

Maddox Victory A "White Backward Step"

ATLANTA - (NPI)--The primary election victory of segregationist Lester Maddox may help start a "full-scale racial war in this country," Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., has asserted. "This state's race relations have worsened recently," he said, "and Maddox's victory could make them even worse."

MADDOX IS remembered as the advocate of violence and disrespect for law and order, who would put the law into the hands of the few. Carrying a pistol in his hand, Maddox drove away Negro customers who sought service at his Pickwick restaurant. The pistol-packing racist said God was his campaign manager.

Maddox's victory came as a surprise to the segregationist and others in the state who expected Ellis G. Arnall, a racial moderate, to win the Democratic nomination for governor.

Maddox's success left Georgians with a choice between two Goldwater men in November. He will face segregationist Republican Howard H. Callaway in the general election. Callaway is said to be only slightly less of a racist.

THE MADDOX triumph left a sick feeling in the stomach of many leading Georgians. Mayor Ivan Allen Jr. of Atlanta called Maddox "a totally unqualified individual" and added, "The seal of the great state of Georgia has been tarnished."

Dr. King said the Maddox victory made him "ashamed" to be a Georgian. Maddox's victory, he said, is a "white backward step" which turned back the clock of history. "Unless the forces of reason take over," the rights leader added, "we're in for more trouble between the races."

MADDOX'S ELECTION victory was interpreted as a triumph for the "white backlash" which is said to result from mounting racial disorder across the nation.

Elsewhere in the country that "backlash" was threatening to split the Democratic party, bolster Republican strength in the South, and possibly produce a new segregationist party. Even worse, it could result in further political ambitions--on a national level--for Gov. George C. Wallace.

According to Arkansas Gov. Orval E. Faubus, Wallace would be elected President today if he were running as a third-party candidate against moderate Democratic and Republican nominees. Faubus said Wallace would make a good president. The Arkansas governor added that the segregationist Alabama chieftain could win easily because of a "white backlash" to Negro rioting.

WALLACE HAS threatened to run for President in 1968 as a third-party candidate if neither of the two major parties nominates a conservative.

Maddox's victory wasn't the only triumph for the "white backlash." Shortly before, George P. Mahoney had saved his campaign for governor of Maryland by opposing open housing.

In Arkansas, Jim Johnson, a founder of the White Citizens Council, won nomination over five opponents who soft-pedaled the race issue in the Democratic governorship primary, and in Louisiana, John R. Rarick won the Democratic nomination for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives by labeling the incumbent, James H. Morrison, an ally of the "black power voting bloc."

RESULT OF THE "white backlash" upsurge, said poll taker Lou Harris, will possibly be a split in the Democratic party. Another pollster, George Gallup, has found white displeasure with the pace of integration at a 10-year high.

Expected to benefit from the "backlash" in the South was the Republican party. Richard M. Nixon, who was defeated in efforts to become President of the United States and governor of California, was right in there trying to capitalize on the Southern backlash.

Nixon called on Republicans to concentrate their energies in conservative areas of the South like Tennessee, South Carolina, and North Carolina, where wages are relatively low. The election loser called on the GOP to unite in the South, insisting that the party can win if it sticks to fundamentals.

Nixon never spelled out those "fundamentals" or why Republicans should concentrate on poor areas. But he was not unaware that the Southern white backlash saved the GOP from almost total defeat in the 1964 Presidential elections and could do the same in 1968.

SO MANY REASONS TO REELECT SAWYER

LAXALT APOLOGY TO FBI

Las Vegas **SUN** FINAL Republican Ashamed Of Foe's Attack

VOL. 17 NO. 91 PHONES: CIRCULATION 382-3078, NEWS 385-2111 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1966 10 CENTS FORTY-FOUR PAGES

WHERE ELSE WILL YOU SURRENDER, MR. LAXALT?

- DO YOU APOLOGIZE because Governor Sawyer vigorously fought the federal government on increasing grazing fees and expanding foreign meat imports in order to protect our ranchers?
- DO YOU WAVE THE WHITE FLAG at Washington because Governor Sawyer fought for the right to veto War on Poverty projects, to prevent the program from becoming a boondoggle?
- DO YOU FEEL Nevada's right to determine its own affairs, as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, is not worth defending?
- ARE YOU ASHAMED because Governor Sawyer fought a movement for a federal income tax credit that could mean a state income tax for Nevada?
- DO YOU WANT TO RETREAT because Governor Sawyer fought the Department of Interior to regain part of the 86% of Nevada owned by the federal government?

