WALTER WHITE
1934 - 1945
January 8, 1935

My dear Mr. White:

I spoke to the President and he says he will take up the subject of the Costigan-Wagner Bill in his next conference with the leaders.

I am enclosing a letter from Donald Richberg in regard to Negro labor.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. Walter White  
Nat'l. Ass'n. for the Advancement of Colored People  
69 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I was very greatly disappointed on receiving the telegram from Mr. McIntyre last evening saying that it will be impossible for the President to receive the delegation on the Costigan-Wagner Bill prior to the convening of the Congress. Mr. McIntyre, however, states that he will advise us as to when the President will be able to receive the delegation.

As the memorial asks the President to put the Costigan-Wagner Bill on his "must" program in his opening address to Congress, we are forwarding the memorial today, by mail, with the list of signatories to date. I enclose copy of the letter which we have written him.

We hope that we shall be able to present the full list of signatories as soon after the convening of Congress as possible.

May I express to you our very sincere thanks for your efforts to arrange the appointment.

With cordial personal greetings, I am

Ever sincerely,

Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.
Dear Mr. President:

I have the honor to transmit to you hereewith the text of a memorial which has been signed by a number of distinguished American citizens representing all sections of the United States, creeds, races and occupations. It was our hope to be able to present this to you personally through the medium of a small and distinguished committee but we cannot do this due to telegraphed word from your secretary, Mr. Marvin H. McIntyre, that it is impossible to arrange an appointment with you until after the opening of the Congress at which time he will advise us.

Inasmuch as the memorial, which is enclosed, asks that you, as President, in your opening address to the Congress place the oft-repeated anti-lynching bill upon your "must" program, we send it to you at this time the signatures which have been received to date. We trust that we shall have opportunity personally to present the full list of signatures to you as soon after Congress has convened as is possible.

You will note that the signers of this memorial include nine governors and governors-elect, 47 mayors, 53 bishops and churchmen, 54 university and college presidents and professors, and 109 lawyers, editors, writers and citizens distinguished in other fields of endeavor. The chief significance of this memorial, in our opinion, is in the widespread support which it gives to your own unqualified condemnation of lynching, especially as expressed in your opening address to the Seventy-third Congress on January 3, 1934, in which you declared that "...lynching, and kidnapings have threatened our security" and that "these violations of ethics and these violations of law call on the strong arm of government for their immediate sup-
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The White House
Washington, D. C.
pression; they call also on the country for an aroused public opinion."

We wish also to direct your attention to the number of individuals, including churchmen, officials and others, from the South who urge Federal action against lynching. No longer does the doctrine of states' rights or sectional feeling stand in the way of Federal aid to the states as provided in the Costigan-Wagner bill in suppressing lynching, which you have rightly termed "that vile form of collective murder". Evidence is being piled up daily that thoughtful southerners are demanding action by the Federal government against lynching, among the evidences of this being the passage unanimously by the Women's Missionary Council of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, of a resolution endorsing the Costigan-Wagner bill.

We respectfully ask your usual thoughtful consideration of the enclosed memorial and its signatories.

Respectfully,

(Signed) Walter White
Secretary.
January 21, 1935

My dear Mr. White:

I have your letter of the 17th, and there are no new developments that I know of since I talked to you.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. Walter White
69 Fifth Avenue
NY
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I know you have probably thought ill of me for my failure to give you sooner definite information about the Schenectady matter. When I did not hear from Mr. Baker I wrote him again and here is copy of the letter which I have just received, which explains the delay.

Before taking the matter up with Dr. Brown I would appreciate your letting me know if there have been any new developments since I discussed this with you and if there are any new facts which would be helpful to Dr. Brown.

I had hoped to be able to get up to Schenectady myself but work on the anti-lynching bill, an exhibition of pictures dealing with the subject of lynching which we are planning at the Jacques Seligmann Galleries, and a number of other pressing matters have tied me very closely to my desk here.

We are all delighted here to learn from Mr. James Weldon Johnson that there is a possibility of your being present at the dinner on the evening of February 12th in honor of Mr. Arthur B. Spingarn's twenty-one years of service as chairman of our National Legal Committee. I do hope Mr. Johnson's invitation to you to agree to say a few words at least is going to be favorably accepted.

May I say that this not only would be a great honor for us but your presence would serve to reassure colored people and their friends during this dark period.

Cordially,

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.
January 15th, 1935

Montclair, N. J.

PERSONAL

50-52 Elmwood Ave.

Dear Mr. White:

Please pardon my inexcusable delay in answering your two communications – particularly the first one. The fact is that I have been working in New York City since November 16 having ceased my connection with the Albany Inter-Racial Council on the 15th.

In the hustle of making the transition to this new way of life your first letter became misplaced and was completely forgotten. And I intended to answer the second one more promptly than I have.

No successor to me has been appointed in Albany as yet, I believe. The organization is undertaking to economize. If you wish the name of a reliable person who will act in a thoroughly confidential manner I would suggest Dr. William Brown, 90 Second St., Albany, who is chairman of the local branch of the N.A.A.C.P.

Reiterating my apologies for this delay,

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) James H. Baker, Jr.

Mr. Walter White, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 69 Fifth Avenue New York, City.

JB,Jr.: ABB
January 22, 1935

My dear Mr. White:

I talked to the President about both your letters this morning. He wants me to say that he has talked to the leaders on the lynching question and his sentence on crime in his address to Congress touched on that because lynching is a crime. However, he, himself, will write you more fully a little later on.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. Walter White
Nat'l Ass'n. for the Advancement of Colored People
69 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

There have come to us a disturbing number of expressions of disappointment that the President did not include lynching in his opening address to the Congress, though a great many people had asked him to do so. To all of those who have spoken to me about it, I have urged patience, saying that perhaps the President will send a special message to Congress on lynching or include specific recommendation for passage of the Costigan-Wagner bill in his address to the Congress on crime. I wonder if you could advise me if my optimism is well founded. It would help during this very trying period to know that our efforts have not been in vain.

We had a great meeting here in New York last Sunday. I enclose copy of the program. Similar meetings are being arranged under the joint auspices of the Federal Council of Churches, the Y.W.C.A., Y.M.C.A., branches of the N.A.A.C.P., and other organizations, in strategic cities throughout the country.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.

WW:LB

How do your Senators and Congressmen stand on the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill?

ENDORSED BY THE NATIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU, 215 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I want you to see the enclosed letter which I have just written to the President.

I enclose also clippings from one of the more widely circulated newspapers in which you will note how the N.A.A.C.P. and I are being attacked because of our waiting for action by the President, which action we feel confident will be taken. This feeling is growing speedily unless some forthright action is taken soon, I fear.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.
The Hon. Franklin L. Roosevelt  
President of the United States  
The White House  
Washington, L. C.

My dear Mr. President:

We wish to place before you the facts which lie back of the brazen shooting by a mob yesterday at Franklinton, Louisiana, of Jerome Wilson, which shooting took place, apparently, without the slightest interference on the part of the authorities in thekill. The ridiculous story told by officers that "a mob stole into the sheriff's office around 3:00 A.M. today, obtained the keys to the cell and located Jerome in one of them" and that the mob riddled Jerome's body with bullets because officers declared; the mob feared that Wilson's "cries would arouse parish authorities" is too flimsy for belief by any sane man.

Here are the facts as established by careful investigation of the charges against Jerome Wilson:

Wilson's father, John Wilson, and his family lived on a farm about seven miles from Franklinton, near the village of Clifton, Louisiana. John Wilson is considered an excellent farmer and is one of the most prosperous ones, white or colored, in his section of the parish. In 1924 Mr. Wilson purchased an eighty-acre tract of land to add to his already large farm. He owns a comfortable home on his plantation.

Mr. Wilson's prosperity, due to the industry and frugality of himself and family, aroused the enmity and jealousy of some of the whites.

On Saturday morning, July 21, 1934, Joe Magee, white range rider appointed by the State to inspect the stock on all farms, went to the Wilson home and told Jerome Wilson, twenty-eight-year-old son of John Wilson, that a mule, which...
was at that time standing in the lot, had to be dipped. Jerome Wilson told Magee that they knew that the mule was to be dipped and would be dipped as soon as his father had secured the necessary permit. Magee became enraged and declared that he himself would have him dipped. Jerome Wilson told Magee that he would have to wait until his father, the owner of the mule, returned. Magee ignored Jerome's statement and said that he was going to do as he pleased. Jerome informed Magee that if he interfered with his father's property that he (Jerome) would act to protect that property during his father's absence.

Magee thereupon went to the nearest telephone and called Sheriff Delos C. Woods at Franklinton declaring that he had been threatened by the Wilson family and that they had "attempted to mob him." Deputy Sheriff Woods, we are informed, is notorious for arresting people without warrants regardless of charges. Deputy Sheriff Woods immediately rushed to the Wilson home taking with him two other deputies where he was joined by Magee. The four white men approached the porch on which Mrs. Temple Wilson, wife of John Wilson, and her sons were sitting. As Woods reached the steps he announced that he had come for the mule. Recognizing him as an officer of the law, Jerome told him that the mule was in the lot and that he could go and get it if he wished to. Woods thereupon continued to mount the steps saying that he had not only come for the mule but for Jerome as well. Jerome and his brother, Moore Wilson, asked the deputy sheriff to produce his warrant, stating that no cause had been committed and that Jerome would not willingly go to jail unless a warrant were produced.

Woods grappled with Jerome to take him by force and illegally since he had no warrant. Moore came to his brother's rescue, whereupon Woods drew his gun and shot Jerome and Moore. When the shooting began the smaller children ran away from the house. Wounded in the hip, Jerome staggered into the house, secured his shotgun and upon returning to the porch fired one shot, which the shot killed Deputy Woods. We are informed that Deputy Sheriff McCauley McClain claims that he shot Jerome when he returned to the porch. We understand, however, that Deputy Sheriff Woods was shot from behind and slightly over the right ear by a pistol bullet, whereas Jerome Wilson had only a shotgun. Three of the Wilson boys were shot, Moore and Jerome being most dangerously wounded. They and their brother Felton were placed in jail without receiving any medical attention and none was given until the late afternoon of that day. Moore died in the jail that night around nine o'clock and, though the weather was extremely hot, being late July, his body was allowed to remain in the cell with the other members of the family until noon of July 2nd.

Four members of the family, including the mother who had no part in the melee at all, were charged with murder and six other members of the family were charged with being accessories after the fact and material witnesses.

On the nights of July 31st, 2nd and 3rd mobs attempted
to take all members of the family from the jail and lynch them, with dismaying speed plans to try Jerome on the charge of murder were rushed to satisfy the blood lust of the mob. On July 30th, only nine days after the shooting, Jerome was placed on trial at the parish court house in Franklin. The court room was crowded with rustic parishioners, all of the white race, and Negroes were not allowed in the court room. A motion for a postponement made by defense attorneys because of the physical condition of the defendant and because they had only been notified three days before that they were to defend Jerome Wilson, was overruled by the judge. So bitter was the atmosphere that a Negro relative of the defendant who got into the courtroom on the second day of the trial, had to flee for his life from the courtroom where he was set upon by white persons who beat him with fists, rocks, and other weapons. All this was done in the open courtroom and apparently without even a protest by the court officials.

The case was given to the jury at 11:30 P.M. on the afternoon of Tuesday, July 31st, when no verdict had been rendered by nine o'clock that night the judge ordered the defendant taken back to the jail and locked up. The sheriff and his deputies attempted to execute the order of the court they were rushed by a mob which attempted to tear the badly wounded prisoner and lynch him. The howling of the mob reached the ears of the jury in the small parish court house where at least three members of the jury, even in that charged atmosphere, were so convinced of the innocence of the defendant that they stood out for acquittal even though they knew that their own well-being was in jeopardy because of their stand. Apparently the noise of the attempted lynching had its effect for the following morning the jury brought in a verdict of guilty.

So outrageous was the situation that one of the leading attorneys of Louisiana, the Hon. George Bray Hill, became interested in this case. Through the activities of the New Orleans branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, prominent churchmen and others of both races the Louisiana Supreme Court reversed the conviction on the grounds that the defendant had not received a fair trial, whereupon Jerome Wilson was lynched yesterday in the very building which is supposed to be the symbol and instrument of justice.

Much more than the body of Jerome Wilson was lynched by that mob. Every concept of lawful and orderly procedure was lynched at the same time, as well as every element of decency and fair play. This case proves once more that nothing except Federal action as represented by the Costigan-Wagner anti-Lynching Bill can or will stop lynching. Mr. President, we
submit that the body of Jerome Wilson cries out to you to demand of Congress without delay that it pass the Costigan-Wagner Bill and throw the full weight of the Federal Government behind the fight to wipe out this bestial crime.

Respectfully,

(Signed) Walter White
Secretary.
You Are Urged to Attend a

MASS MEETING

Against Lynching

Broadway Tabernacle

FIFTY-SIXTH and BROADWAY

NEW YORK CITY

January 6, 1935

3 P.M.
PROGRAM

THE REV. ALLAN KNIGHT CHALMERS
Pastor of Broadway Tabernacle
Presiding

ANTHEM “Lift Ev’ry Voice and Sing”

AUDIENCE

INVOCATION

DR. ROBERT W. SEARLE
General Secretary, Greater New York Federation
of Churches

BRIEF ADDRESSES

DR. JOHN W. ROBINSON
Pastor, Christ Community Church

DR. W. RUSSELL BOWIE
Rector, Grace P. E. Church

HON. BERNARD S. DEUTSCH
President, Board of Aldermen, City of New York

MICHAEL WILLIAMS
Editor, The Commonweal

CONTRALTO SOLO

MISS ETTA MOTEN

REMARKS

WALTER WHITE
Secretary, N.A.A.C.P.

ADDRESS

HON. EDWARD P. COSTIGAN
U. S. Senator from Colorado

Benediction

DR. WILLIAM LLOYD IMES
Pastor, St. James Presbyterian Church
Cooperating Organizations
Greater New York Federation of Churches
Federal Council of Churches
Metropolitan Board, Y.W.C.A.
National Council, Y.M.C.A.
World Alliance for Friendship through the Churches
Home Missions Council
Council of Women for Home Missions
The Catholic Interracial Council
Foreign Missions Conference
National Conference of Jews and Christians
Central Conference of American Rabbis
Writers’ League Against Lynching
The League for Industrial Democracy
Interdenominational Preachers Meeting of New York
National Urban League
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

Individual Sponsors
Mrs. Ernest R. Alexander
Dr. Walter G. Alexander
James E. Allen
Mrs. Mary R. H. Allen
Elsie M. Anderson
Miss Lillian Anthony
Mrs. Francis M. C. N. Bacon
Roger Baldwin
William C. Ball
Rev. Charles F. Banning
Rev. C. Rankin Barnes
Rev. Roswell Parkhurst Barnes
Col. William G. Barrett
Dr. Edward E. Best
Harry L. Binse
Rev. Hutchins C. Bishop
Thomas Bridges
Rev. A. J. Bond
Mathieu Y. Bequette
Dr. W. Russell Bowle
Rev. Russell Morse Broughton
Dr. William Adams Brown
Rev. Fred L. Browne
Mrs. William R. Buchanan
Mrs. Pearl S. Buck
Dr. Charles E. Burton
Daniel B. Butts
Dr. S. Parkes Cadman
Dr. Eugene C. Carder
Gerard L. Carroll
Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert
Rev. Edmund B. Chaffee
Miss Caroline B. Chapin
Mrs. John C. Clark
Franklin D. Cogswell
Mrs. William Hugh Coverdale
Hon. William D. Cunningham
Rev. George N. Davis
Miss Dorothy Day
Dr. Clement DeFreitas
Hubert T. Delany
Mrs. Fred S. Dennett
Thomas J. Divinney
Rev. E. P. Dixon
Mrs. Cleveland E. Dodge
Nicholas A. Donnelly
Rev. H. Paul Douglas
Dr. J. Stanley Durkee
Mrs. Lucius Eastman
Mrs. Douglas W. Eakton
Mrs. Daniel J. Fleming
Dr. Raymond L. Foman
Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick
Rev. William Hiram Foote
Rev. Frank S. Fry
Lewis S. Gannett
Miss Katherine Gardiner
Rev. Charles K. Gilbert
Rabbi B. Benedict Glazer
Rev. Dr. Samuel H. Goldenson
Rev. Dr. Sidney Goldstein
Francis S. Grant
Percy Greene
Rev. Max Grod
Michael Gunn
Rev. Cameron P. Hall
Henry Harlston
Miss Rose Haus
Dr. George E. Hayes
Mrs. William Henry Hay
Mrs. T. E. Herder
T. Arnold Hill
Miss Margaret Hiller
Hon. James J. Hoyt
Rev. John Haynes Holmes
Mrs. Walter E. Hope
George K. Housen
Dr. Finis S. Ilesman
Dr. William L. Ives
James Witham Johnson
Eugene Kinkel Jones
Mrs. Orrin R. Judd
Dr. William R. King
Dr. John W. Langdale
Mrs. Henry Goddard Leach
Abraham Lefkovitz
Rev. Henry S. Leiper
Rev. Solomon Lowenstein
Dr. Malcolm James MacLeod
Rev. William T. Manning
James Marshall
Miss Lucy R. Mason
Mrs. Douglas Mathewson
Peter Martin
Rev. F. A. H. McHale
Rev. Andrew J. Martin
Mrs. William F. Morgan
Rev. Claude E. Morris
Dr. Hamilton A. Morse
Rev. Rev. Francis J. McConnell
Hon. George Z. Medalie
Dr. J. H. Malle
Alexander F. Miller
Mrs. William Fallowes Morgan
Rev. Claude E. Morris
Dr. Herman N. Morse
Francis S. Moreley
Leslie R. Moore
Rev. Lewis Seymour Mudge
Harry S. Myers
G. W. A. Murray
Dr. Frederick B. Newell
Drs. Reinhold Niebuhr
Dr. Eric M. North
Dr. Hudson J. Oliver
Miss Mary White Ovington
Mary A. Paige
Mrs. W. T. Payne
Mrs. Carl S. Parach
Mrs. Henry Hill Pierce
Mrs. Andrew J. Piacenti
Mrs. Harry H. Plant
Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling
Rev. Dr. de Sola Pool
Rev. A. Clayton Powell
Hon. Joseph M. Proskauer
Mrs. Joseph M. Proskauer
Mrs. Francis F. Randolph
Mrs. Warren A. Ransom
Mrs. Dorothy M. Reed
Dr. Christian F. Reinsch
Dr. Howard C. Robbins

Dr. E. P. Roberts
Dr. Millard L. Robinson
Hon. Otto C. Rosebury
Dr. Daniel Rubell
Dr. Theodore F. Savage
Dr. Paul Scherer
Mrs. William Jay Schieffelin
Mrs. George T. Scott
Dr. Leon Scott
Rev. Robert W. Searle
Dr. Charles H. Sears
Miss Anne Seeholtz
Mrs. Seymour Shed
Dr. Minot Simons
Dr. Robert E. Speer
Arthur A. Spingarn
J. E. Spingarn
Dr. Frederick K. Stamm
Dr. Augustus Steinle
Rev. Rev. Ernest M. Stiles
Miss Dorothy Straus
Foster S. Strauss
Maceo Thomas
Dr. Channing H. Tobias
Mrs. Edward Perry Townsend
Rev. Charles Tucker
Oswald Garrison Villard
Miss Elizabeth Walton
Dr. John H. Warmish
Schuyler N. Warren
Dr. Robert A. Watson
Rabbi Jacob Weisenstein
Michael Williams
Dr. Louis T. Wright
L. Hollingworth Wood

LIFT EVERY VOICE AND SING

Lift ev’ry voice and sing,
Till earth and heaven ring,
Ring with the harmonies of Liberty;
Let our rejoicing rise
High as the sining skies,
Let it resound loud as the rolling sea.
Sing a song full of the faith that the dark past has taught us,
Sing a song full of the hope that the present has brought us.
Facing the rising sun of our new day begun,
Let us march on till victory is won.
Stony the road we trod,
Bitter the chastening rod,
Felt in the days when hope unborn had died;
Yet with a steady beat,
Have not our weary feet
Come to the place for which our fathers sighed?
We have come over a way that with tears has been watered,
We have come, treading our path thro’ the blood of the slaughtered,
Out from the gloomy past,
Till now we stand at last:
Where the white gleam of our bright star is cast.
God of our weary years,
God of our silent tears,
Thou who hast brought us thus far on the way;
Thou who hast by Thy might
Led us into the light,
Keep us forever in the path, we pray.
Let our feet stray from the place, our God, where we met Thee,
Lest our hearts, drunk with the wine of the world, we forget Thee;
Shadowed beneath Thy hand,
May we forever stand.
True to our God,
True to our native land.

Words by JAMES WELDON JOHNSON
Music by J. ROSSAMOND JOHNSON

Copyright by Edward B. Marks Music Co., 223 West 49th Street, New York City.
January 24th, 1935

My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Your letter of January 22nd has done a great deal to revive my somewhat flagging spirit with regard to the anti-lynching bill. I shall look forward eagerly to the letter from the President which you state he is writing me a little later on.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.

How do your Senators and Congressmen stand on the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill?

ENDORSED BY THE NATIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU, 215 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I was in Washington Monday and a part of Tuesday and telephoned the White House hoping, through Mrs. Scheider, to get a chance to say a few words to you. However, you and Mrs. Scheider were tied up at the time that I telephoned; so I had to leave to keep a speaking engagement in Philadelphia before I could see you.

I have to be back in Washington on Monday, and perhaps Tuesday, February 4th and 5th. Would it be convenient for me to come in and see you for a few minutes on either one of these days?

Cordially,

Secretary

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I find that I won't be able to get down to Washington on Monday so I won't have to take up any of your time. But I will be in Washington later on, if not before certain hearings on February 14th when the Senate Judiciary Committee will be held on the Costigan-Wagner bill. I know you will be glad to learn that I had a long and very satisfactory talk with Mrs. Caroline O'Day in Washington last Monday and she has agreed to be one of a very small group of distinguished witnesses who will appear before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

For your private information I think you will be interested in the enclosed copy of letter from former Congressman L. C. Dyer and of my reply, which is rather typical of what seems to be a rather persistent campaign which is gaining some headway among thoughtwful colored and white people regarding the possibility of effective action by the present Congress on lynching. I, however, still cling to my belief that you and the President will be able through vigorous action to secure a vote on the bill during the present session of Congress and to overcome the opposition of a small minority. In this connection I think you will be interested in the article by my associate, Mr. Roy Wilkins, on his interview with Senator Huey Long. I am sending you a marked copy under separate cover.

I have also received a letter from Miss Katherine Gardner, copy of which is enclosed, which shows the kind of questions which we are constantly being asked by organizations and individuals interested in the bill.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.

WW: CTF

How do your Senators and Congressmen stand on the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill?

ENDORSED BY THE NATIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU, 215 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
Law Offices
L. C. Dyer
The Chemical Building
751 Olive Street
St. Louis, Mo.

January 28, 1935.

Mr. Walter White,
Secretary, N.A.A.C.P.,
69 Fifth Avenue,
New York N.Y.

Dear Walter:

I see in the February "Crisis" that you are giving considerable space to anti-lynching legislation in the present Congress. You are too smart and you have had too much experience with this subject to believe that the present Democratic Congress will enact any legislation of this kind. You, of course, remember that it was the Democrats in the Senate who prevented this legislation being enacted into law at the time it passed the House of Representatives.

