

was a 1946 graduate of the Hotchkiss School in Lakeville, Conn., and a 1950 economics graduate of Yale University. He received a master's degree in business administration from Harvard University. He was a 1958 graduate of Temple University's law school, attending classes at night while a foreman on a steel assembly line during the day. He served in the Marine Corps during the Korean War and was aide-de-camp to Lt. Gen. Lewis B. "Chesty" Puller. Years later, in Congress, Rep. Coughlin chaired the Capitol Hill Marines, a group of congressmen who had been in the Marine Corps. He was practicing law at a Philadelphia firm when he was elected to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives in 1964 and to the state Senate in 1966. He won his U.S. House seat in 1968, when Richard S. Schweiker (R) left to make a successful bid for the U.S. Senate.

A tall, slender man with a patrician air, Rep. Coughlin was known for wearing—and defending—bow ties. When a magazine writer said in the 1980s that men who wore bow ties were not to be trusted, Rep. Coughlin was quoted as saying, "I've never known one who wasn't trustworthy." His first wife, Helen Ford Swan Coughlin, died in the early 1950s. His marriage to Elizabeth Worrell Coughlin ended in divorce. Survivors include his wife of 21 years, Susan MacGregor Coughlin of Alexandria; a daughter from his first marriage, Lisa Coughlin Powell of Plymouth Meeting, Pa.; three children from his second marriage, Lynne Coughlin Samson of Wayne, Pa., Sara Coughlin Noon of Bel Air, Md., and R. Lawrence Coughlin III of Seattle; and five grandchildren.

SICKLE CELL DISEASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I had the joy on Monday to visit one of the hospitals in my district, the Miller Children's Hospital located in Long Beach and within the Long Beach Memorial Hospital complex. What a joy it was, Mr. Speaker, to talk with the many children who had such hope and such enthusiasm even given the fact that they are sickle cell anemia children.

I was met, as I came into the hospital, by Kala, age 5. So much spirit, so vibrant, so eager to talk with me about the things that she does in school. I was absolutely pleased to see this youngster, who is really suffering from sickle cell anemia, to have such hope and such determination, something that we can all and should all emulate.

And then I went to the next ward and I saw Etan. Etan was with his mother and father, and he, too, is suffering from sickle cell anemia. I talked with Etan. He is an A student in school. His father and his mother hailed from Nigeria. He has to come in every so often for a blood transfusion.

I was so pleased to see these two young people, who are so vibrant, so much life, and yet their life can be taken in a moment's time if they are not given this type of blood that they have to have.

Then I went down the hallway and I saw another young guy by the name of

Chris. He was in the hospital, again having this blood transfusion, and he was with his father, his mother, and his brother Maurice. They are a family of 10. It was amazing to me how this family was so close-knit there, pulling for Chris to come through. He, too, had to have this blood transfusion, and he, too, had just a wealth of energy, as much as he could put out; and so much love, so much compassion, smiling all the time, not knowing exactly whether he will be with us next year or not.

These are children, Mr. Speaker, that have been afflicted with sickle cell disease. And we, as African Americans, know much too often about sickle cell. We know that sickle cell and that disease is a disease that affects a special protein inside of our red blood cells called hemoglobin. The red blood cell has an important job. They pick up oxygen from the lungs and take it to every part of the body.

We also recognize, Mr. Speaker, that sickle cell disease affects 3 in every 1,000 African American newborns. Although in the United States most cases occur among African Americans, this disease also affects people of Arabian, Greek, Maltese, Italian, Sardinian, Turkish, and of Indian ancestry. Affected children are at an increased risk of mortality or morbidity, especially in the first 3 years of life.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, the Miller Children's Hospital at Long Beach Memorial is such an outstanding one because it treats these kids. It has an absolutely state-of-the-art clinic that has helped in so many ways with our children gaining their strength and being able to get back up and go to school and to monitor them. They monitor them to make sure that when there is a need for them to come back in for a transfusion, they come back in.

