

Moderates favor improved status for Negro

(Third of a series.)

The man who drove the editor from the Jackson airport to a motel was young, a fellow pilot, and "just happened to be going that way." He was interested in the editor's project, an attempt to view the status of the Negro and integration in his state. He was willing, as most persons in the state were, to answer questions. (The feeling of hospitality is so ingrained in most Mississippians that even those who disagreed violently with you go to considerable lengths to make your stay pleasant, to make you feel welcome.)

"Where," the editor asked, "do you find the moderates on the racial question?"

"You don't," the driver answered. "Many of them moved out of the state. Others keep their mouths shut. They're afraid of the pressure, economic and social."

He was wrong. The number of Mississippi residents who think the time is past due for an improvement of the status of the Negro in their state is large. These people don't stand on street corners and make speeches. They are quiet at meetings of luncheon clubs. They are careful what they say, and where they say it. But they exist, and exist in numbers which might be surprising to the leadership of racist organizations such as the Citizens Councils, or to many Mississippi politicians.

Who are these moderates? Where do you find them? What is their leadership? (Remember, there is danger in using labels. What would be a moderate on the racial question in the South might be considered fairly conservative in another state. And a political conservative down in Mississippi could be called a member of the radical right in Oregon.)

The moderates have three things in common. They are young, they are well-educated, and their incomes are above average. This doesn't mean you can immediately assume each 25-year-old college graduate with an income of \$8,000 or over is ready to grant the Negro everything he is asking. Or that everyone over 40 is an untarnished race supremacist. To do so would be a terrible mistake.

The middle-roads are found in every walk of life. They are ministers, and lawyers. They are doctors, and motel managers. They are newspapermen, and teachers. They are salesmen, and small businessmen, and housewives. Don't assume they constitute a majority; they don't. They are not outspoken — events of the past five years increased

the value of personal silence to almost all of them.

They have one thing in common with the racists. Almost every white citizen of Mississippi seems hurt, angered, and disturbed at the image of his state in the eyes of the rest of the nation and the world. Moderates claim, with some justification, that reporting of Mississippi's race troubles has been done unfairly by some newspapers, by some radio and teevee men. They say, with some justification, that too many of the people who write about their state know little of the situation there.

But, unlike the racists, they see some justification on the other side. The moderate is a man who views segregation as a moral issue, not as a part of "our Southern way of life." He believes it morally wrong for one group of persons to subject another group to sub-standard treatment because of a difference in skin color. He doesn't want to see complete social integration (nor do the vast majority of his Northern friends) but he does feel the Negro is entitled to a fairer shake than he has received in the past.

Many Mississippians, in a quiet, unspectacular way, are doing something about the situation. A number of employers, some small, some large, have integrated plants, have made sure Negroes in their areas have equal opportunities to the jobs under their control. This has not been done suddenly, since Oxford, but generally over a period of several years.

One thing disturbs many of the long-term moderates in the white group. It is equally disturbing to the older Negroes, who had worked quietly, with some results, to better the position of their race in the state. This is the disappearance of the rapport which once existed between the two groups. Each has been pushed, against its will, toward the extremes represented by the more outspoken members of each race. Now, members of each group report, it is almost impossible for whites and Negroes to sit down and arrive at any reasonable solution to a particular local problem of the Negroes.

Moderates blame political leaders for the disappearance of a rather substantial amount of goodwill which once existed, on both sides. They blame President Kennedy and the national administration for the push he has put on civil rights matters. Like everyone else, they object to being "told" what to do. They blame, with equal fervor, their own Gov. Barnett. They insist, and rightly so, that Barnett's

attitude toward even token integration at the University of Mississippi or other schools made the situation much worse than it was five years ago.

But even those Mississippi residents who are disappointed in Mr. Kennedy admit unless unceasing pressure is kept on their state by the national government, civil rights progress will stop in Mississippi, stop for a period of several years. They object to the amount of force used by the federal government. But they agree that some pressure is necessary.

They object, with considerable justification, to the picture painted of their state through some well-publicized incidents involving persons interested in improving the lot of the Negro. They particularly feel the news media around the country overplayed various shipments of food and clothing to certain areas of Mississippi. Much need for food and clothing simply did not exist, they say, and there is evidence they are right.