You and the "Crisis" ought to tell the colored people the truth, which is that there is no chance whatever for this legislation in the present Congress. The colored people are wasting their time and postage in even writing to members of the Congress urging the enactment of it. You ought to be fair with the colored people in this matter and tell them that no Democratic Congress will ever enact anti-lynching legislation with any teeth in it. I trust that you and the "Crisis" have not been deceived in this matter like a lot of colored people were in the last election.

Of course we all know that some colored people sold out principal for a mess of potage. The race as a whole suffers for this. If the "Crisis" is to continue in this deception I hope you will discontinue sending it to me.

With best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

(Signed) L. C. Dyer
February
1935

My dear L. C.:

Thank you for your letter of January 28th. Even were I to grant all that you say, yet we are faced with the concrete and inescapable fact that the Democratic party is in control of Congress and will be for at least two more years. What then should we do? Wait until the Democrats are out of power and the Republicans again before we agitate for an anti-lynching bill? It may be, as you say, that "there is no chance whatever for this legislation in the present Congress." But the same thing was true repeatedly of Republican Congresses for no Republican Congress ever passed an anti-lynching bill during the many years when its representatives were in as complete control of Congress as are the Democrats today. It is true, as you say, that Democrats in the Senate prevented passage of the Lyer bill after it had been passed by the House; but you do remember, don't you, that Senator Lodge and other Republicans were a party to abandonment of the bill in the face of the filibuster led by southern Democrats.

It would be foolish, in my opinion, for Negroes to be blindly partisan so far as Democrats are concerned as it was for them to be blindly Republican. The Association is still maintaining its principle of political independence and continues to advocate to colored voters that they support men and measures rather than party labels which today are almost meaningless.

Even though I do not agree with your point of view I am glad to have had your letter and to have heard from you.

Ever sincerely,

L. C. Lyer, Esq.,
721 Olive Street
St. Louis,
Missouri.

Secretary.

WW:CTF
Mr. Walter White  
69 Fifth Avenue - NAACP  
New York, N.Y.

My dear Mr. White:  

I am having an increasing number of inquiries from the church organizations which we are heading up in the campaign for pushing the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill as to the status of the bill in Congress. So far I have been unable to give them any reassuring report. These organizations represent millions of church people who are American citizens and who are deeply interested in the passage of the bill. They have been hoping that the President would send a message to Congress about it and are growing greatly concerned at his silence.

Are there any further steps that can be taken to insure prompt consideration of the bill?

Sincerely yours,

Katherine Gardner

G-1
THE WHITE HOUSE
Washington


Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt,
(Personal).

An exhibition of paintings, drawings, etchings, sculptures, and woodcarving dealing with lynching and sponsored by a group of distinguished Americans will open at Jacques Seligmann Galleries, New York City, February fifteenth. I would very much like to have you honor us by being one of patrons. Senators Costigan and Wagner, Governor Lehman and others among patrons. Please wire if we may add your name.

(Walter White.)
February 15, 1935

My dear Mr. White:

I am afraid I will not be in New York for very long for some time to come. If I am there when your exhibition is still going on, I will surely try to stop in for a minute. I may be there for a short time on the 23rd.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. Walter White
Nat'l Ass'n for the Advancement of Colored People
69 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., N.Y.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

The enclosed clipping from this morning's Times will show you that race prejudice is not confined to the south. It was a terrible blow, after we had gotten out all our printing, but we were able to secure another gallery this morning-- the Arthur U. Newton Galleries at 11 East 57th Street.

It would be a great thing if during the exhibition you could pay it a visit-- and I assure you that it will be well worth while artistically. If you are going to be able to do so, could you let me know several days in advance? Your attending the exhibit would be a most effective rebuke to those persons who forced poor Mr. Seligmann to cancel the exhibition which he personally did not want to do.

Cordially,

Walter White
Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.

WW: CTF
How do your Senators and Congressmen stand on the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill?
PROTESTS BAR SHOW OF ART ON LYING

Macabre Exhibition Canceled on 'Outburst' of Objections From Secret Sources.

SOCIAL MESSAGE WAS AIM

Display Backed by Prominent Person Will Be Held, Negro Group Official Indicates.

Protests from unidentified sources reached yesterday in the macabre exhibition of art on ‘lynching’ which was to be opened today in this city.

The exhibition, which was to open today in the Rookery Hotel, was to be closed in the gallery for Mrs. J. Q. Anderson, a Negro artist who has repeatedly asked the Art Institute for the exhibition of negro art. Several announcements had been made by the gallery directors that the exhibition would not be held.

An artist who had been working on the project was asked to present his work to the police yesterday, and was told that it was to be exhibited today.

Although no further information was available, the show had been arranged by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. Whitehouse declining to reveal the source of the protest, said: "I think we have been working on the project for the past two years. However, I was faced with an unknown at any time. But I want to keep the gallery free of any such protests."

WORK BY PROMINENT ARTISTS

The picture and sculpture in the show are to be the work of negro artists from all parts of the country. Among the work included will be the famous painting by Mrs. George Biddle, "The Family of Jacob," which was done in a Negro style. There was a large oil painting by Thomas H. James, Negro artist, which was being used in a book on Negro art.

One of the most unusual works exhibited in the show was "Regrettably," a painting by Martin F. Preston, a young Negro artist who was shown to his mother about the exhibition. He was asked how he got a view of the lynching. In the picture a Negro was portrayed as the victim of a lynching.

The exhibition was generally successful, and the work had been received not only with an eye to its artistic merit but also as a social statement.

A number of sponsors.

Among them were Miss Henrietta S. Selig, Miss Henrietta Selig, Mrs. John Brown, Dr. Henry Brown, and Mrs. John Brown. Mrs. Washington, chairman of the National Conference on Women's Rights, was also present.

HELEN L. RICHARDSON, EDITOR

Artists had cooperated willingly to the undertaking in hopes of White and black artists working more closely together.
Mr. Walter White
455 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y.

I will come in to exhibit at nine on the 23d for few minutes.
I can not make statement nor see reporters. You can say I have
been there after I leave.

Eleanor Roosevelt

Feb. 20, 1935
February 13, 1925

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I am delighted to have your letter of February 13 and to learn that you may possibly be able to visit the lynching exhibit on the 23rd. I am enclosing a copy of the catalog.

It will mean a very great deal to have you at the exhibit, because many Americans will follow your example in visiting it who otherwise would not do so.

Have I your permission to advise the press that you may visit the exhibit? This would be done, of course, with the express understanding that no advance publicity would be given to your visit should you not wish it. We would like very much, however, to have at least the principal newspapers have reporters at the galleries to receive a statement from you.

Cordially,

[Signature]

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.

WW/RR

How do your Senators and Congressmen stand on the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill?

ENDORSED BY THE NATIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU, 215 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.
February 18, 1935

Dear Miss Scheider:

Will you please do me the kindness of getting the enclosed letter into Mrs. Roosevelt's hands as soon as possible and then letting me know by wire if she grants the request which I have made?

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary

Miss Malvina Scheider
The White House
Washington, D.C.

WW/RR

How do your Senators and Congressmen stand on the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill?

ENDORSED BY THE NATIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU, 215 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
March 1, 1935

My dear Mr. White:

I understand the President has told Secretary McIntyre that he would see Mr. Ernst. If Mr. Ernst wishes to see me I will, of course, be glad to see him if he will let me know when he gets his appointment with the President.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Mr. Walter White
By Fifth Avenue
New York
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

May I take the liberty of suggesting that it would be very helpful, in my opinion, if you and the President should talk with Mr. Morris L. Ernst who has just returned from the Virgin Islands. He has told me of some of the observations he has made there, not only dealing with the Judge Wilson situation but also with such fundamental civil liberties issues as the ballot and the question of illegitimacy.

Mr. Ernst has just had conferences in Washington with Messrs. Ickes, Chapman and Gruening. I believe that both you and the President would gain a great deal of valuable information from a conversation with Mr. Ernst.

Mr. Ernst's address is 285 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I thought you would be interested in seeing the enclosed press release on the lynching on March 18th of Ab Young at Slayden, Mississippi.

Ever sincerely,

Walter White
Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.
N.A.A.C.P. ASKS FEDERAL ACTION IN MISSISSIPPI LYNCHING

Third Mob Murder of 1935 Was Interstate Kidnapping and Can Be Classified Under Lindbergh Law, Says White

New York, Mar. 18.—A request that the federal government act against the kidnappers and lynchers of Ab Young, put to death by a mob in a school yard at Slayden, Miss., March 18, was telegraphed to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Homer S. Cummings by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as soon as the lynching became known.

Young was captured at Roseville, Tenn., and transported across the state line into Mississippi where he was hanged and shot. He was accused of murdering a white highway employee. The N.A.A.C.P. telegram to Attorney General Cummings, signed by Walter White, secretary, declared the federal government had the power to act under the Lindbergh kidnapping law and said: "In the name of the laws which you have taken a solemn oath to uphold, we vigorously insist that your department proceed at once against the kidnappers of Young yesterday."

To President Roosevelt the N.A.A.C.P. secretary cited the Young lynching as the third in 1935 and the second in five months where a victim has been transported across a state line. He called upon the Chief Executive to spur the Department of Justice to action and to urge immediately the passage of the Contigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill which has just been reported favorably out of committee.

According to a special story in the Memphis Press-Sentinel, Young was captured and held prisoner in the school house just outside of Slayden from noon until 4:10 p.m., when he was hanged. During this time practically the whole town was arguing whether Young should be turned over to officers rushing there from Holly Springs, Miss., or whether he should be burned alive. It seems the argument was about fifty-fifty, with more in favor of burning, but those in favor of burning were very stubborn, though outnumbered. While the argument was at its height about fifty men are said to have become "disgusted." They left in automobiles and hanged Young quickly by driving a truck out from under him. They then returned to town and told the rest of the population that the argument was "all settled."

It is said Young's neck was not broken by the crude method of hanging. He slowly strangled to death. While he was in his last agonies, a few of the younger whites began shooting at his body for fun. More and more joined in taking "pot shots" at the swinging corpse until it was riddled with bullets.

A jury quickly returned a verdict of death at the hands of "parties unknown." It is certain that local and state authorities

(Continued on Page 2)
will take no further action.

The text of the N.A.A.C.P. telegram to President Roosevelt:

"The third lynching of nineteen thirty-five took place yesterday at Slayden, Mississippi when Ab Young, suspected of murder was killed by a mob. This is the second instance within the last five months where a victim was kidnapped by a mob and transported across a state line. Young was seized according to the Associated Press by mob at Roseville, Tennessee, taken across the state line into Mississippi and there lynched. This is unquestionably a clear violation of the so-called Lindbergh Kidnapping Law which provides for federal action in cases of kidnapping or abduction "for ransom reward or otherwise". The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and cooperating organizations with a total membership of forty-two million working for passage of federal legislation against lynching respectfully but vigorously urge two courses of immediate action upon you as leader of the American people. First, we urge you to order the Department of Justice to proceed against the kidnappers of Ab Young under federal legislation against kidnapping. Failure of Department of Justice to act in the notorious kidnapping of Claude Neal last October from Brawton, Alabama and transportation across the state line into Florida where he was lynched with abnormal bestiality has caused profound criticism of the inactivity of the Department of Justice. We urge that the department be not permitted again to be guilty of misdemeanour. Second, we ask you immediately to urge upon Congress prompt passage of the Contigan-Wagner bill which on Monday was favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee."
March 18, 1935.

My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Here is a fine editorial from the influential Macon, Georgia, Telegraph of February 15, which I want you to see.

When you shall have read it, I wish you would call it to the attention of the President, as I know he, too, will be glad to see this strong expression of Southern opinion.

I enclose also copy of a petition we are circulating. One newspaper announcement that the petition was being circulated has brought a phenomenal demand from all parts of the country for petitions to be signed. It looks as though we shall have no difficulty in getting several hundred thousand signatures. There is a growing feeling that a vigorous and bold demand right now for a vote in the Senate would insure passage.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.
Please Sign and Circulate This

ANTI-LYNCHING PETITION TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Anti-Lynching Bill S. 24 and H. R. 2776
(Known as the Costigan-Wagner Bill)

A DIGEST OF THE BILL

The phrase "mob or riotous assemblage," when used in this Act, shall mean an assemblage composed of three or more persons acting in concert, without authority of law, for the purpose of killing or injuring any person in the custody of a peace officer or suspected of, charged with, or convicted of the commission of any crime, with the purpose or consequence of preventing the apprehension and/or trial and/or punishment by law of such person or otherwise of depriving such person of due process of law or the equal protection of the laws.

SECTION 2: Failure, neglect or refusal to protect an individual against a mob is deemed denial of due process of law and the equal protection of the laws of the state. Act secures to all citizens protection guaranteed by the U. S. Constitution.

SECTION 3: (a) Failure on the part of any local or state officer charged with the duty of protecting an individual in his custody from injury or death, or to apprehend, keep in custody or prosecute any mob member, is deemed a felony, punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(b) Any local or State officer who conspires with a mob member to injure or put to death a prisoner without authority of law, or suffers such prisoner to be taken from his custody to be injured or put to death is guilty of a felony, as are those who conspire with him. On conviction the parties participating therein shall be punished by imprisonment of not less than five years and not more than twenty-five years.

SECTION 4: Gives jurisdiction to the District Court of the United States judicial district wherein the person is injured or killed by a mob to try and punish in accordance with the laws of the State all persons who participate therein: Provided state officers have failed to apprehend, prosecute, or punish such offenders; or (2) that jurors are so strongly opposed to such punishment that there is probability that those guilty of the offense will not be punished in such State court. Failure to act within thirty days after the offense, to apprehend, indict or prosecute shall constitute prima facie evidence of the failure, neglect, or refusal described.

SECTION 5: County liability: Injured person or legal representative may recover from $2,000 to $10,000 from the county involved in civil action against such county in the U. S. District Court of the judicial district in which such person is injured or killed. Prosecution by the U. S. District Attorney. Where the county fails to pay the judgment, the court has jurisdiction to enforce payment by levy of execution upon property of the county, or may otherwise compel payment by mandamus or other appropriate process. Failure of any officer to comply with any lawful order of the court in the premises shall be liable to punishment for contempt and to any other penalty provided by law therefor. The amount recovered is exempt from claims of creditors and shall be paid to the injured person or his heirs.

SECTION 6: Transportation of the victim from one county to another county: Both counties jointly and severally liable to pay the forfeiture. Action shall be brought and prosecuted by U. S. District Attorney. Any district judge of the U. S. District Court concerned may direct that suit or prosecution may be tried in such place as he designates in such district.

There have been 5,070 lynchings since 1882. Less than one-sixth of the victims have even been accused of rape. Since 1889, 93 women have been lynched. Lynchers are rarely arrested; almost never convicted. The States will not stop lynching. A Federal law is necessary.

WALTER WHITE,
Secretary, National Association
for Advancement of Colored People,
69 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
PETITION to the PRESIDENT of the UNITED STATES

We, CITIZENS of the UNITED STATES, respectfully urge the President of the UNITED STATES

To recommend to the 74th Congress the immediate passage of Bills S. 26 and H. R. 2776 to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing and punishing the crime of lynching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STREET ADDRESS</th>
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<th>OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
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COUNTY OR CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

Petition sent by: NAME

STREET ADDRESS

CITY AND STATE
From

MR. WALTER WHITE, Secretary,
National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People,
69 Fifth Avenue,
New York, N. Y.
Federal Check on Lynching

The measures by which the Federal Government undertakes to curtail upon the jurisdiction of the states, particularly in the matter of holding "fair" elections, used to be known as "force bills." One of them made the name of Senator Lodge odious in the South for many years.

But public sentiment in the South has about crystallized into the feeling that only by federal intervention can we ever hope to wipe out lynching, and the committee in charge of the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill has begun to hold hearings in Washington. Because of the crowds, white and black, which filled the House committee room at the last session of Congress, when this bill was being considered, it has been decided to hold the hearings in the large courts room of the Senate office building.

Under the Hoover administration Representative Byers of Missouri offered an anti-lynching bill, but he suffered under the handicap of representing a Negro district, and perhaps that was at least one of the reasons why the bill did not get far any further.

No such charge can be brought against Sen.

ator Wagner or Representative Costigan, good, steering Democrats from a white constituency, and it is believed that the bill has a chance of success.

Under the terms of this bill local officers who fail, neglect or refuse to make all diligent efforts to protect prisoners from mobs and to apprehend mob participants would be guilty of a felony, punishable by a fine of $5,000 and imprisonment for five years.

Any officer, having a prisoner in custody, who conspires with others to lynch, also would be guilty of a felony, along with members of a mob, punishable by imprisonment from five to twenty-five years.

If, within thirty days of an injury or lynching, the State where it occurs shows no disposition to prosecute offenders, the federal court could take jurisdiction.

Finally, any county in which a person is seriously injured or killed by a mob would be liable to the injured person or his heirs in an amount not less than $2,000 nor more than $10,000 an "liquidated damages."

There will be a certain amount of opposition to this bill here in the South, but it is a fair question to ask what else are we to do.

Lynching goes on year after year and punishment for the crime is practically unknown. One of the most revolting of these crimes was the latest to gain general attention, when a Florida mob, near Marianna, after bringing the victim from an Alabama jail, where he had been taken for safe keeping, sent out invitations in the morning to attend the lynching, which resolved itself into slow torture, with gruesome details hardly fit to be printed.

Members of that mob were well known to the officers of the law, who, indeed, might have prevented the lynching in the first place if they had cared to do so, and yet no one was ever punished, no one in that state has ever been punished for such a crime.

Although, as the women of the state themselves point out, there have been thirty lynchings.

This brutality simply cannot go on. The states have had ample opportunity through the years to do something to prevent this barbaric crime. The time has come when something must be done and the federal anti-lynching bill appears to be the answer.
THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON  

March 20, 1935.

MEMORANDUM FOR MRS. SCHEIDER

Will you tell Mrs. Roosevelt that the President says he cannot see Walter White until after he gets back from his trip?

G. G. T.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I note in the press that President Roosevelt plans to leave for Florida on March 23rd for a vacation. I do very much hope that it will be possible for me to talk with him prior to his departure.

Senator Huey Long is quoted in the press as declaring when he heard of the favorable report of the Senate Judiciary Committee that, "By God, I'll filibuster until Christmas Eve to kill that bill!" (Incidentally I was told this morning that there is a possibility of Father Coughlin coming out for the bill in one of his radio broadcasts.)

If the bill is passed by the Seventy-fourth Congress, I believe strongly that its best chance is now. If no vote is taken until along towards the end of the session, I fear it will be swamped in the usual confusion and press of legislation. That is why I am very anxious to talk with the President now to discuss means of achieving a vote. Vigorous action by himself would have profound effect not only on this legislation, but on the situation generally. At least this is the impression I have gathered from talking with many members of the Senate.

With cordial personal greetings,

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT
The White House
Washington, D.C.

How do your Senators and Congressmen stand on the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill?

ENDORSED BY THE NATIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU, 215 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 14, 1935

MEMORANDUM FOR MRS. SCHUYLER

I did not make an appointment for Mr. White for two reasons:

The first was, that the President's appointments are so heavy that it is impossible;

The second reason was, that the President is not discussing with anyone messages that are under consideration in a Committee.

Confidentially, also, this is a very delicate situation and it does not seem advisable to draw the President into any more than we have to.

Yours...

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Roosevelt:

Mrs. Scheider told me over the telephone yesterday how busy you will be today, so I shall not trouble you before returning to New York tonight.

I shall, however, be back in Washington next Wednesday, March 13th, to attend a dinner given by Dr. Oscar Chapman to Pres. Johnson of Howard University. Would it be at all possible for me to see the President on either Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday to discuss with him the anti-lynching bill? For the reasons we discussed in New York it seems to me wiser not to seek this interview through the regular channels.

—Senator Van Nyns informed me yesterday that the bill will be reported favorably next Monday.

Sincerely,

Walter White
March 23, 1935

My dear Mr. White:

I talked over the lynching exhibit with Mrs. O'Day and Miss Perkins. Miss Perkins feels that it would start up very violent feelings going through the South and that the artistic value, unless it were very great, would hardly lift people above the subject shown.

In thinking it over, I do not feel that, with the exception of a few things, the exhibit had tremendous artistic value. I do realize all the advantages of having things put before people in a visual way, but think that we must be very careful where and how we do it. We do not want to start passions in the South which will make horrible occurrences any more frequent than they are, particularly when the Bill is being discussed and there will be enough flatulent speeches in Congress.

If I were you, I would watch very carefully all results in every place and be prepared to counsel or to limit the people who see the exhibit wherever it seems wise. I would in every way be sure that you had no violent opposition. For instance, I think it would do a great deal of harm if a group were to raid the exhibit and destroy it in some southern city.

I am sorry that the President is so busy he will not be able to see you until after he gets back from his trip.

Mr. Walter White
69 5th Avenue
N.Y.C.

Very sincerely yours,

3:DD
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Will you read Mrs. O'Day's letter to me and my reply about sending the exhibition of an Art Commentary on Lynching on tour, and let me have the benefit of your opinion?

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.
March 18, 1935.

Mr. Walter White
National Asso. for the Advancement
of Colored People
69 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.

My dear Mr. White:

I have received a letter signed by Mr. Brickell, Mr. Cullen, Mrs. Spingarn and others, on sending the Art Commentary on Lynching on a tour throughout the country. I am not at all sure that this would be a good thing to do.

You may remember my telling you what happened to Mr. Shilliday when he went into Texas to do some investigating - I am very much afraid that the same spirit would be roused in some of the Southern cities that you have on your itinerary. I also have a feeling that the exhibition if held in certain places, would arouse the sadistic instincts of a certain class of the people and would react to the detriment of the colored citizens.

I would suggest that you write to Mrs. Roosevelt about it before you make your plans. From a conversation that I had with her some ten days ago about the New York exhibition, I am inclined to think that she agrees with my views as to the inadvisability of so extended a tour, at least.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Caroline O'Day
(Mrs. Daniel O'Day)
March
19th
1945

My dear Mrs. O'Leary:

Thank you very much for your thoughtful letter of the 18th. We too were very much concerned about the effect of sending an Art Commentary on Lynchings into the South and we very carefully sought the opinion of those in position to know. Here are some of the results.

Baltimore, as you know, is quite southern in its sentiment. To both our amusement and gratification, the Maryland Institute and a number of other galleries jumped at the chance of showing the exhibition and even became somewhat impatient because of delays in Philadelphia in getting the right gallery. The exhibition will open at the Maryland Institute on April 1st and will run for a fortnight there. If it is at all possible I wish you could arrange to see the exhibition while it is there and let us know if you still feel that it would be unwise to send it further south.

I also send you enclosed copy of a letter from Miss Susan Byrwick of the Macon (Georgia) Telegraph and a letter from Dr. George Fort Milton, editor of the Chattanooga News, one of the most influential newspapers in the South. Dr. Milton is one of the patrons of the exhibition, as are Mr. Douglas S. Freeman, editor of the Richmond News Leader, and author of the four-volume life of Lee which has recently received such enthusiastic praise, and Dr. Virginius Dabney, editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

It is our plan to send the exhibition only to larger places and always where there is a large liberal and college group. The present tentative itinerary, following the Washington show, is as follows: Richmond, Chapel Hill (N.C.), Atlanta, Nashville, New Orleans and Dallas, Texas.

The exhibition will then swing north through Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Cleveland, Cincinnati and Boston. This will not be the exact itinerary as they are dependent upon the availability of galleries and other local arrangements. We have had no results for the
exhibition from a number of colleges and universities and from cities like Hanver, Omaha, Johnstown, Berenton and other places.

Another indication that may be of some value is that a remarkably large number of southerners visited the exhibition in New York, registered their names and addresses and a number of them urged us to send the show south. These, of course, are the more liberal and intelligent ones as they would not otherwise have visited such an exhibition.