Sickle cell disease is an inherited disease of the red blood cells, as I said before, which can cause attacks of pain, damage to vital organs, and risk of serious infections that can lead to early death. This is why, Mr. Speaker, for infants and young children with sickle cell disease they are especially vulnerable to severe bacterial infections such as those that cause meningitis and blood infection. Infections are the leading cause of death in children with sickle cell disease.

I cannot say enough about the testing and the great physicians and nurses that are helping our children who have sickle cell. So I call on all my fellow colleagues to join me in the fight to support this universal patient access and research for sickle cell disease.

□ 1830

BUSH ADMINISTRATION DOWNGRADES ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to highlight the negative aspects of the Bush administration's environmental record. I do not come to the floor lightly. I am not here because I particularly want to be critical of the President or this administration; but it has been upsetting to me, particularly because I think in the aftermath of the September 11, because the Nation and I personally have focused so much on defense and the war on terrorism and homeland security issues, many times when efforts were made by the administration to weaken environmental laws or change agency rules in ways that weaken environmental protection, it has been difficult to get the public to pay attention to those issues or to even get the media's attention to the fact that in many cases environmental regulations have been watered down or changed in a way that is not good for the environment.

I was hoping that was just a coincidence and it would not continue, but it has continued. There are reports which have come out, one of which I would like to go into in a little detail tonight, which shows that this administration continues to downgrade, if you will, environmental protection.

When the President came forth with his budget last Monday, there was another strong indication of his willingness to downgrade environmental concerns because of the level of funding proposed in his budget for some key environmental programs.

I do not think that anyone really expected when President Bush took office that this administration would be strong on environmental issues, but many times there was rhetoric that suggested maybe we were wrong and maybe there would be some heightened concern over the environment. But the fact of the matter is that the administration's actions are very much the opposite. They continue, whether by regulation or through their spending policies, to take action which I think ultimately hurts the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start out this evening by going through briefly a report that was put out by the Natural Resources Defense Council, the NRDC on January 23, just a couple of weeks ago. Basically what they looked at was agency actions over the spectrum of the Nation's most important environmental programs, whether that be protecting air, water, forest, wildlife or public lands. The report is actually entitled "Rewriting the Rules: The Bush Administration's Unseen Assault on the Environment." It basically provides a review of agency action since September 11, and it shows very dramatically that there, basically, has been an intensification of efforts after September 11 to downgrade environmental protection.

I think it is unfortunate that this is the case because I believe most Americans feel that not only is the environment an important issue, but it is a

quality-of-life issue that everyone should be concerned about. I find in my district in the State of New Jersey, it does not matter whether a Member is a Republican or a Democrat, Americans want to protect the environment.

Let me review some of the points that this report makes. Again, it is called "Rewriting the Rules: The Bush Administration's Unseen Assault on the Environment." The first is with reference to clean air. We know that there is a fundamental requirement of the Clean Air Act that older electric power plants and other smoke stack industries must install state-of-the-art cleanup equipment when they expand or modernize their facilities, in other words when utilities are in the process of expanding an older facility. The older facilities may be exempt from certain standards of the Clean Air Act, but if you expand an old facility or build a new facility, then the company has to come under the provisions of the Clean Air Act. It is the grandfathering that is exempt.

But what we find is that the Bush administration is trying to basically allow expansion of these older, dirty power plants without meeting the new requirements or the new rules. There is a new source requirement that says that for new industrial facilities and power plants, that industry has to put in place air quality improvements. That needs to be done for older, expanded plants, the same way as is required for new plants. But the Bush administration is saying that older plants may be expanded without having to upgrade equipment.

Mr. Speaker, when the Clean Air Act was passed, it was understood that even though the older plants were grandfathered, that they would be phased out and at some point there would only be the new plants which met the stricter environmental criteria. If this administration allows the older plants to essentially retool and expand under the old rules, not only will those plants continue to have a life of their own, but now there will be even more power generated using old and outmoded methods that allow the air to be more and more polluted.

The second issue that the NRDC report references with regard to wetlands. For more than a decade, the cornerstone of America's approach to wetlands protection has been a policy that calls for no net loss of wetlands. This actually originated with the first President Bush, with the first Bush administration. But with no public notice or opportunity for comment, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers moved to effectively reverse this long-standing policy by issuing a new guidance on wetlands mitigation. These weaker standards would mean the loss of tens of thousands of acres of wetlands that provide flood protection, clean water and fish and wildlife habitat. This reversal of the no net-loss policy, which has occurred since September 11, is just one component of a broader Bush ad-

ministration effort to diminish wetlands protection.

