

CHAPTER I

THE STATUS OF RACIAL INTEGRATION IN THE ARMED SERVICES

CLARENCE MITCHELL

*Director of the Washington Bureau of the National Association  
for the Advancement of Colored People*

Integration in the Armed Services will probably be marked officially as "mission accomplished" when this writing appears in print. Dr. John A. Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense, said in a statement released on October 12, 1953, that within eight months from that date there would be no more segregated Army units. Thus, by June 1954, the nation will have for the first time a fighting force that gives to citizens in life the same equality they have so often found in death.

The impact of integration on civilian life is beautifully demonstrated by this excerpt from a speech of Dr. John Fischer, Superintendent of Public Schools in Baltimore, Maryland, delivered on June 14, 1954, at a special meeting of teacher and school officials on desegregation of the schools in his city. He read as his conclusion a letter from a white school principal which contained this paragraph:

"My step-son found the colored boys who fought in Korea beside him to be first-class fighting men, who neither asked for nor received special favors. He learned that the colored skin received enemy bullets with the same bravery that the white skin received them."

The Air Force with approximately 7 per cent colored personnel has been integrated since 1950. The same is true of the Navy and the Marine Corps which have 7 and 4 per cent colored personnel respectively. The Army, with nearly 13 per cent colored per-

sonnel has been the last hold-out. The other branches of the Service continue to present certain special problems, but their official policy is one of complete acceptance of full integration.

The halting of segregation in the Armed Services is one of the finest examples of an entrenched evil yielding to the pressure of public opinion. The chief channels of this opinion were and are the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Negro Press. From time to time other forces have been operating, but these two institutions have never relented in their protests against incidents and policies of segregation in the Armed Services. If either of these groups had been willing to settle for continued segregation in the Armed Services, the fight would have been lost. Walter White, Executive Secretary of the NAACP, has recorded the memorable meeting with President Franklin Roosevelt in September 1940 when, with A. Philip Randolph and the late T. Arnold Hill, he called for total abolition of racial segregation in the Armed Services.<sup>1</sup> In 1951, Thurgood Marshall, Special Counsel for the NAACP, went to the fighting front in Korea as part of the organization's struggle for full integration and justice in fighting forces. This writing is an attempt to list a few of the highlights that helped to achieve integration. It also will suggest a few items

<sup>1</sup>*A Man Called White*, p. 186.

that give warning on the necessity for continued vigilance.

The turning point on integration came with the issuance of Executive Order No. 9981 on July 26, 1948. This was the first major evidence that the President, himself, really intended to place his office on the side of fair play. The President's Order said that, "There shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the Armed Services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. This policy shall be put into effect as rapidly as possible." This Order, like Executive Order 9980, which was issued on the same day and dealt with discrimination in Government employment, was the result of the long campaign to drive Jim-Crow from American life.

#### *The Russell Challenge*

The action of the Chief Executive was challenged in Congress by Senator Richard B. Russell, Democrat of Georgia, in 1950. An able general of the anti-civil rights forces, Senator Russell had once before succeeded in wrecking an executive program in the field of civil rights. He struck a death blow to the Wartime FEPC by inserting some innocent sounding language in an Appropriation Act.<sup>2</sup>

The Russell action, which was the first major test of what Congress would do if it had a chance to vote on the question of integration in the Armed Services, took the form of an amendment providing that persons serving in the Armed Forces would be given the right to state whether they wished to serve with members of their own race.

Two future aspirants to national office were entangled by Congressional interest in segregation. One was Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat of Tennessee, who voted for the Russell Amendment when it came to the Senate floor. The other was a wartime hero—General Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The question of integration was raised by Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Republican of Massachusetts, when General Eisenhower was testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1948. Senator Russell is the chairman of this committee when the Democrats are in control of Congress and the ranking member when the Republicans are in control. At that time, the Republicans were in control, but Senator Russell was present and it may be that the Eisenhower remarks were tempered to avoid offending the Georgian.

General Eisenhower's contribution to the discussion was as follows:

There has been a sort of compromise made with this problem right down through the years with the Army. . . . In the war, when we became so desperate for Infantry replacements in the Fall of 1944, we did not make the best use of our Negro manpower. We had some 600,000 in Europe. We told the Negroes we would take volunteers for service lines; in the front lines; 2,400 of them volunteered.