Nevada needs a Governor who can be counted on to fight. Our independence is not negotiable.

NEVADA STATE DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE / WM. MAC DONALD, CHAIRMAN

SO MANY WAYS TO HELP REELECT GOVERNOR GRANT SAWYER

A 'GRASS ROOTS' VOLUNTEERS FOR SAWYER HEADQUARTERS OPENS TODAY AT 1305 'D' ST. --- GOVERNOR SAWYER WILL BE THERE TO SAY "THANK YOU" BUFFET and REFRESHMENTS SERVED FROM 2:30 to 5:00

V
O
T
E

S
A
W
Y
E
R

V
O
T
E

S
A
W
Y
E
R

Law Professor Analyzes Weaknesses Of FEP Laws

Washington, D.C.--"Legal Restraints on Racial Discrimination in Employment", a book by Professor Michael I. Sovern of Columbia Law School, is reviewed in the Labor Department's Monthly Labor Review (August 1966), by John E. Drotning, Associate Professor of Industrial Relations, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Professor Drotning states: THE TITLE of Professor Sovern's book will probably lead most readers to expect a good deal of legalistic jargon, but this is not the case. Mr. Sovern's book is clearly written and extremely readable.

The problem is well-stated. Negroes are handicapped in employment and occupational status because of (1) employer and union-discrimination and (2) inadequate formal and informal (apprenticeship) education. Moreover, discrimination in housing in urban areas compounds the problem.

After defining the problem, the author goes on to analyze the situation and suggest substantive and procedural improvements in civil rights legislation. His discussion includes State legislation, recent Federal civil rights legislation, and the role of the executive branch of government and its administrative agencies. The examination of State fair employment practices legislation emphasizes New York State's Ives-Quinn law. Case material aptly illustrates its adequate content but inadequate procedures--what the law says means little if there is no way to enforce it.

A NEGRO FINDS it extremely difficult to convince a State fair employment commission of discrimination, and generally accepts a lower paying job rather than bring charges. Mr. Sovern suggests that administrative agencies in the civil rights field might "search out" discriminating employers on their own initiative. But this raises some questions: How would this help the Negroes? How would a job applicant learn about these employers? And if he knew, would he apply for a job with such an employer? Another suggestion is to upgrade the quality of commission personnel and to provide the staffs with larger budgets.

Mr. Sovern then turns to Congress and the Civil Rights Acts of 1964. The limitations of title VII are highlighted. For example, since the Civil Rights Act does not render State laws inoperative, Federal and State agencies may operate at cross purposes. The Federal Commission can take a case even though a State has disposed of it; and if the State agency cannot dispose of it within 60 days, the Federal Commission can move in. Moreover, the Attorney General's nexus with a State is independent of the Federal Commission's arrangements.

THE EXECUTIVE branch of government is also involved in civil rights activity and Mr. Sovern traces the implementation of executive orders from the New Deal era to the present. He argues that Franklin Roosevelt's wartime executive order was inadequately enforced and made it necessary for "concerned" States to take over in situations involving racial discrimination.

The important role played by the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act in preventing discrimination by both unions and employers is discussed in chapter 6. Some of this discussion is difficult to follow, particularly the section on the role of the NLRB vis-a-vis the courts.

FINALLY, THE "effectiveness" of redress available to a jobseeker who has been discriminated against under (1) New York State law, (2) title VII of the Civil Rights Act, (3) the Secretary of Labor, and (4) the NLRA is discussed, using the New York State case of Lefkowitz versus Farrell as an example. Professor Sovern also comments on the overall weaknesses of statutory and administrative restraints on racial discrimination in employment.

The appendices are very complete, and include title VII, the current executive order, and regulations on nondiscrimination in apprenticeship. A minor irritant is that footnotes are not at the bottom of the pages, but in a separate booklet.

This is an important study for all concerned people, and it should serve as an example to be followed by other lawyers interested in finding audiences outside their profession.