By 1947 the racial tensions of the postwar period had been relaxed. Violence, in particular, had declined, partly because federal investigation and prosecution had harassed the assault forces of racism. The job situation had stabilized for minority people, who found that they generally had not reverted to their prewar positions. Many minority-group veterans were enjoying the government benefits to which they were entitled. Moreover, rapport with the White House and other federal offices was improving. In short, 1947 was stable enough to allow time for consolidation of goals and forces, for stocktaking.

The wartime breakup of Little Tokyos scattered Japanese-Americans across the land and gave them a feeling of unsettledness. But they rose to the challenge by taking maximum advantage of educational and economic opportunities. As William Caudill observed in his study of the twenty thousand Japanese-American newcomers in Chicago, by 1947 "white employers and fellow employees accepted the Nisei and were enthusiastic in their praise of them." Japanese-Americans also won acceptance in white lower-middle-class neighborhoods, largely because the Chicago middle class had "projected their own values into the neat, well-dressed, and efficient Nisei in whom they saw mirrored many of their own ideals." What happened in Chicago occurred to a greater or lesser degree in other communities. Furthermore, the Japanese-American Citizens League, captained by the indefatigable Mike Masaoka, forged ahead in relieving the artificial burdens placed on its people. In 1946 the Senate passed an evacuation claims bill, and prospects for House and Senate approval in the new Eightieth Congress were good. Also a dent was made on laws restricting land
ownership by alien Japanese when in 1947 Utah repealed its alien-land law.¹

Chinese-Americans benefited, too. The favor extended to them during World War II continued into the postwar period. Job barriers remained low, and good will was the usual standard in relations between them and white America. In fact, by 1950 their median incomes were to exceed those of poor whites and all other racial minorities except Japanese-Americans. A 1946 amendment to the Immigration Act of 1924 allowed alien wives of citizens to be admitted to the United States on a nonquota basis and gave preference in the quotas to the alien wives and children of resident aliens. The War Brides Act of 1947 permitted the entry of Oriental wives of American servicemen, a victory for both the Chinese- and Japanese-Americans.²

Indians were preparing to take advantage of the Indian Claims Act of 1946, and they were pressing for elimination of barriers to voting and to allocation of state funds for social-security benefits in Arizona and New Mexico. Indeed some hope could be gained from the fact that since 1938 five states had removed restrictions on voting by reservation Indians. Most critical was the situation of the Navajos, who were threatened with starvation with the onset of the winter of 1947. In early December President Truman reported that in addition to regularly appropriated relief funds, the government was making available to the Navajos surplus food, clothing, and equipment. Later that month Congress appropriated additional relief funds for the Navajos, and for the Hopis, who lived in their midst.³

During the 1940s another minority group, the Puerto Ricans, emerged in force. As American nationals, they had the right of free entry into the continental United States. Almost 70,000 had settled on the mainland by 1940. Between 1942 and 1945 there was a net migration of 25,000 more. The exodus, however, occurred thereafter, thanks to cheap airline passage and high hopes. By the middle 1950s about 490,000 had settled in the continental United States, and approximately 80 percent of them were in New York City. Most of the Puerto Ricans had few marketable skills and little knowledge of English. They were ripe for attack by loan sharks and landlords, and usually ran last in the race for jobs. They had not been on the mainland long enough by the time of the Truman administration to be well organized. Consequently, they had few defenders, politically and otherwise. As Earl Brown wrote in 1947 of the Puerto Ricans coming to New York, their arrival “is not unlike the migration of southern Negroes to it after World War I. The only difference is that the Puerto Ricans who come here are
worse off than the Negroes were. And that’s hard to believe.” The Puerto Ricans not only faced problems traditionally encountered by newcomers to the United States, but many of them carried the additional cross of color. Little was done to help them. Indeed it was only in the late 1940s that they slowly came to be recognized as an element in the nation’s spectrum of minority problems.