In general, the Negro is less well-educated than his brother citizen that is white, and if you make a complete amalgamation what you are going to have is in every company the Negro is going to be relegated to the minor jobs he is never going to get promoted to such grades as technical sergeant, master sergeant, and so on because the competition is too tough.

<sup>2</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP files.

I personally have always stood for organizing the Negro down to include units no larger than platoons.<sup>3</sup>

The NAACP made an all-out effort to defeat the Russell Amendment. It was rejected on June 21, 1950, by a vote of 42 to 29.

An interesting footnote on the Russell Amendment came in 1952. At a hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee, a representative of the NAACP questioned whether integration in the Armed Services would be continued if Senator Kefauver, then a candidate for the Democratic Party's nomination for President, became the nation's Chief Executive.

Senator Kefauver was not present at the time, but it is a measure of the public support gained by integration that he felt it necessary to send the following statement:

"The question of nonsegregation in the Armed Services has been debated and decided by the Congress. One of the chief aims and desires of my entire life has been better race relations. The law apparently has worked well and I do not propose to change it.<sup>4</sup>

#### *Second try for Jim Crow*

A second attempt to get legislative support for segregation came in 1951. At that time, Congress was considering the Universal Military Training Program. A warning on what was to happen was given when a witness for the NAACP appeared before the House Armed Services

Committee. Representative William H. Bates, Republican of Massachusetts, cited his experience in the Merchant Marine as proof that Negroes desired segregation. When the NAACP Representative said that segregation should not be permitted, Mr. Bates asked, "Is it your point that we should force them to live with whites . . . even though they do not want to?"<sup>5</sup>

Representative Arthur Winstead, Democrat of Mississippi, introduced the now infamous Winstead Amendment which was really the Russell Amendment. This time, however, twelve northern Republicans supported the pro-segregation move. Apparently, they thought that they could get away with their action because the committee took the vote in executive session. To their great dismay, however, Robert Allen, columnist for the *New York Post*, published their names on March 22, 1951. Three southern Democrats actually voted against the segregation amendment.

Tactically, this action of the House Committee was a blunder on the part of those who favored segregation. A wave of indignation struck the country. Telegrams, letters, and delegations began registering the opinion of the people.

Two stirring speeches against the amendment were made by Congressmen William L. Dawson, Democrat of Illinois, and Adam Clayton Powell, Democrat of New York. Forty-four delegates from eleven key states came to Washington, at the call of the NAACP, to talk with their Congress-

<sup>3</sup>Senate Hearings on Universal Military Training March 17 to April 3, 1948, Pages 995-996.

<sup>4</sup>Senate Hearings on National Security Training Corps Act, February 1952, Page 511.

<sup>5</sup>House Hearings on Universal Military Training, January 23 to March 8, 1951, Page 853.

men. Some of the Northern men who had planned to keep the amendment as a part of the bill had expected to get away with their action while the House was in the Committee of the Whole. At that time, they knew that there would be no record vote. When the vote came, however, many of them had to oppose segregation because some of their important constituents were sitting in the gallery watching them.

The Winstead Amendment came to a vote on April 12, 1951. Representative Melvin Price, Democrat of Illinois, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, offered an amendment to eliminate the Winstead proposal. Among the Democrats who took the floor to speak against segregation were Congressmen Chet Holifield of California, Sidney Yates of Illinois, Charles Howell of New Jersey, and Ray Madden of Indiana. Republicans who denounced segregation were Congressmen Jacob Javits of New York, George Bender of Ohio, James Fulton of Pennsylvania, and Millet Hand of New Jersey.

The pro-segregation bloc's most vocal leaders were Congressmen Edward deGraffenried of Alabama, W. M. Wheeler of Georgia, and Jamie Whitten of Mississippi, all Democrats.