Please do not believe me to be headstrong in placing this information before you. I do so only because I value your opinion so and because there are many who feel that the graphic representations of lynching would do a great deal of good, especially in the South.

I would be grateful if, after receiving this letter and reading the enclosures, you would let me know if you still feel as strongly as you do.

I am following your suggestion and am sending Mrs. Roosevelt copy of your letter to me of March 16th and of this reply.

With cordial personal greetings, I am

ever sincerely,

Secretary.

Hon. Caroline O’Day
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.
Dear Mr. White:

Your letter concerning my visit to the Art Commentary on Lynching reminded me that I had meant to send you the editorial from The Macon Telegraph on the subject of the Costigan-Wagner Bill. Perhaps you have already had it from a clipping bureau, but perhaps you have not seen it. I enclose it.

May I not take this opportunity to tell you how fine I considered the exhibition of pictures in the Galleries! I believe it was a fine piece of work to exhibit them for the vigorous appeal of the pictures carried a lesson which hundreds of words could not teach.

In its feeble way, the TELEGRAPH, I think you know, has been striving toward an end to lynching. They are carrying on.

Sincerely yours,

Signed: SUSAN MYRICK
Mr. Walter White  
69 Fifth Avenue  
New York, N. Y.

My dear Mr. White:

This will acknowledge yours of March 8th. In the same mail I have a letter signed by a number of the New York group interested in the lynching exhibition. I think you are quite right that it would be a good idea to display the pictures over the country, and particularly in the South. I am very glad that plans to this end are being worked out, and think you are wise to let the arrangements be made through the College Art Association.

I am enclosing a check for $10.00, which I wish you would be good enough to send to Miss Suzanne LaFollette as a contribution from myself to the expenses in the sending around of the exhibit.

Faithfully yours,

Signed: George Fort Milton
My dear Mr. White:

The more I think about going to the exhibition, the more troubled I am, so this morning I went into talk to my husband about it and asked him what they really planned to do about the bill because I was afraid that some bright newspaper reporter might write a story which would offend some of the southern members and thereby make it even more difficult to do anything about the bill.

My husband said it was quite all right for me to go, but if some reporter took the occasion to describe some horrible picture, it would cause more southern opposition. They plan to bring the bill out quietly as soon as possible, although two southern Senators have said they would filibuster for two weeks. He thinks, however, they can get it through.

I do not want to do anything which will harm the ultimate objective, even though we might think for the moment that it was helpful and even though you may feel that it would make some of your race feel more kindly toward us. Therefore, I really think that it would be safer if I came without any publicity or did not come at all. Will you telephone me at my New York house at seven o'clock on Friday night? The number if Rhinelander 4 - 7438. You can then tell me how you feel.

Very sincerely yours,
AN ART COMMENTARY ON LYNCHING

THE FUGITIVE
by John Steuart Curry

Arthur U. Newton Galleries
Eleven East Fifty-seventh Street
New York City

Galleries open 10:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. daily, except Sunday

Price of Catalogue: Twenty-five Cents
THIS LYNCHING

In order to understand it you must understand something about the whole American South. It would be better to go live for a time in one of the miserable little interior towns, say in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi.

And then you must go back to slavery, to what it did to the spirit of man on the land. There has been a very terrible thing happened to man, all over America, in the North as well as in the South, in connection with the land. It might be better for all of us here in America if we could, at least for a while, give up the whole Christian idea, this business of the salvation of the individual soul, the bargain struck with our God. . . . "I'll stand for any sort of life here, on this American earth. I'll have my fun, my joy in life in the hereafter." The implication that you will not learn to love and honor the ground under your feet as that might lead to pagan sun worship, earth worship. I have often wished that our President, some one of them . . . Roosevelt would be a good one to start it . . . he is a man who seems to have joy in life . . . that he would proclaim a day in the Spring . . . let's say May first, internationally looked upon as Labor Day, as a day of fiesta. Let us all go out of our towns and cities on the day and walk about planted fields, singing and feasting for the good American earth, all day long.

What has all of this—this earth feeling I am here speaking of to do with lynchings, and in particular with lynchings in the South. Well, don't worry, it will spread to the North, too.

For, you see, I do feel that all of this killing, particularly of Negroes, by lynching has its deep implications. You can't lynch the man with whom you work and—in the South you see, long ago, before the Civil War, there was this ugly degradation of man's common labor on the face of earth to get his food. A gentleman didn't do it. He made his slaves do it.
But only a few men could be gentlemen, in the sense suggested above, that is to say through ownership in lands and slaves. As for the rest—and it applies to the great body of white men in the old South—to work in the field, touching earth with your fingers was slaves business. The overlord, big plantation owner strutting before the man below, the Poor White in the South as now the industrial overlord of the North struts before his slaves.

It does seem necessary for the human, any human to in some way get back his self respect . . . call it that. I must in some way feel manhood power in myself. If I am thwarted in my work, the tools of my work dirtied for me, the earth under my feet dirtied for me, I must get even.

There comes then this perversion, quite naturally I think. The Poor White of the South, who goes blood mad in one of his ugly little towns, goes Negro killing. Negro lynching is not really trying to preserve the purity of his women . . . the excuse always given. Look at Scottsboro. Does anyone really believe that the white men, the Poor Whites who crowd into the court room down there, so eager to lynch those black boys, can any man believe they are trying to protect the two white women involved in that affair? And have not the white women of the South more than once declared that they do not want protection from the white males through lynching?

It is then simply an assertion, ugly and perverted, of man's hunger for self-respect. "I cannot get it from the land as land and labor are handled in the South. I cannot get it from the factory where cheap goods are made. I must get it somewhere. Let me go kill, kill, kill. At least that is an expression of physical might."

There it is. That is the foundation for your killings, for your lynchings. Look at Shelbyville in Tennessee. There they did not get their Negro. He was slipped away by a Judge, who must have been a man, so they destroyed their courthouse, their temple of justice. It is pretty significant, I think, and I think too that the struggle against lynching in this country will become really powerful when it goes deeper, the old justice destroyed and a new feeling of real justice born.

And that means, doesn't it, understanding, even of the dread thing, how it got into men, how man's sense of manhood always has been and always will be involved with the work he does, his touch with tools, earth, materials. To strike only at the lynchers is to strike always at the surface of the evil. It is pulling your punches. There had been too much punch pulling. The Poor White, who does the lynching is really a Poor White.

—SHERWOOD ANDERSON

A NOTE

An Exhibition of this nature serves two paramount causes. It brings to the attention of a large number of persons the fact that lynching is an existing condition, and it raises the question of what is to be done to outlaw it.

Practically everyone knows that the killing of human beings, generally Negroes, by means of violence and without legal sanction, has been the rule and not the exception for more than seventy-five years. Newspapers carry accounts of mob-murder, the barbaric details deleted and edited for family reading, and anyone who can read or see a picture knows by this time the more or less common program of a lynching. Furthermore, many readers have become hardened to the point where they accept without second thought the inevitability of the practice.

Lynching is not accidental. It is cold-blooded premeditated torture ending in death. Its locale is almost always in the Southern States where the cultural standard of the white population is far below the level of Western civilization. It is a primitive, barbaric custom that appeals to that part of man's nature which has not been benefited by contact and association with civilized influences. Lynching exists in a world of its own, and it should be dealt with as any other major crime.

Debate on the subject of lynching has been beclouded by statements from various sources that the practice is necessary in order to protect the honor of Southern womanhood. This is merely an excuse designed to cover up the true intent and purpose. Rape is not confined to any one race or nationality.
The appeal of lynching to the-uncivilized lies in its blood-thirsty attitude towards torture and pain. The dragging of a Negro's body behind an automobile over miles of road, the mutilation of the body, and the slow blood-letting or strangulation demonstrates that the mob wishes to engage in the act of torture even more than in the actual death. A member of a lynching party is an active participant whether he is merely an observer or whether his own hands do the killing.

Social deterioration is the payment extracted for a lynching. The community surrounding a lynching scene loses all trace of progress and civilization. The children practice brutality just as if they were learning to fish and hunt. In the end, the contamination envelopes the entire state, and no man, woman, or child escapes its brutalizing influences.

The constant threat of lynching is holding back the progress of the Negro race in the South. No race of people, white or black, can rise to its full height when over its head is suspended the fear of inhuman mutilation and death.

After seventy-five years nothing has successfully curbed lynching. Eradication by education will help, but only after the passage and enforcement of anti-lynching laws. The law and the enforcement of the law will have to come first. The Southern States have demonstrated by means of a policy of inaction that they will not take the necessary steps.

It should be plain, therefore, that it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to pass the necessary legislation, and to place the enforcement of the law in the hands of the Department of Justice. Until that is done, lynching will continue in the future as it has in the past, and each day of delay will force millions of people towards further descent into the slough of barbarism.

—ERSKINE CALDWELL
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My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I am sure you will be gratified to see this fine editorial from the Macon (Georgia) Telegraph of February 15th. Equally interesting and gratifying is the fact that this editorial has elicited very widespread commendation in the South.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.
THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON  

April 2, 1935  

My dear Mr. White:  

Mrs. Roosevelt will be glad to  
see you about half past four on the 8th  
in New York City, at her house, 49 East  
65th Street.  

Very sincerely yours,  

Melissa F. Bradner  
Secretary to  
Mrs. Roosevelt  

Mr. Walter White  
69 Fifth Avenue  
New York  
N.Y.
April 2, 1935

My dear Mr. White:

Mrs. Roosevelt will be glad to see you about half past four on the 8th in New York City, at her house, 49 East 65th Street.

Very sincerely yours,

Secretary to Mrs. Roosevelt

Mr. Walter White
69 Fifth Avenue
New York
N.Y.
Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Your opinions regarding the lynching exhibition are very valuable and we shall take them into very careful consideration.

The exhibition opens on Sunday at the famous Maryland Institute in Baltimore. There was actually a contest among several galleries for the privilege of showing it.

Baltimore is sufficiently far south and sufficiently southern in temperament for us to learn something from the experience there; and we will be guided largely by the reaction there.

We may not be able to send the exhibit very far because of lack of funds.

I am sorry not to have been able to see the President before he went South, but I am hoping I shall be able to talk with him as soon as possible after his return. In the meantime, I should like very much to talk with you. Do you expect to be in New York any time soon? If not, and you can arrange to see me, I will come to Washington.

Ever sincerely,

[signature]

Secretary

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.

WW/RR
April 5, 1935

My dear Mr. White:

Mrs. Roosevelt asked me to thank you for sending her the editorial from the Macon Telegraph. She was very much interested to see it.

Very sincerely yours,

Secretary to
Mrs. Roosevelt

Mr. Walter White
659 Fifth Avenue
New York
N.Y.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I am sorry that I missed you both in Washington last week and in New York this week. There were three matters that I wanted to discuss with you. One of them, of course, was the anti-lynching bill. We now have written pledges from 43 Senators and 123 Congressmen that they will support the bill. I enclose a digest of these pledges. The Y.W.C.A., the Federal Council of Churches, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and other organizations interested in the bill have secured additional pledges. When these are received it is likely that the situation will look even more favorable.

More and more southern newspapers are coming out for the bill. I enclose editorial from the Chattanooga News of April 5th, which Dr. George Fort Milton, distinguished author, and editor of the News, has just sent me. And here is a statement which we have just received from Dr. Will W. Alexander, of the Interracial Commission and which is significant, don't you think, in the light of Mrs. Ames' attitude?

I also have before me a digest of the report made by the Rosenwald Fund on an investigation of the land tenure system in the South. This investigation of the effect of the reduction of cotton acreage leads the Rosenwald Fund to the conclusion:

"Unfortunately, because of the old race bugaboo, the South is peculiarly incapable of handling problems of disrupted economic systems and floating populations of casual workers. Great bands of Negroes, unattached to the soil, unaccountable to regular bosses, are a new and
unmanageable problem. These Negro hordes, competing with poor whites for such casual labor as appears, competing with whites for relief while it lasts, possibly raiding fields or stores if they begin to starve - all this may easily lead to hysteria, terrorizing, lynchings, and race riots of unprecedented scope and violence."

This would seem to furnish a strong argument for passage without fail of the Costigan-Wagner bill in this session of Congress.

Indications from all parts of the country seem to establish that the country at large would not stand for a filibuster against the bill, providing a sufficiently determined stand against the filibuster were made. Unfortunately there is a very wide-spread and rapidly growing cynicism on the part of many colored and white people as to whether or not the anti-lynching bill will really be voted on at this session. I need hardly add that I do not share this doubt.

The other two matters I want to discuss were the Virgin Islands situation and also a means of focusing public attention upon the means and extent of discrimination, especially by local administrators, employers and labor unions, against the Negro under the various recovery agencies. It would take too long for me to go into either of these adequately in a letter so that I must reserve discussion of them until I have opportunity to talk with you.

With cordial personal greetings to you and the President,

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.
Dr. Will W. Alexander, Director of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation, with headquarters here, today gave to the press the following statement:

"At Franklinton, Louisiana, early Friday morning, masked men broke into the jail, evidently without resistance from the officers in charge, and lynched a prisoner to whom the Louisiana Supreme Court had granted a new trial. The past history of such occurrences offers no assurance that the Louisiana authorities will make any effort to punish the members of this mob. The persistence of these occurrences and the refusal of local authorities either to protect their prisoners or to punish lynchers would seem to make it imperative that the Federal Government take positive and vigorous steps to protect the lives of its citizens. Southern Representatives and Senators now in leadership in Washington will find it difficult to justify indifference or opposition to Federal legislation for the control of lynching."

1/12/35
April 11, 1935

Following are expressions from members of the House of Representatives in communications re the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill:

William A. Ashbrook, Ohio: "I am of the opinion that my support will be given the bills you mention to suppress lynching."

Sol Bloom, New York: "I want to assure you that it will give me pleasure to support suitable anti-lynching legislation."

(Introduced H.R. 184) William F. Brunner, New York: "I will introduce a bill during the coming session of Congress, and will do all in my power to secure passage of same."

(Introduced H.R. 148) Emanuel Callier, New York: "I shall introduce in the next session the bill which I introduced in the last session, providing for anti-lynching legislation."

William M. Citron, Connecticut: "Rest assured that I will give serious consideration to everything you mention therein." (referring to letter from the N.A.A.C.P.)

Charles J. Colden, California: "I am opposed to lynching and I will support any reasonable measure which is against such violent and unlawful activities."

Francis R. Condon, Rhode Island: "I am in favor of an effective anti-lynching law being passed by Congress."

William P. Connery, Jr., Massachusetts: "I wish to assure you that I shall be glad to support any legislation which I feel will do away with lynching."

Eugene E. Crowe, Indiana: "I assure you that it (the matter of anti-lynching legislation) will have my earnest consideration when it comes before me."

Thomas H. Cullen, New York: "I am strongly in favor of Senator Wagner's bill dealing with anti-lynching legislation and you may rest assured that I shall do whatever possible in behalf of same."

John J. Delaney, New York: "When the matter in which you are interested is presented to Congress I will be sure to give it my attention."

Samuel Dickstein, New York: "I am very much in favor of any legislation which will do away with this blot on our civilization."

John D. Dingell, Michigan: "I have always been opposed to lynching and therefore I not only favor the Costigan Anti-Lynching bill but I have worked with the Senator toward its adoption . . I hope that we are successful in wiping out this curse of American civilization which is on a par with kidnapping and murder where ransom is demanded."

(continued)
Donald C. Dobbin. Illinois: "This instance (the Marianna lynching) and the outcome of the recent attempt at another lynching in Tennessee... strengthens my belief that there should be national legislation on the subject. That has been my conviction for some time."

Frank J. G. Dorney, Pennsylvania: "I can assure you that I will take a sincere interest in Federal anti-lynching legislation, and shall give it serious consideration at the opportune time."

Matthew A. Dunn, Pennsylvania: "I wish to state that I am more than willing to support any legislation which will put an end to lynching."

Andrew Edmiston, West Virginia: "I will lend my support to any Federal anti-lynching Bill."

William A. Ekwall, Oregon: "You may rest assured I shall be found on the side of law and order on any question before Congress."

Phil Ferguson, Oklahoma: "I am going to give this matter my personal consideration."

G.W. Gillette, Iowa: "I want to assure you I will be glad to give any assistance in my power to this type of legislation."

Joseph Gray, Pennsylvania: "I am not familiar with the provisions of this bill, but I think any measure would be good that has a tendency to abate this vicious practice. When the matter is presented I shall give it my serious consideration."

Arthur D. Healey, Massachusetts: "You may rest assured that this matter will have my utmost attention when Congress convenes in January."

Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., Missouri: "I assure you that the Wagner-Costigan Bill will have my unqualified support and I shall do everything to see that it is enacted. You may consider me as definitely committed in favor of this legislation at this time."

Knute Hill, Washington: "I wish to assure you that I will be heartily in favor of any proposals seeking to stamp out the lynching evil. I believe in law and order and justice for all."

Sam Hobbs, Alabama: "This will acknowledge yours... to which I shall be glad to give my careful consideration and study."

Edward A. Kenney, New Jersey: "I am in favor of Federal anti-lynching legislation and shall be pleased to give it my support."
Clarence F. Lea, California: (From his secretary) "Mr. Lea wishes me to assure you that he will give his earnest consideration to the legislation in which you are interested."

William Lemke, North Dakota: "You may be sure that when this bill comes before the House of Representatives it will receive Congressman Lemke's earnest consideration and support." (From his secretary)

Louis Ludlow, Indiana: "I am very ardentaly supporting the Wagner-Costigan anti-lynching proposal and it is my intention to introduce a duplicate of it in the House."

Francis T. Maloney, Connecticutt: "This is a matter in which I am deeply interested, and I assure you it will have my careful consideration. I would, of course, favor anti-lynching legislation if it was properly drawn."

Cal Magee, Michigan: "I have always voted for anti-lynching legislation and expect to continue to do so. I shall be glad to vote for the bill to which you refer at the very earliest opportunity."

Melvin J. Mars, Minnesota: "You can be assured of my continued support for adequate Federal legislation to suppress lynching. I have always been a supporter of your federal anti-lynching legislation."

Charles F. McLaughlin, Nebraska: "This matter will have my earnest consideration."

James M. Mead, New York: "I wish to inform you that I am in sympathy with the views expressed in your letter."

Theodore L. Moritz, Pennsylvania: "I assure you that I am interested in Federal anti-lynching legislation."

Mary T. Norton, New Jersey: "I want to assure you that you may count upon my full support of the Federal anti-lynching bill if and when it comes before Congress."

Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois: (Letter from his secretary) "You are informed the Congressman favors such legislation and you may be sure that in the event such measures come before the House of Representatives during the coming session of the Congress they will receive his active support."

Caroline O'Day, New York: "Long ago, I pledged my support of the Anti-lynching Bill, for I realize full well what a grave danger to the country lynching constitutes. When I assumed my new position in Washington, I hope to have the opportunity to confer with Senators Costigan and Wagner about the proposed Bill."

(continued)
Emmet O'Neal, Kentucky: "I have discussed this matter with the colored people of my District and I think my position is well understood by them."

E.W. Patterson, Kansas: "As a citizen of the great middle west and as a lawyer, I have for a long time felt that it would be necessary to take different means for the suppression of lynching, if the guarantee of the Constitution of a fair trial to any citizen accused of crime was to become a fact rather than a phrase. I can assure you that you will find me at all times willing and anxious to cooperate in orderly government and that I will be in favor of any proper legislative proposal to suppress lynching and guarantee to every man in this country his constitutional rights."

Samuel B. Pettengill, Indiana: "Without committing myself to the details of any particular bill, I am prepared to vote for federal anti-lynching legislation."

D. Lane Powers, New Jersey: "I want you to know I am heartily in favor of Federal Anti-Lynching (legislation) and shall vote for this measure when it is brought before the Congress."

Harry C. Ransley, Pennsylvania: "I wish to advise you that I will work and vote for the proposed Federal anti-lynching legislation at the next session of Congress... I have always supported legislation which I believed was beneficial to your people."

Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois: "Allow me to advise that I am heartily in favor of the Federal anti-lynching legislation and permit me to assure you that I will do all within my power to aid in the passage of legislation of this kind."

Harry Sauthoff, Wisconsin: "I am willing to go on record as being absolutely opposed to lynching and shall give this serious consideration."

Leonard W. Schuetz, Illinois: "Please be informed that I am in accord with your views and will be very happy to cooperate when the anti-lynching Bills will be presented to the House of Representatives."

George N. Seger, New Jersey: "You may be assured that this will have my support as in the past."

F.J. Sisson, New York: "It is my present intention to support the Wagner-Costigan Bill or any other sound federal anti-lynching legislation."

Bertrand E. Snell, New York: "I certainly shall be very pleased to give it (the bill) very careful consideration when it is before us."

(continued)
Andrew Somers, New York: "I am pleased to inform you that the anti-lynching legislation will receive my earnest consideration and support."

William H. Sutphin, New Jersey: "I am happy to inform you that I am an ardent advocate of such legislation, and enclose herewith a speech which I made regarding such legislation."

Chester Thompson, Illinois: "May I assure you that it is my intention to support any anti-lynching legislation that may be under consideration in the 74th Congress, for I certainly believe in the equality of races."

Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania: "I assure you that I am entirely in sympathy with what you hope to accomplish."

Otha D. Wearin, Iowa: "I can assure you that this matter will receive my careful attention."

Charles H. Wolverton, New Jersey: "I can assure you that I am now and always have been strongly in favor of the passage of such bill or any other that would effectually deal with this matter. There is no justification, in my opinion, for lynchings, and I will be glad to cooperate in any way that is within my power to pass appropriate legislation to deal adequately and effectually with the same."

William H. Wilson, Pennsylvania: "I am already on record in favor of anti-lynching legislation, and I stressed it during my campaign."

Orville Zimmerman, Missouri: "I assure you that I shall be glad to cooperate in the passing of any such legislation which may come before the next Congress."

Frank H. Lee, Missouri: "You may be assured that I am unalterably opposed to any enmities which might give rise to such atrocious occurrences. . . I want to assure you that I will be ever ready to assist."

(Introduced H.R. 6545) Henry P. Koppleman, Connecticut: (From his secretary) "I know you will be interested to know that the Congressman has always condemned lynching and in the early days of the last session introduced a bill in Congress calling for federal action to punish the crime of lynching. If anything, he is more vigorously opposed to lynching today than he was at the time he introduced this bill."

J. L. Willigan, Missouri: "I assure you if this matter comes before the House for consideration it will receive my undivided attention."
Louis Ludlow, Indiana: "I am heartily and enthusiastically in favor of this legislation and am doing all I can to promote it."

U.S. Guver, Kansas: "I am heartily in accord with legislation to this end... You may count upon my support both in and out of the committee for a sane and practical measure to stop this practice."

William J. Granfield, Massachusetts: "You may be assured when this legislation comes before the House for consideration, it will receive my whole-hearted support."

J. Leroy Adair, Illinois: "I would assure you I would be glad to support any bill that has to do with the prevention of lynching in any form."

Leo E. Allen, Illinois: "I will be glad to support any anti-lynching bill in the House of Representatives."

Fred A. Britten, Illinois: "It will be a real pleasure for me to support the Senator Costigan Bill or any other bill of like character that is designed to oppose, obstruct or penalize mob violence and lynching."

Martin A. Brennan, Illinois: "Please be assured that I shall give this legislation my earnest consideration when it comes before the next session of Congress."

Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois: "If an anti-lynching bill is brought before the House for consideration, I expect to support such legislation."