Some advances had taken place among the more than two million Mexican-Americans. The broader outlook of the some quarter-of-a-million Mexican-Americans who saw wartime military service contributed somewhat, as did increases in urbanization, unionization, and job opportunities. Yet these were only beginnings. Most Mexican-Americans were at the bottom of the labor market. Their language and the pattern of employment in gangs isolated them from contacts with the general community, and the formation of leadership was a slow process. Additional handicaps were that many of them had questionable claims to citizenship and that there was a continual and sizable infusion of fresh migrants, legal and illegal, from Mexico to meet the calls for farm labor in the Southwest. In brief, Mexican-Americans generally were second-class citizens and often in a position in the Southwest below that of Negroes.

Religious minorities were in a different situation. Catholics still smarted from minor discriminations—occasional college admissions quotas, for example. Moreover, in the postwar period, there were spectacular attacks against them as agents of the supposedly monolithic structure of the Vatican. Surprisingly, much of this came from such men as Paul Blanshard and Harold E. Fey, who were veteran battlers for civil rights. Yet, these attacks were prime examples of the fact that anti-Catholicism was often the anti-Semitism of the intellectuals. American Catholics did not constitute a monolith, but a large minority that was itself made up of many smaller minorities, some better off than others. Only a few, such as Latin-American and Negro Catholics, were greatly disadvantaged, but most of the subminorities were no worse off than most Protestant groups in America.

The situation for Jews was somewhat different. Discrimination was more widely practiced against them in education, employment, housing, resorts, and clubs. Their problem was not that of getting a stake in society, but of being as free as the majority of Americans to do what they wanted to with that stake. Theirs was not a struggle for basic political, economic, and educational rights, but for good will, freedom to develop further, and respect for their merits as individuals. In these respects, 1947 was an encouraging year for Jews. The Anti-
Defamation League, in its report on anti-Semitism during 1947, acknowledged “the substantial and heartening advances toward good will, understanding and cooperation among racial and religious groups in the United States. Important sections of the pulpit, press, radio, motion pictures and other opinion-molding media gave increased attention to the problems of prejudice and bigotry and stressed the ethical and practical need for democratic unity.” The League could also exult about President Truman’s Committee on Civil Rights, his Commission on Higher Education, and the “successful operation” of fair employment practices commissions in Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York.

American culture was responding somewhat to the cry for justice for minorities. Gordon Allport noted that universities, schools, churches, government agencies, and even some industries were giving attention to cultural conflicts. He wrote that since the 1930s “there has been more solid and enlightening study in this area than in all the previous centuries combined.” For example, the number of master’s and doctoral theses dealing with the Negro had greatly increased, from 76 in 1932 to 182 in 1939, to 330 in 1947, to 571 by 1950. The pronouncements of Protestant church organizations reached flood stage between 1945 and 1947, when at least seventy statements against prejudice and discrimination were issued. The landmark was the declaration of the Federal Council of Churches in March 1946, which renounced “the pattern of segregation in race relations as unnecessary and undesirable and a violation of the Gospel of love and human brotherhood.” Yet, Frank S. Loescher pointed out in 1948, “There is little evidence yet that the convictions of the rank-and-file membership of Protestant denominations are greatly influenced by these official actions.”

The number and variety of books on human rights rolling off the presses in 1946 were impressive. They included Buell G. Gallagher’s Color and Conscience, which was a plea for Christian deeds to reduce racial tensions; Margaret Halsey’s Color Blind; Fisk University’s series of Social Science Source Documents; the volumes in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science entitled Essential Human Rights and Controlling Group Prejudice; J. Howell Atwood’s The Racial Factor in YMCAs; and the Police Training Bulletin: A Guide to Race Relations for Police Officers, sponsored by the American Council on Race Relations and the California Department of Justice. The years 1947 and 1948 saw more of the same, most notably Charles S. Johnson’s Into the Main Stream; Robin W. Williams, Jr.’s The Reduc-
tion of Intergroup Tensions; Malcolm Ross’s powerful plea to end segregation in All Manner of Men; John Hope Franklin’s From Slavery to Freedom; and Robert C. Weaver’s The Negro Ghetto. Also significant were the inexpensive Freedom Pamphlets published by the Anti-Defamation League, including by 1948 Arnold M. Rose’s The Negro in Postwar America, W. Henry Cooke’s Peoples of the Southwest, and Gordon Allport’s A B Cs of Scapegoating. The dam had burst. The trickle of studies, essays, and manuals that had started during the late 1930s was now a steady stream, and it would grow—with the addition of such classics as Lillian Smith’s Killers of the Dream, Morton Grodzins’s Americans Betrayed, and Carl Rowan’s South of Freedom—into a river of data, concepts, and protests. This river would not wash away prejudice and inequality, but it would erode them.

