Alternate at-large: John R. Scott, Jacksonville.

GEORGIA—Delegates at-large: Benjamin Jefferson Davis, Atlanta; Joseph H. Watson, Albany; 1st district, * William James, Statesboro; * B. W. S. Daniels, Savannah; 2nd district, B. F. Cofer, Albany; 3rd district, E. S. Richardson, Marshallville; 4th district, E. J. Turner, Columbus; 6th district, * Sol C. Clemons, Macon, and * J. J. Wright, Forsyth; 8th district, W. H. Harris, Athens; 10th district, R. C. Williams, Augusta; 11th district, E. W. Brinkins, Woodbine; 12th district, H. A. Hunt, Fort Valley. Alternates at-large: William P. Harris, Athens; Mrs. Sarah Watson King, Atlanta; 1st district, Mrs. Mamie M. Pringle, Savannah· 2nd district, Lem Webb, Arlington; 3rd district, J. A. Lee, Cuthbert; 4th district, R. H. Cobb, Columbus; 5th district, A. T. Walden, Atlanta; 6th district, G. W. Drake, Thomaston; 7th district, * Frank P. Rogers, Jr., Marietta; 8th district, P. J. Blackwell, Elberton; 10th district, George W. Bentley, Lincolnton; 12th district, L. L. Ellison, McRae.

ILLINOIS—Delegates: 1st district, Oscar DePriest, Chicago, and Daniel M. Jackson, Chicago. Alternates: 1st district, Robert R. Jackson, Chicago, and Roscoe C. Simmons, Chicago.

INDIANA—Alternate at-large: Ernest Tidrington, Evansville.

KANSAS—Alternate at-large: T. W. Bell, Leavenworth.

KENTUCKY—Delegates at-large: W. T. Merchant, Louisville; 1st district, S. H. George, Paducah. Alternate at-large: G. W. Broadus, Richmond.

LOUISIANA—Delegates at-large: J. A. Bingaman, New Orleans; 1st district, Walter L. Cohen, New Orleans; 2nd district, C. C. Wilson, New Orleans; 6th district, J. H. Lowery, Donaldsonville. Alternate at-large: Andrew Turner, New Orleans; 2nd district, E. S. Swann, New Orleans.

MARYLAND—Delegates: 4th district, John L. Berry, Baltimore; 5th district, Jeremiah Hawkins, Brentwood. Alternates: 4th district, Marse S. Calloway, Baltimore; 5th district, Mrs. H. B. Cardoza, Bennings, D. C.

MASSACHUSETTS—Alternate: 11th district, Walter Foster, Boston.

MISSISSIPPI—Delegates at-large: *P. W. Howard, Jackson; * S. D. Redmond, Jackson; * W. L. Mhoon, Jackson; 2nd district, G. S. Goodman, Holly Springs; 3rd district, E. P. Booze, Mound Bayou; 4th district, * W. W. Phillips, Kosciusko; and D. M. P. Hazley, Kosciusko; 5th district, * C. T. Butler, Meridian; 6th district, Thomas I. Keys, Ocean Springs; 8th district, * A. M. Redmond, Jackson, and * E. L. Patton, Jackson. Alternates at-large: *Mrs. M. C. Booze, Mound Bayou; * A. J. Brown, Vicksburg; * Mrs. Annie E. Mhoon, Jackson; * E. W. Barnes, Canton; 1st district, L. G. Sims, Aberdeen; 3rd district, J. H. Miller, Mound Bayou; 4th district, C. H. Wheeler, Okolona; 5th district, A. C. Drummond, Newton; 6th district, C. J. Burns, Laurel; 8th district, J. W. Hair, Jackson.

MISSOURI—Delegates at-large: Walthall Moore, St. Louis; 12th district, C. E. Clark, St. Louis. Alternates at-large: Mrs. Myrtle Cook, Kansas City; 8th district, C. G. Williams, Jefferson City.

NEW JERSEY—Delegate at-large: Walter G. Alexander, Orange. Alternate at-large: Bessie B. Mention, Princeton.

NEW YORK—Delegate: 21st district, Richard M. Bolden, New York City.

OHIO—Delegates at-large: E. W. B. Curry, Springfield; 21st district, Leroy N. Bundy, Cleveland. Alternate at-large: Leroy H. Godman, Columbus.

PENNSYLVANIA—Alternates at-large: Mrs. Daisy E. Lampkin, Pittsburgh; 1st district, William Almond, Philadelphia.

SOUTH CAROLINA—Delegates at-large: Wesley S. Dixon, Barnwell; John H. Goodwin, Columbia; 2nd district, John M. Jones, Saluda; 5th district, John D. Dye, Lancaster; 6th district, William Howard, Darlington. Alternates at-large: L. C. Waller Greenwood; Benjamin Madden, Laurens; Edwin J. Sawyer, Bennettsville; 1st district, T. H. Pinckney, St. George; 2nd district, William A. Jackson, Aiken; 4th district, B. T. Smith, Spartanburg; 5th district, E. W. Boulware, Winnsboro; 6th district, J. R. Levy, Florence; 7th district, C. G. Garrett, Columbia.

TENNESSEE—Delegate: 10th district, R. R. Church, Memphis.

WEST VIRGINIA—Alternates at-large: S. R. Anderson, Bluefield; J. C. Gilmer, Charleston; 5th district, J. E. Brown, Keystone.

* ½ vote each.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—Delegate at-large: John R. Hawkins, Washington. Alternate at-large; William H. Jernagin, Washington.

For list of Negro delegates to 1924 Convention, see 1925-26 Negro Year Book pp. 245; for 1920 Convention, see 1921-22 Negro Year Book pp. 183; and for 1912 and 1916 Conventions, see 1918-19 Negro Year Book, pp. 208-10.

NEGRO DELEGATES TO NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONVENTION
1912, 1916, 1920, 1924, 1928

STATES	1912 Delegates	1916 Delegates	1920 Delegates	1924 Delegates	1924 Alternates	1928 Delegates	1928 Alternates
Alabama	7	1	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	4	0	0	0	0	1	2
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Colorado	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Florida	4	1	4	1	0	0	1
Georgia	13	10	5	11	0	13	12
Illinois	0	0	1	0	1	2	2
Indiana	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Kansas	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kentucky	1	1	1	1	0	2	1
Louisiana	5	6	6	6	0	4	2
Maryland	0	0	2	1	0	2	2
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mississippi	11	6	2	6	0	11	10
Missouri	0	0	2	1	0	2	2
New Jersey	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
New York	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Ohio	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
South Carolina	12	6	2	4	0	5	9
Tennessee	1	2	1	3	0	1	0
Texas	6	1	0	1	0	0	0
West Virginia	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
District of Columbia	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
Total	65	35	29	39	1	49	55

Further Efforts to Build Up Republican Party in South

To further the efforts to build up the Republican party in the South President Hoover, on March 26, 1929, issued the following statement:

"It has been the aspiration of Republican Presidents over many years to build up sound Republican organizations in the southern states of such character as would commend itself to the citizens of those states.

"This aspiration has arisen out of no narrow sense of partisanship but from the conviction shared in equally by the leaders of all parties that the basis of sound government must rest upon strong two-party representation and organization; that the voice of all states in the councils of the government can be assured by no other means; that the welfare of the nation at large requires the breaking down of sectionalism in politics; that the public service can be assured only by responsible organization.

"Furthermore it has been the belief of these leaders, whose views I share, that the building up of such organization must in every conception of our foundations of local self-government evolve from those states themselves.

"Republican leadership in the border states and in Virginia and North Carolina has long since built up vigorous party organization which assures Republican representation in the Congress from those states.

"In other states including Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, and Florida, the Republican leadership has in recent times shown increasing strength and is now rendering able and conscientious service in maintaining wholesome organization under whose advice the appointments to public office have steadily improved and commended themselves to the citizens of those states with increased confidence in the party.

"I heartily approve and welcome the movement of the leaders of Texas, Alabama, Florida and other states to broaden the basis of party organization by the establishment of advisory committees of the highest type of citizenship to deal with administrative questions and who will also cooperate with independent Democrats.

"This movement, springing as it does from within the states themselves insures its strength, perma-

nence and constant improvement in public service.

"Recent exposures of abuse in recommendations for federal office, particularly in some parts of the states of South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi under which some of the federal departments, mainly the Post Office, were misled in appointments, obviously render it impossible for the old organizations in those states to command the confidence of the administration, although many members of these organizations are not subject to criticism.

"But such conditions are intolerable to public service, are repugnant to the ideals and purposes of the Republican party, are unjust to the people of the South and must be ended. The duty of reorganization so as to correct these conditions rests with the people of those states, and all efforts to that end will receive the hearty cooperation of the administration.

"If these three states are unable to initiate such organizations through the leadership of men who will command confidence and protect the public service, the different federal departments will be compelled to adopt other methods to secure advice as to the selection of federal employees."

Views of White Press on a Two-Party System in South

The reaction of the press to President Hoover's pronouncement was varied. The Literary Digest's summary of the views of the white press follows:

"Reconstruction" was the policy of the Republican party until last month as far as the South was concerned, says The Boston Globe (dem); "Mr. Hoover has now thrown the policy on the scrap heap." "If Mr. Hoover succeeds," says The New Haven Register (Ind.), "he will end the last excuse for division between sections of the country that is based on the controversies that brought about the Civil War."

The political angle engages the attention of The Baltimore Evening Sun (Ind.) which says:

"Many observers have assumed that as soon as the emotional crisis, precipitated by religious warfare, has subsided, all the southern states would promptly flop back into the Democratic column. But this assumption does not take into account the thousands of southerners who have for years been wishing that they dared vote the Republican ticket. To these the 'Holy War' came as a blessed relief. Under guise of supporting any war one could vote the Republican ticket without being regarded as disreputable. Such men will continue to vote that ticket if it is made possible for them to do so.

"Mr. Hoover, unlike the observers, takes account of this element. He is aware that, while the millions of southerners represented by Bishop Cannon could vote for him as against a Catholic without losing caste, they cannot, without losing caste, put themselves under the leadership of such Negro politicians as Ben Davis, Perry Howard, and Gooseneck Bill McDonald. Therefore, if Mr. Hoover continues to maintain Davis, Howard, and McDonald as high officers in his party, these southerners at the next election will—regretfully, perhaps, but resolutely—part company with him.