During the debate, Congressman deGraffenried tried to give the impression that the Department of the Army favored the Winstead Amendment by giving the following quote from testimony of former Secretary of the Army, Gordon Gray, during Hearings before the House Armed Services Committee:

Mr. Winstead. Mr. Secretary, would you have any objections to providing in this bill that each individual when he registers shall have the right to express himself on three

questions: Do you prefer to serve in a segregated unit, or do you prefer not to serve in an integrated unit, or do you have any choice? It would give us a chance to let the individuals speak instead of the politicians and the Secretary of Defense.

Secretary Gray. Mr. Winstead, I wouldn't have an objection to an individual expressing himself. If that is what you mean, as you stated it, I would have no objection to their expressing themselves. I don't know that we could agree that that would be binding.<sup>6</sup>

To this Congressman Powell replied, "I defy any member of the Armed Services Committee to tell me a single person of importance in the Pentagon, on the joint staff, who has told them that they are in favor of the Winstead Amendment."<sup>7</sup>

The forces of segregation were defeated by a vote of 178 to 126.

The political significance of segregation in the Armed Services is pointed up by this sidelight on the Winstead Amendment. Former Representative Lansdale Sasser, Democrat of Maryland, was listed by Columnist Allen as voting for segregation in committee. The Congressman quickly sent a letter to the Maryland State Conference of NAACP Branches assuring them that he had voted to table the Winstead Amendment. Senator J. Glenn Beall, Republican of Maryland, who was then a member of the House, assured the NAACP that he thought the Winstead suggestion was "contrary to American principle" and that he would vote against it on the floor.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup>*Congressional Record*, April 12, 1951, Page 3866.

<sup>7</sup>*Congressional Record*, April 12, 1951, Page 3868.

<sup>8</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP files.

*The Senators Intervene*

Meanwhile, pro-civil rights Senators, led by Herbert H. Lehman of New York and Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, were showing increasing concern about the Defense Department's continued opposition to NAACP amendments to military legislation which would end segregation. In one conference with Army officials, Senator Humphrey bluntly told his listeners that it was a political hazard to omit the NAACP type amendment from legislation.

On March 5, 1951, six U. S. Senators met with Department of Defense officials to press for speeding up the program of integration in the Armed Services.<sup>9</sup> At that time, after conferences with Army officials, the Association reported on segregation in the Army as follows:

The Army has shown a few colored troops the promised land of integration in basic training units and some specialties. However, the vast majority of ground troops are still in the bondage of segregation.

"There is integration during basic training at Forts Dix, New Jersey; Riley, Kansas; Knox, Kentucky; Jackson, South Carolina; Ord, California; Roberts, California; Wood, Missouri; Camps Chaffee, Arkansas; and Breckenridge, Kentucky. However, our discussion at the meeting revealed that most of the colored people entering the Army are sent to existing colored units as replacements. Even those who are integrated during the period of basic training are sent to segregated units when they have completed their training.<sup>10</sup>

The meeting of Senators with the Department of Defense officials was arranged by Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, who was then Assistant Secretary of Defense. The Department pledged in this meeting that integration would begin in the Far East first, that it would be followed by integration in Europe, and, finally, there would be integration in the United States.

Later, Mrs. Rosenberg said in a letter to Senator Herbert H. Lehman, who attended the meeting, "I feel very strongly that whatever advances have been made in the elimination of discrimination and segregation in the Army, recently, should be credited not only to the officials of the Department of Defense, but also to you and the Senators who are associated with you."<sup>11</sup>

Mrs. Rosenberg submitted the following progress report to Senator Humphrey, who was also at the March meeting, on October 6, 1952:

*Department of the Army*

In March 1951, representatives of the Department of the Army presented to you and interested colleagues, in conference, information on the general subject of the utilization of Negro manpower in the Army.

At that time, individual integration had been accomplished in all military schooling and in most training divisions. A few Negro units had been made organic parts of larger white units. It was emphasized that the process of Army integration must be gradual and not geared to a specific timetable.

Since March 1951, integration has been accomplished in all training divisions and in replacement training centers throughout the United

<sup>9</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP Report, December 28, 1951.

<sup>10</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP Report, December 28, 1951.

<sup>11</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP files.

States. In May 1952, the Far East Command completed the process of integration, including the discontinuance of racial designations previously applicable to certain units. These are two highly significant advances.