The President made a pledge during Earth Day of this year that he would preserve wetlands; but if we look at what his administration is doing, they supported relaxing a key provision of the Clean Water Act, the National Permit Program, which regulates development and industrial activity in streams and wetlands. So the Corps of Engineers is loosening the permit standards and making it easier for developers and mining companies to destroy more streams and wetlands.

Mr. Speaker, a third area is mining on public lands. Mining activities have despoiled 40 percent of western watersheds, according to the EPA. But instead of addressing this problem, the Bush administration is making it worse. In October, the Department of the Interior issued new hardrock mining regulations reversing environmental restrictions that apply for mining for gold, copper, silver, and other metals on Federal lands. Under the new rules, the agency has renounced the government's authority to deny permits on the grounds that a proposed mine could result in substantial irreparable harm to the environment. So the new rules also limit corporate liability for irresponsible mining practices, undermining cleanup standards that safeguard ground and surface water.

□ 1845

These were again put into place in October, in the aftermath of September 11, essentially when most of us, including the media, were not paying too much attention.

A fourth area that I would like to mention that is in the NRDC report is particularly important to me, because when I was first elected to Congress back in 1988, basically I ran on a platform that I was going to put an end to ocean dumping off the coast of New Jersey, off the coast of my district. I have been very successful with my colleagues from New Jersey, with my other Members of the House, with the Senators from New Jersey over that 14-year period now to basically put an end to all direct dumping, if you will, in the ocean, whether it be sewage or toxic dredge material or the other types of materials. We had all kinds of garbage and different things that were placed out in the ocean.

Sewage, of course, contains bacteria, viruses, fecal matter and other wastes, and it is responsible each year for beach closures, fish kills, shellfish-bed closures and human gastrointestinal and respiratory illnesses. In 1988 in New Jersey, because of all the medical waste and the sewage sludge that was washing up on the beaches in the summer, we actually had to close all the beaches in the State, or almost all the beaches in the State. It cost New Jersey billions of dollars. People were getting sick, the economy was suffering, it was really a bad situation, both healthwise and economically speaking.

According to the EPA, there were 40,000 discharges of untreated sewage into water bodies, basements, playgrounds and other areas in the year 2000. Before the Bush administration took office, the EPA issued long-overdue rules minimizing raw sewage discharges into waterways, and requiring public notification of sewage overflows. The proposed rules, however, were blocked by the regulatory freeze ordered by the Bush administration last January. A year later, the administration still has not issued the final sewage overflow rules. Technically, they remain under internal review at the EPA, but in practice they are languishing in regulatory limbo.

This was an action that was taken by the Clinton administration, by the prior President, in an effort to try to minimize raw sewage overflow into our rivers, oceans and streams, and the Bush administration when they came into office basically got rid of that regulation, but promised they would come up with new ones. A year later we do not have them. Once again we have an example where clean water, like clean air, like wetlands, all these things are suffering because of either action or inaction by this current administration.

The last thing that the NRDC mentions in the report is OMB's centralized assault. The full-scale regulatory retreat at Federal environmental agencies is only part of the story, according to the NRDC.

Over the long term, the most telling indication of the Bush administration's intentions is the role played by the Office of Management and Budget. The Bush administration has given unprecedented new power to OMB to gut existing environmental rules and bottle up new ones indefinitely. And the OMB has carried this effort a step further by reaching out to polluters and their champions on Capitol Hill to develop a hit list of environmental safeguards they plan to weaken. The list provides a road map of upcoming regulatory battles that include safe drinking water standards, controls on toxins, Clean Air Act requirements, water pollution limits, pollution from factory farms, and forest planning regulations.