"Therefore, when he flung the Negroes out, the President unquestionably did take a long step toward assuring the permanency of the Republican South. It is rough on the Negroes, but it is first-rate politics."

While certain that no student of southern conditions will admit for a moment that Mr. Hoover can permanently break the Solid South, The Richmond Times-Dispatch admits that "because of his leadership, many restless voters may yet find a political home in which they can take pride." And an editorial in The Jacksonville Journal concluded with the words: "It looks as if the South may within the next few years embrace the two-party theory."

"The mere fact that a Republican President should have taken notice of the evil of job-peddling in the South is something to be grateful for," admits The Birmingham Age-Herald, but it cannot find anything "stirring and epochal" about a mere separation of "sheep from goats among Republican leaders." "The President is mistaken," declares the Jackson (Miss.) News, "if he believes that by substituting white leaders in whom the people of Mississippi have confidence whatever, he can form a white Republican party strong enough to compete with entrenched Democracy." Governor Bilbo of Mississippi is quoted as saying, "As between the black-and-tan organization that has been in power, and the leaders whom Mr. Hoover will probably select, I prefer the Negroes." The News thinks this voices much southern sentiment.

"If the Republican party manages to keep clean after once being subjected to a thorough scrubbing, it stands to become a real factor in the political life of the Southland," we read in The Republican Charleston (W. Va.) Mail. Here The San Francisco Chronicle (Rep.) sees "a step toward making it respectable for a southerner to be a Republican," and David Lawrence, in one of his Washington dispatches, points out that the President's announcement "affords a place for the Hoover Democrats to go if their brethren don't take them back."

It will be a good thing for both Republicans and Democrats, argue The Chicago Evening Post (Ind.) and Los Angeles Times (Rep.), to have a real two-party South, and The California Daily even thinks that this may help to create a natural party division of the country into conservative and liberal camps. The New Republic has no illusions about such hopes—"economic developments in the South are moving it toward the Republican party, but these developments will be much too slow for Mr. Hoover's impatience." The Providence News (Dem.) is skeptical about any real clean-up—"it may be that after a period of great breast-thumping and eye elevation, the Perry Howards will find their way back to grace." Even among papers which approve the purpose of the Hoover move, there is acute perception of certain practical difficulties, especially in connection with the Negro voter. As The Hartford Courant (Rep.) puts it:

"A southern Republican party under Negro leadership or in which Negroes and whites are to mingle on terms of equality cannot be made to attract the white element Mr. Hoover is after. A 'lily-white' party cannot be made strong unless it takes the same attitude toward Negroes the Democratic party does. If the Republican party turns its face against the Negroes in the South, it will lose the Negro votes. There will be repercussions in northern and border states where Negro votes are important and where, in some cases, they represent the balance of power."

The most vigorous presentation of the dilemma thus outlined comes in a Chicago Tribune editorial, which says that the two-party idea is a good one, but to accomplish it "the Democratic party in the South must be reformed as well as the Republican."

"What Mr. Hoover proposes to do is to abolish the Republican organization as a protection for the Negroes, and deliver it to a faction of the Democratic party. The Republican party will sacrifice its Negroes. Wades, Sumners, and Stevenses are needed to prevent it.

"Under existing conditions in the South the Republican party organization has been the only asylum for the Negro. In violation of the Constitution, he is disfranchised, and the protection of the ballot-box is denied to him. He gets slave justice in the southern courts, and he may be murdered with impunity. Arrayed against him are the southern whites with their Ku Klux Klan, whites with a thirst for mint juleps for themselves and prohibition for the Negro. The enemies of the Negro compose the Democratic party in the South.

"The upbuilding of a strong two-party system in the South should not come until the South enfranchises the Negro or takes the constitutional penalty of reduction of representation in Congress for failure to do so."

"No one but a blind partisan, steeped and saturated in malice and hate," could have written the sentences just quoted, bitterly replies The Nashville Tennesseean from the South, and it makes a wholesale denial of The Tribune's assertions:

"The Democratic party has administered, almost without interruption, the public affairs in the states of the South. It has provided for the education and whatever opportunities for development the Negro has had. It has contributed of our wealth to promote the welfare of the Negro. Democratic leaders and the Democratic party have routed the Ku Klux Klan in the South. They have pleaded for justice for the Negro. The relations between the two

races are today better than they have been since reconstruction days. The Democratic party is not now and has never been the enemy of the Negroes. It is a slander and a libel to say that the Negro receives 'slave justice' in the courts of the South."

The Springfield (Ohio) Sun, under the caption "Sleeping Dogs Down South," said, "President Hoover has displayed considerable interest in cleaning up the party in the South. G. O. P. leaders frankly admit conditions in the party there have been deplorable.

"However, the southern end of the party will never be able to meet the problem of the Negro voter honestly and gain white adherents in the South in great numbers. That is, it cannot meet the problem honestly if it is sincere in its stand for support of the Eighteenth Amendment upon which it stood in the last election.

"The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments freed and enfranchised the Negro and guaranteed him the same right to vote as the white man. The Amendments are disregarded in the majority of southern states.

"By maintaining a solid white party the white man down South keeps the Negro from voting in nominations. This party has been Democratic since the Civil War.

"It is proposed to have a lily-white G. O. P. in the South. This would mean that the Republican party would go South and preach disregard for the Constitution while it fights aggressively to uphold it in the North.

"Now that the sleeping dogs have been aroused the Solid South, which is politically a white South, may become a white elephant to either party of its allegiance. It is becoming more and more difficult to explain those sleeping dogs while preaching upholding of the Constitution."

The Negro Press on President's Plan for Building up Republican Party in South

The Negro press expressed itself very frankly with regard to the President's plan for building up the Republican party in the South:

"More is involved," said The Chicago Defender, "in Mr. Hoover's plan of strengthening his party in the South rather than in the creation of a strong southern Republicanism. It may involve important party changes in the North itself. For it is not easy to discriminate against Negroes below the line without stirring Negro antipathies above the line. The rejection of Negro leaders in the black belt may conceivably lead to Negro resentment in the northern states.

"No plan that Mr. Hoover can present will make southern Republicanism formidable if it includes any effort to enforce the Fifteenth Amendment generally. Few southern Caucasians will support a crusade for general Negro enfranchisement. Never can southern Republicanism command the support of any great number of southern whites until it accepts the southern view of Negro suffrage and when that is done by the President and his lieutenants, there is danger of a Negro revolt at the North.

"In numerous northern states where Negro disfranchisement has never been practiced the Negro vote is a powerful factor. Without that vote several northern states now uniformly Republican would not be Republican at all. It, therefore, would become a serious matter in a national sense for the President to embrace a program that ignores the Fifteenth Amendment and to accept the southern view of suffrage. In trying to make southern states doubtful the administration might easily make northern states doubtful also."

The view of the St. Louis Argus was: "Many, many have been our thoughts concerning the reports through the public press to the effect that President Hoover has given his approval to a plan to take from the Negro whatever leadership he has in the South and put it into the hands of the so-called lily-whites in an effort to build up a Republican party in the South.

"As we see it, and we are not judging hastily, it looks to us that the President is 'kidding' himself if he thinks for one moment that there is the remotest chance of building a Republican party in the South at this time or as long as this country is conducted on a half-slave and half-free basis, as it is now operated.

"We wonder if Mr. Hoover thinks for one moment that the mere fact that such states as Texas, Florida, Virginia, and North Carolina, which

gave him a majority vote last November, is an indication that these states are any more Republican today than they were a year ago, or two years ago. Surely everybody knows that it was a case of voting against, rather than voting for. It was against the Catholic Church and liquor and not necessarily for Hoover and the Republican party. Had not the Democratic nominee been a Catholic, Hoover never would have carried a single southern state. Surely anybody who thinks at all knows this from a logical conclusion."

President Hoover has declared, said The Baltimore Herald-Commonwealth, "for a two-party system in the South, for a clean Republican organization in each state and an end to patronage selling in those states.

"The bright young men on the daily papers, always ready to give the Negro a jab, write pretty stuff in which they declare that the President has taken a stand for a party that is 'white, respectable and effective.'

"That the President wants a party that is respectable and effective there can be no doubt, but any assertion that he has any intention or thought of excluding Negroes, North or South, from the Republican party we believe to be absolutely false.

"In South Carolina Negroes derive no benefit from politics and for twenty years have taken no interest in conventions or elections. Disfranchised by Democrats and used as tools by the state organization the number who take active interest in politics has dwindled every year until those who attend precinct and county political conventions average less than fifty to the county.

"The great majority of those who attend these meetings are paid workers of the organization; the balance are men of character and deep party interest but despair of hope for party progress and give their time and labor in the vain effort to maintain some degree of respectability in the party. Intelligent and thoughtful Negro men and women of the South will welcome the advent of the two-party system in that section. They do not control now, they hold no offices now in the South and have nothing to lose but everything to gain, as under the two-party system they will in time surely recover the franchise."

The Houston (Texas) Informer comment was that: "The recent statement issued by President Herbert Hoover, discussing and dealing with Republican party organization in several of the southern states, has created quite a furore in political circles not only in the affected states, but throughout the country, and many Americans of both races are still endeavoring to analyze and comprehend the full import of the presidential announcement.

"For instance, the President censures the conduct of partisan affairs by Republican leaders in South Carolina, Georgia and Mississippi, while commending the partisan leaders in Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas and Florida.

"It is oddly strange that of the three states accused of bartering federal offices and other wrongdoing, two have colored National Committeemen and Committeewomen.

"After all, what is behind this Hoover statement?

"Is he trying to sound the deathknell to the active participation of colored Republicans in the affairs and councils of the party in the states and nation, and is this in line with a national plan to make the party 'lily-white' in the South?

"Is it additional political sop being dished out to the South in the vain hope that this section will become enamored of the Republican party, and that the proverbial political lion and lamb will lie down together?

"We are with President Hoover and party leaders in any honest and sincere desire and program to 'clean house' in the Republican party, but we cannot agree with the chief executive that Texas is among those southern states which are 'now rendering able and conscientious service in maintaining wholesome organizations.'

"Whether the President knows it or not, he is treading on dangerous ground, and he should wait until he has been in office long enough to know all the facts in the cases before giving out such a statement."