The leadership of the moderate group is rather quiet. This is not surprising. Moderates in any field are likely to be quiet. It is very unpopular, on this particular issue in this particular state, to be an outspoken moderate. And leadership is not very effective if it gets too far in front of its followers.

Mississippi churches provide some leadership. Catholic churches in the state have been de-segregated, without a great deal of fuss. An Episcopal layman, prominent in his church, said he was sure any Negro who came to the door would be seated at any service he wished to attend. One minister, of another church, said his congregation would object violently if such an event occurred at the doors of their church. He said all he could do at present would be to ask his congregation if turning any person away from the door was a Christian act. Christian or not, Negroes would be turned away from the door in many white churches. Three college girls, two Negroes and one white, were arrested, sentenced to a year in jail and fined \$1,000 each a few weeks ago when they tried to attend services at a still all-white Jackson church.

The Mississippi moderate is disturbed by the press-agency of the NAACP, CORE, and other organizations active in the Negro campaign. It has undoubtedly assisted in giving his state a bad name. The NAACP, in particular, has shown a real ability to pick targets carefully, and get the maximum publicity value out of many small incidents.

Mississippi, many of these people feel, made

considerable progress toward solving its own problems, until Governor Barnett took office. Barnett and his friends, one man said, appeal to "the illiterate, the semi-literate, and the bigot. I've heard the statement that it is better to light one candle than curse the darkness. But it's awfully hard to find a candle in Mississippi these days." Barnett, he feels, is almost certain to be followed by another man just as bad, or worse. Mississippi, this man says, has been pushed too far to turn back now. There is going to be considerable violence before the racial situation is improved. Such improvement as comes will be accompanied by bitterness which will last for many years. But, he says, it must come sooner or later, if any progress is to be made.

Mississippi moderates frequently are quite bitter about some news media in their own state. The Jackson newspapers, in particular, are criticized. Some readers feel these newspapers have slanted views, distorted in editorials, and helped to whip up the worst kind of sentiment. There can be, at the same time, relatively little criticism of some of the better-edited small newspapers in the state. They have attempted to handle a very sensitive local situation, one which has seriously split their communities, with honest reporting and sound news judgment. They have attempted to provide quiet leadership toward calmer waters.

Moderates accuse the federal government of playing politics with the race issue, of playing for Negro votes in the North. But they are just as unhappy with the government of their own state. As one woman put it:

"There is nothing like a hate campaign or a good race issue to incite people and make them forget everything else. From our governor on down this has been used. Our University has become a political football between the federal and state governments. Our people were passionately inflamed, and lied to. It is hard to believe our leaders really thought the state of Mississippi could prevail against the Union. But they told us it could."

"Leaving the moral and Christian angles out of the argument for the present, it would seem only fair that the small section of the country whose customs it will disrupt should yield with some degree of graciousness to the will of the country as a whole. And it would seem the path of honor and dignity to fight our battles by way of the courts, rather than with Molotov cocktails and bricks."

'We're agreed, then, that the Senator is the front runner'



Time to tell the story

The UPI reporter covering sessions of the National Reclamation Association annual convention at Sun Valley, Idaho, a few days ago "dispatched a story which got precious little play in the newspapers. It deserved more."

The story was on a caucus of the California state delegation to the convention. It reported remarks of Harry Horton, of El Centro, a delegate to the convention.

Horton said he could not reveal his source but told his state caucus that "I think it's safe to assume more than one study has been made of bringing water from the Northwest to the Southwest."

He said he understood that the Pacific Southwest water plan of Interior Secretary Stewart Udall had originally included a Northwest-Southwest water transfer but that it had been removed for "political reasons."

Oregon, Washington and other Northwest states, Horton said, are a little skittish about taking water from the Northwest to the Southwest and "I don't blame them."

Several such studies have been made in the past. One can assume, however, from Horton's remarks that the studies he referred to were of greater magnitude than earlier reports on the subject.

Secretary Udall might be considered to have a conflict of interest in the matter, in view of the long fight between Arizona and California over waters of the Colorado River. Arizona has won the fight, which means California must find a source of water to replace what she thought she had coming from the Colorado.

Udall should make the new studies public, now, instead of letting favored persons leak portions of them to convention sessions.