Such writings were supplemented in other cultural areas. Novelists found race relations an increasingly intriguing theme, as testified to by such best-selling books as Sinclair Lewis’s Kingsblood Royal, William L. White’s Lost Boundaries, and Ann Petry’s The Street. Appearances by Negroes on the New York stage continued to rise, with twenty shows employing 219 black actors in 1945 and twenty-eight using 279 in 1946. The NAACP and Jewish organizations worked to gain decent portrayals of minorities in motion pictures. Their endeavors were partly responsible for the production of a number of films during the late 1940s that attacked prejudice and discrimination. The NAACP also labored to improve the Negro’s image in public media generally, enlisting the help of prominent people in radio, theater, publishing, and advertising.

Other advances came. In athletics, Jackie Robinson signed to play for Montreal, becoming the first Negro to enter modern big-time baseball. Trackmen Herb McKinley and Buddy Young covered themselves with sports glory at Illinois. Young was also one of college football’s first black stars in a generation. In 1946 Negro nurses were admitted to the American Nurses Association in fourteen hold-out states. By the same year a number of newspapers, including the New York Times, Detroit News, Dallas Morning Sun, Christian Science Monitor, Providence Journal, Des Moines Register, and Fresno Bee, had dropped the practice of identifying people by race unless it was essential to a story. Negroes broke into the larger press world, so that by 1947 eighteen of them worked as full-time newsmen on newspapers of general circulation. By then, thanks to pressure from the National Newspaper Publishers Association and individual reporters, black newsmen were accredited to the State Department. Similar developments took
place in white-collar, scientific, technical, and professional jobs. A 1948 Urban League survey of twenty-five cities found 7,734 Negroses in such positions, almost all in jobs closed to them but a few years before and in communities covered by strong fair employment practice laws. There was a new look to advertisements in black newspapers by 1948. National business firms not only increased their advertising but adorned it with pictures of attractive or prominent Negroes. The new code of the Association of Comic Magazine Publishers stated that “ridicule of or attack on any religious or racial group is never permissible.” Negro membership in labor unions continued to be high, and, in fact, even increased from 1,250,000 during the war to 1,500,000 by the 1950s.10

Important gains were made in education. The number of Negroes enrolled in high schools in seventeen southern and border states and the District of Columbia rose from 254,580 in 1939–1940 to 338,032 in 1949–1950, while the black population remained relatively stable. The number graduating from high school increased from 30,009 to 45,291 in the same years, and the elementary- and secondary-school year lengthened from 156 to 173 days. The amount of funds allocated to Negro education in ten southern states on a classroom-unit basis between 1939–1940 and 1949–1950 skyrocketed from $441 to $2,197, or some 400 percent. That rise looks less dramatic, however, when compared to increases in funds for white classroom units over the same period, which grew from $1,096 to $3,291. That meant a dollar increase of $2,195 per white unit compared to one of only $1,756 per Negro unit. Black colleges bulged during the postwar era, with 79,391 students enrolled and 8,504 degrees awarded in 1949–1950. The problem was that there was insufficient room for prospective black enrollees in either Negro or white colleges. Only some twenty thousand of about one hundred thousand Negro veterans eligible for college under the GI Bill were able to find an institution that would accept them, and some 70 percent of those were enrolled in segregated institutions. Another fifteen thousand applied but were turned away for lack of space.11

There were other school developments. In 1947 Archbishop Joseph Ritter desegregated the Catholic schools of St. Louis, and the following year Archbishop Patrick O’Boyle began integrating the Washington, D.C., parochial schools, a process that spread gradually to other dioceses. Illinois passed legislation in 1945 and 1949 to force complete desegregation of its public schools; and in 1947 New Jersey ratified a constitutional provision declaring that no person shall “be discriminated against in the exercise of any civil or military right, nor be segre-
gated in the militia or in the public schools, because of religious principles, race, color, ancestry, or national origin. The New Jersey constitution was unique in that in effect it equated segregation with discrimination, thereby denying that separate racial establishments could be equal. Such legal provisions, however, had little impact on de facto school segregation, which continued to victimize most racial minorities.