"The edict of the President scrapping black and tan organizations in the states of Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina and approving of

the lily-white organizations in other southern states has been recalled by him to taunt the advocates of a strong white Republican party in Dixie."

Success of Party Should Rest on Good Government Rather Than on Patronage

In October, 1929, the White House made public a letter from President Hoover telling the new Florida Republican organization that the success of the Republican party rests on good government, not on patronage.

It was alleged patronage abuses in the states of Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina which led President Hoover to issue his statement last March. It was a row over patronage that caused him to write a letter of rebuke to the Florida organization.

The letter was addressed to Fred Britten, secretary of the Republican state organization of Florida who had protested against President Hoover's disregard of the organization's recommendations for filling the district attorneyship in the southern district of Florida.

In the background of the Florida patronage row is the whole scheme of eliminating the Negro and building up a lily-white Republican party in the South.

The President's letter deals with this conflict. "It is the natural desire of the administration," wrote the President, "to build up and strengthen the Republican party in Florida. That can be done in cooperation with the state organization if the organization presents candidates who measure up to my requirements of public service.

"This is an obligation in the interest of the people of the state and the first tenet in that program is that no longer shall the laws of the United States be flouted by federal officials; no longer shall public offices be regarded as mere political patronage, but that it shall be public service.

"I note your demands that the organization shall dictate appointments, irrespective of merit or any responsibility, and that you appeal to opponents of the administration to attack me. I enclose herewith copy of statement which I issued last March. That statement was no idle gesture."

Negroes Win Right to Vote and Register in Oklahoma

Litigation over the right of Negroes to register and vote in Okfuskee County, Oklahoma, was finally ended June 1, 1927, when the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, St. Paul, Minnesota, dismissed the appeal taken from the United States District Court rendered at Tulsa, Oklahoma, against the county election board of Okfuskee County and the state election board of Oklahoma commanding the registrars to place upon the registration roll the names of more than 1,000 qualified voters of the Negro race.

Attorneys secured a judgment against the county election board in 1924, compelling the registration of about 800 Negroes. The board then appealed the case to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals which was argued and submitted in May, 1926.

A second suit was filed by more than 800 party plaintiffs against the county and the state election board including the state registrar, who is also secretary of the Senate of Oklahoma. It was tried in the Federal District Court at Tulsa in October, 1926.

This suit was in the nature of a mandatory injunction enjoining the state officials from refusing to afford the Negro voters an opportunity to register under the state law and commanded the state election board to appoint precinct registrars and furnish the necessary supplies for registration.

Judgment was rendered in favor of the plaintiffs. A colored registrar was duly appointed as a result of which more than 2,000 Negroes registered.

In order to prevent the Negroes from voting in the general election, the defendants applied to the Circuit Court of Appeals at St. Paul, Minnesota, November 1, 1926, for a writ of prohibition and stay of execution, which was opposed. Writ was denied, the Negroes were allowed to vote in the general election pending the appeal from the judgment of the District Court upon its merits.

Pending the hearing of the second appeal an opinion was rendered by the Circuit Court of Appeals in the first case in which the Court held that the District Court had jurisdiction and authority to issue a writ of mandamus in the first case, commanding the registration of qualified Negro voters.

The question of jurisdiction and power of Federal Courts to intervene was the principal matter involved. This question having been decided in the first appeal practically terminated the question involved in the second appeal.

The Circuit Court of Appeals sustaining the motion of the plaintiffs, made on June 2, 1927, to dismiss this appeal, put an end to the long drawn out litigation over the rights of the Negroes to vote.

As the result of the votes of the 2,000 Negroes registered in Okfuskee County by virtue of this litigation a Republican county judge and county commissioner favored by the colored people were elected. A Negro justice of the peace and several other Negro officials were also elected in that county.

The Negro and the Texas Democratic Primary

In 1918, the Negroes of Waco, Texas, went into the courts and demanded that they be permitted to vote in the so-called white primaries about to be held in that city. On February 28, 1918, Judge E. F. Clark of the Nineteenth District Court, in an injunction suit filed by several Negroes against E. L. Duke, et al., to restrain the holding of a "White Man's Primary," ruled that keeping Negroes from voting in the white primaries was a violation of Federal Law, of the state constitution, and also contrary to the Terrel Election Law. As a result of this ruling Negroes voted in the white man's primaries of Waco and Houston.

In 1922, the Supreme Court of the state ruled that any political party had the right in Texas to prescribe the qualifications for persons voting in its primaries and that therefore, the Democratic party had a right to hold a "White Man's Primary."

This decision, however, did not stop Negroes attempting to vote in Democratic primaries in the state. Negroes at Waco, Texas, were barred from participating in the 1922 Democratic primary under the ruling of Judge James P. Alexander of the Nineteenth Judicial Court at Waco.

During the early part of the year 1921, C. N. Love, W. L. Davis, J. B. Grigsby, William Nickerson, Jr., Newman Dudley, Jr., and Perry Mack of Houston, Texas, applied to the district court for an injunction to restrain the city Democratic executive committee and the election judges from holding a strictly white voters' primary, and to compel them to permit all electors, regardless of race, creed or color, to vote in the party primary. The court held that the question of voting under the primary election statutes was a political and not a legal one, and that it was without jurisdiction to interfere with the action of the executive committee. The plaintiffs appealed to the first court of civil appeals. This court also dismissed the suit. They then sued out a writ of error to the Supreme Court of Texas. This court dismissed the case for want of jurisdiction, but refused to write an opinion. The case was brought from that court to the Supreme Court of the United States on a writ of error.

October 20, 1924, this court ruled the case out on the ground that the "cause of action had ceased to exist."

The rule promulgated by the Democratic executive committee was for a single election only that had taken place long before the decision of the appellate court. No constitutional rights of the plaintiffs in error were infringed by holding that the cause of action had ceased to exist. The bill was for an injunction that could not be granted at that time. There was no constitutional obligation to extend the remedy beyond what was prayed.

Negroes voted in the 1922 Democratic primary election at San Antonio, Texas. Because of this, the committee on salaries and platforms recommended to the State Democratic Convention the following platform plank: "In view of the fact that certain counties in this state have not adhered to the recommendations of the state executive committee to exclude Negroes from participating in the primary elections, we direct our incoming legislature to so amend the law as to forever exclude Negroes from participating in any Democratic primary election held in any county of this state."

Texas Primary Law Declared Unconstitutional

In October, 1923, the state legislature of Texas passed a law prohibit-

ing Negroes from participating in Democratic primaries.

The law was enforced throughout the state. At El Paso, Dr. L. A. Nixon (colored), and a regular Democrat of many years standing, who had voted in previous Democratic primaries, presented himself at the polls, and was denied the privilege of casting his ballot. He brought suit for $5,000 damages against the election judges, and to test the constitutionality of the law. This case was carried through the courts of Texas to the United States Supreme Court. On March 7, 1927, this court in a unanimous opinion declared the Texas law barring Negroes from voting in the Democratic primary elections to be unconstitutional.

Under the caption, "The Negro's Right to be a Democrat," The Literary Digest presented a summary of the views of the leading papers on the Texas decision. "Does it take color of the skin to make a Democrat? Isn't a man a Democrat who believes in the Jeffersonian principles of democracy?" The questions come from a newspaper in the capital of Texas, the southern state whose law forbidding Negroes to vote in a Democratic primary had just been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Such enthusiastic acceptance of the doctrine laid down by Mr. Justice Holmes is rare, but even in Texas we find no criticism of the court's opinion, but rather suggestions that the Texas law was unwise, and that the matter of excluding undesirables from the party ranks might better be left to party officials whose decisions in a purely social matter cannot be brought into conflict with the Constitution of the United States. From other southern states come similar observations, coupled with hints that the Democratic party of the South knows how to keep its complexion pure white without benefit of unconstitutional legislation. In the North the judicial opinion that no state law may restrain a Negro from being a Democrat if he so desires meets with considerable enthusiasm. The Nation finds here "A decision in the spirit of Massachusetts, in the abolitionist days of Justice Holmes's youth, when liberty was still a living part of the American tradition." The Brooklyn Citizen considers it "the most momentous decision the colored race has achieved in its fight for equal rights since the Civil War." For this, as The New York Times reflects, "is the first time that the Supreme Court has pronounced on a clear issue of the rights of black men, as compared with whites, under the constitutional amendments adopted after the Civil War."

What do they think about this extremely emphatic decision in the State of Texas? They are not altogether surprised, judging from the Texas newspaper comments that have reached us. The San Antonio Express gives this version of the origin of the law:

"Here in San Antonio, and elsewhere in Texas, not so many years ago, political bosses and their precinct workers herded Negroes to the Democratic primary polls in July and voted them 'solid' in the familiar old ways. Then in the following November the same Negroes would vote the Republican ticket straight."

So the law quoted by Justice Holmes was enacted. But The Express "seriously questions whether the Democratic committees, state and county, let alone the commonwealth, may bar out Negroes from their party primaries so long as the voting in such primaries actually is conducted under the regulation and protection of state laws, both civil and penal." For in this way the state does "take cognizance of party primaries, and thus do they become in effect a state concern." Similarly, The Dallas Times-Herald finds in the decision an indication "that the primary is no longer regarded as an informal election held within a party for nominating candidates, but is looked upon by the court as a full-fledged election!"

"The fact that the state is being called upon to assist the party in nominating its candidates gives the courts the authority to say who shall vote for the nominees. Naturally, Negroes are entitled to vote in an official election. The same argument is made by The Dallas News, which thinks that the law in question is an infringement of the rights of political parties, and besides, "as a matter of fact, the specter of Negro domination in Texas is utter foolishness." The Houston Post-Dispatch calls for

the repeal of the whole law in question, as a "useless and senseless provision in a primary election law full of glaring faults." Of course, says The Houston Chronicle, "no legislative body in America has the right to classify men by color or race in the passage of laws." In the opinion of The Fort Worth Telegram, the primary idea presents a serious difficulty, and the only solution may be a return to the convention system. Finally, we have the statement from the Austin American, quoted at the opening of this article, which indicates wholehearted agreement with Mr. Justice Holmes and his colleagues.