In the Alaskan, Austrian and European Commands, programs of gradual integration have been initiated and are being progressively implemented. The procedures followed in this regard are comparable to those used successfully in the Far East Command. In the Continental United States, integration is nearing completion in the three Regular Army divisions and many non-division units, regardless of geographical location.

At the present time, the number of all-Negro units in the Army is approximately one-third less than that of May 1951, and the decline is continuing. Racial designation has been progressively removed from 134 units throughout the Army.

#### *Department of the Navy*

The Navy has submitted the following report:

The Secretary of the Navy issued the following policy statement to all ships and stations in June 1949:

1. Reference (a) (AlNav 423-45) is cancelled and superseded by this letter.
2. It is the policy of the Navy Department that there shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the Navy and Marine Corps without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.
3. In their attitude and day-to-day conduct of affairs, officers and enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps shall adhere rigidly and impartially to the Navy Regulations, in which no distinction is made between individuals wearing the uniform of these Services.
4. All personnel will be enlisted

or appointed, trained, advanced or promoted, assigned duty and administered in all respects without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.

5. In the utilization of housing, messing, berthing and other facilities no special or unusual provisions will be made for the accommodation of any minority race.

At the present time there is no segregation in the Navy or Marine Corps and the equality of treatment of all races and creeds has been amply demonstrated in fact in both the Navy and Marine Corps, especially during the present Korean action.

#### *Department of the Air Force*

On 11 May 1949, the Secretary of Defense approved the Department of the Air Force policy which provides for equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the Air Force without regard to race, color, religion or national origin. Concurrently with the former Secretary's approval of this policy, an Air Force directive was published and given the widest possible distribution throughout the Air Force.

Immediately following the publication of this directive, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, discussed this new non-segregation policy with all the major Air Force commanders, when they were assembled at Air Force Headquarters for a general briefing on policy and tactical matters.

The following statistical information indicates the extent and progress made in the distribution of Negro personnel throughout the Air Force:

1. In January 1949, there were 167 predominantly white Air Force units containing personnel, whereas by December 1951, this figure had increased to 3,145 Air Force units.

2. On June 1952, there was only one Air Force unit which was predominantly manned with Negro personnel. This unit's strength was 98 officers and airmen, of whom 92 were Negro personnel. At the same time, the total number of Air Force units comprising some Negro personnel had increased to 3,466.
3. Air Force personnel, including Negroes, are assigned as required throughout the world solely on the basis of their job classification. One exception to this procedure is Iceland, the Department of State having requested that Negro personnel not be assigned to units stationed in Iceland.

Because of the policy of equality of treatment and opportunity for all Air Force personnel, it has not been deemed necessary to maintain statistics concerning the skill and assignment of any particular group.

Reports from field commanders indicate that, while there have been scattered racial incidents of small importance, there has been a general acceptance of the non-segregation policy by all personnel of the Air Force.

#### *The President's Stand*

The Presidential election year saw General Eisenhower as Supreme Allied Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Europe.

The *Pathfinder Magazine* of May 7, 1952, carried a statement saying, "General Eisenhower has ordered integration of white and Negro troops in the European command. The order went into effect last month, means that as much as one-third of some units will be colored. It also means Eisenhower will have a good talking-point in winning Negro support for his candidacy."

The Department of Defense was quoted in press dispatches as denying that Eisenhower had taken the action. An Army spokesman was quoted as saying:

Full integration had been ordered to start in Europe April 1 by the Department of the Army. It followed similar action ordered in the United States in January 1950 and later for U. S. Army units serving in the Far East. The order was not 'secret' and simply directed that Negro GI's be integrated with white troops; that they be assigned entirely on a basis of individual capabilities and qualifications and that 'Negro units' as such be abolished. The order was not issued by General Dwight D. Eisenhower, as claimed in some reports, but was actually a letter in March from the Department of Army requesting the European Command to implement an earlier Army-wide order.<sup>12</sup>

Fortunately, the General, though not responsible for this act, apparently had decided that segregation must be abolished. The first real test he faced on this after he took office as President came on March 19, 1953, when Mrs. Alice Dunnigan, White House correspondent for the Associated Negro Press, noted the long effort of the NAACP to get segregation abolished in schools on military posts, and asked the Chief Executive what he proposed to do about it?