Clearly, the formal barriers to mixing the races in educational institutions were starting to crumble, as white colleges and schools began to accept Negro students and to offer courses dealing with race problems. Even a nucleus of black teachers at white colleges had developed. By 1947 some sixty of the three thousand Negro college professors in the United States taught at white institutions. In 1948 Allison Davis was promoted to professor of education in the University of Chicago, the first of his race to hold that rank on a permanent basis in a great American university. It all was a modest beginning, but one that lent hope for better educational opportunities for minorities. Moreover, it was part of an overall movement that made the nation's colleges and universities more cosmopolitan, as sprinklings of Indian, Oriental, Spanish-speaking, and especially Negro students were found on campus, along with large numbers of Jews, foreigners, and Catholics. At the same time there was an infusion of Jewish and Catholic professors at public and nonsectarian private institutions. It must be said that liberal attitudes had opened the gates, but the GI Bill had pushed a greater diversity of students and teachers onto campus.

Housing was another area of development. Federal statistics showed that between 1940 and 1947 overcrowding (where an average of more than one-and-a-half persons lived per room) in nonfarm housing decreased from 6 to 4 percent for whites and from 18 to 15 percent for nonwhites. The percentage of dwellings that required major repairs or lacked private baths and flush toilets declined from 34 to 22 for whites and from 75 to 61 for nonwhites. The percentage without electric lighting decreased from 40 to 20 for nonwhites, while for whites it stood at about 2. The percentage of nonwhites who owned their homes grew from 23.8 in 1940 to 33.6 in 1947, although white homeowners rose from 42.7 to 54.5. There were also slight advances in combating discrimination and segregation in assigning public housing under the new laws of several states in the period 1945-1947, notably in Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. The federal government, however, took the path of least resistance on
segregation by following local law and policy in granting aid to housing projects.\textsuperscript{14}

Although fair employment practices legislation was stymied in Congress, there was much activity in the statehouses during the middle 1940s. From 1944 through 1949, fair employment bills were introduced fifty-nine times in twenty-seven states and enacted in ten. Both Democratic and Republican legislators were responsible for such legislation, although they were generally spurred by coalitions of Negro, Jewish, and interracial organizations as well as by some Protestant and Catholic groups. Support from labor, civic, and veterans' organizations came at best sporadically, which perhaps accounted in part for the fact that several of the laws had no teeth.\textsuperscript{15}

Employment patterns and income held up well compared with those of 1940. The percentage of jobless nonwhites ran 5.4, as compared with 3.3 for whites in 1947. The percentage of employed nonwhite males in various occupations rose between 1940 and 1948: in government work, from 1.7 to 4.2; professional services, 2.9 to 4.2; manufacturing, 16.1 to 24; construction, 4.8 to 6.7; mining, 1.8 to 5.1; trade and finance, 11.7 to 13.6; transportation, communication, and public utilities, 6.7 to 9.6. The percentages declined from 43.3 to 22.4 in agriculture and from 8.3 to 7.6 in domestic and personal services, indicating a considerable improvement in the types of work found by nonwhites. Median wage and salary income of the individual nonwhite grew from $364 in 1939 to $863 in 1947 and to $1,210 in 1948, and of whites during these same years from $956 to $1,980 to $2,323. The median nonwhite income increased from 38.1 percent of median white income in 1939 to 43.6 in 1947 and to 52.1 in 1948, although the dollar gap widened. Moreover, probably because of higher nonwhite unemployment, the median nonwhite family income dipped from 56.6 percent of white median family income in 1945 to 51.1 in 1947.\textsuperscript{16}

