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THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Article X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

"I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground: That 'all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people.' To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress, is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition."

—Thomas Jefferson.
FACTS YOU SHOULD KNOW
ABOUT STATES’ RIGHTS DEMOCRATS

A. Statement of Principles Adopted by States’ Rights Democrats at Birmingham, Alabama, Saturday, July 17, 1948:

“1. We believe that the Constitution of the United States is the greatest charter of human liberty ever conceived by the mind of man.

“2. We oppose all efforts to invade or destroy the rights vouchsafed by it to every citizen of this republic.

“3. We stand for social and economic justice, which, we believe, can be vouchsafed to all citizens only by a strict adherence to our Constitution and constitutional rights of the states and individuals. We oppose the totalitarian, centralized, bureaucratic government and the police state called for by the platforms adopted by the Democratic and Republican conventions.

“4. We stand for the segregation of the races and the racial integrity of each race; the constitutional right to choose one’s associates; to accept private employment without governmental interference, and to earn one’s living in any lawful way. We oppose the elimination of segregation, the repeal of miscegenation statutes, the control of private employment by federal bureaucrats called for by the misnamed civil rights program. We favor home rule, local self-government and a minimum interference with individual rights.

“5. We oppose and condemn the action of the Democratic Convention in sponsoring a civil rights program calling for the elimination of segregation, social equality by federal fiat, regulations of private employment practices, voting and local law enforcement.

“6. We affirm that the effective enforcement of such a program would be utterly destructive of the social, economic and political life of the Southern people, and of other localities in which there may be differences in race, creed or national origin in appreciable numbers.

“7. We stand for the check and balances provided by the three departments of our government. We oppose the usurpation of legislative functions by the executive and judicial departments. We unreservedly condemn the effort to establish nationwide a police state in this Republic that would destroy the last vestige of liberty enjoyed by a citizen.

“8. We demand that there be returned to the people, to whom of right they belong, those powers needed for the preservation of human rights and the discharge of our responsibility as democrats for human welfare. We oppose a denial of those by political parties, a barter or sale of those rights by a political convention, as well as any invasion or violation of those rights by the federal government.

“We call upon all Democrats and upon all other loyal Americans who are opposed to totalitarianism at home and abroad to unite with us in ignominiously defeating Harry S. Truman and Thomas E. Dewey, and
every other candidate for public office who would establish a police state in the United States of America."

The Birmingham Conference of States' Rights Democrats did not form a new party and did not nominate anyone for any office. The Conference DID recommend to the duly constituted Democratic Parties of the various states that such parties in each state nominate J. Strom Thurmond and Fielding L. Wright as candidates for President and Vice-President of their State Democratic Parties. This has been done by the regular and duly constituted Democratic Parties of Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina. Other states will take like action. In as many other states as possible, the States' Rights, Thurmond-Wright ticket will be placed on the ballots so that people who believe in States' Rights can vote for these men who stand for Constitutional, States' Rights government and the preservation of individual liberty.

Those who are supporting the cause of States' Rights Democracy are

STATES' RIGHTS DEMOCRATS

regardless of what names they may be called by commentators and headline writers.

B. In the November general election the Thurmond-Wright ticket can accomplish the following:

—Thurmond-Wright can easily receive 100 electoral votes or more. Should no candidate receive a majority of electoral votes this will throw the election in the National House of Representatives and Senate. Should this happen, Thurmond and Wright will have an excellent chance of being the next President and Vice-President of the United States.

—Should Dewey run away with Truman outside the South—and Thurmond-Wright receive 100 or more electoral votes—then the States' Rights Democratic candidates will receive more electoral votes than Truman. This will make Senators and Congressmen from States' Rights states the minority party in the Congress and will give them complete control of all minority party committee assignments.

C. National Headquarters of the National States' Rights Democratic Campaign Committee is now open in the Heidelberg Hotel, Jackson, Mississippi. Liaison offices are open in Columbia, South Carolina, and in Room 276, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C. Merritt Gibson of Longview, Texas, is National Campaign Director in charge of the headquarters offices. All necessary field men and headquarters personnel is on the job to wage an intensive national campaign for Thurmond and Wright and for States' Rights Constitutional government.
D. This type of campaign requires considerable money and all loyal States' Rights Democrats are urged to contribute NOW to George C. Wallace, Treasurer National States' Rights Democratic Campaign Committee c/o Capital National Bank Jackson, Mississippi.

E. Governors Thurmond and Wright appeal to Americans in all states, who believe that individual freedom and human rights are dependent upon Constitutional States' Rights government, to rally behind them and to assist in this fight for the way of life Americans have long enjoyed and under which our nation has prospered for over 150 years. They deplore Truman's, Dewey's, and Wallace's cheap political appeal to fringe groups and the willingness of these three men and their fellow-travelers to desert constitutional government and States' Rights—and to thereby jeopardize the security, tranquility and unity of the nation—in order to win votes from un-American minorities.
GOVERNOR J. STROM THURMOND
States' Rights Candidate
for
PRESIDENT
of the United States
J. STROM THURMOND

Thurmond, James Strom—Formerly Lawyer and Farmer, at Edgefield; born December 5, 1902, at Edgefield; son of J. William and Eleanor Gertrude (Strom) Thurmond, of Edgefield; married Miss Jean Crouch of Elko, South Carolina, November 7, 1947; graduate of Clemson College, B.S. 1923; studied psychology and other special courses in summer schools thereafter; studied law at night and admitted to South Carolina Bar December 13, 1930, and subsequently admitted to practice before the various Federal Courts, including the United States Supreme Court; served as County Attorney and City Attorney; served as teacher in McCormick, Ridge Spring and Edgefield High Schools, 1923-29; member County Board of Education, Edgefield County, 1924; County Superintendent of Education, Edgefield County, 1929-33; State Senator from Edgefield County, 1933-38; while in the Senate, he was a member of the Social Security Committee that prepared and sponsored the first law providing for assistance to the old people, the blind, and needy children, the joint committee of the Senate and House that prepared and sponsored the first Rural Electrification Act, and the joint committee that prepared and sponsored the act to construct the Santee-Cooper Power and Navigation Project, sponsored legislation for increased State-supported school term, school textbook system, school attendance law, prevention of chiseling of teachers' salaries, new buildings at the State colleges and other legislation for the promotion of education, Soil Conservation Act, the Wade Hampton State Office Building, and legislation for betterment of labor conditions and protection of farmers; Circuit Judge of South Carolina, 1938-46 (served in Army in World War II for 3½ years during this period), and while Circuit Judge occasionally served as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the State.

Served in Officer's Reserve Corps 1924-37 and subsequent to World War II, and as Officer in State Guard 1941-42; Volunteered for service in World War II the first day war was declared against Germany, obtained a leave of absence from his position of Circuit Judge and entered upon active duty April 17, 1942, member of the First Army and attached to the famous 82nd Airborne Division for the invasion of Europe, served in all battles of the First Army which fought through France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Czechoslovakia and Germany, transferred to Pacific Theatre after the war in Europe ended and was serving in the Philippine Islands when the war against Japan terminated, discharged from service January 20, 1946, received the following decorations, awards and medals for his war service: Legion of Merit for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services on the Continent of Europe, Bronze Star for heroism on the field of battle in France, Army Commendation Ribbon for service of an exceptionally high order in both quality and volume of output, