David Lawrence Observes:

Lincoln Never Called for Equality

WASHINGTON — They stand before the shrine of Abraham Lincoln—before the impressive edifice which memorializes a great man. But do all those assembled Wednesday before the massive statue of the country lawyer who became president of the United States know what he really said about the race problem? Would the Negro leaders of today venture to quote what Lincoln actually said in his public speeches—more than 100 years ago?

As it generally realized, for instance, that Lincoln didn't favor the social equality of Negroes and whites and frankly stated that he didn't believe this should be established by law or otherwise? Also, would what Lincoln had to say about the legitimacy of "resisting" court decisions be approved today by the members of the American Bar Association who voted recently for a resolution condemning the effort of certain groups to correct—by legal methods—rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States considered to be unjust and arbitrary?

Yet it's all in a book published in 1863 by the Library of Congress, giving the stenographic records of speeches made by Abraham Lincoln in his famous debates with Stephen A. Douglas. Lincoln denounced slavery, and then explained his position on the race problem generally as he said:

"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, in my judgment will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and I as much as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position."

"I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that not withstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas, he is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without labor of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man."

"What next? Free them and make them politically and socially equal? My own feelings will not admit this; and if mine would, we would all know that those of the great mass of white people will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if, indeed it is any part of it. A universal feeling, whether well or ill-founded, cannot be safely disregarded. We cannot, then, make them equal."

In another speech in 1858, Lincoln said, "I will say that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not even in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is no physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot as yet, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.

Romney Gains Support

WASHINGTON — A new and significant factor is beginning to show in the ratings of the 1964 Republican presidential possibilities.

It is a factor capable of upsetting all past calculations, capable of altering the entire Republican picture.

It has been little discussed because it has been buried in the bigger news of the latest Gallup and Harris polls showing President Kennedy running formidable ahead of all Republican contenders everywhere except in the South.

These polls show something else. They show a sudden, substantial upsurge in voter support for George Romney of Michigan—the governor who has not lifted his voice to get into the race; but has discouraged others from doing anything in his behalf.

ROMNEY GAINS IN POLLS

COMPARING WITH GOLDWATER

And what's been happening?

It seems as though everything has been happening without anyone noticing it.

The Gallup poll finds that Gov. Romney, nation-wide, is running absolutely even, neck-and-neck, with Sen. Barry Goldwater when each is pitted against Kennedy. The results: Kennedy 62 per cent, Romney 37 per cent, and Goldwater 37 per cent.

The new Harris poll shows Goldwater 42 per cent, Romney 38 per cent, and Scranton 18 per cent. While the supporters of Goldwater and Rockefeller have been actively mobilizing support for their men for some time, each has been in public life for many years. Romney is a fledgling, has been governor for only eight months. There is no organized movement behind his presidential hopes. The fact is, with all of these disadvantages, he is running even with Sen. Goldwater—or better—against the President, an event of major political importance.

ROMNEY AS NOMINEE

WOULD DELIGHT RIE

Romney's sharp rise in public backing is especially welcome to some important leaders in the party. The most important leader of all to whom it is welcome is former President Dwight Eisenhower.

It is no secret that Gen. Eisenhower is not warm towards Sen. Goldwater, is not warm towards Gov. Rockefeller. He would be more than delighted to see Gov. Romney the 1964 nominee.

Gen. Eisenhower's conviction is that a successful GOP nominee must be of the "moderate" image which he presented to the country for eight years. He intends to exert his own great influence to help bring about this.

But even Gen. Eisenhower, with all his continuing prestige and influence, and the proportion of Republicans who still see him as a "good general" and "the best of the lot," is not the man to ignore completely.

So, irrespective of the homage being paid to Abraham Lincoln for a particular purpose, there are plenty of quotations which if uttered by anyone else today would cause many whites and Negroes to denounce such a spokesman as a "racist" or "extremist." Yet the fact is that many people who want to see the Negro given every opportunity to advance in the economic field and enjoy the political privileges and benefits of life probably share the historic views of Abraham Lincoln.
March on Capital Day of Disgrace

WASHINGTON—The "march on Washington" will go down in history as marking a day of public disgrace—a step backward in the evolution of the American system of government. For in 1860, the state of the United States presented to the world was that of a republic in which the people had struggled to become their own masters, but which on Aug. 28, 1963, permitted itself to be perverted as unable to legislate "equal rights" for its citizens except under the intimidating influence of mass demonstrations.

Newspapers, television and radio, the public forums in halls and stadiums have been available as mediums through which the "right of petition" could be effectively expressed and public opinion formed on controversial questions. But a minority, group in the Senate who drew up to their side church leaders and groups as well as civic organizations—decided that a massive public protest would be a better way to impress congress and the president with the ideal that unemployment and racial discrimination can be legislated out of existence.

Government by mob has on a few occasions in the past darkened the pages of American history. A Philip Randolph, the leader of the "march," frankly characterized the "march" as a symbol of "revolution." He said, "In our pluralistic democratic society, causes must gain acceptance and approval and support. They can only gain acceptance, approval and support if they can get attention, and in order to get attention—with numerous causes seeking the focus of public opinion—it is necessary for the dramaturgy to be developed of a given cause."