Apparently there was a rise in the volume of Negro businesses. Although the assets of banks owned and operated by blacks only grew from $28,584,815 in 1945 to $31,307,345 in 1947, assets of Negro insurance companies jumped from $72,787,542 in 191 firms in 1945 to $118,705,607 in 216 companies in 1948. The number of policies increased from 3,789,989 to 4,944,464. In 1943 Negro savings and loan institutions reported their worth as $3,131,399, while in 1947 they counted assets of $8,864,342.\textsuperscript{17}

During the 1940s, based in part on the rising prosperity of minorities, a civil-rights coalition was formed. The coalition was composed largely of Negroes and Jews, supported by other minorities and by
sympathetic whites among Catholics, Protestants, and the unchurched.

The coalition's work was best seen in the struggles in Congress and state legislatures for fair employment laws, although after 1945 it was active on other fronts too. It reached its high point about 1949–1950, after which, distracted by the effects of the Korean War and the country's loyalty-security psychosis, the coalition lost momentum.

During the 1940s the coalition was somewhat sustained by the nation's slowly changing attitudes. Competing with the belief that America had a Negro, or Indian, or Mexican-American, or Oriental, or Jewish, problem was the idea, as Lillian Smith said in 1946, that there was a "white problem." Even more significant was the developing concept in many areas that there had to be cooperative approaches to the problem, whatever it was called. In St. Louis in 1946, for example, this idea took the practical form of thirty-six community organizations holding a week-long institute to seek techniques to encourage better race relations. Over the following three years this seed fruited both in the desegregation of the governing boards, staffs, memberships, and clients of numerous organizations and social agencies in the city, and in a mounting number of interracial and interfaith conferences. 18

This is not to say that understanding was achieved among men of good will, even among such men in minority groups. There were antagonisms, for example, between Negroes and Jews because of a residue of mutually unfavorable views and occasionally unpleasant contacts. Even when they gathered together to discuss civil-rights questions, as Kenneth Clark observed, condescension often marked the attitudes of Jews. Yet earnest efforts were made to overcome these problems for the common good. The fact that in its first issue Commentary, sponsored by the American Jewish Committee, published Clark's straightforward article on Negro-Jewish relations was one example. Black writers and leaders such as Gordon Hancock and A. Philip Randolph pointed out the sufferings of Jews because of prejudice.19 Most significant was the joining of forces to lash out against discrimination. Not only were Negro and Jewish groups actively cooperating in seeking fair employment legislation, but the Anti-Defamation League struck out at prejudice wherever it found it. The pattern of mutual cooperation was set early in the postwar period and would be repeated in case after case.

Cooperation was not limited to Negroes and Jews, for leaders in many minorities believed that what affected one group could affect all. In New York City, as early as 1945, the Japanese-American Citizens League (JACL) sponsored a rally for a permanent FEPC, which used
two Negroes and two Japanese-Americans as speakers. A Mexican American challenge to school segregation in California was supported by amicus curiae briefs filed by the NAACP, the National Lawyers Guild, the American Jewish Congress, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the JACL. At a Memorial Day dinner of Japanese-American veterans in Chicago in 1946, segregation was condemned, in general, and Senator Bilbo and Representative John Rankin, in particular, as high priests of Jim Crowism. In Los Angeles and San Francisco, Negroes during the war had moved into the Little Tokyo sections; and when the Japanese-Americans returned from detention camps, the two groups lived together in amity. The American Jewish Congress joined the JACL and the ACLU in contesting California’s alien-land law before the Supreme Court. And Negro newspapers spoke their piece for Japanese-Americans, with the Afro-American, for example, writing that “American prejudice and hatred of Japanese-Americans is one of the blackest pages in our history.”

Among Negroes, a change of emphasis was developing. The post-war period saw an increasing demand for racial integration as well as equality. Early in 1946 the Courier, in discussing school segregation, championed the mixing of races in the schools. NAACP Secretary Walter White inveighed against de facto segregation of public facilities. Writing Fiorello H. La Guardia about a proposed new hospital in a black area of New York City, White wrote that “segregation can never be the answer to racial discrimination, whether it be imposed from without or established from within.” Even a southern Negro moderate like Charles S. Johnson in 1947 wrote, “For the Negro to accept segregation and all of its implications as an ultimate solution would be to accept for all time a definition of himself as something less than his fellow man.”