The problem that I see, Mr. Speaker, is that this administration started out basically saying that they were going to try to improve the environment, making that commitment. A lot of us doubted that that commitment was real, and now in the aftermath of September 11 we see that it is not real, and, in fact, every effort is being made to gut environmental protection. I think that the public increasingly will not stand for this. If anything, the Enron scandal points out that the public is very wary of big business, corporate interests being able to extend their political influence on Capitol Hill to do things that are not in the interest of the little guy, that are not in the interest of the general public. I have no doubt that the environment is something that the public sincerely cares

about and that once these administration actions are brought to light, we can see mounting support to oppose any kind of changes that seek to basically downplay or degrade the environment.

I wanted to mention, Mr. Speaker, if I could, what happened and some of the highlighted cuts that the President brought forward in his budget last Monday. I think that, as with everything related to the environment, the key is having good laws on the books, having agencies that will carry out those laws, but those agencies cannot carry out those laws unless they have the funding to do so, and in many cases they do not have the enforcement arm to make sure that permits are not violated and that people are basically not going along with the laws that exist, the good laws that exist on the environment.

When you talk about cutbacks in the areas that I am going to discuss, that has a major impact on the ability to improve environmental quality. If the money is not there to clean up the water, to clean up the air, to take the action, to do the enforcement, then we will continue to see a policy of environmental degradation.

I wanted to get into a little detail about some of the budget concerns that I have in what the President proposed last Monday. In the first instance, I would like to talk about the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This is really an open space issue.

At the end of the 106th Congress, the work of numerous Members, administration officials and literally thousands of conservation, environmental and recreation interests across the country culminated in what was the greatest piece of conservation funding legislation enacted in our lifetime. This was at the end of the last Congress. There was a bipartisan deal that set aside a total of \$12 billion over a 6-year period, from 2001 to 2006, to fund an array of important programs, including the Land and Water Conservation Fund that protected open space, wildlife habitat, wildlife and cultural treasures, and supported recreation. This fund, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, is dedicated and protected for these purposes. It cannot be used for any other budget purposes.

The fund started out at \$1.6 billion and is slated for 10 percent increases each year to reach a total of \$2.4 billion by fiscal year 2006. The fund is large enough to fully fund the open space program that Congress enacted, but the administration in its budget proposal cut this historic program by \$250 million below its authorized level of \$1.92 billion for the next fiscal year.

The Bush administration's budget also erodes the original purpose of this Land and Water Conservation Fund, first by cutting existing programs such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund by \$88 million, State and tribal wildlife grants by \$25 million, and the Endangered Species Fund by \$5 million;

and also zeroing out the Urban Parks and Recreation Program. It substantially increases the level in the fund for Federal lands maintenance, and this was supposed to be complementary, not part of the effort to acquire more open space.

So what we see is a promised program, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which was supposed to be money set aside just for specific open space purposes, now being cut even though there was a commitment over this period of time to make sure that it was fully funded.

There is a similar problem with wildlife refuges. The wildlife refuge system celebrates its 100th anniversary in 2003. Defenders and a number of other organizations have called for more than doubling the refuge system's budget to a total of \$700 million so that it has the funds to carry out its mission. In other words, there was supposed to be a significant increase in this fund. But what has happened, what the Bush administration has proposed, is to basically cut back on staff. Nearly 200 refuges have no staff on site, and at its fiscal year 2002 funding level, needed operation increases are five times greater than needed maintenance increases. What the administration is doing again here is not providing enough funding to actually run the wildlife refuge programs and making it more and more difficult to maintain the refuges around the country.

We have a similar situation with endangered species. The administration has requested \$125.7 million, level funding, for the Fish and Wildlife Service core endangered species program. But this amount falls far short of the \$275 million recommended for the next fiscal year by environmental groups. They do not have enough funding in the Fish and Wildlife Service to complete action on more than 250 species that are currently candidates for protection. This is the listing of the species under the Endangered Species Act. So if you do not have the money to actually go out and list species and decide what is going to be on the endangered species list, essentially there is no protection for those species.

Last year, the Service estimated that it needs \$120 million, or \$24 million per year over 5 years, just for the process of eliminating the backlog for listing critical species. This does not account for a lot more that could be looked at and placed on the list. The administration has requested just \$9 million for listing. Again, this is a way through the budget that the Bush administration makes it more difficult, if not impossible, to enforce the Endangered Species Act, by not providing enough funding to do the process of listing species. That is just the listing process.