Leo Kocakowski, Illinois: "I am in hearty accord with the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. I am sure, too, that the Administration as well as the members of both Houses of Congress will vigorously support a Federal Anti-Lynching Bill when it comes before the next session of Congress."

Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois: "I will support such a bill designed to provide federal action in the cases of mob violence."

Edwin M. Schaefer, Illinois: "I have always been opposed to mob violence and I assure you of my support in the legislation during the next session of Congress that will tend to curb that menace, and to organize law enforcement throughout the country. I take very much the same position as our President who has publicly denounced lynching tendencies which so suddenly spread over our country during the past month."
Martin L. Sweeney, Ohio: "When Senator Costigan's bill to make lynching a federal offense is presented to the House for consideration I shall be only too glad to remember your suggestions."

David Lewis, Maryland: "I am in sympathy with your views on this subject. The anti-lynching bill which I understand is to be introduced this session shall have my most serious consideration."

Chester C. Bolton, Ohio: "If the Senate measure to which you refer comes to the House for action, or there is other legislation presented on the subject, you may be sure of my very careful consideration."

James O. Scrugham, Nevada: "I have the greatest confidence in the sound judgment of Senator Costigan, and will be much inclined to favor any measure of the character which he may introduce."

John E. Hollister, Ohio: "I am not familiar with Senator Costigan's Bill but you may be sure that I shall give it full consideration when I have had a chance to study its contents."

William E. Hess, Ohio: "I am not familiar with the details of the bill but the general subject matter meets with my approval, and I assure you that this legislation shall have my very careful consideration."

Ernest Lundeen, Minnesota: "Your views and suggestions are appreciated and will be given every consideration in connection with the bill. At the time this measure is brought before the house."

Harold Knutson, Minnesota: "I will gladly support a federal anti-lynching law. So long as we permit lynchings in this country we are not in condition to criticise or reprove other countries."

Allen T. Treadway, Massachusetts: "If any measure of this nature comes before the House for action, you may be assured it will have my most careful attention."

Clarence Cannon, Missouri: "You may be certain that I shall be glad to cooperate at every opportunity in every legitimate measure for the maintenance of law and order."

Reuben T. Wood, Missouri: "I have always been opposed to mob rule as it is an instrument of barbarism... and you may be assured that it will be my purpose to render my every influence and cooperation to the enactment of a law making lynching a Federal crime and giving Federal courts jurisdiction over the same."
Schuyler O. Bland, Virginia: "This matter shall certainly have my careful consideration when it is presented to the House."

Glen Griswold, Indiana: "Will be glad to support anti-lynching legislation."

Frederick R. Leibach: "Assured the Newark, N.J. Branch of his hearty cooperation and support of the bill."

Charles V. Truax, Ohio: "I can be depended upon to support any legislation which is progressive and humane."

Will Rogers, Oklahoma: "This matter will receive my careful attention."

Virginia E. Jenckes, Indiana: "I wish to be placed on record as being opposed to lynching and I shall support any and all anti-lynching measures which may come before the Congress."

J. Will Taylor, Tennessee: "I shall be glad to support any legislation directed at the eradication of the crime of lynching, as I have done in the past."

Theodore Christianson, Minnesota: "I shall, of course, support the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill in the coming session of Congress. Lynching is one of the blots upon the national life, and I shall do my best to see that it is eliminated."

James R. Claiborne, Missouri: "I believe that the mob of citizens who willfully, maliciously and unlawfully destroy property or human life should be, first, punished by the state where the offense is committed, and if for any reason that state is unable or unwilling to act, then, if it is constitutionally possible, the Federal Government should have the right to act."

William T. Schulte, Indiana: "I am going to do everything in my power to foster this bill and enlist the aid of my friends to push this measure through the House."

Alfred F. Beitler, New York: "I am strongly opposed, as a rule, to the Federal Government injecting itself into local affairs, but when there is no other way to protect society from foul and unspeakable crimes, I am in favor of the Federal Government taking hold."

(continued)
George A. Dondero, Michigan: "I do not know the provisions of the bill in question, hence am unable to state my stand in reference to the same... however, I might say that I am unalterably opposed to the practice of lynching, believing it to be un-American and without (justice. I shall favor any measure which aims to prohibit the same provided it has no objectionable features."

Thomas O’Malley, Wisconsin: "I may say that I am in favor of anti-lynching legislation and when such a bill is brought before the House I will give it most careful attention."

John G. Cooper, Ohio: "This measure will have my hearty cooperation and support and I sincerely hope that it will be enacted into law at the earliest possible moment."

Schuyler Merritt, Connecticut: "I am not familiar with the Costigan-Wagner Bill and never able to make a decided statement about a bill until I know what it is, and hear it discussed in Congress. In general, I do not favor taking over by the federal government of responsibilities and duties which should be assumed by the states."

William J. Sirovich, New York: "Should the 74th Congress bring in an anti-lynching bill, I shall be very glad to support it."

John Taber, New York: "I am in favor in general of an anti-lynching bill. I am not much familiar with the Costigan-Wagner Bill."

Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Massachusetts: "I have always deplored lynching and shall be glad to help in any legislation which I believe would banish this relic of ancient days."

James W. Fitzpatrick, New York: "Please be advised that I am against lynching and believe it should be stopped, and therefore, you can be assured that I shall vote for legislation of this nature."

George P. Darrow, Pennsylvania: "I have heretofore supported anti-lynching bills and voted for the Dyer Bill. My views on this subject have not changed."

(continued)
(Introduced H.R. 5)

Joseph A. Gavagan, New York: "I wish to assure you that I am heartily in accord with the principles of the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill, and shall work and vote for its passage."

John J. Boylan, New York: "I will be very glad to support the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill or any measure of a similar character if introduced in the 74th Congress."

William L. Higgins, Connecticut: "My attitude now is just the same as it always has been. I am against lynching and believe the authorities should do all in their power to prevent it. I shall heartily support any bill which has that as its object."

Bryon B. Harlan, Ohio: "I feel that enactment of the Costigan-Wagner Bill will tend to displace lynch law by constitutional law. During the hearings on the bill in question, it was held by some that its enactment would not be constitutional, but I believe the able brief submitted to the committee by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle, a New York attorney, effectively disposes of that argument against the legislation."

Anthony J. Griffin, New York: "I presume it (Costigan-Wagner Bill) will follow the lines of the old Dyer anti-lynching bill... and upon which I made a speech in its support."

James J. Farley, Indiana: "I am shocked and horrified by lynching, no matter whether the victim be white or colored and am ready to join sincerely in every rational and lawful effort to make an end of mob violence as a means of requital when crime has been committed."

James P. Monaghan, Montana: "Law and order we must have. They can only be maintained in the interest of all by the steady peaceful course of courts and reasonable adjudication of wrong."

Clifford R. Hope, Kansas: "I have always supported legislation of this type and intend to give my hearty support to this or any similar measure in the next session of Congress."

Fred C. Gilchrist, Iowa: "I favor the idea of an anti-lynching bill."

(Introduced H.R. 6025)

James Wolfenden, Pennsylvania: "I favor the passage of the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill."

(Introduced H.R. 5848)

Stephen M. Young, Ohio: "I will work and vote for the enactment of an adequate anti-lynching bill."

(continued)
L.T. Marshall, Ohio: "You may count on me and my support of any anti-lynching bill presented to the Congress."

Roy O. Woodruff, Michigan: "Please be advised that I shall vote for this measure if and when it comes before the House of Representatives."

Fred H. Hildebrandt, South Dakota: "Is one hundred per cent for all legislation concerning the Negro.

The North and South Dakota delegations in Congress are for the Costigan-Wagner Bill". H.F. Reden, Sioux Falls, S.D.

J. Becharach, New Jersey: Stated he is in favor of the Costigan-Wagner Bill." (New Jersey)

Jesse R. Holcott, Michigan: "I have always been heartily in favor of action by Congress to prevent lynching and want to help the cause in every possible way." (Port Huron)

J. Twing Brooks, Pennsylvania: "I shall lend my support to secure favorable consideration of this legislation and do everything I can to aid in bringing it out on the floor of the House for early action." (Sewickley)

John M. O'Connell, Rhode Island: "When such legislation comes upon the floor of the House for action, you may be very sure that I will give the bill my support." (Providence)

J.H. Hoepel, California: "I am heartily in favor of the Costigan-Wagner Bill and consider it just and needed legislation." (Monrovia)

John P. Dockwiler, California: "Should the Costigan-Wagner Bill pass the Senate and reach the House, I assure you I shall not only vote, but urge its enactment into law." (Venice)
Following are expressions from Senators in communications re the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill:

W. Warren Barbour, New Jersey: "I am strongly in favor of anti-lynching legislation, and I hope that the Senate will be able to reach this subject early in the session."

W. Warren Barbour, New Jersey: (Letter to Mrs. A.P. Kear, Secretary, Paterson Interracial Commission): "I assure you that I shall continue to support this legislation to the utmost. I was strongly in favor of the Costigan-Wagner measure. I was very deeply disappointed when the last Congress adjourned without at least taking a vote on this important matter. I am hopeful of success at the next session."

Alben W. Barkley, Kentucky: "When this measure is taken up by Congress for action, I shall give it my most earnest and careful consideration."

Arthur Capper, Kansas: "I shall give my very best support to the anti-lynching legislation to be introduced in the Congress which meets in January."

James J. Davis, Pennsylvania: "As I see it now I am for the Costigan-Wagner Bill."

Joseph F. Guffey, Pennsylvania: "I will gladly support any movement that will put an end to these atrocities. While I have not had an opportunity to study fully the Costigan-Wagner Bill, it seems to offer a way to aid in suppressing lynchings."

Rush D. Holt, West Virginia: "I always have been in favor of an anti-lynching bill and will support such legislation in the United States Senate. There is no place for lynching in a civilized country."

Henry W. Keyes, New Hampshire: "Please be assured the bills you state are to be introduced will receive my earnest consideration."

Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Wyoming: "The proposed legislation will receive my most earnest consideration. I have always believed that all people should be guaranteed the right of fair trial in our courts."

Sherman Minton, Indiana: "Wish to assure you that when this bill is presented and comes before the Congress, it shall have my favorable support."

James P. Pope, Idaho: "You may be assured that this matter will have my most careful consideration."

(continued)
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Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Washington: "This will have my serious consideration at the coming session of Congress."

Arthur H. Vandenberg, Michigan: "You may be very sure of my complete interest in your anti-lynch legislation."

Frederick Van Nuyss, Indiana: "Will continue to do everything that I can on behalf of Federal anti-lynching legislation."

David J. Walsh, Massachusetts: "Should any such proposals be introduced when this session is convened, I shall be glad to give it my sympathetic consideration."

A. Harry Moore, New Jersey: "I shall be glad to do my part in securing the passage of this bill."

(From the 73rd Congress)

Marcus A. Coolidge, Massachusetts: "You may be sure of my interest in this matter...shall be pleased to give the same careful study and serious consideration."

Elmer Thomas, Oklahoma: "In the event the measure is introduced, I shall be glad to give it my careful consideration."

Thomas P. Gore, Oklahoma: "I have not yet seen a copy of the bill and have not been advised of its provisions but I shall be glad to check upon it and give it careful consideration."

Harry Flood Byrd, Virginia: "I am glad to have your views and assure you that they will have full consideration when this legislation comes before the Senate."

Alva B. Adams, Colorado: "I have given but little attention to this measure up to the present time, but shall be very glad to give it careful consideration when it reaches the floor, and shall keep your wishes in mind."

Robert J. Bulkley, Ohio: "I would vote for one (anti-lynching bill) if convinced that circumstances demanded such a measure...."You may be sure that legislation on this subject will receive my sympathetic and careful consideration."

Pat McCarran, Nevada: "The President in his Message read before Congress dwelt on this very subject and called upon the people of this country to put forth their best effort as a mass and as a Government to end lynchings, I subscribe to this principle."

(continued)
Charles L. McNary, Oregon: "Will warmly support federal anti-lynching law."

Ernest W. Gibson, Vermont: "I am in favor of the bill which you have mentioned and shall be glad to support it."

Royal S. Copeland, New York: "I am in favor of the Costigan-Wagner Bill."

Arthur R. Robinson, Indiana: "I assure you I shall give the matters referred to my best attention and consideration."

Augustine Lonergan, Connecticut: "I am in sympathy with the views expressed in your telegram. (Hartford Branch)"

R. Ryan Duffy, Wisconsin: Wrote L. Collins, Madison, Wisconsin, that he favored the bill but thought it unconstitutional.

Henry F. Ashurst, Arizona: "I am in favor of the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill and I shall support and vote for the same. It is unconstitutional and outrageously wrong to lynch or to deprive any person in the United States of life without a fair trial in accordance with the laws of the country."

L. J. Dickinson, Iowa: "If the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill comes to a vote, it is my expectation to vote favorable thereto."

J. Hamilton Lewis, Illinois: "When the bill comes forth I shall be most pleased to read it, and as my record is well known on the subject my vote will be determined wholly by the provisions and obligations of the measure."

Bennett Champ Clark, Missouri: "I am heartily in favor of the proposed Anti-Lynching Bill."

Gerald P. Nye, North Dakota: "I am delighted to tell you that I shall give the bill my most earnest support and I shall gladly cooperate in every way possible to expedite consideration for it."

Henrik Shipsted, Minnesota: "This legislation is receiving my careful consideration... I expect this bill to be reported out. I also expect to support it."

Bronson Cutting, New Mexico: "I intend to vote for the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill."

Thomas D. Schall, Minnesota: "Shall do my best."

(continued)
Homer T. Bone, Washington: "Lynching has been a blot upon our national record. You may rest assured that I shall do all I can to assist in passing the anti-lynching bill."

Vic Donahey, Ohio: "I know precious little about the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill but expect to inform myself when I assume my duties. Naturally, I am against lynching anywhere or any time."

John G. Townsend, Jr., Delaware: "I was in favor of this measure when it was before Congress at the last session."

Daniel O. Hastings, Delaware: "I am not certain that I know what the provisions of the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill are but certainly I should be in favor of anything that would aid in any way in suppressing the horrible crime of lynching."

Elbert D. Thomas, Utah: "I shall support the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill."

Warren R., Austin, Vermont: "You may be sure that I will give it (Costigan-Wagner Bill) sympathetic and interested consideration."

James Couzens, Michigan: "I am, of course, earnestly against lynching but I am unable to commit myself to any specific bill until it has been fully debated on the floor of the Senate."
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I did not get in touch with you again before returning to New York last night because I did not want to trouble you too much.

I want you and the President, however, to see the enclosed poll of the Senate on the anti-lynching bill, as of yesterday, April 19th. This is based upon (a) written commitments to the N.A.A.C.P. or cooperating organizations, (b) personal statements to supporters of the bill, or (c) statements made to Senators Costigan, Wagner, LaFollette, et al. We have purposely made it conservative. Of those on whom we have no report, to date, it is possible that Senators Brown, Burke, Carey, Dieterich, Gary, Maloney, Pittman and Radcliffe may vote for the bill. Much pressure has been brought to bear on Senator McAdoo of California but we do not know what his attitude is.

Unfortunately, Senator Davis is ill at Battle Creek and is not even receiving telegrams, according to his secretary. I am trying to ascertain whether he arranged for pairing before leaving.

I don't want to have you feel that I am imposing upon you but I wish you would discuss with the President the possibility of his sending a message to the Congress. It may be that this would be the only way in which the filibuster, which will be led, we understand, by Senators Bilbo, Smith, Long and McKellar, can be overcome.

I am returning to Washington Sunday night to remain throughout the fight. I can always be reached through Dean Charles H. Houston, Howard University Law School, 420 Fifth Street, N.W., telephone Metropolitan 1807.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.

[Additional text]

How do your Senators and Congressmen stand on the Costigan-Haller Anti-Lynching Bill?
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Mrs. Roosevelt.

P.S. - Senator McNary has pledged his unqualified support and both he and Senator Hastings have stated that we can safely count on all the Republicans voting for the bill.

W.W.
Favorable:

Henry F. Ashurst, Arizona
Warren R. Austin, Vermont
W. Warren Barbour, New Jersey
Homer T. Bone, Washington
William E. Borah, Idaho
Robert J. Bulkle, Ohio

William J. Bulow, South Dakota
Arthur Capper, Kansas
Bennett Champ Clark, Missouri
Royal S. Copeland, New York
Edward P. Costigan, Colorado
James Couzens, Michigan
Bronson Cutting, New Mexico
James J. Davis, Pennsylvania
L. J. Dickinson, Iowa
Victo Donahey, Ohio

F. Ryan Duffy, Wisconsin
Lynn J. Frazier, North Dakota
Ernest W. Gibson, Vermont
Joseph F. Guffey, Pennsylvania
Frederick Hale, Maine
Daniel O. Hastings, Delaware

Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico
Rush D. Holt, West Virginia
Hiram W. Johnson, California
Robert M. LaFollette, Wisconsin
J. Hamilton Lewis, Illinois
Augustine Lonergan, Connecticut
Pat McCarran, Nevada
George McGill, Kansas
Charles L. McNary, Oregon
Jesse H. Metcalf, Rhode Island
Sherman Minton, Indiana
A. Harry Moore, New Jersey
Louis Murphy, Iowa
James E. Murray, Montana
Matthew M. Neely, West Virginia

George W. Norris, Nebraska
Gerald P. Nye, North Dakota
Thomas D. Schall, Minnesota
Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Washington
Henrik Shipstead, Minnesota
Frederick Steiwer, Oregon
Elbert D. Thomas, Utah

John C. Townsend, Jr., Delaware

Harry S. Truman, Missouri
Arthur H. Vandenberg, Michigan
Frederick Van Nues, Indiana
Robert F. Wagner, New York
David I. Walsh, Massachusetts
Favorable - Cont'd.:

Burton K. Wheeler, Montana
(?) Wallace H. White, Jr., Maine

Not Committed But Probably Favorable:

Alva B. Adams, Colorado
Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Wyoming
James P. Pope, Idaho

Not Committed:

Alban W. Barkley, Kentucky
Marcus A. Coolidge, Massachusetts
Thomas P. Gore, Oklahoma
Henry W. Keyes, New Hampshire
Peter Norbeck, South Dakota
Elmer Thomas, Oklahoma

No Report:

Fred H. Brown, New Hampshire
Edward R. Burke, Nebraska
Robert D. Carey, Wyoming
William H. Dieterich, Illinois
Peter G. Gerry, Rhode Island
William Gibbs McAdoo, California
Francis T. Maloney, Connecticut
Key Pittman, Nevada
George L. Radcliffe, Maryland

Doubtful:

Hattie W. Caraway, Arkansas
Carl Hayden, Arizona
William H. King, Utah
M. M. Logan, Kentucky
Robert R. Reynolds, North Carolina
Joseph T. Robinson, Arkansas
Millard E. Tydings, Maryland

Opposed:

Nathan L. Bachman, Tennessee
Josiah W. Bailey, North Carolina
John H. Bankhead, Alabama
Theodore C. Bilbo, Mississippi
Hugo L. Black, Alabama
Harry Flood Byrd, Virginia
James F. Byrnes, South Carolina
Tom Connally, Texas
Opposed - Cont'd:

Duncan U. Fletcher, Florida
Walter F. George, Georgia
Carter Glass, Virginia
Pat Harrison, Mississippi
Huey P. Long, Louisiana
Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee
John H. Overton, Louisiana
Richard B. Russell Jr., Georgia
Morris Sheppard, Texas
Ellison D. Smith, South Carolina
Park Trammell, Florida
Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt:

The negro citizens of South Carolina are anxious to see the Costigan Wagner bill pending today become a law. We deplore the attitude of our senior senator who appears to believe lynching a necessity preventive for criminal assault. Of the thousands lynched since eighteen eighty two, less than one person in seven was even accused of said offense. We are pleading with those whose wisdom and experience enable them to see the evil of lynching and mass murder in spite of the apparent insignificance of the alleged criminal. Numerous instances on record not only prove that state laws do not see that every man is given a chance to receive justice before the law by process of a fair and impartial trial but also that many innocent men have been brutally murdered under mob rule. This matter lies close to the hearts of enlightened Christian Americans. We beg that you continuously call it to the attention of your illustrious husband, letting him know of our profound interest and of our belief that he will use his unprecedented and unlimited power and influence in an effort to obtain passage of this bill.

State Negro Citizens Committee, R. W. Mance, Chairman,
Mrs. Andrew W. Simkins, Secretary.
TELEGRAM

The White House
Washington

34 WU JM 83 D.L.

Durham, N.C., April 29, 1935.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt:

Representing the general sentiment of the negro race and many of the whites in the southland I am appealing to the President through you to use every influence in seeing that the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill is passed. After careful deliberation we have concluded that the passage of such a bill is the only solution to this diabolical crime of lynching. The very fine impression you made on the negroes of North Carolina prompts me to make this request of you.

C. C. Spaulding.
May 8, 1935

Dear Mr. White:

I am so sorry about the bill. Of course, all of us are going on fighting and the only thing we can do is to hope that we will have better luck next time. Very sincerely yours,

Mr. Walter White
69 Fifth Avenue
New York
N.Y.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I send you here with copies of this week's issues of four of the leading Negro weeklies which will give you and the President an idea of the Negro reaction to the filibuster. I also send an editorial from last week's Afro-American which pays you so well merited a tribute.

May I take this means of expressing to you again our thanks for the deep personal interest in the bill. We are by no means discouraged but determined to fight all the harder against lynching and for Federal legislation.

Sincerely,

Walter White
Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Thank you for your letter of May 8.

Success of the filibuster and of Senator Robinson’s repeated motions to adjourn and thus displace the Costigan-Wagner Bill as the pending business of the Senate has been a bitter disappointment to those persons who have worked so faithfully for the bill.

I hand you enclosed self-explanatory copy of my letter to the President in which I offer my resignation as a member of the Virgin Islands Advisory Council. I regretted the necessity of doing this but under the circumstances could not see any other course to follow.

We are determined not to let ourselves become discouraged but to work with even greater effort to secure passage of the bill at this session of the Congress.

Ever sincerely,

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.

P.S. - Since receiving your letter the enclosed letter, which you will note is mimeographed and is probably being widely distributed, was received from Senator Dickinson. This will show you, especially in its first paragraph, the use to which abandonment of the bill is being put.

May I have this back when you and the President shall have seen it, if you wish to show it to him? — WW
May 6, 1935

My dear Mr. President:

I wish to submit herewith my resignation as a member of the Advisory Council for the Government of the Virgin Islands.

As you know, I am deeply interested in the experiment now being conducted in the Virgin Islands, and my resignation is in nowise due to any matter dealing with the Islands. In order to make this clear, it is necessary for me to state the reason for my resignation.

I am not unaware of the efforts which you have made in private conferences with certain senators to secure a vote by the Congress on the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill. I am fully cognizant of the fact that the Democratic leader of the Senate, the Hon. Joseph T. Robinson, would never of his own volition have permitted consideration of the motion to consider the bill and that he did so solely because of your efforts.

On the other hand, it is a matter of great disappointment that you as President did not see your way clear to make a public pronouncement by means of a message to the Senate or otherwise, giving your open endorsement to the anti-lynching bill and your condemnation of the shameless filibuster led by a wilful group of obstructionists who, under the antiquated rules of the Senate were able to thwart the desire of three times their number of senators to vote for the bill and of many millions of Americans, North and South, and of all races and creeds who insisted upon passage of a bill to end lynching.

It is my belief that the utterly shameless filibuster could not have withstood the pressure of public opinion had you spoken out against it. The Southern press itself took the lead in condemning the crass and unethical means taken by the filibusters to kill the measure.