For years the NAACP had battled for equal educational facilities, and since the middle 1930s it had worked for admission of black students to public white professional schools when separate-but-equal facilities were not available. By 1947 the association’s lawyers began an all-out assault on school segregation, “on the ground,” as Charles H. Houston wrote, that “there is no such thing as ‘separate but equal,’ that the only reason colored people are segregated is to prevent them from receiving equality.” In taking this line of attack, the NAACP had the backing of counsel for the American Jewish Congress. Negroes were further encouraged by a federal court decision against segregating Mexican-Americans in California’s schools. As Lawrence Scott wrote, the ruling “opens the way to an attack on the whole expensive, segre-
gated school system of the South and Middle West. It shows the possibility of a favorable ruling by the Supreme Court.\textsuperscript{22}

Other groups sought to break down racial barriers. The Catholic Interracial Council of Los Angeles challenged a state law prohibiting interracial marriages. In the test, which involved a Negro and white Catholic couple, the California Supreme Court in 1948 invalidated the law. Coalition was also evidenced in politics. Blacks and Mexican-Americans in San Antonio joined together to elect a Negro to the junior college's board of trustees and a Mexican-American to the school board.\textsuperscript{23}

In 1947 Walter White, in his role as Pontifex Maximus of interracial forces, complained that there was insufficient coordination in the holy war against prejudice. He proposed establishment of a Supreme Headquarters Against All Bigotry. Such a headquarters was never established, but White, as much as any man, must have been aware of the increase in cooperative efforts to combat intolerance and discrimination. Not only was there considerable cooperation among Jewish and Negro groups, but also a certain amount with Japanese, Catholic, and Mexican-American elements as well as with general organizations like the Marxist Civil Rights Congress (formerly the International Labor Defense), the ACLU, the American Veterans Committee, and the CIO. Indeed, the high point was reached during the late 1940s, thanks to the economic resources available to the groups involved, their many common goals, and the increasing receptivity of the nation and the Truman administration to civil-rights pressures. This intensity of concern was seen on the local as well as the national level. Carey McWilliams wrote in 1948 that there were some seven hundred organizations interested in civil rights. In 1949 there were official human-rights agencies in twenty-one states and fifty-one cities. The American Council on Race Relations later conducted a census which revealed that 1,350 groups around the nation were concerned with improving intergroup relations.\textsuperscript{24}

The international situation was another factor that stimulated action by those who quested for civil rights. The concepts of the interrelatedness of peoples and the need for international cooperation reached a peak in the 1940s partly because of the wartime alliance against the Axis powers and partly because of the later search for a way to avoid another, an atomic, world war. Many people were also aware that happenings in the United States, the greatest of the superpowers, would be observed with keen interest abroad. St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton had stated it well when they wrote in 1945,
“What happens to one affects all. A blow struck for freedom in Bronzeville finds its echo in Chungking and Moscow, in Paris and Senegal. A victory for fascism in Midwest Metropolis will sound the knell of doom for the Common Man everywhere.”

This became all the more important as America cast about for allies to stave off what it considered to be the postwar threat of international communism. American government pronouncements on behalf of principles of democracy, freedom, and human rights in the East-West struggle for the allegiance of men all over the world were somewhat heartening, partly because they paralleled the goals of the nation’s minorities and partly because of growing official awareness that violation of them at home was an embarrassment abroad for the United States. The work of the United Nations was also encouraging, and the attempts to establish the UN Commission on Human Rights and an international bill of rights were of particular interest. As Edward Stettinius, America’s representative on the UN Preparatory Commission, reported, through the efforts of a human-rights commission “the United Nations will be able to focus world attention continuously upon the promotion of human rights and freedoms and upon violations of these rights and freedoms whenever and wherever they occur.” To minorities in America, this promised that their problems would draw additional interest at home and abroad. Certainly, there was a paradox involved in America’s concern for democracy on the world scene and its treatment of minorities at home. It was high irony, for example, that the United States was more concerned with democratic elections in Poland than in the American South.