Other southern states do not seem to be greatly perturbed. Attorney-General Knox of Mississippi says the election laws of his state have been upheld by the United States Supreme Court, and that "in order to qualify for suffrage a person must be able to read and write, and understand the Constitution of the United States and Mississippi." "The Georgia Primary law does not stipulate any color qualifications," says former Senator Hoke Smith, in The New York World. "There is nothing in the primary laws of South Carolina specifically barring any duly qualified citizen from participating in a primary," explains The Charleston News and Courier. The same condition obtains in North Carolina. We read in The Raleigh News and Observer:

"Democratic committees unofficially invite only white voters, and no colored voters have presented themselves in Democratic primaries. If they should try to take part in the Democratic primaries in the southern states, where there is a large Negro population, the Democrats would undoubtedly abandon a legalized primary as the method for making nominations."

But whatever changes are made in the primary laws of southern states, "will be with the view of preserving white supremacy," this, declares The Atlanta Constitution, "will continue as now and under laws that are constitutional."

Negroes Petition Texas State Democratic Executive Committee as Entitled to Vote in Primary

Upon the announcement of the Supreme Court decision that the state law barring Negroes from Democratic primaries was unconstitutional, the Texas legislature enacted a new statute delegating to the executive committee of the Democratic party the power to fix membership qualifications.

Negroes attempting to maintain their right to vote in Democratic primaries requested injunctions to prevent election officials from barring them from the primaries. They were refused in two federal courts.

"On July 23, 1928, Judge J. C. Hutcheson, Jr., of the Southern Texas United States District Court in a ruling at Houston, denied J. B. Grigsby an injunction against Guy Harris, chairman of the Harris County Democratic Executive Committee in behalf of all members of his race in the county asking that election officials be restrained from barring Negroes from the state and primary elections on July 28. Judge Duval West of the Western Texas United States District Court, in a ruling at San Antonio on July 24, 1928, sustained the right of Democratic organizations to bar Negroes from the Democratic primary in Texas. Appeals from the decisions of Judges Hutcheson and West were made.

A furor was created at a meeting of the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee in January, 1930, when a number of Negroes appeared as applicants for recognition as entitled to vote in Democratic primaries. The committee had met to take action relative to those persons who bolted the party presidential nominees in 1928. It was charged, by some of the bolters seeking readmission, that in barring the bolters the committee deliberately invited every Negro in Texas qualified to vote to participate in the 1930 primaries. Commenting on the incident The Dallas (Texas) News of February 4, 1930, under the caption "The Negroes Want In," said:

"You cannot blame the Negroes behind the movement to petition the state Democratic executive committee for permission to vote in the Democratic primaries of Texas. The Negro is a citizen of Texas and the Democratic primary, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, determines in this state what men shall rule over the Negro citizen. The Negro who is interested in that is by his

very interest evincing one of the basic qualifications of citizenship.

"The Negro's angle of view is easy to understand. The party's slant is a bit more complicated. It is one of the principles—call it one of the prejudices, if you insist—of the Democratic party in Texas that white men, on the average, make better officers than colored men, and that white men are and ought to be politically the dominant race in a population predominantly white. Moreover, the whole theory of party government breaks down if a party cannot receive whom it will to be of its own membership (within the limits of citizenship, residence and like qualifications, of course) and reject whom it will.

"The number of Negroes who would actually enter a Texas primary would not be large enough to imperil anything. The kind of Negro who would affiliate genuinely with the Democratic party in Texas would be of the better, substantial sort. His vote would do no harm, and his presence would cause no more disturbance than it does in the general election, where he has as good a legal right as anybody else."

At a meeting in June, 1930, the Democratic State Executive Committee, by a vote of 14 to 13, decided to restrict the Democratic "white" primary elections in Texas, to members of the white race. In the meantime the Negroes of the state began preparations to again carry the question into the courts. Commenting on the action of the executive committee, The Houston Informer, in its issue of June 28, 1930, said:

"By the term 'white' is meant all races in this state, except Negroes, which official act bestows the right of citizenship upon Mexicans, Chinese, Japanese and other polyglot races.

"Notwithstanding the decision of the United States Supreme Court, which outlawed the former civil statute in this state that excluded Negroes from participation in Democratic primary elections and recent ruling of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in invalidating the Democratic primary ruling in Virginia—a law similar to the present Texas statute which empowers executive committees of political parties to prescribe the qualifications of their members—the Democratic party leaders in Texas, though divided on the proposition, seem determined to exclude colored citizens from their primary elections.

"It is now up to the Negroes of Texas to resort to court action in another attempt to exercise their constitutional rights; and, since federal officers will be voted for in the July primary election held by Texas Democrats, it appears to The Informer that a constitutional question is involved and that redress should be obtained in some federal district court in this state.

"Of course, those Negroes who are denied the right to vote in the forthcoming Democratic primary elections have a good cause for civil damages against election officials and party leaders after the election has been held, and candidates will have grounds on which to contest the election or elections. Negroes, who are otherwise qualified, are American citizens under the provisions of the Federal Constitution and its Amendments, and no state has the right or authority to abridge or curtail these rights. Going a bit further, no state can delegate to a political party powers that the state does not possess, no more than John Doe can grant or deed something to Bill Smith which the former does not own or possess. Employing state machinery in the conduct and operation of all its primary elections, the Democratic party (or any other political party so engaged) becomes a state agent. This has been The Informer's contention."

On July 15, 1930, the McClellan County (Waco, Texas) Democratic Executive Committee voted, unanimously, to permit Negroes to participate in the Democratic primary on July 26.

On July 19, 1930, Federal Judge C. A. Boynton, at El Paso, dismissed injunction proceedings brought to prevent Texas state Democratic officials from barring Negroes from the Democratic primary. The petition was filed by Luther Wiley, a San Antonio Negro, and named Governor Dan Moody, Attorney-General R. L. Bobbitt, D. W. Wolcox, state Democratic chairman, and other state and party officials defendants. Boynton held the Democratic primary is not an election in the sense

of federal laws and therefore is not influenced by those sections of the Constitution guaranteeing there shall be no race qualifications for voting. The petition of R. C. Scott, a Waco Negro, asking a similar injunction, also was dismissed.

Negroes Win Right to Participate in Virginia Democratic Primary

March 30, 1928, Judge Beverly T. Crump, in the Law and Equity Court of Richmond, Virginia, ruled that Negro Democrats were not eligible to vote in the Democratic primary. He denied the petition of a Negro, James O. West, for a mandamus requiring the judges of the election at the first precinct of Madison ward to permit him to vote. On June 5, 1929, Judge D. Lawrence Groner, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, handed down a decision in the case of James O. West, in which it was ruled that the Virginia Primary Law is in contradiction of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States. An appeal from his decision was made by the Democratic party of Virginia.

The Norfolk Journal and Guide, a Negro newspaper, in commenting on the Virginia decision said: "When Judge D. Lawrence Groner in the United States District Court declared the state primary law which restricted participation in Democratic party primaries to white voters violative of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, another barrier to full exercise of the suffrage on the part of qualified Negro voters was removed. Therein lies the importance of the decision to Negro citizens. The Democratic party primary rule was obviously set up to place certain disabilities upon qualified Negro voters. They should have no voice nor power in the selection of those who were to be voted for in the general elections, which were, in view of political conditions existing at the time of the adoption of the primary rule, mere ratifications of what took place in the primary. The disfranchisement of those qualifying under the rigid general election laws was thereby accomplished. Under the one-party system until recently paramount in Virginia and other southern states the Negro voter had to surmount a double barrier in order to make a ballot mean anything.

"Judge Groner's decision, does not mean however, that there will be an influx of Negro voters into the Democratic primaries. While the trend among the younger and more open-minded members of the race is away from entire allegiance to the Republican party, a large majority of those qualified to vote are still Republicans. It is very difficult to convince members of our group that are past forty years of age that we do not owe, collectively, a very sacred obligation to the Republican party. Changes in doctrine, practice, and policy, which the Republican party has undergone in the past two decades, make no difference with them. It makes no difference even, that the Republicans in Virginia have accomplished by different methods precisely what the Democrats had the candor to give legal status to. So the Democrats need not fear that there will be any considerable accretions to their ranks by reason of the court's decision."

The Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch said editorially: "No doubt, the decision of Judge D. Lawrence Groner, of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, holding that the Democratic primary law of Virginia contravenes the Constitution of the United States, amazes and shocks many of the rank and file of the Democratic party. Yet when the Supreme Court of the United States, on March 7, 1927, handed down its opinion in the Texas case, it forecast the eventual denial of the validity of the Democratic primary law of Virginia in just such a case as Judge Groner decided yesterday, and in just such calm and reasoned opinion."

"It is true that in Texas the statutes of the state confine participation in the primaries in question to white persons, while in Virginia that restriction is set up by party law. But the party laws have been adopted in pursuance of authority conferred by sections 227 and 228 of the Code of Virginia, as amended. If the General Assembly itself may not under the decision just reported, enact a law restricting participation in primary elections of white persons, then it follows that it cannot delegate power to adopt such a resolution to a political party. The result is that

the party rule extending the right to vote in primaries only to white persons otherwise qualified is invalid to protect officials who may deny the right to vote to any person on account of color.

"Before Judge Groner, in what will be known as the Virginia case or the West case, the issue was sharply defined. It was this: Can the General Assembly vest a group of individuals—a political party, if we like, with authority to adopt restrictions which it cannot itself adopt, under the Federal Constitution, and in the act thus delegating authority provide that such restrictions shall have the force of law? That in effect, was precisely the question before Judge Groner.

"The General Assembly of Virginia having provided for the primary as a method (though optional) for the nomination of candidates, and the Supreme Court of Virginia having declared it when adopted an inseparable part of the election machinery, it would seem necessarily to follow that the legislature cannot by delegation or otherwise give validity to a claimed right which it is itself prohibited by the Constitution from enacting into law. . . . . .

To The Ledger-Dispatch, the logic of that reasoning and conclusion seems inexorable—whatever the effect of the decision may be. At the moment, it would seem that the only possible way of continuing to confine participation in primaries to white persons, if that is considered necessary, would be to abolish the formally legalized primary, to rid it of the sanction of the state, to deprive it of such safeguards as the state throws about it, and to convert it into a literally private affair insofar as the state was concerned. If that course were followed, we take it, the state, the federal government and the courts would have no more control over it than they have over who should be admitted to membership in a fraternal or beneficial order.