At the same time, the Fish and Wildlife Service is desperately short of funding needed to recover species; in other words, those that have already been listed and need actions by the Federal Government to make sure that

they recover. At least 40 currently listed species could become extinct, even though they are listed and protected, because there is not enough funding for needed recovery actions. I will not list all of these, but the Florida panther is one, and a number of Hawaiian birds and plants. Again, this is another area where the administration is basically allowing a program to degrade because we do not have the money to either list an endangered species or to protect them.

I wanted to also mention the Cooperative Conservation Initiative. The administration is proposing \$100 million for a new Cooperative Conservation Initiative while mandated actions and current programs are crying for funds. They are coming up with this new program proposed that supposedly is going to deal with conservation issues, but it is not at all clear what its purpose is, at the same time that they are cutting back on funding for some of the other programs like the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the endangered species program.

There are two other areas I wanted to mention this evening, Mr. Speaker. One deals with oil and gas development on public lands. The other deals with our national forests. What the Bush administration is doing in their budget, the President's budget, boosts oil and gas development on our public lands. Under the Bureau of Land Management, the administration is requesting a \$10.2 million increase to expand energy and mineral development on public lands, including expedited permitting and increased leasing, energy-related rights of way and further development on Alaska's North Slope, including plans for drilling, of course, in ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, in Alaska. The administration's budget includes assumptions of receipts from lease sales in ANWR in 2004. It also requested a \$14 million increase for the Bureau of Land Management land use plans, some of which are for national conservation areas, but some are for energy development.

I am not saying that it is always a bad thing to increase oil and gas drilling, but in many of these cases these actions are being taken in environmentally sensitive areas, particularly ANWR. Obviously the administration, the President, continues to push for drilling in ANWR, which from an environmental point of view would be very damaging to the wildlife refuge and to the environment in general in Alaska.

The last thing I wanted to mention relates to national forests. The Forest Service budget includes a damaging pilot charter forest legislative proposal that establishes forests or portions of forests as separate entities outside of the national forest system structure and reporting to a local trust entity for oversight, so basically to get rid of the oversight requirements that currently exist.

This is nothing more than a giveaway of portions of our national forests, which, of course, are irreplaceable

ecosystems that belong to all the American people. The budget also includes a timber sales offer level of 2 billion boardfeet, a substantial increase from the 1.4 billion boardfeet in recent years. This reflects a return to the timber targets of the Reagan years when politicians set logging levels that had no basis in science. It is also a clear departure from the practice of recent years to manage for the health and sustainability of the land, with outputs a by-product of good land management, not a good goal. The Forest Service is heavily subsidized to meet these harvest goals.

Again, Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is difficult, I think, to understand a lot of these measures, whether it be the budget measures or the agency actions that I mentioned before in the aftermath of September 11. It is hard to monitor and to realize the impact of a lot of these actions because they are in specific agencies, they impact certain parts of the country. But if you add them all up, both the budget cuts as well as the agency actions in the last few months, you can see that this administration is clearly moving more and more in intensifying its efforts to try to cut back on environmental protection.

□ 1900

I think the only way that we are going to stop this is if more and more people speak out. It is being done basically under the cover of September 11, when a lot of the media are not paying attention, and I hope that over the next few months we are able to bring more and more attention to some of these measures and to get the administration to stop intensifying their efforts.

I notice that since I have been in Congress, if an action is taken to weaken the Clean Air Act or Clean Water Act in committee or on the floor of the House, because it is legislative, Members are usually aware of it and they can come in committee or to the floor and object to it and usually put a stop to it because of the public outcry.

But when it comes to agency actions, when it comes to cutbacks in funding for some of the agencies in the fashion that I have described this evening, it is a much more insidious process and much more difficult I think for the public to understand what is going on or to focus on it; and I just think it is extremely unfortunate that the President has taken advantage of this period since September 11 to intensify his efforts to degrade the environment and to take both these agency and budget actions.