I feel, therefore, that in justice to the cause I serve I cannot continue to remain even a small part of your official family. I regret the necessity of taking this action, but I do not see that I can follow any other course with honor.
Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt - 2

to the cause I serve and to myself.

Respectfully,

Signed: WALTER WHITE

Secretary.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.
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COME TO DINNER, LADIES!
BY WILLIAM FIDLER
(FOR A. N. P.)

Eleanor Roosevelt; Frances Perkins; Martha Fawcett: Now, now, new ladies, come to dinner!

Those of us who fought, bled, died and came away, in behalf of women's
right to go to colleges, to enter politics, become cabinet members, and even
to assume the role of unofficial female Assistant President of the United
States, did not expect you to bring in ten men into the University of
California, into the government departments at Washington, and even into the
White House.

Somebody invited Frances to make a speech at the University of Cali-
ifornia, without consulting Martha, who seems to occupy some position of
authority or influence at that University, and who evidently was not fancy
Frances. Therefore Martha sent a note to Frances, asking her to be present.
Frances, who was very busy with her duties elsewhere, felt that she could
not come.

Martha, therefore, went to the University of California, and gave a speech
on women's rights, which was received with enthusiasm.

Of course, this first-class college is quite within women's rights,
but it is not, indeed, radical ideas to order, please, let your homeser
should act a role of gentle, modest and retiring members of the male species,
as Hugh Johnson, Henry Luce, and Father Coughlin. "Soon it may be necessary
to re-educate the men of the United States in order to bring a softer
and gentler influence into our politics. It is clear that the
strong women who are running these institutions are in need of the gentle
touch of husband and male relatives and friends.

Not so rough, ladies!

AMERICA, HEED OUR CALL
BY MARK FISHER
(FOR A. N. P.)

We love this country's free yet blessed soil
So fertilized with blood of ancestors
Born from our bones we went bent in toil
Crushed from our limbs by hands so vilely crude.
Yet when we heard the cruel cry of war
We did not hesitate to heed its call,
But bought forth in silken field of me
That peace and freedom might endure for all.
And while our blood was being shed abroad,
At home our brothers' necks were being stretched
Across a line while Christians cheered and wept.
To see their hate in death so gringly etched
A stain on this nation's mighty neck -
America, you must remove this stain!
Favorable

Alva D. Adams
Henry P. Ashurst, Arizona
Warren R. Austin, Vermont
W. Warren Barbour, New Jersey
Homer T. Bone, Washington
William E. Borah, Idaho
Robert J. Bulkley, Ohio
William J. Bulow, South Dakota
Edward R. Burke, Nebraska
Robert D. Carey, Wyoming
Arthur Capper, Kansas
Bennett Champ Clark, Missouri
Royal S. Copeland, New York
Marcus A. Coolidge, Mass.
Edward F. Costigan, Colorado
James Couzens, Michigan
Bronson Cutting, New Mexico
James J. Davis, Pennsylvania — Ill at Battle Creek Sanitarium
Is paired for

L. J. Dickinson, Iowa
Vic Domahs, Ohio
F. Ryan Duffy, Wisconsin
Lyman J. Frisbie, North Dakota
Ernest W. Gibson, Vermont
Joseph F. Guffey, Pennsylvania
Frederick Hale, Maine
Daniel O. Hastings, Delaware
Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico
(Rush D. Holt, West Virginia) — Vote will not count
Hiram W. Johnson, California
Henry W. Kenyon, New Hampshire
Robert M. La Follette, Wisconsin
Augustine Loc-Argan, Connecticut
Pat McCarran, Nevada
George McGill, Kansas
Charles L. McNary, Oregon
Jesse H. Metcalfe, Rhode Island
Sherman Minton, Indiana
A. Harry Moore, New Jersey
Louis Murdock, Iowa
Copy

James H. Murray, Montana
Matthew W. Nealy, West Virginia
Peter Norbeck - Ill, is being paired for.
George W. Norris, Nebraska
Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Wyoming
Gerald P. Nye, North Dakota
James F. Pope, Idaho
Thomas D. Schall, Minnesota
Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Washington
Hendrik Shipstead, Minnesota
Frederick Steilner, Oregon
Albert G. Thomas, Utah
John G. Townsend, Jr., Delaware
Harry S. Truman, Missouri
Arthur H. Vandenberg, Michigan
Frederick Van Nuys, Indiana
Robert F. Wagner, New York
David I. Walsh, Massachusetts
Burton K. Wheeler, Montana
Wallace H. White, Jr., Maine

Not Committed:
Alben W. Barkley, Kentucky
Owen Thomas, Oklahoma

No Reports:
Fred H. Brown, New Hampshire
William H. Disterich, Illinois
Peter G. Gerry, Rhode Island - out of town, surely does not know when he will return - not paired 4-25
William Gibbs Neadoo, California - Ill, will be back - 4-24
Francis T. Maloney, Connecticut - Ill at home - not paired - 4-25
Key Pittman, Nevada
George L. Radcliffe, Maryland - Probably "no" on const. grounds.

Doubtful:
Hattie W. Carraway, Arkansas - May be out when vote is taken
Carl Hayden, Arizona -
William H. King, Utah
W. M. Logan, Kentucky
Robert R. Reynolds, North Carolina - will be out of town
Doubtful (continued):

Millard E. Tydings, Maryland
J. Hamilton Lewis, Illinois

Opposed:

Nathan L. Baxtman, Tennessee
Josiah W. Bailey, North Carolina
John H. Bankhead, Alabama
Theodore G. Bilbo, Mississippi
Hugo L. Black, Alabama
Harry Flood Byrd, Virginia
James P. Byrnes, South Carolina
Tom Connally, Texas
Duncan U. Fletcher, Florida
Walter F. George, Georgia — Will be away all week
Carter Glass, Virginia
Pat Harrison, Mississippi
Thomas P. Gore, Oklahoma
Pat Harrison, Mississippi
Henry F. Long, Louisiana
Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee
John H. Overton, Louisiana
Joseph T. Robinson
Richard B. Russell, Jr., Georgia
Morris Sheppard, Texas
Ellison D. Smith, South Carolina
Park Trammell, Florida
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I am sure you will be interested in seeing the enclosed copy of editorial on the filibuster, from the May 4th Chattanooga News which is edited by the famous author, Dr. George Fort Milton.

In a letter from Dr. Milton he says:

"I certainly feel that Southern Senators do no service to their section by filibusters of this character. Of course I am by no means convinced that the Costigan-Wagner bill in the form in which I saw it would have actually worked in practice. But I am becoming pretty thoroughly convinced that the Southern States have neglected their opportunity to take State action, that some action is absolutely necessary and inasmuch as the States have declined to take it, a Federal action is altogether defensible."

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.
"A Southern Voice

On April 26 the Commission on Interracial Cooperation held its annual meeting in Atlanta. This is a Southern organization, which for almost twenty years has been striving to bring about better relationships between whites and Negroes throughout the Dixie States. Among its members are numbered some of the finest citizens of the entire Southland. Not only its membership but its record of action has demonstrated that it has an eye single to the real benefits of this section.

On that very day there was a filibuster in the Senate of the United States. Southern Senators were seeking to talk to death the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill. These Southern Senators had the best of intentions, but we believe they were out of touch with the changing feeling of the South, for they were willing to jeopardize all other legislation to prevent the anti-lynching measure from coming to a vote.

At any event, while this filibuster by Southern Senators was going on, the Commission on Interracial Cooperation adopted without a single dissenting vote a statement deserving full quotation:

"Hitherto the Commission on Interracial Cooperation has taken no position relative to Federal anti-lynching legislation. We were agreed that the primary responsibility for the prevention and punishment of lynchings rested upon State officials and courts, and that, in the last analysis, public opinion was largely the determining factor. Consequently, the Commission from its inception has worked continuously along these lines, seeking anti-lynching legislation in a number of States, urging vigorous preventive measures when lynchings were threatened, asking effective court action against the members of mobs, and at the same time seeking through all possible avenues of publicity and education to build up a public opinion that would no longer tolerate crimes of this character.

Lynching records of the last fifteen years indicate progress along the line of prevention. Officers generally are more vigilant than formerly in the protection of prisoners, thereby reducing the lynching toll. Meanwhile intelligent public opinion is practically unanimous in condemnation of mob violence.

On the contrary, with rare exceptions, attempts at prosecution in lynching cases continue to be futile. In nearly every case the community hysteria which gives rise to a lynching makes impossible any effective court action against the perpetrators of the crime. Consequently, in not one case in ten is an effective effort made by the authorities to identify and prosecute the members of lynching mobs. Even in the rare cases in which such efforts have been made, indictments have seldom been obtained, and convictions have usually proved impossible.

Disappointed by this record of impotence on the part of State and local officials, the commission has reluctantly been forced to the conclusion that little is to be expected from this source, at least
in the immediate future, and that an appeal to the Federal courts in such cases is justified and demanded by the conditions.

"The commission favors, therefore, the enactment of Federal legislation to this end, in the hope that Federal agents and courts would be in better position to act fearlessly and effectively in the prosecution of participants in the crime of lynching.

"We believe that this statement better represents the feeling and attitude of the intelligent leadership of the South today than does the filibuster by certain Southern Senators. There was a time when it could properly be said that here was a matter that the State should be given a chance to attend to themselves. This was said forty years ago, and the States did have their choice. But, as the statement of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation has pointed out, while today 'intelligent public opinion is practically unanimous in condemnation of mob violence,' nevertheless, 'with rare exceptions attempts at prosecution in lynching cases continue to be futile... In not one case in ten is the effort ever made by the authorities to identify and prosecute the members of lynching mobs.'

"Notwithstanding the tremendous increase in the vitality of community disapproval of lynching, local machinery has been doing nothing about it at all. It is a heinous crime, a blot upon any ordered society. It is an offense not only against the mob's victim; he may be guilty of the crime alleged and merely expiating in this awful and illegal fashion a crime for which he would in due course pay the legal penalty. The real affront is to take steps toward correction, but have done practically nothing about it, there remains but one agent to execute the needed function, the Federal Government. Under the circumstances, it seems to us no service to the South to prevent the passage of a law which might increase the security of life for all in this section. The Commission on Interracial Cooperation has voiced real Southern feeling better than have the filibusters."
May 23, 1935

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

We have today sent the enclosed letter to members of the Senate, quoting an editorial from the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of May 4.

Ever sincerely,

Walter White

Secretary

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

The White House

Washington, D.C.

WW/RR

How do your Senators and Congressmen stand on the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill?

ENDORSED BY THE NATIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU, 215 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE — ST. LOUIS, MO., June 25 - 30, 1935
May 22, 1935

To the Members of the United States Senate:

We invite your attention to the editorial quoted herewith from the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of May 4, 1935:

"Irony, Politics and The Negro."

"Parliamentary procedure dictated that the most convenient way for those southern senators opposed to the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill to defeat that measure was to put through a motion to adjourn the session of the Senate which was considering it.

"After a filibuster which, for a change, leaned upon the sanctity of the federal constitution more heavily than upon that of southern womanhood and which derided invasion of states' rights more than invasion of southern white homes, the lynch-law supporters were successful in voting adjournment, which killed consideration of the bill.

"The next step was to call the Senate again into session immediately to take up the Harrison soldiers' bonus bill.

"But the Senate must open with prayer. So John Garner of Texas, vice-president of the United States, scurried through the corridors of the capitol to find a clergyman. Finally the Rev. Zebarnoy Phillips, chaplain of the Senate, was located.

"He prayed to a God of justice and a God of mercy to guide the Senate of the United States.

"When the next Negro body writhes on a rope in Dixie, that invocation will echo hollowly over the heads of the mob.

"In an address at Albany, N.Y., during the last presidential campaign, one of the candidates spoke of the desperate condition of the socially
underprivileged.

"To those unfortunate citizens aid must be extended by the government; not as a matter of charity but as a matter of social duty," he said. "Where the state itself is unable successfully to fulfill this obligation which lies upon it, it becomes the positive duty of the federal government to step in to help."

"The silence of this same speaker boomed from the White House during debate on the Costigan-Wagner bill, opponents of which shrieked against federal assumption of states' responsibilities.

"When the next mob dances in the light of flames about a stake in the south, that declaration of high duty and intent will be a ghostly wisp of smoke, drifting off toward the heavens."

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary
May 27, 1935

My dear Mr. White:

Mrs. Roosevelt asks me to acknowledge your letter of May 21st and to tell you she is very sorry it will not be possible for her to accept the invitation to speak in St. Louis on June 30th.

Very sincerely yours,

Secretary to
Mrs. Roosevelt

Mr. Walter White
69 Fifth Avenue
New York
N.Y.
May 21, 1935

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Thank you very much indeed for letting me see the memorandum Miss Perkins sent you on the Civilian Conservation Camps.

I am very much interested also in the memorandum from the President this morning attached to Senator Dickinson’s multigraphed letter.

We have had an avalanche of editorials on the filibuster against the Costigan-Wagner Bill. I am having the more important of these pasted in a scrapbook. If you would care to see it, I should be glad to send it to you.

For the reasons set forth both in his official and his personal letter to you of yesterday, I very much hope that you will be able to accept Mr. Roy Wilkins’ invitation to you to speak at the Twenty-sixth Annual Conference of the N.A.A.C.P. at St. Louis on June 30. It will mean a very great deal to have you with us.

Cordially,

Secretary

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.

WW/RR
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 28, 1935.

MEMORANDUM FOR
MRS. SCHEIDER

The President says he
does not think Mrs. Roosevelt should go
but if Oscar Chapman could go it would
be a good idea.
Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt  
White House  
Washington, D. C.  

My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I want to add a personal word to the official invitation extended to you, and to say what had better be left unsaid in our official letter.

There is great restlessness, doubt, and even some hostility among the colored people because of some things which the Administration has, or has not, done. I think it is extremely important that at this Conference, which comes just prior to the election year, that the Administration have a good will spokesman at our Conference.

There is hardly a phase of the New Deal program which has not brought some hardship and disillusionment to colored people. The NRA benefited them little, if at all; from the FWA they secured a very small amount of employment; from the AAA the black tenants and sharecroppers have thus far received little consideration; the FERA has benefited them some, but there has been a great deal of discrimination in its administration. Now that the new five billion dollar work relief program is announced, colored people are viewing their prospects with greater and greater cynicism.

It has not helped any of these matters that the anti-lynching bill, despite all the support it had, was not able to get a hearing and a vote in the Senate.

It is my feeling that it would be good strategy from the Administration's standpoint, and good Americanism from the standpoint of the welfare of all our people, for some emissary to give a sincere word of reassurance to the colored population through their oldest civil rights association. We hope that you will consent to be that ambassador.

Very sincerely yours,

Roy Wilkins

Roy Wilkins
Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
White House
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

In St. Louis, Missouri June 25 - 30 will convene the 26th Annual Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. It is a particularly significant Conference because it will be meeting in the midst of the greatest crisis ever faced by the twelve million colored American citizens. Because the N.A.A.C.P. is the oldest organized body concerned with the citizenship problems of the Negro, this Conference has come to be regarded as the most important gathering of colored people of the year, although not the largest. For this reason, speakers at the Conference may consider that they are addressing the colored population of the country.

It is because of the significance of this Conference that we extend you a most cordial invitation to address it on Sunday afternoon, June 30, the closing session. Mr. White very much hoped to be able to talk to you personally upon this invitation during his recent stay in Washington, and he regrets that the pressure of other affairs upon your program prevented that conference. He wishes me to say that he joins with all colored people in the hope that you may find it possible to speak on June 30 in St. Louis.

I need not say to you how greatly concerned the colored people of the nation are with the crisis through which our country is passing. I am sure I do not need to point out their great anxiety over the application to their particular situation of the general remedies which the President is sponsoring. There are a thousand questions and equally as many misgivings in their minds, and no message would be better received than one from you.

We know how busy you are and how crowded is your schedule, and we know something of the factors which you must
bear in mind in accepting engagements, but we wish to assure you that no appearance of yours could be more stabilizing and reassuring to an apprehensive section of the population than yours at St. Louis next month.

Our program is being formulated and we will appreciate hearing from you at your convenience.

Very sincerely yours,

Roy Williams
Assistant Secretary.
June 3, 1935

Walter White
69 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York

Mrs. Roosevelt unable to meet Roy Wilkins. Will be away June 5.

MALVINA T. SCHEIDER
Secretary to Mrs. Roosevelt.
New York, June 3, 1935.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt:

Our Mister Roy Wilkins will be in Washington Wednesday, June fifth. Can you grant him few minutes to discuss vitally important association matter with you.

Walter White,
69 Fifth Avenue.
June 3, 1935

Dear Mr. White:

The President will see Mr. Mergold's report and I will try to see him, but I do not expect to be here very much during the next three months, so cannot make any definite promises.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. Walter White
69 Fifth Avenue
New York
Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Mr. Nathan R. Margold, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, is in the Virgin Islands or on his way back, as you doubtless know.

It has occurred to me that, knowing Mr. Margold's independence of judgment and opinion, he would perhaps have gathered on his visit to the Islands information which might be of value to you and the President.

I, therefore, take the liberty of offering the suggestion that it might be a good idea for you to talk with him when he returns to Washington.

Mr. Margold was for several years connected with us doing the most exhaustive study of the legal background of the Negro's disabilities that I know of. During the intimate association with him that I had as a result of this study I learned to know that he accepts no opinion because of its source but arrives at his own opinion on the basis of facts. It is for this reason that I think he will probably bring back from the Virgin Islands information which may be helpful.

We first came to know of Mr. Margold when we sought the advice of Professor Felix Frankfurter as to the best person to do the job which Mr. Margold did for us.

Ever sincerely,

Secretary

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.

May 27, 1935
Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt  
The White House  
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

It is with a sense of pride in his accomplishments as a life-long resident of the State of New York that I present to you the name of Mr. Nathan R. Margold for consideration to fill the vacancy in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia created by the death of Justice Hitz.

Mr. Margold has won enviable distinction in almost every field of endeavor open to the lawyer. His brilliance as a legal scholar led to a teaching position at the Harvard Law School. His record first as an Assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, and later in private practice, caused his services to be demanded as counsel in some of the most important cases arising in recent years — cases involving not only extremely intricate problems of legal analysis and synthesis, but also large questions of public policy and social judgment. Notable among these was the five-cent fare case against the Interboro Rapid Transit Company, in which Mr. Margold served as special counsel to the New York Transit Commission and later to the City of New York. In every instance where the public called upon Mr. Margold, the public was the gainer.

In addition, Mr. Margold has generously and consistently devoted his talents to protecting and advancing the welfare of various minority groups. He has acted as counsel to the Pueblo Indian tribes and to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
Since March 1933, Mr. Margold has been the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and served during a large portion of this time as Chairman of both the Petroleum Administrative Board and the Labor Policy Board for the Petroleum Industry. His work in Washington has not only received the unalloyed praise of all those connected with the Department; but in addition it has won general laudation throughout the government service.

Having gained through sheer merit an honored name as student and teacher of the law, as prosecuting attorney, as practicing lawyer and consultant, and as federal officer in a highly responsible post, Mr. Margold is now ambitious to round out his career in judicial service. My personal knowledge of the man, combined with what I have heard from many sources, convinces me that he is eminently qualified to fill the high position to which he now aspires with a dignity, an energy, and an ability worthy of the traditions of our courts.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Robert F. Wagner
Senator Royal S. Copeland has written a letter of endorsement and recommendation but a copy thereof is not available for inclusion here.
COPY

Seventy-Fourth Congress
William I. Sirovich, N. Y., Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES U.S.
Committee on Patents
Washington, D. C.

July 12, 1935.

My dear Mr. President:

I wholeheartedly recommend the appointment of Hon. Nathan R. Margold, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, to succeed the late Mr. Justice Hitz on the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

I have known Mr. Margold, who is one of my constituents, for several years. From personal observation of his work before and since his appointment as Solicitor, I have had an opportunity to form a reliable judgment concerning his character, temperament, and ability. In addition, numerous senators, representatives, and others who have come in contact with him have praised him to me in the highest terms.

Only the other day, I was discussing Margold with my old classmate Felix Frankfurter. He has known Margold as one of his students and later as his colleague at the Harvard Law School, and has closely followed his career. Professor Frankfurter told me that Margold is one of the most brilliant men who ever came out of the Harvard Law School, that he has one of the best legal minds in the country, and that he would make a judge of outstanding distinction.

I am completely in accord with Professor Frankfurter's opinion. Senator Wagner is endorsing Margold's candidacy, and, if necessary, I could obtain the endorsements of Senator Copeland and of a large majority of the New York delegation. In addition, Senator King, Chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, has stated that Margold's appointment to the Court of Appeals of the District would be entirely agreeable to him.

By reason of temperament, training, and ability, Margold is admirably fitted for judicial office. I sincerely and strongly urge his appointment. I am sure that if appointed, he will bring great credit to you and to the Administration.

Respectfully yours,

(Sgd.) William I. Sirovich.

The President

The White House.
Dear Mr. President:

Word has just reached me that Mr. Nathan R. Margold, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, is being considered for possible appointment to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, as a successor to Justice Hitz.

Although Mr. Margold is not a Coloradoan, his acceptable services in the Department of the Interior and his all-round talents appeal to me as justifying an endorsement of him by Western men. He is known to me as a scholarly and devoted public official, with exceptional qualifications for a place on the Bench. He combines an active mind, a liberal outlook, and training and character which impress me as qualifying him beyond most available men for judicial service in this highly important jurisdiction.

Faithfully yours,

(Sgd.) Edward P. Costigan

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.
UNITED STATES SENATE

Committee on Appropriations

Washington, D. C.
July 17, 1935.

My dear Mr. President:

I am advised that Senator Robert F. Wagner and others have suggested to you the appointment to the vacancy now existing in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, of Mr. Nathan R. Margold now Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

Although I have known Mr. Margold only since he was appointed to his present position, his record in that capacity has been such that I am happy to join with Senator Wagner in recommending him to your consideration. He is a man of unusual ability and I feel that he is in every way qualified for the position for which he is being urged.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) Joseph C. O'Mahoney

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt

The White House.
July 16, 1935

The President of the United States
The White House
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

I am informed that Honorable Nathan R. Margold, the present Solicitor of the Interior Department, is a candidate for appointment as Justice of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

I am satisfied that Mr. Margold is eminently well qualified for this position and it gives me great pleasure to recommend him to your favorable consideration.

Thanking you for such consideration as you may find it possible to give Mr. Margold in this connection, I am

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) Carl A. Hatch.
UNITED STATES SENATE

Washington

July 17, 1935.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
President of the United States,
White House,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

I have received the intelligence that Hon. Nathan R. Margold's name will be presented to you for consideration to fill the vacancy in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia created by the death of Mr. Justice Hitz.

I feel confident that Solicitor Margold would meet the requirements not only of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, but of any court in the country. I only desire to call your attention to his legal efforts as counsel for the Pueblo Indian Tribes in my State. He did noble work for the Pueblo Indians and his cooperation was very helpful to the members of Congress who were trying to settle this long pending problem between settlers and Indians in New Mexico.

You may consider this letter as an approval of his high aspiration and I feel confident that you will give his application serious consideration.

Very sincerely,

(Sgd.) Dennis Chavez,
New Mexico.
Senator Homer T. Bone has written a letter endorsing Mr. Margold, but no copy has yet been obtained.
Copy

UNITED STATES SENATE

Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

July 18, 1935.

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt
The President
The White House

Dear Mr. President:

It has come to my attention that Mr. Nathan R. Margold, Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, is being considered for appointment to the District Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, to succeed Justice Hitz.