On June 30, 1930, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals sitting at Asheville, North Carolina, ruled that the Democratic party of Virginia has no right to bar Negroes and other races from its primaries. This ruling affirmed the decision of the District Court of Richmond. On September 13, 1930, the sixty days' time limit, for noting an appeal from Judge Groner's ruling, to the United States Supreme Court, expired. It would appear that the Negroes of Virginia had established their right to participate in the Democratic primary in that state.

On September 13, 1930, the sixty days' time limit, for noting an appeal from Judge Groner's ruling, to the United States Supreme Court, expired. On September 16, it was reported from Richmond that "election officials in local primaries will be instructed by the city electoral board to vote Negroes who satisfy the officials that they are Democrats under the same condition applying to white voters." This was in accordance with the ruling of the United States District Court.

The Negro and the Democratic Primary in Arkansas and Florida

At a meeting of the Pensacola, Florida Democratic executive committee on March 15, 1928, a resolution was passed defining those who could take part in the city primary to be held April 10, 1928. The resolution passed pointed out that "only duly qualified white Democratic electors are declared to be and are held as members of the Democratic party in Pensacola, and are therefore, entitled to vote in the primary election." This resolution was in accordance with the regular call for the primary which had been issued and the action was taken with a view to offset Negro voters, it was claimed, when it was discovered that more than 1,000 Negroes had registered as Democrats. This situation was pointed out and the committee was called together to take action.

On April 10, 1928, Henry E. Goode, a Negro, was denied the privilege of voting in the Democratic primary at Pensacola, Florida. He filed a suit for $5,000 damages against Paul Riera, Thomas Johnson and Clifford Bell, managers of the election booth where the denial was made.

Judge Richard M. Mann, of the Second Division Circuit Court, Little Rock, Arkansas, on November 26, 1928, issued a temporary order restraining judges and clerks in the city primary of Little Rock from denying Negroes the ballot. This ruling resulted from a petition filed

in the Pulaski County chancery court by Dr. J. M. Robinson and nine other Negroes asking the court to restrain election officials from denying Negroes the right to participate in primary elections.

"Section 2 of the Democratic rules under which Negroes have been barred provides that 'the Democratic party of Arkansas shall consist of all eligible and legally qualified white electors, both male and female, who have openly declared their allegiance to the principles and policies of the Democratic party as set forth in the platform of the last preceding Democratic national and state conventions, who have supported the Democratic nominees at the last preceding elections, and who are in sympathy with the success of the Democratic party in the next succeeding election."

Judge Mann ruled that these restrictions discriminated against Negroes and were not in accord with decision of the United States Supreme Court invalidating a Texas statute forbidding Negroes the ballot in Democratic primaries.

Negroes voted in the Little Rock Democratic primary on December 2, 1928, for the first time since the party law was passed which denied them the right to vote. A report of the voting said that, while white voters in general accepted the ruling of the court, there were those whose ire was aroused by the decision. One of the latter group, a doctor, struck a Negro postman on the head as he cast his ballot. The white physician was arrested and charged with disturbing the peace.

A move to restrain Democratic party officials from barring Negroes at any primary in Arkansas was made, December 8, 1928, by Negroes who obtained a temporary order November 27 enabling members of their race who could qualify as Democrats to vote in the recent city primary.

Permission was given by the chancery court, where the litigation was pending, to include E. L. Compere, chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee and H. L. Lambert, its secretary, as defendants. When brought in November, the suit named only the judge and clerks in the city primary as defendants.

With the state committee leaders as defendants, the suit was expected to settle definitely the status of the Negroes who regarded themselves as Democrats through having supported candidates of that party in the past. The Negroes asked that the restraining order be extended in scope to give them access at the Democratic polls throughout Arkansas, and that the Democratic officers be enjoined permanently from enforcing the party rule limiting participation in primaries to white persons.

On August 29, 1929, Chancellor Dodge announced the dismissal, for want of equity of the suit filed in Pulaski County chancery court on November 27, 1928, by Negroes who sought the privilege of voting in the Democratic primaries. The chancellor ruled that "no question of the validity of Arkansas' primary laws was involved in the litigation. The Negroes were not barred from primaries by statute. The state laws do not undertake to prescribe the requirements for voting in primaries. Negroes were prevented from taking part in the primaries by the party rule. An appeal from the ruling of Chancellor Dodge was made.

A petition was filed in the United States Supreme Court on July 17, asking this tribunal for a ruling whether political party organizations in the various states could lawfully prohibit Negroes from participating in their primaries. Pointing out the uniform success of the democratic candidates in the Arkansas elections, the protestants claimed that being denied the right to vote in the primaries deprived them of their most important constitutional rights.

On March 24, 1930, the Supreme Court of Arkansas in denying the appeal, declared that no state law had been passed depriving qualified electors of the right to vote on account of color, but that as a party rule with which the state was unconcerned did this, the appeal was without the jurisdiction of the Arkansas courts.

"Being a voluntary political organization and not an agency of the state," the court's opinion said, "the Democratic party had the right to prescribe rules and regulations defining qualifications of membership and to provide that only white people could become members without coming within the prohibition of either

the Fourteenth or Fifteenth Amendments."

Primary election laws were defined by the court as instrumentalities to legalize the primary but not to enforce the holding of such primaries, or to define party machinery applicable thereto.

"A political party," the opinion read, "such as the Democratic party in Arkansas, is an unincorporated association of persons sponsoring certain ideas of government or maintaining certain political principles or beliefs in the public policies of government."

Referring to the Texas case of Nixon vs. Herndon, in which the Supreme Court of the United States declared unconstitutional a Texas statute barring Negroes from Democratic primaries, the Arkansas Supreme Court distinguished between what in that case was a state law and this, a party rule. An appeal to the United States Supreme Court was made.

Why the Negro Would Divide His Vote

Under the title "Let the Negro Give and Take" The Atlanta Independent gives the Negroes' point of view with respect to the white primary: "Let the Democrats of the South abolish the white primary, and hold party primaries like the Democrats of the North do, and the Negro will divide his votes both locally and nationally.

"Let the Democratic party, like the Republican party, establish a national primary policy, based on principles and not on race and religious prejudice, and the Negro will divide his votes, and vote for men and measures rather than party policies. Let the Democrats of the South use some of the common sense that the Democrats use in the North and make a political ally instead of a political alien. Why deny the Negro the freedom of the ballot in the South so long as northern Democrats give him the ballot, vote him, send him to Congress, elect him to the legislature, as aldermen, councilmen, senators, civil service commissioners and share with him the emoluments of war? Liberalize both your political and economic policy and invite the Negro to vote with you and share with you the duties and responsibilities of state. He wants to vote with his neighbors. He believes his neighbor's interest is his best interest. White supremacy will not be imperilled or threatened by this broad and humane policy. No minority group or people have ever been a serious menace to the rule of the majority in any government long at a time."

Negroes Register and Vote As Democrats in North Carolina

In the 1930 North Carolina senatorial primary between F. M. Simmons and J. W. Bailey a considerable number of Negroes registered. The largest number was at Raleigh (Wake County) where 375 registered as Democrats, 45 as Republicans and 2 as Independents. The registration of Negroes as Democrats in North Carolina attracted national attention and strong opposition within the state. This opposition was led by The Raleigh News and Observer. An editorial on this subject appearing in the June 2, issue of this journal said:

There was no excuse, reason or justification for the introduction of the Negro into primary contests this year. With few exceptions, the Negro is not responsible.

The Negro in North Carolina has been a Republican since he was enfranchised. He is a Republican whenever his vote will help that party. The attempt to introduce him as a disturbing element in the Democratic primary is a wrong alike to the Negro and to the Democratic party. Those who have been induced to register as Democrats would serve their race by voluntary declining to be used by any political faction. Democratic conventions and meetings and primaries have always been confined to white voters. There has been no change in the rule and policy. Except in a few local scrambles in Raleigh where some unworthy Democrats were willing to put the party in jeojardy to carry a selfish purpose, there has been no appeal by Democrats to the Negro. Even then it was repudiated by Democrats who saw the danger. This is the first time politicians have sought to induce Negroes to come into a state primary to kill hundreds of the votes of white Democrats. No matter who is guilty, the Democrats of North Carolina will not tolerate this unauthorized departure from a policy that has been in existence since 1868.

The right of Negroes to register and vote as Democrats was challenged by Bart M. Gatling, Wake County manager for Senator Simmons.

A number of the challenged Negroes declared they were Democrats and had voted the Democratic ticket before. Officials ruled, on the challenges, that the only questions that could be asked the Negro registrants were whether they had ever voted the Democratic ticket in the past and whether they intended to support the Democratic nominees in the November election.

Before this ruling was put into effect, several queries along the educational line developed that all the registrants were able to read and write, and held either high school or college diplomas.

On June 4, of 127 Negroes summoned to appear for hearing on that day, 70 were present and it was reported were given approval without exception by the precinct registrars and judges of election.

In the Wake Forest precinct of Wake County Negroes were not permitted to register. These Negroes sent the following protest to the county board of elections:

Whereas, the recent registration at Wake Forest has proved to be irregular, illegal and unsatisfactory to many of the citizens residing in the township, in that the discrimination rule has been applied and used when qualified Negroes appeared for registration in order to bar them from registering; and

Whereas, the registrar yielded the duties of his offices as registrar by asking and allowing outside parties to participate in conducting the examination of certain applicants which was a violation of section 17 of the election laws of North Carolina; and

Whereas, said registrar made efforts to intimidate Negroes by sending them word that it was useless to come for registration and that they would surely be barred.

Therefore, we, the undersigned citizens, do file our protests against said registration, and ask that a copy of this protest be sent the state board of elections.

At Wilson, (Wilson County) on June 9, 18 challenged Negroes were permitted to remain on the registration books as Democrats while, it was reported, more than two score local Negroes who had been on the books as either Democrats or Republicans were not challenged.

Not all of the North Carolina newspapers approved of the position taken by The Raleigh News and Observer. The Rocky Mount Telegram in its issue of June 2, pointed out:

That the registration of Negroes in the capital city has been brought up and overplayed purely for political purposes is indicated by figures given in Associated Press dispatches from Raleigh. These figures show that there were 2,017 Negroes on the old primary registration books of Raleigh township as Democrats. Under the new registration, however, the registration about which all the stir has been needlessly generated, only about 500 Negroes are on the books.