Obviously, we have an opportunity during the appropriations process to turn this around and not accept the President's budget on a lot of these environmental initiatives, and that has to be part of what we try to accomplish over the next few months as we move through the appropriations process.

I will say once again, it is my intention to come to the floor again and

bring other colleagues to draw more and more attention to the President's anti-environment policies. They are not in sync with the American people, and they are certainly not in accordance with the promises that he made when he first ran for President.

THE CASE FOR REPARATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer a Special Order tonight in conjunction with the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who will be joining us very shortly, as well as some other members of the Congressional Black Caucus, to speak on an issue that we feel is very, very important to our constituents and to our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, reparations, the act or process of making amends, is a word that often evokes vociferous reactions from many citizens in our Nation. Ever since I have been in Congress, among the first bills introduced at the beginning of the term are bills calling for reparations for slavery.

Although I have always supported legislation dealing with the establishment of a commission and various other efforts to examine the issue of reparations, I have not always supported other measures, many of which call for direct remuneration. There was always the question of who can be identified as deserving, and how do we determine how much they deserve.

But the question of reparations in the traditional form aside, I believe very strongly that there is ample documentation of various forms of racial injustices that occurred very often under the color of law. Not only can we document the injustices in many of these instances, but we can also identify those who were the subject of the injustices; and the time is long since passed for our government to take up where we fell short in 1872 when this Congress rescinded "40 acres and a mule."

The Associated Press recently documented some of these injustices when it conducted an 18-month long investigation into black landowners who have illegally and sometimes legally had their land stolen from them. After interviewing 1,000 people and examining tens of thousands of public records, the Associated Press documented 107 land-takings in 13 Southern and border States. In those cases, 406 black landowners lost more than 24,000 acres of farm and timberland, plus 85 smaller properties, including stores and city lots.

This research was compiled in a three part series titled "Torn From the Land," which detailed how blacks in America were cheated out of their land or driven from it through intimidation, violence, and even murder.

Some had their land foreclosed for minor debts. Still others lost their land to tricky legal maneuvers, still being used today, called partitioning, in which savvy buyers can acquire an entire family's property if just one heir agrees to sell them one parcel, however small.

Mr. Speaker, although I am going to submit the entire research by the Associated Press as part of my statement, I wish at this time to read an excerpt from one of those series:

"As a little girl, Doria Dee often asked about the man in the portrait hanging in her aunt's living room, her great-great grandfather. 'It's too painful,' her elderly relatives would say, and they would look away.

"A few years ago, Johnson, now 40, went to look for answers in the rural town of Abbeville, South Carolina.

"She learned that in his day the man in the portrait, Anthony B. Crawford, was one of the most prosperous farmers in Abbeville County. That is until October 21, 1916, the day the 51-year-old farmer hauled a wagon load of cotton to town.

"Crawford 'seems to have been the type of Negro who was most offensive to certain elements of the white people,' Mrs. J.B. Holman would say a few days later in a letter published by the Abbeville Press and Banner. 'He was getting rich for a Negro, and he was insolent along with it.'

"Crawford's prosperity had made him a target.

"The success of blacks such as Crawford threatened the reign of white supremacy," said Stewart E. Tolnay, a sociologist at the University of Washington and coauthor of a book on lynchings. 'There were obvious limitations or ceilings that blacks weren't supposed to go beyond.'

"In the decades between the Civil War and the civil rights era, one of those limitations was owning land.

"Racial violence in America is a familiar story, but the importance of land as a motive for lynchings and white mob attacks on blacks has been widely overlooked, and the resulting land losses suffered by black families such as the Crawfords have gone largely unreported.

"The Associated Press documented 57 violent land takings, more than half of the 107 land takings in an 18-month investigation of black land lost in America. The other cases involved trickery and legal manipulations.

"Sometimes black landowners were attacked by whites who just wanted to drive them from their property. In other cases, the attackers wanted the land for themselves.

"For many decades, successful blacks 'lived with the gnawing fear that white neighbors could at any time do something violent and take everything from them,' this, according to Loren Schweninger, a University of North Carolina expert on black land ownership.

"While waiting his turn at the gin that fall day in 1916, Crawford entered