The question was the climax of months of work by the NAACP, Senator Hubert Humphrey, Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, and, especially, parents who objected to sending their children to segregated schools.

President Truman had vetoed a bill because it contained language that was

<sup>12</sup>United Press, May 22, 1952.

designed to jeopardize integration in schools on military posts. In his veto message the President said, "The Congress has included one provision in this bill which I cannot approve. This provision would require a group of schools on Federal property which are now operating successfully on an integrated basis to be segregated . . . This proposal, if enacted into law, would constitute a backward step in the efforts of the Federal Government to extend equal rights and opportunities to all our people."

A young white mother from Minnesota had openly protested against the segregation in a school on a Texas post where her husband was stationed.<sup>13</sup>

President Eisenhower made his now famous statement that there was no legal or moral justification for such discrimination and promised to investigate. He said, "I will repeat it again and again whenever Federal funds are expended I do not see how any American can justify legally, logically, or morally discrimination in the expenditure of these funds. If there are any benefits to be derived from them all should share, regardless of such inconsequential factors as race or religion."

At that time, there was only one major post on which Federally operated schools were still segregated. This was at Fort Benning, Georgia. It is significant that the integration in these schools was accomplished peacefully and successfully despite opposition from Governor Talmadge. However, there are twenty-one posts which operate segregated schools that are run by

local authorities, although the cost is paid by Uncle Sam.<sup>14</sup>

A target date of ending segregation in all schools has been set as "not later than September 1955." Although this date was set by the Department of Defense, NAACP investigation has shown that when the President announced segregation would be ended, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, requested that integration be delayed. Hence, the conclusion is inescapable that integration in all schools on military posts would be an accomplished fact if Mrs. Hobby had not intervened. However, there is no reason to believe that the Department of Defense will alter its plans and postpone integration to a date later than September 1955.

A significant move, affecting colored Stewards in the Navy Department, was made when it ended the practice of directing colored personnel into this branch of the Service in such large numbers that it became almost completely segregated. The Marine Corps, which followed similar practice, advised the NAACP on April 1, 1954, that it is now studying its entire Stewards Branch and, pending the outcome of the study, "no one is being enlisted in the Stewards field."<sup>15</sup>

#### *Some Danger Signals*

There are some danger signals for the future. For example, out of the highly integrated Air Force, there comes the statement in the *Washington Evening Star*, dated April 1, 1954, that:

<sup>13</sup>*Breakthrough on the Color Front* by Lee Nichols, page 194.

<sup>14</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP Report.  
<sup>15</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP files.



"The colored race evidently has a marked susceptibility to red blood cell changes into the sickle shape at high altitudes.

When the NAACP protested H. Lee White, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, replied that:

"I have looked into the matter presented in your letter of 2 April 1954 and have enclosed for your information a copy of the paper which Lt. Colonel James P. Jernigan presented 31 March 1954 at the 25th Annual Meeting of the Aero Medical Association. Colonel Jernigan did not deviate from his prepared text and read the paper as cleared for presentation prior to the meeting. No press release was prepared on this paper, and the remarks in the *Evening Star* apparently were written by one of the several reporters who attended the various presentations during the convention."<sup>10</sup>

"Colonel Jernigan did not make the statement, as such, which was attributed to him in the newspaper. I regret that this misunderstanding has occurred."

The Colonel's speech contained this paragraph which apparently gave the newspaper the basis for its story:

The nine cases treated at Warren AFB Hospital were seen during the period October 1950 and June 1953. All were negroes except Case #5 who, although denying negro ancestry, was decidedly dark complexioned. Eight were Korean returnees en route to the Eastern United States, whereas one patient had the onset of his symptoms during a flight from Lackland AFB, Texas, to Cheyenne, Wyoming.

The question remains, "Why does a highly placed Air Force officer believe

that it is significant to note the fact that a handful of airmen who were the victims of a new ailment were also colored and that one while denying that he was a Negro was dark in color?"