Although Mr. Margold is not from my state, I am pleased to join his many other supporters by adding my endorsement. During Mr. Margold's term as Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, he has established an enviable record as an astute lawyer, a liberal minded government official, and a man of unquestioned integrity.

I am sure that if permitted to serve on the District Court of Appeals, Mr. Margold would be a distinct credit to the bar.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) J. P. Pope
Senator Burton K. Wheeler, although unwilling to depart from his precedent of not giving written endorsements to non-residents of Montana, has authorized the statement he will upon request or inquiry orally endorse the candidacy of Mr. Nathan R. Margold and recommend his appointment to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.
Senator William H. King has authorized the statement that the appointment of Mr. Nathan R. Margold to succeed Mr. Justice Hitz on the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia would be perfectly agreeable to him. While unwilling, because of his official position as Chairman of the District of Columbia Committee in the Senate, to make an affirmative written endorsement, Senator King will if requested affirm that in his judgment Mr. Margold is fully qualified for this position.
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

July 16, 1935.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

I am taking the liberty of heartily joining with many friends of Mr. Nathan R. Margold in recommending his name to you for consideration in connection with the appointment to the U. S. Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

While I have only known Mr. Margold since he has occupied the position of Solicitor in the Department of the Interior, nevertheless, I know of his distinguished record and brilliant legal mind and capabilities. In the position I have had for several years of Chairman of the Interior Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee I have been in position to learn and know of his splendid work in that important position.

There is a candor, a frankness and an intellectual honesty about him that I genuinely admire. I feel that he has really a judicial mind and is eminently fitted by education, legal qualifications, real ability and temperament to render a great service to the District of Columbia and be an honor to the bar and to yourself in appointing him.

Trusting you may honor him with this position, I remain

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Edward T. Taylor
COPY

John J. Dempsey
New Mexico

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C.

July 15th, 1935

My dear Mr. President:

I desire to recommend for your consideration Mr. Nathan R. Margold for appointment to fill the vacancy in the Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, which has occurred because of the death of the Hon. William Hitz.

As you know Mr. Margold has been for a little more than two years Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, in which capacity he has demonstrated his unusual legal ability and other qualities which I feel make him fitted to fill this vacancy with honor and distinction.

Knowing that if you should appoint him it would be only after very careful consideration of his education and experience I do not believe it is necessary for me to go into detail in those respects. I have, however, inquired as to his qualifications and unhesitatingly endorse him for the position.

Very respectfully,

John J. Dempsey

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt
The White House.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, D. C.

July 20, 1935.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

I desire to join the host of other sponsors who are recommending the appointment of Nathan R. Margold, Solicitor for the Department of Interior, to fill the vacancy existing in the Associate Justiceship with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

I do not suppose it is necessary for me to reiterate the details of his splendid background, in education, training and experience, as most of that is a matter of public record.

Suffice to state, his professional, public and private career to date prove him a man of unusual talents, untiring industry, exceptional devotion to his duty and loyalty to the cause of justice.

His appointment, I am confident, would meet with universal approval among those who are interested in keeping the personnel of the Bench on a high plane.

With kindliest personal regards, I am

Faithfully yours,

(Sgd.) Henry E. Stubbs,

Member of Congress.
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C.

July 15, 1935

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

To the many already submitted I wish to add my recommendation of Honorable Nathan R. Margold, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, to fill the vacancy in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, created by the death of Mr. Justice Hitz.

It is, I believe, entirely unnecessary for me to detail Mr. Margold's high qualifications for this position, for they have already been brought to your attention by many who are perhaps better acquainted with him than I.

I wish to state, however, that I have the very highest regard for Mr. Margold's character and ability and strongly urge his appointment, which I feel certain would reflect great credit on your Administration.

Respectfully yours,

(Sgd.) M. A. Zioncheck
Copy

Law Offices
MULLEN & SHEA
Tower Building
Washington, D. C.

July 18, 1935.

Dear Mr. President,

I am advised that the name of Nathan R. Margold, present Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, has been presented to you for appointment to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Justice William Hitz.

Some time ago I became acquainted with Mr. Margold in his official capacity in the Department of the Interior. Thereafter I had occasion to examine certain of the legal opinions he has given and to know something about his administration of that important office.

Both his knowledge of the law and the fairness of his point of view impressed me. These impressions have been supplemented by information given me by people who have known Mr. Margold for many years. They have advised me that he has been an honest, outstanding lawyer and, in addition, has capably discharged many important duties of a public or quasi-public character.

In recommending Mr. Margold as a Justice in the Court of Appeals I have in mind the fact that he has remaining many years of useful service. I am sure that he will add to the dignity and traditions of this Court.

Respectfully,

(Sgd.) ARTHUR F. MULLEN

Arthur F. Mullen

The President
White House
Washington, D. C.
July 22, 1935.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

Permit me to indorse the suggestion that Nathan R. Margold, now solicitor of the Department of the Interior, be appointed to take the place on the Court of Appeals for the District, vacated by the death of Justice Hitz.

Mr. Margold's qualifications as a lawyer are abundantly supported by his career and will no doubt be presented by those of his profession; but I am moved to this indorsement by my belief that in his character, experience and vision of public life lies the final assurance of his fitness for this high place in our judiciary.

Very respectfully,

(Sgd.) John L. Lewis

The above is a carbon copy of a letter written this day by Mr. John L. Lewis, President of the United Mine Workers of America, to the President of the United States.
July 12, 1935

The Honorable
The Attorney General
Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

Attention: Mr. Harold M. Stephens

Sir:

Nathan Margold, Esq. would be a splendid choice for the vacancy now existing in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

My contact with Mr. Margold goes back to the days when he was a student of mine at the Harvard Law School, and later a colleague of mine on the faculty. His gifts of intellect and character, his clarity of thought and expression, were manifest then. His interesting subsequent career has borne out his earlier promise. It is quite unusual to find a lawyer thirty-six years old with such a seasoned and varied professional experience, the details of which are no doubt before you. In all the jobs he has done — whether as law teacher, as Assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, as an attorney in private practice, retained often as special counsel in cases of large public interest, as Solicitor of the Department of Interior, with added administrative duties as Chairman of the Petroleum Administrative Board and Chairman of the Petroleum Labor Policy Board — he has displayed a sure technical skill combined with a broad progressive outlook. With his experience and temperament, his high conception of public service, his gentlemanly courteous bearing, Mr. Margold has every equipment for a place on the bench.

Respectfully yours,

Calvert Magruder, General Counsel
National Labor Relations Board.
To investigate the relationship between employees and contractors on public works.

July 16, 1935.

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

Nathan R. Margold, Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, is, I understand, a candidate for the vacancy in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia existing by reason of the unfortunate demise of Justice Hitz.

I have known Mr. Margold for several years and, as a practicing attorney, have had perhaps a rather unusual opportunity of observing his work as Assistant United States Attorney, also in connection with his various retainers of a public character wherein he appeared as special counsel, and, more recently, in the several positions of importance and distinction he has held in the Department of the Interior.

As a consequence of this familiarity with his legal and public career and my knowledge of his splendid educational background, his scholarly aptitudes, his preeminent success in the private practice of the law, and the unqualifiedly high character of the service he has rendered in public positions to which he has been called, it is with genuine enthusiasm that I recommend Mr. Margold to your favorable consideration for the present vacancy on the bench of the District Court of Appeals.

It is my deep-rooted conviction that his dignified bearing, broad scholarship, mature judgment, ripe experience and outstanding ability would constitute an adornment to that distinguished bench which would in turn reflect the greatest credit upon the wisdom of the appointing power.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Philip J. Philbin
SPECIAL COUNSEL.
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT SECRETARY
WASHINGTON

July 19, 1935.

Dear Mr. President:

For more than two years I have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Nathan R. Margold, Solicitor, Department of the Interior, personally and officially. His learning, good judgment and mental integrity have won for him the respect and confidence of the entire Department. He has an exceptionally keen analytical legal mind and untiring application. He entertains liberal views and a clear understanding of the vital economic and social problems now pressing for solution.

I sincerely believe that his appointment to the place on the United States Court of Appeals for the District, made vacant by the death of Justice Hitz, would add prestige to the court. He has all the qualifications which are necessary for a successful judicial career. My confidence in Mr. Margold's integrity, ability and uprightness is such that I commend him without reservation for your favorable consideration.

Faithfully and respectfully yours,

(Sgd.) T. A. Walters

First Assistant Secretary.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.
My dear Mr. President:

It is with pleasure that I recommend the appointment of Mr. Nathan R. Margold to fill the vacancy on the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia caused by the death of Mr. Justice Hitz.

Although I have been acquainted with Mr. Margold personally only since he has been Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, I have known of his achievements in the law for several years. As student, prosecuting attorney, teacher and private practitioner of law, his record invariably has been one of supreme excellence. Of equal importance, Mr. Margold's record shows that since completing his law course at Harvard, he has nobly carried the banner of the progressive cause with regard only for the public welfare and without any thought of personal aggrandizement.

My observation of Mr. Margold's conduct as Solicitor for this Department has led me to have a constantly increasing respect for him as a man and as a lawyer. I have found him to be a man of unusual ability, character, courage, loyalty and understanding. He possesses to an extraordinary degree the rare attributes and qualities which go toward making a judge of outstanding distinction. His service as Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, as Chairman of the Petroleum Administrative Board and as Chairman of the Labor Policy Board also has given him a wide knowledge of the functions of the executive branch of the Government which would be of great assistance to him as a member of the judiciary, particularly in the District of Columbia where so many of the cases directly concern the Federal Government.

It is my well considered opinion that the appointment of Mr. Margold to the Court of Appeals would bring credit to you, to the Administration and to the federal judiciary.

Respectfully yours,

(Sgd.) Oscar L. Chapman
Assistant Secretary.

The President

The White House.
The Honorable

The Attorney General.

My dear Mr. Attorney General:

Because I am sure that the public interest would be well served by his appointment to a Federal judgeship, I highly recommend the appointment of Hon. Nathan R. Margold, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, to succeed the late Mr. Justice Hitz on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Margold is eminently qualified in all respects for the position. His brilliant legal career dates from the time he was a cum laude student at Harvard Law School, and has included teaching on the Harvard Law School faculty, conducting with uninterrupted success a multitude of cases as an Assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, and later in private practice rendering notable services to public bodies, particularly to the New York Transit Commission in the five-cent fare case against the Interboro Rapid Transit Company.

Mr. Margold's record here as Solicitor has been noteworthy. His opinions on questions of law are remarkable for their lucid analysis, and for the sure touch with which he resolves the many intricate problems of administrative law which arise in the course of this Department's work. I like to point out the Secretary's opinion in the Elk Hills (Section 56) case, prepared by the Solicitor, as an outstanding example of Mr. Margold's work. It combines to a remarkable degree those qualities which indicate a thorough mastery of legal technique. It is a judicial performance in every sense of the word. There are not many judges now sitting who can do better.

Because of Mr. Margold's extraordinary legal learning, and because of his appreciation of the administrative problems that confront government, I feel that he is preeminently and peculiarly qualified for a seat on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, charged as it is with the consideration of so many cases dealing with the public interest, and affecting the operations of the government.
The appointment of Mr. Margold, having in mind his experience, his judicial temperament, and his conspicuous legal abilities, would reflect great credit upon the Administration, and would add lustre to the Federal bench.

I strongly urge his appointment.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) HARRY SLATTERY
Personal Assistant to the Secretary.
July 12, 1935.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

I should like to add my warm endorsement to others of Mr. Nathan R. Margold, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, who I understand is being considered for a Federal Judgeship.

In my ten months in the Department of the Interior, I have had frequent opportunities to observe Mr. Margold's work, to note his mental processes and to take cognizance of his point of view and character. He has impressed me deeply, not only as a lawyer of unusual ability, but one possessing to an extraordinary degree that particular quality designated as a "judicial temperament". Apart from his manifest technical qualifications, he is in every sense of the word a "New Dealer," who while thoroughly familiar with American tradition and purpose is also aware of the overshadowing fact that we live in a changing time and in a rapidly evolving world.

I feel certain that the appointment of Mr. Margold to the Federal bench, should you consider so appointing him, would add luster to the bench and reflect high credit on your administration.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) Ernest Gruening
Honorble Franklin D. Roosevelt,

Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

With earnestness, I desire to add my word as to the qualities of Mr. Nathan R. Margold, now Solicitor of the Interior Department, who, I am informed, is being considered for a federal judgeship.

For two years I have known Mr. Margold as the Solicitor of the Interior Department. The improvement which he has brought to the law work of the Department is nothing less than revolutionary. This part of Mr. Margold's record will be known to you through the testimony of others. But previously, for a number of years, I had known Mr. Margold as a lawyer of public spirit. As an individual and as a lawyer, he gave his extraordinary talents to causes, of which the Indian cause was only one. I have long believed that a great career on the bench could await Mr. Margold. In his ability "to see life steadily and see it whole" Mr. Margold has not been excelled by any one whom I have ever known. But he has a more positive sort of power — the power swiftly to reach to the heart of social and legal issues, and so to deal with them that the individual of simplest intelligence can understand the controlling principles. If the judiciary is to move forward in this moving world and is to supply leadership, the creative endowment, it would seem, must be provided. Mr. Margold has this endowment.

Of Mr. Margold's personal character I could not speak highly enough.

Respectfully,

(Signed) JOHN COLLIER

Commissioner.
July 18, 1935.

The President,

The White House.

My dear Mr. President:

I have been advised that Nathan R. Margold, Esquire, of New York, now Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, has been recommended to you for appointment to the office of Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to fill the vacancy created by the death of Justice William Hitz. In support of Mr. Margold's candidacy, I respectfully submit to you my unqualified recommendation and endorsement.

I have known Mr. Margold only during the last two years, while he has been Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. During that time, however, my duties as Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office have brought me in close and frequent contact with the chief legal officer of the Department. In the course of such association Mr. Margold has earned my most genuine respect and admiration. Indeed, just as repeated contacts with him and with his work have required an ever higher evaluation of his ability, his judgment, his integrity and his industry, so an increasing realization of these qualities has caused me to enlist his good offices with increasing frequency.

I have never known a man whose special talents and aptitudes have impressed me as more particularly those to be desired in a judge. Other persons will be able better than I to pass judgment upon his legal learning, but to his God given sense of justice I can bear witness. The counsel which he gives and the decisions at which he arrives bear the unmistakable stamp of such sound and unbiased judgment as can only be the product of a mind, brilliant and honest and of judicial bent. I am sure that as a Judge Mr. Margold not only would decide well and justly but, equally important, would inspire the confidence of litigants in the rightness and the honesty of his judgments.

Probably I can no more adequately convey my admiration for Nathan Margold and my belief in him than to say that in him I see both the personal qualities and the intellectual attainments which I would have wished in a son.

Very truly yours,

(Sgd.) Antoinette Funk

Assistant Commissioner.
July 15, 1935.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,

Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

I should like to add my tribute to the ability and effectiveness of Mr. Nathan R. Margold, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, who I understand is being considered for a Federal Judgeship.

Mr. Margold is a man of proven integrity and superior ability. He will add to the prestige of any position he is called upon to fill. Since he became Solicitor of the Department of the Interior he has furnished repeated evidence of his scholarship and ability.

His departure would be a serious loss to this Department. No one with whom I have ever been associated has made greater claims on my admiration and respect. He has devoted his time and thought to making the activities of the Department contribute to the social and economic well-being of the country. There is need for judges with learning and ability, but even greater need for judges who have the required sympathy and understanding to make the law an instrument in the solution of the social and economic problems which now press for attention.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) Elwood Mead
United States
Department of the Interior
War Minerals Relief Commission
Washington

July 20, 1935.

My dear General:

Please do not accept this letter as a mere formal endorsement of the appointment of Honorable Nathan R. Margold, Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, to succeed the late Mr. Justice Fort in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

My acquaintance with Mr. Margold has been limited to my association with him in our official duties of this Department. The nature of our work, however, has been such to permit me to make an appraisal of his attainments and qualifications as an official and man.

In my judgment, he is exceptionally endowed with that rare qualification of hearing with complete open-mindedness any matter submitted for his consideration and then with strict intellectual honesty, wholly devoid of prejudice or passion, rendering an opinion. He has a definite, concise and clear manner of discussion and is able to be quite forceful without, in any sense, appearing personal.

The above qualifications, it seems to me, will fully justify you in considering his availability based entirely on merit.

Without minimizing in the least degree the political benefit which would accrue to the Administration in his appointment I personally prefer to stress his qualifications for this important position.

Very truly yours,

(Sgd.) Roscoe Fertich
Commissioner.

The Honorable,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.
July 19, 1935.

The Honorable,

The Attorney General.

My dear Mr. Attorney General:

I have just learned that Mr. Nathan R. Margold, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, is being considered for appointment to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

As a member of the Petroleum Labor Policy Board I was intimately associated with Mr. Margold during the period in which he was chairman of the Petroleum Administrative Board. In my association with Mr. Margold I was greatly impressed with his keenness of intellect, his rare legal ability and the impartial and judicial attitude which he consistently manifested in passing judgment upon the numerous complicated economic and legal questions with which he was confronted. In his treatment of these problems he reflected a breadth of social vision, a depth of understanding, a spirit of progressiveness so essential to a jurist if our legal structure is to be adapted to our ever changing economic and social conditions.

In my opinion Mr. Margold is eminently well-suited both by the qualities of his mind and the breadth of his experience to perform with dignity and distinction the important duties which a place upon the bench would require of him.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) George W. Stocking,
Chairman.
Hays, Kansas
July 13, 1935.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

There is a vacancy in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia at this time and I am writing to call to your attention the qualifications of Mr. Nathan R. Margold for this position.

As you know, Mr. Margold has been a very able Solicitor for the Department of Interior. During the last Congressional term, I had occasion to call on Mr. Margold in regard to oil matters and other business and always found him to be courteous, well informed and ready to handle the matter in a most efficient and capable manner.

No doubt you are familiar with Mr. Margold's background and need no further information in that regard so I will briefly state that he was an instructor of law at the Harvard Law School; as assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York served with distinction; was retained as legal advisor on Indian Affairs by the Institute for Government Research of the Brookings Institution in 1930 and also retained by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for some special legal work.

I am sure that Mr. Margold's many friends will be greatly pleased if he should receive a judgeship either in the District or in New York City where he formerly practiced law.

Very truly yours,

Kathryn O'Loughlin McCarthy.
His Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt,
President of the United States,
The Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

I am writing to give my most cordial endorsement to the recommendation of Hon. Nathan R. Margold, who is at present Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, for the appointment to the vacancy on the bench of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia caused by the recent death of Judge Hitz.

At the time when I took office as United States District Attorney for the Southern District of New York in April, 1927, Mr. Margold was the head of the Civil Division in that office, having been appointed thereto by my predecessor, Hon. Emory R. Buckner. Mr. Buckner had selected him because of his outstanding legal ability and his unusual spirit of public service and because Mr. Buckner was building his staff on a strictly non-partisan basis. I was very glad to continue Mr. Margold in the position as chief of the Civil Division and I regretted very much when subsequently he resigned to accept a professorship at Harvard Law School.

Mr. Margold's record in the office of the United States District Attorney was a most outstanding one and was valued in the highest degree by both the Judges and Mr. Buckner and myself. We all recognized that he had one of those rare legal minds which understands law as a social science and a philosophy, and that he was destined to become one of the great lawyers of the country. His appointment would dedicate his rare talents to a life of exceptional public service.

I trust that in writing this letter I am not venturing too far upon your courtesy.

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) CHARLES H. TUTTLE.
Law Offices
STEARNS, LUCK, FORWARD & SWING
San Diego, California

July 16, 1935

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

Sir:

I am glad to ask your serious consideration of Mr. Nathan R. Margold, present Solicitor for the Interior Department, for appointment to the vacancy on the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

My work since voluntarily retiring from Congress on March 4th, 1933, has brought me into frequent contact with the Interior Department and the work of the Solicitor's Office. From personal observation I can unhesitatingly testify to Mr. Margold's high character and integrity, his keen mental perception, and quick understanding of problems presented, his scholarly attainments and legal training, which fully qualify him for any high judicial position.

But the principal reason why I recommend Mr. Margold's appointment is because I know of his zeal for progressive principles and his deep interest in humanity. In my opinion, Mr. President, the time has arrived when such men as Mr. Margold must be placed on the appellate tribunals, where much of the law of the land is made, if the people's respect for the courts is to be maintained and the country saved.

Sincerely yours,

Phil D. Swing

A Hiram Johnson Republican.
Member of Congress from 11th Cong.
Dist. of California, 1921-1933.
July 16, 1935

Hon. Homer S. Cummings,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

My dear General:

As one keenly interested in the success of the New Deal, I have taken the liberty of addressing a communication to the President endorsing Mr. Nathan Margold for appointment to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. Recent decisions by courts made up of judges reactionary in their point of view threatens your recovery program. It is vitally important that appointments to the appellate courts should be of men of forward looking principles and proven sympathy with the great work the President is undertaking to do. I am sure Mr. Margold is such a man.

Sincerely,

Phil D. Swing
To His Excellency
The President of United States
The White House
Washington, D. C.

I take great pleasure in recommending Nathan Margold for your consideration as a successor to Justice Hitz on the Court of Appeals of District of Columbia. Mr. Margold is eminently qualified, for he has a brilliant and judicial mind coupled with quick understanding of human problems. He generously tendered invaluable services to Pueblo Indians in time of stress. In conversation with Mrs. Roosevelt last winter I asked her to commend him to your attention if such a position presented itself.

STELLA M. ATWOOD.
AMERICAN INDIAN DEFENSE ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mrs. H. A. Atwood, Legislative Advisor
904 West Eleventh Street
Riverside, Calif.

Riverside, Calif.
July 17, 1935

Hon. Homer S. Cummings,
Attorney General,
Washington,
D.C.

My dear Mr. Cummings:

It has been brought to my attention that Mr. Nathan Margold is a candidate for the position vacated by the death of Justice Hitz on the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

My acquaintance with Mr. Margold began at the time when the interests of the Pueblo Indians were in great jeopardy, and he generously gave of his time and splendid legal knowledge to assist them. His help at that crucial moment was invaluable, and no friend of the Indian could ever forget it. His sympathies for the underprivileged are quick and keen. Last winter I was told he had one of the most brilliant minds in Washington, and that he was known as the lawyer's lawyer.

I have noted that with his keen and understanding intellect there is united a calm judicial quality of mind that would preeminently fit him for the position for which he is candidate.

I am enclosing a copy of a telegram which I am sending to our President.

Cordially,

(Sgd.) STELLA M. ATWOOD
Copy

WESTERN UNION

July, 1935.

MARVIN H. McINTYRE
SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

IF THE OPPORTUNITY OCCURS WILL YOU KINDLY CALL TO THE ATTENTION
OF THE PRESIDENT THAT IN MY OPINION NATHAN R. MARCOLD WOULD MAKE
AN IDEAL MEMBER FOR COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STOP
I MOST RESPECTFULLY SUGGEST THAT HE BE APPOINTED TO FILL VACANCY
NOW EXISTING IN THAT COURT.

JOHN R. HAYNES

Charge to:

Dr. John R. Haynes
429 Consolidated Building,
Los Angeles, California.
July, 1935.

HOMER S. CUMMINGS  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

I MOST RESPECTFULLY SUGGEST APPOINTMENT OF NATHAN R. MARGOLD  
TO FILL THE VACANCY IN THE COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF  
COLUMBIA STOP I FEEL HIM TO BE IMIMENTLY QUALIFIED IN EVERY  
WAY TO FILL THAT IMPORTANT POSITION.