Yet with a decrease of approximately 1,500 in the Negro registration, somebody gives vent to a verbal explosion and seeks to manufacture an issue which will bring votes to a favorite candidate through fanning the fires of prejudice, of ill-feeling and of sentiment. The end cannot possibly justify the means and the danger which it brings to North Carolina.

The High Point Enterprise in its issue of May 27 asked:

Ought the Democratic party of the South be closed hermetically against the Negro seeking to affiliate with it?

The News and Observer, todays, says:

There are no Negro Democrats in Raleigh. Nearly every southerner knows a few Negroes who regularly vote the Democratic ticket.

The registration of more than a normal number of Negroes as Democrats is worthy of party notice in Raleigh or elsewhere in the state, and we agree with The News and Observer that the strictest supervision of the primary should be kept to guard against a false brigading of voters, of any color, for immediate political purpose. It is easier, naturally, to keep that guard where the Negro is trying to qualify spuriously for participation in a Democratic primary. But is it really the will of the Democratic party in the South that a Negro may not join it?

The time is coming when all Negroes will be eligible to vote. Their lack of education is the only bar to them now and that they are overcoming. The southern states cannot prevent their voting beyond the day of their qualification. Several southern states have Negro majorities. All of them have such strong Negro minorities as to enable designing white men to swing elections with the use of small white minorities with all Negro adults voting. If not through the loyalty of intelligent Negroes to the best interests of the state rather than to racial pride, how can the better class whites hold these states indefinitely? An arbitrary cloture of the White Supremacy party to an honest Negro desiring affiliation is an interesting and sweeping proposal.

Results of Swapping Education for Non-Participation in Politics

The Fayetteville Observer of May 24, under the caption "The Negro Democrat" said:

Editors of The Raleigh News and Observer are showing so much consternation over Negroes registering as Democrats to vote in the Democratic primary that we have a suspicion that the editors of The News and Observer have a suspicion that the Negroes are not going to vote for their candidates.

Declares The News and Observer in no uncertain words:

The Negro is a Republican and those who advised the Raleigh Negroes to register as Democrats were enemies of Democracy and white supremacy. This is true, no matter what they may call themselves.

While we are glad that the matter of a few Negroes registering in the Democratic primary fails to raise our blood pressure abnormally, nevertheless it is time for southern white people to realize that the participation of Negroes in politics from now on promises to present a problem worthy of the most careful (and unimpassioned) consideration.

Doubtless the blood of The News and Observer boils at the thought of the Negro as a Democrat for that organ is still living in the stirring days of the overthrow of the fusion government in North Carolina more than 30 years ago.

Shortly thereafter Aycock swapped the North Carolina Negro an education for a generation of non-participation in politics.

Whether we like it or not, that swap is now bearing fruit. Every year the Negro in North

Carolina under our system of universal education is becoming a more intelligent citizen. Every year more and more Negroes are able to hurdle the intellectual barrier set up at the downfall of the fusion regime.

And as the Negro becomes more and more educated, whether we like it or not, he is becoming more and more obsessed with the yearning to take part in government.

We are inclined to believe that it is more this yearning of the educated Negro than the machinations of unscrupulous white politicians that is causing the Negroes to turn to the Democratic party as that organ through which they are more apt to secure a voice in their own government.

As the Negro becomes more educated this yearning is going to increase and in the next generation the Negro vote is again going to become a vital factor in North Carolina politics.

White people of both parties should begin to realize this and to plan now how the increasing Negro vote is to be assimilated best into the political fabric of the commonwealth; to consider how the Negro may best be given a share in his own government with a minimum of friction with the theory of white supremacy.

Frankly, we wish the Negro could remain forever the happy non-political citizen he has been for the past generation, but frankly we do not see how this condition can be prolonged much longer in view of our system of universal education.

And frankly, we do see a great social and political danger in making any one political party a permanent Jim Crow car for the ever increasing number of Negro voters.

The problem is a delicate one that calls for judicious and calmly arrived at action on the part of thinking white people. It is not one to be banished by the impassioned waving of the red shirt.

Presidents and the Official Entertainment of Negroes

June 14, 1929, the wife of Oscar DePriest, Negro Congressman from the State of Illinois, was entertained at a formal and official tea in the White House at Washington, D. C., at which tea there was present also as guests, white ladies. In spite of the fact that the entertainment of Mrs. DePriest was only a part of the regular routine of having the wives of all the members of Congress to tea, severe criticism was launched against the administration for this incident. Resolutions condemning it were introduced in the legislatures of Florida, Georgia, Mississippi and Texas.

The charge was made in some quarters that the Hoover administration was setting a social equality precedent. An investigation revealed that instead of setting a precedent, precedent was being followed, for in at least fourteen other instances Negroes had been officially entertained by Presidents of the United States, as follows:

1864—Frederick Douglass dined with President Lincoln at the White House.
1865—At President Lincoln's second inaugural reception Frederick Douglass was entertained at the White House.
1870—Senator B. K. Bruce was entertained by President Grant and the wife of the Senator entertained the members of the diplomatic set at her home at a reception.
1871—P. B. S. Pinchback (at one time governor of Louisiana) was entertained by President Grant at the White House.
1878—President Rutherford B. Hayes was a cousin of President Patton (white) of Howard University, and was entertained by him at the university. At this entertainment President Hayes met John M. Langston, the first dean of the university law school, upon whom President Hayes later called socially at the Langston home.
1885—Frederick Douglass was entertained by President Hayes at the White House.
1886—The minister to Haiti was entertained by President Cleveland.
1903—John C. Dancy (recorder of deeds) and wife were entertained at the White House.
1903—Booker T. Washington, principal of Tuskegee Institute, dined at the White House with President Roosevelt.
1904—Judson W. Lyons, (register of the treasury) and wife were entertained at the White House by President Roosevelt.
1912—President Roosevelt entertained William H. Lewis, former assistant Attorney-General, at the former's home at Oyster Bay, New York, as an overnight house guest.
1926—President Coolidge entertained President Borno of Haiti on the occasion of his visit to the United States.

Bishop W. N. Ainsworth of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, made the following comment:

"From the first years of American history, the President and his wife have entertained members of Congress and their wives, as well as the representatives of all foreign governments.

"Such occasions, while social, are not personal, but official. During these years, every color of human being from lily-white to ebony black, and all that lies between, has been entertained at the White House and by every occupant thereof. It is nothing new.

"The color scheme does not enter into the arrangement and cannot. Every legally elected Congressman or representative of a foreign government is entitled to the same consideration in regard to such official formalities.

"There is no more justification for the exclusion of a black man and his wife from such a function that there is to exclude a red, yellow, brown or white one. The President and his wife do not select any of them; the constituency does.

"It is about time for everybody to quit seeing black only and having these blatant outbreaks about it.

"In my opinion, all of this excitement over the recent White House entertainment is a tempest in a teapot."

With regard to the furore that was stirred up by his wife's presence at the White House, Congressman DePriest, gave out the following statement:

"It's all a lot of moonshine for any one to suggest that a question of social equality was involved in my wife's going to a White House tea. My wife was invited not because she was white or black, Republican or Democrat. She was invited because she happened to be the wife of a man who was a member of Congress. That's all there was to that.

"These southern Democrats, these haters, are trying to stir up prejudice and help themselves politically in those southern states that voted against Al Smith and gave electoral votes for Hoover. The political effect will be to drive all colored votes back into the Republican party.

"There can be no social equality question as between races. Social equality is all a matter of individual taste. It isn't national or racial. For instance, there are men and women of my own race with whom I wouldn't care to have any social relations or contact. There are both blacks and whites with whom I would not want to associate. I associate with persons I like. I keep away from those I don't like."

Commenting on this The New York World said:

"This is so clearly put, so profound in its grasp of the issues involved that there is little to add to it."

Emergence of the Negro "Bloc"

William Hard, special correspondent of a number of southern papers sent the following from Washington under date of April 19, 1930:

"To the wet 'bloc' in the approaching congressional elections there must now be added the Negro 'bloc'; and the effect of both 'blocs' is to increase the chance of the Democrats for winning control of the House of Representatives.

"Oscar DePriest, Republican Negro representative in the Lower House of Congress, from the first district of Illinois, in Chicago, is principally responsible for the emergence of the Negro 'bloc,' which is called 'the people's movement.' The purpose of this movement essentially is to vote for Republican candidates or Democratic candidates or independent candidates in accordance solely with their attitude toward the Negro race. That such a bi-partisan or non-partisan 'bloc' should be originated by a Republican representative is almost without precedent. Authentic reports are that it is going strong in northern and border-state congressional districts in which Negro voters are thickly congregated.

"It might readily prove decisive in many of those districts, and it has its origin in four main discontents.

"First: The Republican Presidential campaign managers of last year discarded all efforts to please the Negroes in favor of efforts to please the southern whites.

"Second: The existing Republican administration has appointed virtually no Negroes to office.

"Third: The Negro division of the Republican national division of the Republican national committee has been closed down.

"Fourth: John J. Parker, of North Carolina, accused of opposing Negro participation in politics, has been nominated to be a Justice of the United States Supreme Court. This fourth discontent might have been in itself of minor consequence. It gets its importance from being the match which set the heap of the previous discontent on fire.

"Negroes have ironically but abundantly proved that they can vote for Democrats."

Legislation Affecting the Civil and Political Rights of Negroes

13TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Sec. 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Sec. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Adopted December 18, 1865.

Constitutional Amendments—The Thirteenth Amendment adopted December 18, 1865, made slavery in the United States unconstitutional. The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments conferred upon the descendants of the slaves and upon the descendants of the free Negroes, the constitutional rights which had been denied them under the so-called

"Black Laws," passed by the different states. (*) Under the Amendments conferring upon Negroes all the fundamental rights of white men, race distinctions were not abolished but race discriminations were made illegal.

It is important at the outset to distinguish clearly between race distinctions, and race discriminations; more so, because these words are often used synonymously, especially when the Negro is discussed. A distinction between the Caucasian and the Negro, when recognized and enforced by the law, has been interpreted as a discrimination against the latter. In fact there is an essential difference between race distinctions and race discriminations. North Carolina for example, has a law that white and Negro children shall not attend the same schools but that separate schools shall be maintained. If the terms of all the public schools in the state are equal in length, if the teaching force is equal in numbers and ability, if the school buildings are equal in convenience, accommodations and appointments, race distinction exists but not a discrimination.