Capital Report

Food and Drug administrators think something fishy about food project

By A. Robert Smith
Bulletin Correspondent

WASHINGTON — The Kennedy Administration is looking for a way to resolve a bureaucratic conflict between New Frontiersmen who want to produce cheap fish protein concentrate for mass consumption and the old line Food and Drug Administration which thinks there is something very fishy about the whole project.

A preliminary attempt to talk out their differences resulted in theatrics by the chief rivals in the dispute. Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, who has convinced Congress to put up nearly \$1 million for the project, and FDA Commissioner George P. Larrick, who is adamantly opposed.

Udall played host at a luncheon attended by Larrick and other high ranking government officials as well as President Kennedy's sister, Mrs. Eunice Shriver, wife of the director of the Peace Corps.

Dr. E. R. Pariser, a Cambridge-educated bio-chemist who heads the fish protein concentrate research team, was explaining to the luncheon guests the search for a low cost source of protein for consumption at home and abroad. As Pariser's vision of a great humanitarian achievement was developed, Commissioner Larrick whipped out a full color picture of the guts of a fish and cried: "Is this what you are asking the American people to eat?"

Udall quickly countered by holding aloft a small sack of odorless powder and asking his guests, "Or is it this?"

This exchange illustrates the conflict. When Larrick thinks of a product made from whole fish, he regards it as "filthy" because the fish has not been cleaned in the customary way by removing head, tail and entrails. But Dr. Pariser sees a product which is pure because the fish has been cleaned chemically without removing any of its parts.

The question comes down to this: when is a cleaned fish clean?

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Kennedy's science advisor, pointed it up during that luncheon conference by asking Larrick whether he would have any objections to a concentrate made from fish cleaned by machinery. Larrick said such a product would be approved by FDA. Wiesner wanted to know why, then, FDA would object to a concentrate made from fish that was cleaned chemically. Larrick maintains that the U.S. food and drug act requires

FDA to disapprove such a product for American consumption.

This issue was raised in a case before his agency in 1961-62 when an Illinois firm proposed manufacturing "whole fish flour," made from whole fish. When FDA invited public comment before ruling on the product, it received over 2000 communications, sharply divided pro and con.

Flour milling interests objected to the term fish flour, hence its change to fish protein. The National Milk Producers Federation said "adequate amounts of nonfat dry milk are available and there is no current or foreseeable need to resort to fish offal as a source of protein."

The thought that fish flour might become an ingredient in bread drew fire from the wheat industry. The Oregon Wheat Commission said it would be "a disheartening setback to an outstanding sanitation and purity program." Western Wheat Associates, Inc., Portland, Ore., said: "The wheat producer, warehouseman, flour miller and baker have been concerned during recent years with elimination of insect and rodent infestation in grain and flour to be processed into bread. Approving... whole fish flour would make a mockery of this whole program."

In counting 736 adverse comments and 1036 favorable to the product, Larrick noted that 21 state officials said whole fish concentrate would conflict with state laws regarding inclusion of fish. Larrick concluded that "consumers in the U.S. generally would regard the product described in the proposal as filthy" and that it violates the food and drug act which bars sale of adulterated food products containing "any filthy, putrid or decomposed substance."

FDA ruled that fish flour would be approved only if made from an "edible species of fish" which has been "properly prepared to remove and discard the heads, fins, tails, viscera, and intestinal contents."

Donald L. McKernan, director of Interior's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries which is conducting the government's fish protein concentrate research, said such a standard is self-defeating for the project because "fish flour processed only from fish filets is prohibitively costly." The object of the project is to produce a concentrate which would supply an individual's protein requirements for as little as half cent per day, to put it within reach of impoverished peoples who need it most.

Interior officials and scientists think FDA's attitude is based on aesthetics and the non-scientific objections of some consumers. The National Fisheries Institute, speaking for the fishing industry which strongly favors whole fish, noted wryly that "millions of pounds of sardines are consumed annually in this country with their viscera and tails intact."

Conceding this point, FDA Assistant Commissioner J. Kenneth Kirk adds that Americans also eat "chocolate covered ants and French fried caterpillars — but they know what they are eating." FDA argues that consumers using fish concentrate might not realize it contained the whole fish, especially if mixed in bread or other products.

"It boils down to this," said Kirk. "What do people in this country decide is filthy?"