JOHN R. HAYNES

Charge to:  
Dr. John R. Haynes  
429 Consolidated Building,  
Los Angeles, California.
The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

I am informed that Nathan R. Margold is under consideration for appointment to a federal judgeship. For about two years Mr. Margold was engaged in important legal work for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, of whose legal committee I am the chairman, and in the course of this work he displayed not only extraordinary ability, energy and erudition, but a most enlightened and progressive point of view. His training, scholarship, ability, patience and character give every indication that he would make a judge of the highest usefulness and I respectfully and warmly urge his appointment.

Arthur B. Spingarn
July 10, 1935

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt
White House
Washington, D. C.

My dear Governor:

I understand that you have before you for consideration the name of Nathan R. Margold, the present Solicitor to the Interior Department, for appointment to fill the vacancy created in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, through the death of Justice Hitz. I have known Margold for many years. His social vision is exciting. His ability at the law has been recognized by all who have come in touch with him. I know of no person who would hold a judicial position with greater disinterestedness than Nathan Margold.

Of course I am not informed as to other names before you at this time to fill this vacancy; but I should imagine it would be only the greatest piece of luck if you could get someone better qualified.

With best wishes to you personally, I am,

Sincerely yours,

(s) Morris L. Ernst.
BIographical statement
Concerning
Nathan R. Margold

Born: July 21, 1899.

Residence: At time of appointment as Solicitor of the Interior Department, Mr. Margold resided in the 14th Congressional District, Borough of Manhattan, City of New York. He is living now in East Falls Church, Virginia.

Education: Graduated Public School 109, Brooklyn, N. Y., in June, 1912. He was class valedictorian.

- Graduated Brooklyn Boys' High School in June, 1916. He was awarded a Regents' Cash Scholarship.
- Entered the College of the City of New York in September, 1916. Graduated in June, 1919, receiving an AB degree.
- Entered the Harvard Law School in September 1920 and graduated in June 1923 with highest honors.

- During his second and third years at the Law School, Mr. Margold was one of the editors of the Harvard Law Review. He was awarded a faculty scholarship during his second year, and the Langdell Scholarship during his third year.

Professional Career

Entered the Law office of Cook, Nathan & Lehman, 111 Broadway, Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, in August, 1923.

Was admitted to the New York Bar in May, 1924.
On the recommendation of Professor Felix Frankfurter and of United States Attorney Emory R. Buskner, Mr. Margold was appointed as Assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York in April 1925. He served actively in that capacity until July, 1927, and for a short time in June and July, 1928. As Assistant United States Attorney, he handled many cases in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York and in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. He appeared often before Judges Julian W. Mack, Augustus N. Hand, Learned Hand, Manton, Goddard and Hough, and was highly praised many times by each of these judges for his work. Although it is several years since he has appeared before any of these judges, and although he has had no connection with any of them other than as attorney in cases before them, Judges Mack, Augustus Hand, Learned Hand, and probably also Judges Manton and Goddard still remember him and would recommend him highly.

In March or April, 1927, without seeking it in any way, Mr. Margold was appointed an instructor of law at the Harvard Law School. He served in this capacity from September 1927 to June 1928, teaching the subjects of criminal law and insurance. During this period he assisted Professor Joseph Henry Beale in editing a new edition of his "Cases on Criminal Law." His contribution included, among other things, the addition of a chapter of cases on Federal crimes.

Here, again, Mr. Margold served with outstanding distinction, as will be certified to by Professor Felix Frankfurter and by many other members who were on the faculty during that year, including Dean Pound, Professors Powell, Beale, Morgan, Scott and Magruder.

In June 1927, Mr. Margold returned to New York City and resumed his duties as Asst. United States Attorney for several weeks. At this time, one of the most important litigations in New York City was the one relating to the five cent fare on the Interborough Rapid Transit Subway and Elevated Lines. The I.R.T. had succeeded, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York and in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, in its efforts to obtain a ten cent fare. Judge Julian W. Mack, on his own initiative, advised Mr. Samuel Untermeyer who, as special counsel to the New York Transit Commission, was in charge of the case against the I.R.T., that he needed a lawyer who could reconstruct the arguments in his case along new lines and that Mr. Margold was qualified for the task. In consequence, Mr. Margold was appointed a special counsel to the New York Transit Commission and evolved some of the most important arguments which enabled the Transit Commission to obtain a reversal in the Supreme Court and to succeed in defeating the I.R.T. in the subsequent litigation in the State courts. On the appeal before the Appellate
Division of the New York Supreme Court he also was retained to write those portions of the brief for the City of New York which dealt with the substantive or nonprocedural issues. In addition to this he was engaged in general private law practice in New York City, predominantly in the capacity of consultant or special counsel in difficult and important cases. Thus, for example, he was retained by Mr. William D. Guthrie to assist him in Tremaine v. Ward, popularly known as the budget controversy between Governor Roosevelt and the New York State Legislature. Similarly, in 1930, he was privately retained to write a memorandum concerning the constitutionality of certain proposed amendments to the New York Public Service Commission law. He was also retained in an important litigation involving a claim of many millions against the estate of the founders of the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers (Scripps v. Scripps, United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit), to write the brief and frame the arguments orally presented to the court by Chief Justice Hughes shortly before his elevation to the Supreme Court bench. (He was not retained by Mr. Hughes, but by the attorney who retained Mr. Hughes to make the oral argument.)

He also was retained as legal advisor on Indian affairs by the Institute for Government Research of the Brookings Institution. In 1930, he succeeded the late Louis Marshall as special counsel to the Pueblo Indian tribes, primarily in matters connected with the large controversy involving the Pueblos from Isleta to Cochiti and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District. He also acted as special counsel to the Pueblo tribes in connection with land title litigations and cases involving compensation to the tribes for lands lost pursuant to the Pueblo Lands Act of 1924.

In 1930 he also was retained by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, to conduct a nation wide legal campaign to test the fundamental rights of negroes under the Federal Constitution. This campaign has been delayed by difficulties in obtaining the money that had been pledged to it out of the Garland Fund. But Mr. Margold was able to complete a most comprehensive survey of the rights and disabilities of the negro race under the Constitution.

For several years prior to April, 1933, Mr. Margold maintained a law office at 225 Broadway, Borough of Manhattan, City of New York.

On March 23, 1933, he was appointed as the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, in which capacity he has served continuously up to the present time.
In addition, when Secretary of the Interior Ickes was appointed Administrator of the Code of Fair Competition for the Petroleum Industry adopted pursuant to the National Industrial Recovery Act, he created the Petroleum Administrative Board to advise and assist him in the work of administering the Code and appointed Mr. Margold as its Chairman. Because of his many duties, Secretary Ickes was forced to rely in large measure upon Mr. Margold's work and recommendations with reference to oil matters. On November 21, 1933, Secretary Ickes created the Labor Policy Board for the Petroleum Industry of which he appointed Mr. Margold Chairman. The combined duties as Solicitor, Chairman of the Petroleum Administrative Board and Chairman of the Labor Policy Board proved far more than Mr. Margold, or for that matter, any other man, could possibly handle effectively. Accordingly, on urgent request, Secretary Ickes relieved him of his duties as Chairman of the Labor Policy Board on January 1, 1934. This relief proved to be inadequate and on further insistent request, Secretary Ickes on November 22, 1934, relieved him of his duties as Chairman of the Petroleum Administrative Board. Since November 22, Mr. Margold has continued in office as the Solicitor of the Interior Department.

In these latter capacities, Mr. Margold also has served with highest distinction as Secretary Ickes and Assistant Secretary Chapman and every important official in the Department have often voluntarily asserted.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Here is self-explanatory copy of letter we wrote Mr. Hopkins yesterday. I thought you might be interested in seeing this.

Ever sincerely,

Walter White

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.
June 11th 1935

My dear Mr. Hopkins:

We understand that you are now selecting a Works Progress Administrator for each of the several states for the administration of the Works Relief Act. It is unnecessary for us to go into any great detail regarding the greater need of American Negroes for work relief as provided in this Act. It is equally unnecessary for us to point out that in many of the states where the bulk of the Negro population lives there is open and flagrant discrimination in the administration of work or other relief.

It is of the highest importance, in our opinion, that to meet these conditions the following steps be taken:

(1) That a qualified Negro be appointed as a Deputy Administrator in every state where there is any appreciable number of Negro citizens.

(2) That qualified Negroes should be integrated throughout the administrative personnel of the Works Progress Administration in each of these states.

(3) That each local Works Administration be specifically charged by your office with the responsibility of proportional integration of Negroes in each project.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People respectfully urges action by your office upon these recommendations.

Ever sincerely,

Mr. Harry L. Hopkins
Federal Emergency Relief Administrator
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1935

Dear Mr. White:

I am more than glad to send you this message:

It was with deep regret that I was obliged to refuse to attend the conference on June 25th, but unfortunately, I am so busy with personal things at the present time that it was out of the question.

I realize that this is a time when many things of great interest to the colored people of the country will be discussed. I am deeply interested in these problems and am sorry that I cannot take part in the discussion.

I hope that ways can be found to accomplish some of the things which you and I both desire, and that your patience, as a group, which has been very great, will be rewarded by better understanding and better conditions for your people in the future.

Very sincerely yours.
June 10, 1935

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

We are all much disappointed that you find it impossible to address our twenty-sixth annual Conference at St. Louis.

Will you not do us the honor of sending a message to be read on the opening night of the Conference, June 25?

In his letter of May 20 Mr. Wilkins told you of the great significance of these annual conferences when there are gathered together not only members of the N.A.A.C.P. but thoughtful and influential representatives, both white and colored, from all parts of the country who are interested in the grave problems which face the Association.

We hope very much that you will send a message. By so doing you will be speaking not only to those gathered at St. Louis but, through them and the press, to the entire country.

Ever sincerely,

Walter White
Secretary

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the resolutions adopted by the delegates to the 26th Annual Conference of the N.A.A.C.P. at St. Louis, Missouri June 25-30.

Ever sincerely,

Secretary

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
White House
Washington, D. C.
As the economic crisis deepens the plight of twelve million American Negroes worsens. Discrimination in employment, in works and other relief, and in other ways, continues, particularly in those sections of the country where eight million, or two-thirds, of the Negro population of the United States live. Notable in such discrimination is the edict from Washington establishing monthly wages of $19 and $21 respectively in regions 3 and 4 under the Works Relief Act; it is no accident that in the expenditure of the four billion, eight hundred and eighty million dollars appropriated by the Congress, the taxes for the raising of which are extracted by the federal government from the pockets of black men at the same rate as white, wages far below the level of decent subsistence should be established for those states in which the bulk of the Negro population of America resides.

Collapse of the cotton market and of the antiquated credit system of the south, the unmitigated terrorism used to perpetuate economic, political and social enslavement of Negroes in the south, combined with indifference, vacillation and weakness at Washington, are creating even more insufferable conditions not only for Negroes in the south and elsewhere but are working irreparable harm upon white Americans as well.

We, therefore, in the name of twelve million American Negroes and of many white Americans who are superior to race prejudice, do pledge ourselves to renewed and increased struggle against these conditions. We do this in no spirit of racial selfishness. We conceive our struggle to be for better conditions for all Americans in that it is a self-evident truth that there can be no lasting peace or justice for any race as long as one race can be exploited because of racial, religious or other prejudice.

If the American Negro is to sustain himself in an effective existence in this country, and some day be lifted from the threat of pauperism, there must be developed everywhere, not only interracial contacts in the field of labor, but also in the business world.

We urge, therefore, that everywhere in America more attention be given by Negroes to independent and interracial ventures in
BUSINESS EDUCATION

We urge the colleges devoted to the education of Negro youth to introduce and develop adequate courses in business in order to help make our race more self-supporting.

LYING

We vigorously and unequivocally condemn the impudent and disgraceful filibuster led by a small reactionary bloc in the United States Senate against the Coopty-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill. The temporary success in preventing orderly debates and vote by the Congress is a surrender by the Federal government to the lowest element in our national life. To surrender was a confession of the impotence of the Federal government to protect its own citizens.

Lynching, as the most degrading form of racial servitude, is a test of the sanctity and integrity of the Congress and the nation. We do not accept any excuse of alleged unconstitutionality for failure of each individual member of the Congress to vigorously to fight for the passage of this bill. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate and other distinguished jurists with social vision declared the Coopty-Wagner bill to be constitutional. We urge all those who are opposed to lynching, both Negro and white, to qualify without fail for voting, especially in the pivotal states, and to register with their ballots, in primaries and general elections, their unequivocal disapproval of all those who opposed or were indifferent to the Coopty-Wagner bill, and to give their support to those courageous members of both houses of Congress who did their duty. We must let enemies of the bill know that we will accept no excuse.

We express our deep appreciation to those organizations with a total membership of more than fifty million Americans who have endorsed the bill. Especially do we appreciate the efforts of those who have worked hard and faithfully for passage. We urge more effective work in the next stage of the struggle by those who have thus far limited their endorsement to moral support.

AGRICULTURE

We vigorously condemn the widespread discrimination against sharecroppers and agricultural workers generally, both Negro and white, under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration; the shameless and unbridled looting of government coffers made open to sharecroppers and tenant farmers; the economy of scarcity through the destruction of crops and other abuses which have flourished. We condemn the suppression of reports of conditions affecting sharecroppers, such as the Myrdal report, and the ignoring of complaints against maladministration, fraud and dishonesty.

We are unalterably opposed to the present form of the Bankhead Farm Tenant Corporation Bill.

We vigorously condemn the flagrant violation of the rights of sharecroppers and agricultural workers generally by planters, their retainers and officers of the law to organize themselves into unions for their own protection. We further condemn the terrorism and violence waged against those workers by planters, their representatives and officers of the law. We call upon all Americans to protest these fascist practices, and to forward the struggle of dispossessed and enslaved farm workers in all possible ways.

WORK RELIEF ACT

We vigorously condemn the setting of monthly wages in regions 3 and 4, in the states of Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, Virginia, and of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, respectively, at the subnormal figure of $18 and $21. In the setting up of machinery for administration of the Works Relief Act we urge the appointment of qualified Negroes, as Deputy Administrators in each state, whereas Negroes constitute any appreciable portion of the population. We urge that Negroes be integrated into all Work Relief projects on the basis of actual need and proportionate population and that the utmost vigilance be exercised by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to prevent discrimination.
WHITE PRIMARY

We urge upon the Congress the passage immediately of adequate laws against barring of qualified Negro voters from the so-called white primary of certain southern states.

While we do not believe political action to be a panacea, we realize fully that the ballot is a potent weapon. To, therefore, urge upon Negro voters throughout the United States to qualify, and vigorously and unselfishly utilize their ballots without regard to political party or creed in their own and the public's best interests.

EDUCATION

We hail the victory won in the trial court in Maryland for educational equality in the granting of a seat of admission for the admission of a qualified Negro student to the School of Law of the tax-supported University of Maryland. This is the opening step in the persistent campaign we must and will wage against every form of discrimination and segregation in all branches of education.

LEGAL DEFENSE

The rights of Negroes in courts of law are today gravely endangered. We pledge our support to the defense of Jess Hollins in Calhoun; Brown, Ellington and Shields in Mississippi; Angelo Henderson in Georgia; the Scottsboro boys in Alabama and other Negro victims of injustice in whose cases fundamental rights are involved.

THE SOUTH

We hail the growth of courageous opinion in the south, especially as seen among younger, more intelligent southerners, both white and colored, and in the press. We pledge ourselves to do all we can in the development of enlightened self-interest among the increasing number of white southerners who see they can never progress as long as the Negro is oppressed.

LABOR

We welcome the growth of labor consciousness but we again warn the leadership of organized white labor, especially American Federation of Labor and railroad brotherhoods, they can never attain freedom for their groups by clinging to the backs of black labor. We urge all workers, white and black, to speed industrial as against craft unionism. We hail the recent victory of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

LEGAL DEFENSE

We urge the responsible officers in all states and in the federal judiciary system to give full recognition to the right of Negro citizens to jury service the same as all other citizens, without evasion, subterfuge, or procrastination. We further urge all Negroes who are brought before juries to insist that there be no discrimination on account of race or color in the selection of their jurors not only as a means of securing for themselves the equal protection of the laws but also of insisting on the participation of Negro citizens in the administration of justice in all states and the federal courts.

ITALY AND ETHIOPIA

We unequivocally condemn Italian aggression in Ethiopia and the imperialist selfishness of all nations in their shameless aggression upon the sovereignty of other nations, and we vigorously urge the President and the Department of State, to voice publicly their disapproval of the Italian government's action in Ethiopia. We urge the United States government to put itself squarely on record against encroachment.

HAITI

We regret and condemn the suppression of free speech by the Vincent administration in the Republic of Haiti, and the
imprisonment of critics of the Vincent government, among them such distinguished Haitians as Jacques Romain, poet and patriot.

**GAG LAWS**

We condemn the forces which are pressing for passage by the Congress and by the several state legislatures of laws against the rights of free speech, free assemblage and a free press. Whether there is any encroachment upon those fundamental constitutional principles of minority groups, like the Negro, are the first to suffer. Persons with all of its evils can be postponed or prevented only by maintenance of traditional American adherence to the principles of free speech.

**NEW PROGRAM FOR THE N.A.A.C.P.**

We approve and pledge our financial, moral and active support to the broadened program of the N.A.A.C.P. We shall intensify our efforts to make our organization an even more effective machine for justice to all men regardless of race or color.

**APPRECIATION**

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in its 26th Annual Conference expresses thanks and deep appreciation to the St. Louis Branch of the N.A.A.C.P. and to the citizens and city of St. Louis for the hospitality extended the delegation and visitors.
July 8, 1935

Dear Mr. White:

Thank you very much for your letter and for sending me the resolutions, which I have not yet seen. I will certainly come to Baltimore for the conference, if it is possible, next June, but of course you realize there will be a National Democratic Convention on then, so that anything I promise to do must be tentative.

I am not going to be in New York until the latter part of July, but will be glad to see you then.

I quite understand the situation about the Virgin Islands and will tell Mr. Gruening about your feelings.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. Walter White
69, Fifth Avenue
New York
N.Y.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I send you enclosed a copy of the resolutions adopted by the delegates to our 26th Annual Conference at St. Louis, June 25-30. These represent, I believe, an accurate portrayal of opinion of the moderate school of thought among Negroes, which opinion is neither left nor right.

I do wish you could have heard the great speech our friend, Josephine Roche, made. She won the enthusiastic approval and affection of everyone in the audience. It would have done your heart good to have heard the applause when she, upon being presented a bouquet of flowers, asked the audience if she might have its approval of her presenting the flowers to you on Monday.

Our Conference next year will be held at Baltimore, June 23-28. Is it too far in advance for us to put in a bid to have you as a speaker at one of the principal mass meetings?

Do you expect to be in New York any time soon? If so, I should like to talk over with you several matters in connection with the Virgin Islands which greatly disturb me. I have had reports from sources that I believe to be reliable, that there is a possibility of some physical violence there during the summer. I want to talk this over with you, and one or two other matters. I talked with Governor Pearson recently, and he is apparently anxious to have me go to the Virgin Islands this summer. While I should like to do this, I do not see how it is possible. Because of my resignation from the Advisory Council, I feel strongly that should I go, I should make the trip only if I were able to pay Mrs. White's expenses and mine in full; certain situations and obligations make this impossible. I am sure you understand.

With cordial personal greetings, I am;

P.S. Resolutions will be mailed to you on Friday.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
White House
Washington, D.C.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I am to be in Washington on next Monday, July 22nd. Would it be possible for me to see you for a few minutes at any time during the day? I shall probably also be in Washington at least Tuesday morning.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.
8/1/35

Sent to
Walter White

Mr. Hopkins' letter July 22
with schedule of wages

"The work program does not
permit any discrimination against
negro workers."
August 1, 1935

My dear Mr. White:

Mrs. Roosevelt and her secretary are away for the summer, and in their absence I have been asked to acknowledge their mail.

I shall bring your letter to Mrs. Roosevelt's attention as soon as possible.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. Walter White
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
69 Fifth Avenue
New York
New York
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I am sending you under separate cover a copy of the August issue of the Crisis in which appears an article, "The Negro Separate School," by Dr. Charles H. Thompson, which I hope you will find time to read. It gives an admirable summation of the reasons why thoughtful colored people oppose segregation.

Ever sincerely,

Walter White
Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
August 5, 1935.

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR MRS. SCHEIDER:

Dear Malvina:

I have been asked to send you a memorandum containing information for Mrs. Roosevelt concerning Walter White, Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The memorandum is sent at this time because Walter White has been bombarding the President with telegrams and letters demanding passage of the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill before the adjournment of Congress; complaining about the War Department's policy regarding the assignment of negro reserve officers in C.C.C. camps etc.

Walter White for some time has been writing and telegraphing the President. Frankly, some of his messages to the President have been decidedly insulting. For example, in a letter he wrote the President on May sixth when he resigned as a member of the Advisory Council for the Government of the Virgin Islands, after expressing great disappointment that the President did not make a public pronouncement by means of a message to the Congress which would openly endorse the Anti-Lynching Bill, he said:

"XXXXXXXX In justice to the cause I serve I cannot continue to remain even a small part of your official family."

His file of correspondence is voluminous.

I am advised by those familiar with White's actions at the Capitol that it was he who some time ago went into the restaurant within the Capitol Building and demanded that he be served, apparently deliberately creating a troublesome scene, compelling his eviction from the restaurant and giving rise to an issue, made much of in the press at the time. The belief in some quarters is that he did this for publicity purposes and to arouse negroes throughout the country through press accounts of his eviction from the Capitol and the refusal of Capitol authorities to permit him to eat in the restaurant there.

Mr. Forster advises that Walter White, before President Roosevelt came to the White House, because of his activities, has been one of the worst and most continuous of trouble makers.

STEPHEN EARLY
September 10, 1935

My dear Mr. White:

I will get "Black Reconstruction" and read it as soon as I can, and I will also try to get the President to read it.

I would like to write Roland Hayes, but all appearances at the White House are arranged through Mr. Henry Jungen, of Steinway and Sons. We usually have two artists at an entertainment. Would he be agreeable to having the Hampton Singers or some other group that same evening?

Very sincerely yours,
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I sent you at the White House last week "Black Reconstruction" by Dr. Du Bois. I think you will be interested in this book because of its depiction of the background out of which many of the problems of the South, especially as far as race relations are concerned, arise. I hope you will find time in your busy life to read it because of its new view of the Reconstruction period.

I do hope also that the President will find time to read it.

If it can be arranged I should like very much to talk with the President about a number of matters, among them the legislative program we are planning for the next session of Congress.

I have just learned that Roland Hayes, the great Negro tenor, is to be in the United States during the coming fall and winter. You know of him, don't you? He will be in the United States until February when he has been asked to sing in France, Spain, Egypt and Italy. It occurred to me that you might care to consider inviting him to sing at the White House at one of next season's musicales. If you should, I would be very glad to sound out Mr. Hayes on this. Or, you could write him directly at his home address which is 58 Allerton Street, Brooklyn, Massachusetts.

Ever sincerely,

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

Hyde Park,
New York.
Hyde Park, N.Y.
Sept. 16, 1935.

Dear Mr. White:

It is impossible, I am afraid, to arrange for the meeting you want before the President goes away as he has every minute taken.

It may be possible that I can arrange a meeting soon after he gets back, as he has promised me that he would do his best. I will keep it in mind. He will not be back until about October 23rd.

I am shocked by the correspondence with Senator Bailey. I think his attitude is extraordinary.

As far as I know now, I think we will be able to arrange for Mr. Hayes on either the fifth or sixth of January. I haven’t set any dates for this coming official season as yet.