There is no discrimination so long as there is equality of opportunity, and this equality may often be attained only by a difference in methods. On the other hand, if the term of the Negro school is four months and that of the white eight; if the teachers of the Negro schools are underpaid and inadequately or wrongly trained, and the teachers of the white schools are well paid and well trained; if Negro children are housed in dilapidated uncomfortable, unsanitary buildings, and white children have new, comfortable, and sanitary buildings; if courses of study for Negro children are selected in a haphazard fashion without any regard to their peculiar needs, and a curriculum is carefully adapted to the needs of white children; if such conditions exist under the law, race distinctions exist which are at the same time discrimination against Negroes. A race distinction connotes a difference and nothing more. A discrimination necessarily implies partiality and favoritism.

REFERENCES: Stephenson—Race Distinctions in American Law, pp. 2-4.

14TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

(*Ratified July* 28, 1868.)

Sec. 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of a citizen of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Sec. 2. Representatives shall be appointed among the several states according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each state, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a state, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such state being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such state.

Sec. 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or Elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any state, who having previously taken an oath as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State Legislature, or as an executive, or judicial officer of any state, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Sec. 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any state shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debt, obligations, and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Sec. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

15TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

(*Ratified March* 30, 1870)

Sec. 1. The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any state, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. (**)

Federal Legislation—**The first Civil Rights Bill was passed by Congress, April 9, 1866. It prescribed that "all persons born in the United States and not subject to the foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States; and such citizens of every race and color, without regard to any previous condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime * * * shall have the same right, in every state and territory in the United States, to make and enforce contracts, to sue, * * * and to full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings, in the security of persons and property, as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment and penalties, and to none other."**

The Civil Rights Bill of 1866 was in a large measure superseded by the Fourteenth Amendment, adopted July 28, 1868. The purpose of this Amendment was (1) to make the Bill of Rights (the first ten Amendments to the Constitution) binding upon the states as well as upon the nation; (2) to give validity to the Civil Rights Bill of 1866, and (3) to declare who were citizens of the United States.

Another Civil Rights Bill was passed March 1, 1875, which declared that all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States should be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters and other places of public amusements, subject only to the conditions established by law and applicable alike to citizens of every race and color, regardless of any previous condition of servitude.

This law was the last effort of Congress to guarantee to the Negro his civil rights. In 1883, the Supreme Court of the United States declared the Civil Rights Bill of 1875 unconstitutional.

That year five cases having to do with Civil Rights of Negroes reached the Supreme Court. "Two of them concerned the rights of colored persons in inns and hotels, two of their rights in theaters, and one in railroad cars. Mr. Justice Bradley, delivering the opinion of the court, took the ground that the first and second sections of the Civil Rights Bill were unconstitutional for these reasons: (1) They are not authorized by the Thirteenth Amendment, abolishing and prohibiting slavery, because the separation of the races in public places is not a badge of servitude . . . (2) The Civil Rights Bill is not authorized by the Fourteenth Amendment, because that refers to action by the state, while the Bill refers to individual discrimination. It is state action of a particular kind that is prohibited."

In June, 1913, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the ruling of 1883 and extended its application to Federal territory and navigable waters of the United States.

State Legislation—**A number of states in the North have enacted Civil Rights Bills which undertake to guarantee equality of accommodation in public places.**

On May 16, 1865, Massachusetts declared that there should be no distinction, discrimination, or restriction on account of color or race in any licensed public place of amusement, public conveyance, or public meeting, imposed a fine of fifty dollars for the violation of this law. The next year it included theaters within the prohibition.

After the Federal Civil Rights Bill was declared unconstitutional in 1883, and the burden of securing to Negroes equality of accommodation in public places was placed upon the states, many of them outside of the South adopted bills which practically copied the Civil Rights Bill of 1875. The following is a list of the states that have such Civil Rights Bills with dates of their adoption:

Connecticut	1884 and 1905
Iowa	1884 and 1892
New Jersey	1884
Ohio	1884 and 1894
Colorado	1885 and 1895
Illinois	1885
Indiana	1885
Michigan	1885
Minnesota	1885, 1897 and 1899
Nebraska	1885 and 1893
Rhode Island	1885
New York	1893, 1895 and 1913
Pennsylvania	1887
Washington	1890
Wisconsin	1895
California	1897

Southern States Whose Laws Restrict the Suffrage(*)

Suffrage amendments have been adopted by the southern states in the following order: Mississippi, 1890; South Carolina, 1895; Louisiana, 1898; North Carolina, 1900; Alabama, 1901; Virginia, 1901; Georgia, 1908; and Oklahoma, 1910.

The substance of the laws restricting suffrage is that the prospective voter must have paid his full taxes and then, in order to register, must own a certain amount of property, or must be able to pass an educational test or must come under the grandfather clause.

Tax Test.—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia require the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting. In Georgia all taxes legally required since 1877 must be paid six months before the election.

Property Test.—The property requirement in Alabama is forty acres of land in the state or real or personal property worth three hundred dollars ($300) on which the taxes for the preceding year have been paid.

In Georgia it is forty acres of land in the state or five hundred dollars ($500) worth of property in the state.

The Louisiana requirement is three hundred dollars ($300) worth of property and payment of personal taxes.

South Carolina prescribes three hundred dollars ($300) worth of property on which taxes for the preceding year have been paid.

Mississippi, North Carolina and Virginia have no property test.

Educational Test

Alabama requires that the applicant, unless physically disabled, must be able to read and write the Constitution of the United States in English.

In Georgia he must, unless physically disabled, be able to read and write the Constitution of the United States in English; or if physically disabled from reading and writing, to "understand and give a reasonable interpretation" of the Constitution of the United States or of Georgia, when read to him.

Louisiana requires that the applicant must be able to read and write and must make an application for registration in his own handwriting.

In Mississippi he must be able to understand or reasonably interpret any part of the constitution of the state.

In North Carolina the requirement is the ability to read and write the state constitution in English.

The Constitution of Oklahoma says the applicant "must be able to read and write any section of the constitution of the state."

South Carolina requires ability to read and write the Constitution.

Virginia requires that the applicant must make out his application in his own handwriting and prepare and deposit his ballot without aid.

---

* See 1925-26 Negro Year Book, pp. 227-231.

** For Negro Suffrage in the Reconstruction Period including Negro members of legislatures see 1925-26 Negro Year Book, pp. 236-40.

*For Negro suffrage before the Civil War see 1925-26 Negro Year Book, pp. 235-36.

Grandfather Clause

The Grandfather Clause permits a person who was not able to satisfy either the educational or property tests to continue a voter for life if he was a voter in 1867 (or in Oklahoma in 1866) or is an old soldier or the lineal descendant of such voter or soldier provided, except in Oklahoma, he registered prior to a fixed date.

The expiration of the date when such persons could register was in South Carolina, January 1, 1898; Louisiana, September 1, 1898; Alabama, December 20, 1902; Virginia, December 31, 1903; North Carolina, December 1, 1908; Georgia, January 1, 1915. The Oklahoma Grandfather Clause intended to be permanent, provided that:

No person who was on January 1, 1866, or at any time prior thereto, entitled to vote under any form of government, or who at that time resided in some foreign nation, and no lineal descendant of such person, shall be denied the right to register and vote because of his inability to so read and write such Constitution. The Supreme Court of the United States, June 21, 1915, declared the Grandfather Clause invalid. Mississippi had no Grandfather Clause.

Understanding and Character Clauses

Only two states, Georgia and Mississippi, have permanent understanding and character clauses. Although in Georgia a person may have neither property nor education he may be permitted to register if he is of good character and understands the duties and obligation of citizenship under a republican form of government.

The Mississippi law permits one who cannot read to register if he can understand and reasonably interpret the Constitution when read to him.

In Alabama, South Carolina and Virginia the Understanding Clause is a part of the Grandfather sections and became inoperative with the "Grandfather Clauses."

Vote in Each State Having Disfranchisement Law in Presidential Election
Immediately Before the Passing of the Law, Immediately After, in Second Election After Passing of the Law, and in 1920, 1924 and 1928

STATE	Year Law Enacted	Persons of Voting Age and Party Vote	Vote in 1888, Election Year Immediately before Law Passed	Vote in 1892 Election Year Immediately after Law Passed	Vote in 1896, Second Election Year After Law Passed	Vote in 1920	Vote in 1924	Vote in 1928
Mississippi	1890	Persons of Voting Age	264,570	286,875	317,511	438,492	872,094	872,094
		Per Cent White	44.6	44.2	43.1	48.7		
		Per Cent Negro	54.8	55.7	56.2	51.1		
		Party Vote:						
		Democratic	85,467	40,288	64,864	69,277	100,475	124,598
		Republican	31,120	1,340	5,123	11,576	8,546	27,191
		All Others	258	11,097	485	1,639	3,494	263
		Total Votes Cast	116,845	52,727	70,472	82,492	112,515	152,052
		Per Cent Total Vote of Total Persons Voting	44.2	18.4	22.1	18.7	12.9	17.4
		Per Cent Democratic Vote White Persons Voting Age	72.3	31.8	46.8	32.2		
		Persons of Voting Age and Party Vote	Vote in 1892 Election Year Immediately before Law Passed	Vote in 1896 Election Year Immediately after Law Passed	Vote in 1900, Second Election Year After Law Passed	Vote in 1920	Vote in 1924	Vote in 1928
South Carolina	1895	Persons of Voting Age	245,148	264,232	283,325	389,199	776,969	776,969
		Per Cent White	44.1	45.0	46.0	52.8		
		Per Cent Negro	55.9	54.9	54.0	47.1		
		Party Vote:						
		Democratic	54,698	59,625	47,283	64,170	49,008	62,766**
		Republican	13,384	9,313	3,579	2,244	1,123	3,114
		All Others	2,410	0	0	26	620	44
		Total Votes Cast	70,492	68,938	50,862	66,440	50,751	65,924
		Per Cent Total Vote of Total Persons Voting	28.8	26.1	18.0	17.1	6.5	8.5
		Per Cent Democratic Vote White Persons Voting Age	60.7	61.9	36.3	38.7		

** Includes Smith and Anti-Smith Democrats.

(Continued on pages 114, 115, 116.)