As yet, there is no indication that the Department of Defense has settled the problem of segregation in National Guard Units. Most of these units that were activated for the Korean War ultimately were made parts of racially integrated groups.

To illustrate what happened, a Defense Department official once told the story of how the Mississippi National Guard was introduced to integration when its members reached an Indiana camp and were examined by a colored doctor.

However, an example of the persistence of segregation comes from Maryland where the colored units, serving under Colonel Vernon Greene, were integrated in Korea, but when the men returned to the United States, Maryland military officials insisted that they resume the pattern of segregation. Colonel Greene and his officers refused to accept this insult and resigned from the Guard.

The Reserve Units of the Army must also be watched closely. Major E. H. Fleming filed a complaint with Charles Shorter, Executive Secretary of the Philadelphia NAACP, in October, 1952, stating that he had filed application with the 79th Infantry Division of the Pennsylvania Military District the previous January, but Major General Robert Wilson advised him (Fleming) that the Reserve Units, including the 79th Division, were designated racially in their activating orders, and that no official instructions had been

<sup>10</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP files.

issued subsequently to the contrary. In November 1953, the Military Aide to the President advised that the Army had taken the necessary action "to effect the assignment of Major Fleming to a unit in the 79th Division." However, final assignment was not made until March 9, 1954.<sup>17</sup>

Because of segregation in colleges and universities, the ROTC also presents a continued threat to integration.

On September 15, 1953, Assistant Secretary of Defense Hannah said,

The ROTC programs of the several military departments have been carefully reviewed and in each case the principle of 'avoidance of religion and racial discrimination' was found to be rigidly observed. This is in accordance with the policy of the Department of Defense not to impose or countenance segregation.

In the operation of the officer training programs, the Services encourage applications from all persons motivated by a desire for military and Naval service. There are no restrictions designed to eliminate or discourage any particular race. Typical of this is the Navy's assignment of Negro officers to special duties in publicizing this year's ROTC program to civic organizations, schools, social clubs, and PTA's in areas containing high percentage of Negro population.

"While it is the policy and desire of this department that all persons receive equal opportunity to participate in the ROTC programs, it must be realized that a primary requisite for selection is that the student be acceptable and enrolled in the college. The Department of Defense may not dictate the entrance requirements to the individual colleges or universities."<sup>18</sup>

### *Off Post Problems*

The final point to be emphasized deals with the personal treatment of service men and women. On posts, this treatment is usually above reproach in that all facilities are non-segregated, even in the Deep South.

In spite of this evidence of a policy of uniform treatment, there still arise bona fide complaints about segregation in facilities such as swimming pools and barber shops. The barber shop problem is found even as far North as Michigan.<sup>19</sup>

Usually, there is a disposition to correct the causes of these complaints, but, frequently, the time consumed in investigation and cover-up explanations is extensive.

Many service people are still likely to encounter trouble in some local communities when they leave the post. On November 27, 1953, approximately fifty colored soldiers were arrested in Columbia, South Carolina, because one of the men sat down beside a white woman passenger. The next day, an officer in the group was fined \$200.00; 47 of the soldiers were fined \$25.00 each; and another soldier was fined \$100.00. The Department of Defense asked the U. S. Department of Justice to investigate the matter, but nothing has been done as yet.<sup>20</sup>

In 1953, also, there was the fantastic experience of Lt. Thomas Williams, a member of the Air Force, who was arrested and fined in Florida because he refused to take a seat in a segregated section of an interstate bus. Police advised him that he "was lucky he didn't get his head beat in."

<sup>17</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP files.

<sup>18</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP files.

<sup>19</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP files.

<sup>20</sup>Washington Bureau NAACP files.

Defense officials, both high and low, try to escape their responsibility in these matters. After long investigations, they usually wind up with a pious suggestion that these are community problems that outside agencies should handle. Nevertheless, it is inescapably clear that most of those who have trouble because of local segregation practices would not have such

experiences if they were not serving in the defense of the country.

It is a cruel fact that colored members of the Armed Services have greater protection against unjust treatment off the posts when they are in Imperial Japan or Ex-Nazi Germany than they do in Alabama or Mississippi. In the midst of the general rejoicing about the progress of integration, this is a sobering thought.