Very sincerely yours,
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Would it be possible for the President to receive a quite small and carefully selected committee to discuss confidentially and frankly the situation with regard to the Negro? At the September meeting of our Board, held last Monday, I was instructed to arrange such a conference if the President is willing to receive such a committee. It is our idea that no publicity be attached to such a conference either before or after it is held in order that there might be frank discussion of the situation with perhaps conclusions of mutual benefit coming from that discussion.

As you and the President, of course, both know, there has been very widespread disappointment among Negroes in connection with the successful filibuster against the Costigan-Wagner bill; the discrimination, chiefly by local officials in the South, in the matter of jobs and relief; and in the generally wretched conditions in which so many Negroes find themselves. We believe such a conference may be of mutual benefit.

We have in mind a small group, not to exceed four or five in number, including such persons as James Weldon Johnson and J. E. Spingarn. Perhaps there would be less likelihood of unwelcome publicity if the conference were held at Hyde Park, either before or after you and the President go to San Diego, rather than if we waited until you return to Washington.

Ever sincerely,

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
Hyde Park,
New York.
September 3rd, 1935

My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I wanted you to see the correspondence we have had with Senator Bailey on the subject of the lynching of Govan 'Sweat' Ward at Louisburg, North Carolina, on July 30th and his assertion, during the filibuster on the Costigan-Wagner bill, that the State of North Carolina needed no incentive to stop lynching or to punish Lynchers.

I enclose also copy of the letter we wrote to President Roosevelt on August 28th relative to the Louisburg lynching and Federal legislation to aid in the ending of the crime of lynching.

Ever sincerely,

[Walter White's signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
Hyde Park,
New York.
August 26th 1925

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

One of the leaders of the filibuster of April 26 to May 1 against the motion to consider the Costigan-McNary bill was Senator Josiah Bailey of North Carolina. At one stage of the filibuster Senator Bailey made the statement that "we need no incentive to do our duty" in preventing lynching or punishing lynchers.

One July 30 a mob of twenty-five to thirty persons put to death a Negro by the name of Govan Ward at Louisburg, North Carolina. This was done at eleven o'clock in the forenoon. The N.A.A.C.P. this morning received the report of an investigation made for us by a southern white man. This report reveals the names of nine members of the mob, among them certain county officials. One of these officials is alleged to have been the leader in formation of the mob, and at least three of the high officials of Franklin County were active participants in the lynching. A member of the National Guard, sent to Louisburg to prevent the lynching, is reported to have cut off a toe from Ward's foot as a souvenir.

Ward was known to have been insane and frequently given to spells of extreme violence. The attacks upon three persons, one of whom was one of his female cousins, which led to the lynching, and another of which attacks resulted in the death of a white farmer, clearly show that North Carolina was derelict in not having long since incarcerated an insane man as dangerous as Ward. Further proof of Ward's mental state is supplied by the circumstance that Ward cut off the head of one of his victims with an axe and was seated in his own front yard playing with the severed head which he had wrapped in bed clothing, when officers of the law came to arrest him.

A statement frequently made is that Negroes "shied"
Negro criminals and that this is one of the contributing causes to lynchings. The fallacy of such a statement is to be seen in Ward's case where a Negro helped the officers of the law to apprehend Ward only to see Ward lynched by a mob apparently with official connivance.

Our investigation further shows that there is no possibility whatever of convictions in Franklin County because public opinion approves the lynching. This is true despite the fact that Governor Ehringhaus, Solicitor Bickett and the leading newspapers of North Carolina have opposed the lynching and demanded punishment of the lynchers. Leading papers of the State freely predict that there will be no arrests and no punishment of any of the lynchers.

In the face of these facts and in this clear-cut instance of the inability of a State like North Carolina, where public opinion is much further advanced than in many other States where lynchings are frequent, it is clearly evident that there can be no end to lynchings until Federal legislation is enacted against it. We have supplied the above information, together with the names of the lynchers, to Governor Ehringhaus and Solicitor Bickett. It is practically certain, however, that their efforts however sincere and vigorous will come to naught.

Once again may we ask what steps you as President and your administration will take in the next session of the Seventy-fourth Congress to insure a vote upon the Costigan-Wagner bill.

Respectfully,

(Signed) Walter White
Secretary.
August
28th
1935

Hon. Josiah W. Bailey
Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.

My dear Senator Bailey:

A southern white man of integrity and probity has just completed for us a personal investigation of the lynching of Govan Ward at Louisville, North Carolina, on July 20th, concerning which we have had some correspondence. His report gives the names of nine members of the mob of twenty-five or thirty persons who at eleven o'clock in the morning, without masks or other efforts at concealment, lynched Ward. His report further shows that certain officials are reported not only to have connived at delivery of Ward to the mob but also to have actively participated in the lynching. A member of the National Guard, sent to Louisville to maintain order, is reported to have cut a toe from the victim's foot as a souvenir. It is further revealed that Ward was known to have been insane, but that nothing was done by the authorities to incarcerate him in an institution. This neglect led to the series of attacks, one of them resulting in a murder, for which Ward was lynched.

It is further reported that however vigorous the efforts of Governor Hargraves, Solicitor Bickett and other officials, backed by the thoughtful newspapers of the State, to effect the arrest and punishment of the lynchers who are known, there is no possibility of conviction because of the community approval of the lynching.

These facts have been supplied to Governor Hargraves and Solicitor Bickett.

May we inquire if in the face of these facts you still maintain that Federal aid to honest state, county and municipal officials is unnecessary?

Ever sincerely,
(Signed) Walter White
Secretary.
WASHINGTON, Aug 23.-Senator Josiah W. Bailey, of North Carolina, one of the leaders in the filibuster against the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill, was charged today by Walter White, Secretary of the N.A.A.C.P., of deliberate distortion of the facts regarding the lynching of Govan Ward of Louisburg, N.C., on July 30th. The controversy is one of the most acrimonious of the present session of Congress and reveals, according to informed observers here, how deeply opposition, even in the South, to the filibuster is getting under the skin of Bailey and other Southern Senators.

The N.A.A.C.P. Secretary charges Senator Bailey with lying unless his State can and does apprehend and punish Ward's lynchers. The full text of Senator Bailey's letter and of Mr. White's reply are:

"August 15, 1935"

"I have your wire of July 31st.

"I did assert that the people of the United States need no incentive by way of Federal interference to prevent lynching. I did assert that there had been more improvement in the reduction of the number of these crimes than in the number of the reduction of any other crimes whatever. These statistics were supplied by the Tuskegee Institute and are not to be questioned. I do not think Federal action would have the slightest thing to do with the stopping of lynching. I shall resist the Costigan-Wagner Bill as often as it comes up and it makes no difference whatever to me that the eyes of the world will be upon me and my State to see if I spoke truthfully and I need no reminder from you on this subject. I have nothing but contempt for your suggestion that I have spoken other than truthfully, and you know that you are lying when you undertake to make it appear that there has not been a very great reduction in lynchings throughout the country and in the South and in my State the past forty years. You have the facts before you. The idea of invoking the Federal power to prevent a crime, the number of which committed in the country is less than fifteen in a year, in an absurdity upon its face. I understand very well what your organization is up to and I do not hesitate to say that so far from advancing the interest of the colored race, it is doing as much as anything to keep the race race-conscious and in a condition of unrest.

"I do not want any more wires from you or any communications. You ought to go out and make an honest living instead of trying to attend to other people's business and taking up collections from people who are deluded by the folly which you put forward."

"Very truly yours,"

"(Signed) J. W. Bailey"

"August 21, 1935"

"My dear Senator Bailey"

"Had I not with my own eyes and ears observed the hysterical bitterness you displayed in filibustering against the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill I should have been unable to believe that a member of a solemnly deliberative body like the United States Senate could have deliberately distorted the plain English language as you have distorted my telegram of July 31st in your reply to me of August 15th. My telegram to you regarding the Louisburg, North Carolina, lynching of Govan Ward on July 30th read:

"On April 26 you vigorously attacked the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill and asserted that 'we need no incentive to do our duty' in preventing lynching or punishing lynchers. Yesterday a mob in your own State, at Louisburg, prevented you and the White House of the State of North Carolina with a challenge to prove the truth of your statement of April 26. Thoughtful Americans, including many white citizens of North Carolina, do not believe that lynching can"

(Continued on Page 3)
be stopped except by Federal action. The eyes of the world will be upon you and your State to see if you spoke truthfully when you filibustered against the Costigan-Wagner bill."

"No statement is made therein as to whether or not lynchings are decreasing, increasing or remaining the same. Can it be that the reason you failed to answer my direct question as to what you and the State of North Carolina plan to do to bring the Louisburg lynchers to justice is because you know that neither you nor your State plan to do anything? The plain question is this: What do you intend to do to make good your boast that North Carolina needs no Federal or outside help to apprehend, convict and punish any and all persons who commit or participate in a lynching in North Carolina? The question as to whether or not you told the truth in the filibuster is not going to be answered in any other fashion except by the apprehension and punishment of the Louisburg lynchers. If they are punished, then that action and it alone will proclaim to the world that you told the truth. Likewise, failure to punish the Louisburg lynchers will prove that you did not tell the truth, and there is no escaping that fact through hysterical statements such as contained in your letter of August 15th.

"I note your letter of August 15th stating that you desire no further communications from me. It is not difficult to appreciate your wish to have this matter buried and humiliate and embarrass you in spite of your self-righteous attitude.

"I note further your statement that 'it makes no difference whatever to me that the eyes of the world the eyes of the world will be upon me and my State to see if I spoke truthfully.' Is it beyond your comprehension to realize that the time has long since passed when territorial subdivisions, whether they be nations or states, can ignore what the outside world thinks? Not even the most notorious European dictators dare be so arrogant.

"My comment on your remark about 'earning an honest living' is that I prefer my own means of earning a livelihood from an Association to which contributions are wholly voluntary, to your own where you draw a salary from public funds raised through the taxation of Negroes as well as white citizens, yet utilize that position to prevent effective action against that bestial and un-Christian crime of lynching which President Roosevelt has rightly termed 'that vile form of collective murder.'

"Perhaps even you have learned by now that the leading newspapers of your own State, and thoughtful North Carolinians of both races, not only do not approve of your attitude but heartily disapprove your participation in the filibuster to prevent even an honest debate and vote upon the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill. I have too much respect for the integrity and intelligence of the large and constantly growing number of decent citizens of North Carolina to feel confident that they will resent your threat to filibuster against Federal anti-lynching legislation 'as often as it comes up.' Do you not realize, my dear Senator Bailey, that the world is moving forward and that the growing number of intelligent people, especially younger ones, will not countenance your continued efforts to block action to eliminate bestial mob violence from our national life?"

"Ever sincerely,
(Signed) Walter White
Secretary"

The N.A.A.C.P. also sent the following clipping to Senator Bailey from the Decatur Herald, Decatur, Ill, August 2, 1935:

In the State Tradition

Most recent of lynchings in the United States is that one reported from the state of North Carolina. The news must have surprised some readers who know that North Carolina has been, in many respects, the most enlightened and civilized of all southern states. Only a week before this lynching, however, another news story had come out of North Carolina, the significance of which may have been overlooked. Some officials of a state prison there were brought to trial. It was testified that they had chained Negro prisoners in unheated rooms in winter, leaving them until their feet were frozen off.

A North Carolina jury, after hearing this testimony, decided that (Continued on Page 4)
the prison officials responsible were guilty of no crime and might return to their work, in which they had proved such efficiency.

In a state of civilization that approves this sort of procedure, lynching quite naturally may be looked upon as the more humane method of dealing with persons suspected of crime.
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a Negro charged with crime only to see him put to death in broad
open daylight."

Convictions Impossible

"It is impossible to convict anyone before a jury from that
county on account of public opinion," the N.A.A.C.P. investigator
states. The officials of Franklin County were either a part of the
mob or in sympathy with it. The local paper justified the act. Solicitor
W. Y. Bickett of Raleigh held an investigation using the local
legal channels but nothing can be done through that procedure. He was
sincere in deploving the deed. The important papers of the State, such
as the Raleigh News & Observer, the Raleigh Times, and the Greensboro
Daily News, were outspoken in their criticism of the local officials."
Governor Ehringhausen censured the local officials for neglect of duty.

Senator Bailey Again Scored for Filibuster

Mr. White also wrote today to Senator Josiah W. Bailey, one of
the leaders in the filibuster against the Costigan-Wagner bill, with
whom there has been an acrimonious exchange of correspondence recent-
ly. The Wari lynching and the fact that participants in it are now
known is cited by Mr. White to Senator Bailey as further proof of the
fact that lynching cannot be stopped without Federal action. "Do you
still maintain," Mr. White asked Senator Bailey, "that Federal aid
to honest state, county and municipal officials is unnecessary?"

ROOSEVELT SUPPLIED WITH
LOUISBURG LYNCHING FACTS

New York, Aug. 28.- Calling attention to the fact that Senator
Josiah W. Bailey, a member of his party and a leader in the filibuster
against the Costigan-Wagner bill, with whom there has been an acrimonious exchange of correspondence recent-
ly. The Wari lynching and the fact that participants in it are now
known is cited by Mr. White to Senator Bailey as further proof of the
fact that lynching cannot be stopped without Federal action. "Do you
still maintain," Mr. White asked Senator Bailey, "that Federal aid
to honest state, county and municipal officials is unnecessary?"

HOUSTON HAMMERS BAILEY ON LYNCHING

New York, Aug. 30.- Inquiring "whether there are any circum-
stances whatever under which North Carolina will take action against
a lyncher" Charles H. Houston, Special Counsel of the N.A.A.C.P. today
forwarded to Senator Josiah W. Bailey, one of the leaders in the
filibuster against the Costigan-Wagner bill, a report from North Caro-
olina of the refusal of officials to seek for the return of a lyncher
who, troubled by his conscience, offered to return to stand trial.

The report, which is confirmed in a news item in the High Point
(N.C.) Enterprise of August 19th, tells of the receipt by Carteret
County officers of a letter from A. F. Taylor, now of Cortez, Florida,
in which Taylor stated that he had participated in a lynching at
Beaufort (N.C.) thirty-five years ago. Taylor asserted that he had
become religious and was being troubled by his conscience. He vol-
unteered to return for trial and punishment if officers wanted him.
According to the North Carolina paper the officers "decided it was
useless to accept his offer."

The man lynched was Louis Patrick who was shot and hanged for
the alleged slaying of Elijah Wicks, a merchant.

It is the Association's intention to offer no quarter to the
filibusters against the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill. It
proposes to wage a relentless warfare of exposure upon those respon-
sible for sidetracking of the bill in the session of Congress which has
just closed.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Thank you very much for your nice letter of the 16th. I do hope very much that the appointment with the President can be arranged. If you can let me know a few days in advance, I will be grateful so that I may be able to get the persons we want to confer with the President to arrange their schedules accordingly.

I knew you would be amazed at Senator Bailey's correspondence. Incidentally, no action has been taken, so far as we have been able to learn, about the lynchers of Govan Ward, whose names were supplied to Governor and to the Solicitor General of North Carolina. The newspapers of the state have been demanding action, saying that the supplying of the names of the lynchers and the evidence against them has put North Carolina on the spot. These newspapers, however, are equally unanimous in predicting that absolutely nothing will be done. We shall see.

I am transmitting to Mr. Hayes the information contained in your letter about the fifth or sixth of January.

Cordially,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
Hyde Park,
New York.
September 23, 1935.

My dear Mr. White:

Mrs. Roosevelt asks me to express her appreciation of your thoughtfulness in sending her a copy of "Black Reconstruction," by W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, and to thank you for it.

She anticipates reading it with great pleasure.

Very sincerely yours,

Secretary to
Mrs. Roosevelt.

Mr. Walter White
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
69 Fifth Avenue
New York
New York
Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of James Weldon Johnson's book, SAINT PATTER RELATES AN INCIDENT OF THE RESURRECTION DAY. I think you would enjoy the title poem, "The Greatest of These is War", and one or two other poems especially.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
Warm Springs,
Georgia.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I think you may be interested in seeing the enclosed copy of letter we have today sent to Senator Borah.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
Warm Springs,
Georgia.

How do your Senators and Congressmen stand on the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill?
ENDORSED BY THE NATIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU, 215 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
November
22nd
1925

Hon. William E. Borah
United States Senator
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Borah:

In view of the numerous current newspaper reports of the possibility of your becoming a Republican candidate for President in 1936, and because you have not yet denied that the proffer of the nomination will be unacceptable to you, we are addressing this open letter to you on behalf of twelve million American Negroes and of many white Americans who are deeply concerned with the alarming increase in lynchings in the United States.

On May 1st, 1925, you delivered on the floor of the Senate what is generally conceded to have been the death blow to the chances of passage at that session of the Congress of the Costigan-Bagner anti-lynching bill. Your speech on that occasion was fundamentally the same as that which you delivered in September, 1922, when another filibuster, led by senators from states which had the worst lynching records, succeeded in side-tracking the Dyer anti-lynching bill. You, therefore, hold the somewhat dubious honor of having been the executioner of two distinctly hopeful opportunities to pass federal legislation which would have given government aid, as in the case of kidnapping, to state authorities to stamp out this odious evil.

In your speech on May 1st you declared, among other things, that "...if this kind of bill can be passed and sustained by the Supreme Court we have utterly annihilated all state sovereignty; we have broken down state lines completely." Later on you declared "I believe we can only have a great Federal Union by having great individual sovereign States, and that when the latter are destroyed we may have a republic in name, but we will no longer have a republic in fact.... There can be no such thing as a Federal Republic unless the States at home preserve their rights as sovereign States to the extent to which the Constitution has defined
them."

In the abstract these are very pretty sentiments. It is well enough to talk about states' "rights"; but we ask you, Senator Borah, to train that legal mind of yours, if you will, on states' "wrongs" which have been perpetrated since you dealt the mortal blow to efforts to stop lynching. Since May 1st, fourteen persons have been done to death by mobs in the United States. You have talked much and often about leaving the prevention of such bestial crimes and the punishment of lynchers to the states. Let us examine concretely how the states where most of the lynchings occurred have done their duty. On July 30th a man, known as "insane," was put to death in open daylight on the streets of Louisburg, North Carolina, by a mob which made no efforts to conceal its identity. A few of the state authorities, we believe with great sincerity, attempted to punish the lynchers. They were unsuccessful. Even when this association sent a white North Carolinian to Louisburg, he was not able to procure information against nine of the lynchers, these nine have not even been arrested, though the information concerning them was supplied to the North Carolina authorities on August 18th.

Only a few days ago, on November 1st, two boys, fifteen and sixteen years of age, respectively, were killed by a mob in Colorado County, Texas. Instead of attempting to uphold the law which he had taken a solemn oath to enforce, the County Attorney openly and unashamedly declared the lynchings to be "the will of the people" and he and his fellow officials have indicated in no uncertain terms that they will do nothing whatever to punish the mob which has lynched not only two boys but the majesty of the law as well.

The utter fallacy of depending on state action in certain cases was dramatically and dramatically exposed in the recent lynching at White Bluff, Tennessee, on November 1st, where members of the mob took the deputy sheriff's gun, used it in putting their victim to death and then laughingly returned the weapon to the acquiescent officer who is quoted as remarking "they all seem to be having a good time."

Before me as I write is a photograph of a lynched figure hanging from a tree in Florida. The body is that of the man lynched at Fort Lauderdale on July 19th. Around the pendent figure stand twelve persons, ten of them well dressed, neat, clean and intelligent white girls ranging in age from four to ten or eleven years. On the faces of these youngsters, now at their most impressionable age, is mirrored mingled horror, fascination and excitement.

Do you feel proud of your handiwork, Senator Borah? And does it disturb your conscience even to the slightest extent that there is the possibility that had the Costigan-Wagner bill been passed last May this lynching and that of thirteen others might not have occurred, and irreparable damage might not have been done to the minds and souls of these children of tender years?

It will be idle speculation on the part of yourself or anyone else to say, as you did on the floor of the Senate last May 1st, that you do not think a federal bill will stop lynching. Perhaps it won't
prevent all lynchings. But if it materially decreases the number of these crimes, should not all decent people give it a trial?

Forget, if you will, that most of the victims of lynching mobs belong to a race which has suffered for three centuries from slavery and race prejudice. Ignore the physical suffering and the anguish of the victim as he is stabbed, strangled or slowly roasted to death. Think instead of the great harm that is done to those who perpetrate such sadistic crimes and to the good name and wellbeing of America. Many Americans today are alarmed at the tendencies toward Fascism being made manifest in our country. Negroes today supply most of the victims of lynching mobs; but who knows but that on a bloody tomorrow other Americans whose skins are white may not also furnish living sacrifices to the gods of racial, political or other prejudices?

Many Negroes, Senator Borah, live in pivotal states like Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Ohio and other states where Negroes vote and their votes are counted. In many of these states the Negro vote holds the balance of power in any normal election. These voters and others generally, including many white Americans, want to know if you will again in the coming session of Congress deal the assassin's blow to efforts for federal legislation against a crime which has taken more than five thousand victims during the last forty-five years and for which crimes there have been convictions in less than one-half of one percent of the cases. There are many Americans, Senator Borah, who no longer believe in the sincerity of members of the Senate who forget states' rights when such issues as prohibition are being discussed but who wrap about themselves the mantle of "constitutionality" when the lives of human beings are taken by lawless mobs.

Ever sincerely,

(Signed) Walter White
Secretary.
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

You probably saw Senator Borah's reply to my letter, copy of which I sent you on November 22nd. You will perhaps be interested in the enclosed copy of letter which I sent him yesterday.

I have been invited to the opening of First Houses next Wednesday, and will be at the luncheon at which you are to speak. If you can spare a few minutes while you are in New York I should like to talk with you about a number of matters.

Ever sincerely,

Walter White
Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.
November 25, 1935

Hon. William E. Borah
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Borah:

I am in receipt of your letter of November 23rd.

Will you permit me to say that if you think my letter of November 22nd extraordinary, may I similarly characterize your reply?

Our national government is a pitiful and impotent structure indeed if the deadening hand of legalism prevents it from taking any action whatever against a crime like lynching. If it be true, as you declare, that, first, you are horrified and opposed to lynching; second, that the Congress is without power to legislate against this evil; and, third, that federal action is possible only by an amendment to the Constitution, may we ask why it is that you have never introduced a resolution for such an amendment?

You further declare that you have often expressed by word and by act your opposition to and horror of lynching. This Association has kept for twenty-six years as complete records as it could of the lynching industry. But search of those records fails to reveal either action or utterance by yourself against lynching, except upon the occasions of the filibusters in 1922 and 1925 when you allied yourself to defeat the Byrnes--Costigan--Wagner Bills with such utter reactionaries as Senators Ellison G. Smith of South Carolina, Cole Pleace of the same state, Heflin of Alabama, Bailey of North Carolina, and Harrison of Mississippi—all states with very bad lynching records.

In order that our files may be complete we will appreciate your giving us the facts on the acts or words upon other occasions which you have put forth against lynching.

Ever sincerely,

(Signed) Walter White
Secretary.
Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.

My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Each year the N.A.A.C.P. issues Christmas Seals to aid in raising additional funds for carrying on its tremendous program. The seals this year were designed by Richmond Barthé, young Negro artist-sculptor, two of whose pieces have been purchased by the Whitney Museum of New York City.

Because of your interest in the work of the Association, we have taken the liberty of enclosing $5 worth of seals for your use. We do hope that you will enjoy using them. Enclosed find return envelop for your convenience in sending check.

Very sincerely yours,

Juanita E. Jackson
Special Assistant to the Secretary
My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I thought you would be interested in seeing the enclosed copy of letter we wrote today to Governor Tallmadge of Mr. John Kirby.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.
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