Vote in Each State Having Disfranchisement Law in Presidential Election

Immediately Before the Passing of the Law, Immediately After, in Second Election After Passing of the Law, and in 1920, 1924 and 1928

STATE	Year Law Enacted	Persons of Voting Age and Party Vote	Vote in 1896 Election Year Immediately before Law Passed	Vote in 1900 Election Year Immediately after Law Passed	Vote in 1904, Second Election Year After Law Passed	Vote in 1920	Vote in 1924	Vote in 1928
Louisiana	1898	Persons of Voting Age	295,791	325,943	361,533	458,178	896,878	896,878
		Per Cent White	53.6	54.6	55.9	61.8		
		Per Cent Negro	46.3	45.2	43.9	38.0		
		Party Vote:						
		Democratic	79,009	53,671	47,708	87,354	93,218	164,655
		Republican	22,037	14,233	5,205	38,538	24,670	51,160
		All Others	0	0	995	0	4,063	0
		Total Votes Cast	101,046	67,904	53,908	125,892	121,951	215,815
		Per Cent Total Vote of Total Persons Voting	34.2	20.8	14.9	26.8	13.4	24.1
		Per Cent Democratic Vote White Persons Voting Age	49.7	30.2	23.5	30.1		

		Persons of Voting Age and Party Vote	Vote in 1896 Election Year Immediately before Law Passed	Vote in 1904 Election Year Immediately after Law Passed	Vote in 1908, Second Election Year After Law Passed	Vote in 1920	Vote in 1924	Vote in 1928
North Carolina	1900	Persons of Voting Age	387,605	452,998	486,765	1,202,518*	1,207,343	1,207,343
		Per Cent White	68.8	69.9	70.4	71.9		
		Per Cent Negro	31.1	29.8	29.2	27.7		
		Party Vote:						
		Democratic	175,066	124,121	136,995	305,447	284,270	288,108
		Republican	155,243	82,625	114,937	232,848	191,753	349,795
		All Others	681	485	378	463	6,664	0
		Total Votes Cast	330,990	207,231	252,310	538,758	482,687	637,903
		Per Cent Total Vote of Total Persons Voting	85.4	45.7	51.7	44.8	40.0	52.8
		Per Cent Democratic Vote White Persons Voting Age	65.6	39.2	39.7	35.4		

* Women voted in North Carolina and Oklahoma in the Presidential Election of 1920.

(Continued on pages 115, 116.)

Vote in Each State Having Disfranchisement Law in Presidential Election

Immediately Before the Passing of the Law, Immediately After, in Second Election After Passing of the Law, and in 1920, 1924 and 1928

STATE	Year Law Enacted	Persons of Voting Age and Party Vote	Vote in 1900 Election Year Immediately before Law Passed	Vote in 1904 Election Year Immediately after Law Passed	Vote in 1908 Second Election Year After Law Passed	Vote in 1920	Vote in 1924	Vote in 1928
Alabama	1901	Persons of Voting Age	413,862	453,561	493,261	573,892	1,135,529	1,135,529
		Per Cent White	56.1	57.0	57.9	62.4		
		Per Cent Negro	43.8	42.9	42.1	37.6		
		Party Vote:						
		Democratic	96,368	79,857	74,374	163,254	112,966	127,548
		Republican	55,634	22,472	25,308	74,690	45,005	113,681
		All Others	2,762	1,465	2,064	3,126	8,084	0
		Total Votes Cast	154,764	103,794	101,746	241,070	166,055	241,229
		Per Cent Total Vote of Total Persons Voting	37.4	22.9	20.6	42.0	14.6	21.2
		Per Cent Democratic Vote White Persons Voting Age	41.5	30.8	26.0	45.6		

		Persons of Voting Age and Party Vote	Vote in 1900 Election Year Immediately before Law Passed	Vote in 1904 Election Year Immediately after Law Passed	Vote in 1908 Second Election Year After Law Passed	Vote in 1920	Vote in 1924	Vote in 1928
Virginia	1901	Persons of Voting Age	447,815	478,099	508,383	613,653	1,192,550	1,192,550
		Per Cent White	67.3	68.2	69.1	71.2		
		Per Cent Negro	32.6	31.7	30.9	28.7		
		Party Vote:						
		Democratic	146,080	86,548	82,946	141,670	139,797	101,631
		Republican	115,865	47,880	52,573	87,456	73,359	115,348
		All Others	2,295	1,439	1,366	1,873	10,570	437
		Total Votes Cast	264,240	135,867	136,885	230,999	223,726	217,416
		Per Cent Total Vote of Total Persons Voting	59.0	28.4	26.9	37.6	18.8	18.2
		Per Cent Democratic Vote White Persons Voting Age	48.5	26.5	23.6	32.4		

(Continued on page 116.)

Vote in Each State Having Disfranchisement Law in Presidential Election
Immediately Before the Passing of the Law, Immediately After, in Second Election After Passing of the Law, and in 1920, 1924 and 1928

STATE	Year Law Enacted	Persons of Voting Age and Party Vote	Vote in 1904 Election Year Immediately before Law Passed	Vote in 1912 Election Year Immediately after Law Passed	Vote in 1916 Second Election Year After Law Passed	Vote in 1920	Vote in 1924	Vote in 1928
Georgia	1908	Persons of Voting Age	548,696	638,844	675,300	711,760	1,414,772	1,414,772
		Per Cent White	56.0	57.6	58.6	60.2		
		Per Cent Negro	43.9	42.3	41.0	39.7		
		Party Vote:						
		Democratic	83,472	93,076	125,845	107,162	123,200	165,382
		Republican	24,003	27,171***	31,878***	43,720	30,300	63,498
		All Others	882	1,026	967	465	13,077	124
		Total Votes Cast	108,357	121,273	158,690	151,347	166,577	229,004
		Per Cent Total Vote of Total Persons Voting	19.7	19.0	23.5	23.1	11.8	16.2
		Per Cent Democratic Vote White Persons Voting Age	27.1	25.3	31.6	25.0		

		Persons of Voting Age and Party Vote	Vote in 1908 Election Year Immediately before Law Passed	Vote in 1912 Election Year Immediately after Law Passed	Vote in 1916 Second Election Year After Law Passed	Vote in 1920	Vote in 1924	Vote in 1928
Oklahoma	1910	Persons of Voting Age	399,120	467,846	509,006	904,852*	1,004,516	1,004,516
		Per Cent White	88.1	88.8	89.6	90.4		
		Per Cent Negro	7.9	7.7	7.6	7.3		
		Party Vote:						
		Democratic	122,363	119,156	148,113	215,808	255,798	219,206
		Republican	110,474	90,786	97,467***	243,464	226,242	394,052
		All Others	21,734	41,674	45,190	25,679	41,141	5,210
		Total Votes Cast	254,571	251,616	290,770	484,951	523,181	618,468
		Per Cent Total Vote of Total Persons Voting	63.8	53.8	57.1	53.6	52.1	61.6
		Per Cent Democratic Vote White Persons Voting Age	35.3	28.7	32.4	26.4		

* Women voted in North Carolina and Oklahoma in the Presidential Election of 1920.
** Includes Smith and anti-Smith Democrats.
*** Republicans and Progressives.

Disfranchisement Has Kept Democratic Party in South in Political Ditch

An analysis of the foregoing tables shows that:

The Democratic vote for Mississippi, in 1888, in the Presidential election immediately before the passage of the disfranchisement law in that state, was 85,467. This number of votes was not equaled until 1924, 36 years later, when with women voting the number was 100,475. The Democratic vote in Mississippi in 1888 was 72.3 per cent of the total white males of voting age. In 1920 it was 32.2 per cent, a decrease for the 32 years of 40.1 per cent.

The Democratic vote for South Carolina in 1892, in the Presidential election immediately before the passage of the disfranchisement law in that state, was 54,698. This was 5.690 more Democratic votes than was cast in the election of 1924, 32 years later at which time women were eligible to vote. In 1892 the Democratic vote in South Carolina was 60.7 per cent of the total white males of voting age. In 1920 it was 38.7 per cent a decrease of 22.0 per cent.

The Democratic vote for Louisiana in 1896, in the Presidential election immediately before the passage of the disfranchisement law in that state, was 79,009 or 49. 7 per cent of the total white males of voting age. In 1920 it was 30.1 per cent of the total white males of voting age, a decrease of 19.6 per cent.

In North Carolina where there was a large white Republican vote the total vote cast in 1896, in the Presidential election immediately before the passage of the disfranchisement law in that state, was 85.4 per cent of all males of voting age. In 1920 with women voting the total vote cast was 44.8 per cent of all persons of voting age. In 1924, with women eligible to vote, the total vote cast was 40 per cent of all persons of voting age and in 1928, 52.8 per cent.

The Democratic vote for Alabama in 1900, in the Presidential election immediately before the passage of the disfranchisement law in that state, was 41.5 per cent of all the white males of voting age. In 1920 it was 45.6 per cent, an increase of 4.1 per cent. The total vote cast in Alabama in 1924, with women voting was 14.6 per cent of all persons of voting age, and in 1928, 21.2 per cent.

The Democratic vote for Virginia, in 1900, in the Presidential election immediately before the passage of the disfranchisement law in that state, was 146,080 or 48.5 per cent of the white males of voting age. In 1920 it was 32.4 per cent. The Democratic vote in 1928 was 101,631 which was 44,000 less than it was 28 years earlier; whereas the Republican vote in 1900 and in 1928 was practically the same, 115,865 for the former year and 115,348 for the latter year. In other words, to defeat the Democrats, it was only necessary to poll 517 less Republican votes in 1928 than were polled in 1900. The total vote cast in Virginia in 1928, with women voting, was 18.2 per cent of all persons of voting age.

The Democratic vote for Georgia in 1904, in the Presidential election immediately before the passage of the disfranchisement law in that state was 27.1 per cent of the total white males of voting age. In 1920 the Democratic vote was 25.0 per cent of the total white males of voting age. In 1924, with women voting the total vote cast was 11.8 per cent of all persons of voting age and in 1928, 16.2 per cent.

When one makes a careful study of the results of voting in the states having disfranchisement laws, he can raise the question, whether, in keeping the Negro in the political ditch, the Democratic party, in these states, has not been compelled to remain in the ditch with him?