Having fought hard for sanitary food standards against processors who cut corners to increase profits, FDA officials evaluate fish protein concentrate in this context rather than in the context of the cold war. Kirk likens the issue to the case of the ketchup maker who used rotten tomatoes but added enough spice and vinegar to make it palatable. Until FDA required the use of fresh tomatoes.

FDA recognizes that there would be economic gains for the commercial fishing industry in this proposed product. FDA suspects manufacturers of fish meal for livestock are promoting the fish protein concentrate

campaign because if refined for human consumption it would bring higher profits.

Whole fish concentrate "is the key to Pandora's box," declared Kirk.

Kirk feels that FDA must hold the line against whole fish flour or FDA will have difficulty resisting other possible schemes, such as processing garbage or manure into nutritious food supplements.

Because FDA's jurisdiction is limited to food consumed domestically it has no legal objection to manufacturing a concentrate for export. But other officials raise a political objection which takes the issue beyond the parochial hygiene debate to the level of international rivalry for spheres of influence in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In Rome last summer officials of the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization reported hearing propaganda that the U.S. was promoting a fish product that Americans were prohibited from eating, obviously poisonous. Administration officials visualize more anti-American propaganda charging the Yankees with selling "filth" for profit, unless FDA reverses its attitude or is overruled by higher authority, say the federal courts or Congress.

To get an authoritative, independent opinion, Interior Secretary Udall asked the National Academy of Sciences whether a wholesome, safe, nutritious product can be made from the entire fish. The Academy selected a committee composed of distinguished medical doctors, nutritionists and marine biologists.

This committee concluded that "a wholesome, safe and nutritious product can be made from whole fish" and that "all portions of the fish can contribute to the nutritional value."

It recommended further research on what species of fish would be acceptable, and it suggested that FDA might develop standards to insure these desirable results rather than to oppose the entire product.

The paradox of the Kennedy administration's dilemma is that fish protein concentrate can already be produced at a price that would make it marketable in the United States, but FDA objects; but the price is still too high for marketing it widely in countries where it is most needed, but where FDA's attitude involves political risks even if the scientists can lick the cost problem. Hence a legal - political breakthrough for U.S. consumption and an economic breakthrough for mass foreign consumption are needed before fish protein concentrate can fulfill the high destiny hopefully marked for it by its staunch advocates.

SUB FOR TWO

DALLAS (UPI) — Nelmarc Marcus specialty store today offered the "ultimate in togetherness" in its Christmas catalog — a "his-and-her" submarine. The two-place cruises at seven miles an hour and sells for \$18,700.

Africa

ACROSS	DOWN
1 African river	1 To not wish (Latin)
2 Tropical	2 Angered
3 Antelope	3 Greater
4 Egyptian deity	4 Penetrated
5 Moslem Bible	5 Risp
6 Masculine	6 Innovations
7 Including	7 Restless
8 Particular average (ab)	8 Enticing woman
9 Awake	9 Lyric poem
10 Hall	10 Trench (comb. form)
11 Fabulous bird	11 Kalends (ab)
12 Hunting residence	12 Flank
13 Voted	13 Vestment
14 Comparative suffix	14 Animal collection
15 Belgian commune	15 Away from
16 Atlantic islands	16 Spanish maids
17 Rope (naut)	
18 Feminine nickname	
19 Half (predic)	
20 African fruit	
21 Horribly larva	
22 Require	
23 Scold	
24 Past	
25 Confine	
26 African desert	
27 Royal Navy ship	
28 Giraffe-like animal	
29 Larder	
30 Presidential nickname	
31 Ordinal suffix	
32 Vacuum tube	
33 Endurance	
34 Scottish	
35 Heron	
36 Before	
37 Socialist Soviet Republic (ab)	
38 South African	

Answer to Previous Puzzle

KITE	SET	DOLL
ENOS	TRI	OTICE
TOLEDO	LE	ENTIDE
NUN	BAT	
REVENGE	REBEL	
FIG	SEVE	ODA
ATTAR	NATIONS	
TOP	SEN	
BARTER	INTERS	
ANNE	AGG	EVIL
MOAT	INS	LE
MOAT	INS	LE

42 Dye	43 Temperate
44 One-seeded fruit	
45 Jacob's son	
46 Letting	
47 German river	
48 Rot flax	
49 Monkey	