Randolph, however, was not content with trying to mobilize American public opinion. He told an audience at the National Press Club on Monday that the "march on Washington" would bring into White House "the struggle of peoples of color in America" for "first-class citizenship." He added, "It will have the value of giving the peoples of the world some concept of this problem. It will serve to bring world pressure on the United States of America to step up the struggle to wipe out race bias, because in the cold war—in the conflict of the free world with the totalitarian world—the free world is seeking the alliance of the Afro-Asian world. And in order that the free world may win the alliance of the Afro-Asian world, the free world must show that we are not only making promises to Africa and promises to Asia to help them advance their cause, but we are going to keep our promises, fulfill our promises with our own citizens at home—especially Negroes of African descent."

QUESTIONS NEED OF DEMONSTRATIONS

But could not the merits of the civil-rights "revolution" have been presented effectively to American audiences without street demonstrations? Couldn't the State Department and the Voice of America instead have dealt comprehensively abroad with the story of the efforts being made inside the United States to deal with the "civil rights" problem?

Also, would it not have been better if the leaders of the "march" had not by their tactics incurred some unfavorable publicity? What should be said, for instance, of a public statement that this week which indicated that 63 per cent of the American people disapproved of the "march on Washington" and thought it unnecessary?

The "right of petition" is a fundamental principle of the Constitution, but it assumes an orderly and non-provocative procedure. The federal government had to go to great expense to police the Wednesday demonstration.

Marchers See Ford

WASHINGTON—Freedom Day for America's 38 million Negroes was strangely quiet on Capitol Hill except for the oratory of House members—and they were talking not about civil rights but about settling the rail dispute.

The halls of Congress were empty of visitors. Footsteps of congressmen and of newsmen covering the capital while Negroes thronged the Washington monument and Lincoln memorial areas to demonstrate for equal rights echoed hollowly in the subways, building corridors and capital plaza sidewalks.

RIGHTS BACKERS

CALL ON FORD

On Capitol Hill it was business as usual except that congressional offices were operating on a holiday. The business of averting a rail strike engrossed the attention of House members.

Three young civil rights demonstrators from Grand Rapids—two of them Negroes and one white—called on Rep. Gerald R. Ford.

They seemed satisfied when Ford told them it was "present intention" to support civil rights legislation as it is shaped by the House Judiciary Committee. But Ford cautioned that he was talking about a bill he hasn't seen yet and could only generalize.

His visitors were Sheri Cote of 1320 Hall St. SE, Alton Low Jr. of 822 New St. SW, and Gary Sarto of 1290 Wealthy St., SE Sarto is an Aquinas College student. Low and Miss Cote are Grand Rapids junior college graduates, and Miss Cote plans to attend Michigan State University.

FORD SEEKS MARCH

who are whites suffer because of the 10 per cent who are Negroes." Lesinski asked.

Rep. August E. Jansen of Battle Creek and Edward Hutchinson of Farmington said they were opposed to President Kennedy's bill submitted to Congress and are staying noncommital until they see what comes out of the House Judiciary Committee

Jansen had his office locked and said he had given his entire staff the day off.

Hutchinson's office was open.

His chief assistant was working. But his three women employees stayed home.

Rep. James Harvey's entire staff was on hand. So was Ford's.

Ford said he expected a vote from demonstrators who had flown here in a plane reportedly chartered by the flag L. W. A.

Rep. Charles A. Chambers of Lansing, Elford Dedberg, Bay City, and Harvey indicated they would vote for the civil rights bill now beginning to take shape in the House Judiciary Committee.

Rep. George Marder of Ann Arbor, a Judiciary Committee member, has remained noncommittal.

Rep. John R. Bennett of Otonagon and Victor A. Kern of South St. Mary's were expected to vote against the bill if their past votes are any indication.

LESINSKI ONLY DEM

TO QUESTION ACTION

Rep. Martha Griffiths, D-Detroit, said she would vote for the civil rights bill but is "opposed to busing students from one part of town to another" in the name of school integration.

There is no provision in the President's civil rights bill for
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MARCH PROVOKED CITY'S BITTERNESS, RESENTMENT

To say that the "march" was successful because large-scale violence was avoided is to ignore the bitterness and resentment prevalent on that day in the city whose normal community life was disrupted. Tens of thousands of people remained sequestered in their homes lest they become jaded or subjected to unsavory displays in moving to and from their residences. American citizens were prevented from pursuing their customary ways. Their right to go to their places of employment was impaired by fear of bodily injury. Would this have happened if the petitioners had relied on the process of reason in a voluntary society, or was it a sample of what happens in backward countries when some force stronger than the individual takes over that prevents freedom of movement?

CAN ONLY MOR

GET LAWS PASSED?

Are injunctions remedied by creating more injunctions, and is the cause of civil rights advanced by interfering with the civil rights of the participants in the mass demonstrations?