The government was not unaware of the paradox. In April 1946 Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in response to a request by FEPC Chairman Malcolm Ross, wrote “The existence of discrimination against minority groups in this country has an adverse effect on our relations with other countries. We are reminded over and over by some foreign newspapers and spokesmen, that our treatment of various minorities leaves much to be desired. . . . Frequently we find it next to impossible to formulate a satisfactory answer to our critics in other countries.” President Truman stated the problem more succinctly in February 1948 when he told Congress, “There is a serious gap between our ideals and some of our practices. This gap must be closed.”

The problem was not only one of the distance between principle and practice for America’s minorities. Nonwhite diplomats in Washington often encountered the barriers of the segregated city when they left their chancelleries, which left them unfavorably impressed with
America's ideals and manners. At least one case cost the United States
the prestige and economic advantage of securing an arm of the UN.
The University of Maryland offered a site and buildings for the estab­
lishment of the headquarters of the Food and Agricultural Organiza­
tion, but the existence of segregation in the vicinity of the nation's
capital was an important factor in the decision to locate the FAO in
Rome.28

The UN Human Rights Commission was formed in 1946, and
work was begun on formulating an international declaration of human
rights. The commission itself became a forum for grievances from
minorities in various countries, including India's untouchables, South
Africa's Indians, and the Palestinian Jews. America's National Negro
Congress also approached the UN with complaints from blacks.
W. E. B. DuBois recommended during the summer of 1946 that the
NAACP petition regarding the problems of America's Negroes, a tactic
approved by the association. DuBois was joined by Rayford W. Logan,
Milton R. Konvitz, Earl B. Dickerson, William R. Ming, Jr., and Leslie
S. Perry in preparing the long petition, which documented the injustices
and proscriptions suffered by Negroes in the United States. The
document, entitled An Appeal to the World, was filed with the UN's
Human Rights Commission October 23, 1947. It was not formally
acted upon because of official American opposition and the reluctance
of the powers to establish the UN's authority in domestic affairs.
Nevertheless, the petition created an international stir as the foreign
press and foreign governments gave it great attention.29

The document also had an impact at home. Some people were
angered at the NAACP's boldness, others were encouraged, and still
others surprised. Attorney General Tom Clark told the National Asso­
ciation of Attorneys General, "I was humiliated, as I know you must
have been, to realize that in our America there could be the slightest
foundation for such a petition. And that the association could con­
dlude that amongst all of our honorable institutions there was no
tribunal to which such a petition could be presented with hope of
redress." Clark may have felt some pangs of humiliation, but the
grievances of black men could have come as no surprise to him. In­
deed, it is apparent that he was using the petition to support the
federal government's quest for solutions to civil-rights problems, when
he announced that he was going to strive to enlarge and strengthen
the Justice Department's Civil Rights Section.30

Although the State Department and Eleanor Roosevelt, the Amer­
ican delegate to the Human Rights Commission, had not welcomed the
NAACP petition, the association was in 1948 invited to designate a consultant to the United States delegation to the UN General Assembly. Walter White was designated, and served in that capacity, becoming the first of many Negroes to serve with the delegation. Meanwhile, the Human Rights Commission drafted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which enumerated rights to such things as life, liberty, security of person, equal protection under law, equality of rights within a nation, fair trial, and free choice of employment, among others. The Declaration was overwhelmingly adopted by the General Assembly in Paris in 1948. It immediately affected the civil-rights struggle in America in that it added more international opinion and legal and moral arguments to the minorities’ arsenal of weapons.\(^\text{31}\)

There can be no doubt that since 1940 the position and importance of minorities in America, particularly of their upper and middle classes, had considerably improved. There also can be no doubt that the change had been fought for every step of the way. True, a small and increasing number of whites agreed that change should come, and still others were willing to yield under moderate pressure. The struggle would continue bitterly, however, because most whites would seldom grant even minor concessions graciously—and sometimes not at all.