These are questions which will need answering, and the full effect of what may come to be called "the mess in Washington" could be reflected in future elections. For what was proved by the big demonstration—that in free America the mob can get laws passed covering the use of "civil rights."—Copy-
The Way of Free Citizens

Whatever reservations we may have about the wisdom or effectiveness of mass marches on Washington, it must be admitted that Wednesday's Freedom March was a moving event. There were fervor and passion in the speeches, and the more than 200,000 persons involved in the march obviously believed devoutly in their cause; yet it is doubtful whether any gathering of this size ever was more orderly or better controlled — and we don't mean merely in the United States, but anywhere.

This was a responsible assembly, met not to cause trouble but to demonstrate unity and purposefulness on one of the critical issues of our time, civil rights. David Lawrence takes the extreme view that the march was a national "disgrace" and a mass attempt to exert pressure on Congress. Undeniably one of its purposes was to impress on Congress the determination of a large section of the American public to see that equality prevails among all men. In assembling, these people were, as Rep. Gerald R. Ford Jr., has observed, exercising as free Americans their right of petition to Congress for redress of their grievances.

The fact that they did assemble and did conduct themselves in exemplary manner must impress the rest of the world tremendously. Here was democracy in action. This sort of thing couldn't happen in Russia or any other Communist state. And it wouldn't likely happen in any other country without being marred by violence and bloodshed. Those who marched conducted themselves with dignity; and those who merely watched were properly restrained, whatever their private convictions might have been.

We cannot guess what the effect of the march may be on Congress, though we doubt that it has either won converts or made enemies there for the civil rights cause. The impression made on the general public appears to be wholly favorable; and it is to the public as much as to Congress that these people addressed themselves. They were intent on proving that violence need not be a part of the campaign for equality. But there can be no doubting the determination of all those devoted to civil rights, Negro and white alike, to see this struggle through. Belittling the march or scorning its purpose can have no useful effect. The worst mistake would be refusing to try to understand what motivated the march. That would be a simple invitation to demonstrations of a much uglier kind.
Roscoe Drummond Says:

Freedom Marchers Score

WASHINGTON — That which many most feared—and some of ill will recklessly hoped for—did not fail the Freedom March on Washington.

It was solemn and responsible. buoyant and confident—and deeply persuasive.

These were the 200,000 Negro citizens and many whites who were massed in the Lincoln Memorial Hall in peaceful, fervent and determined demand that the rights of their prized American citizenship be made equal for all.

They knew what they wanted.

They were petitioning their Congress and their nation for redress of wrongs.

There is no doubt that Congress—and millions of fellow-Americans—were listening.

The consensus in Washington is that their petition will be heeded.

LEADERS, MARCHERS, SHOW DISCIPLINE

The result in law and in climate will not be instant, but the effect of the momentous moving rally will be visible in the weeks to come.

The most important reason is that the Freedom March, which the latest Gallup poll showed more people feared would disintegrate into violence and chaos, exhibited unmatched dedication to non-violence, order and respect for law.

It had to do that to succeed. It succeeded.

It was a risky venture. It could have failed. It would have failed had not its leaders—and their followers—demonstrated unusual discipline and responsibility. This cannot fail to impress a Congress and a country to whom every word and act was unfolded on the TV screen.

A majority already exists in the halls of Congress for strengthened civil rights legislation. But this majority might well evade had it become evident that the leadership of the civil rights groups was not in responsible hands and could not be maintained in responsible hands.

The Freedom March was a splendid feat of responsibility.

Great credit goes to these Negro and white leaders—and to their followers, because unless there is responsibility in fellowship, then responsibility of leadership goes for naught.

It is estimated that nearly 90 per cent of the participants in the march were whites. That was good because it underlined that while the Negroes have long been most aggrieved, the issue is not equality of race but equality of citizenship. Other U.S. minorities have been subjected to discrimination—Jews, Catholics, and so-called hyphenated Americans of various nationalities. This discrimination has waxed or been substantially corrected.

No one is contendng that Congress can create equality by law. It can't. But we can create equality of opportunity and we can, for all Americans, the Constitutional right of equal protection. Some are arguing that no private business, even if catering to the public, should be compelled to serve anyone it does not wish. But this argument is usually advanced by those who have long supported state legislation that has compelled many private businesses not to serve Negroes. One can hardly have the argument both ways.

The Freedom March has been an impressive act of mobilized citizenship. It will be a prod and a challenge to Congress. It will influence but not dictate the terms of new legislation. Congress does not act comfortably to dictation—even from the President. But it cannot escape its own responsibility.

Copyright 1963.

Today's Book

Out of old trunks and attics come personal accounts of the Civil War.

A case in point is the Batchelor-Turner Letters 1861-1864, written by two of Terry's Texas Rangers and edited by Helen H. Rugley, a great granddaughter of one of the writers. It was privately printed in Austin, Tex.

Frank Batchelor and George Turner enlisted in the Terry Rangers (8th Texas cavalry) in 1861. They served through the fighting in Kentucky, Tennessee and Georgia until 1864.

Far better than a historian could tell them, Batchelor and Turner recorded the details of soldier life—the ups and downs of campaigning, the importance of such things as socks that fit and overcoats in the winter—in language that brings back some of the flavor of the period. Neither survived the war.

For Mrs. Rugley it was a labor of love and for the Civil War student some interesting sidelights.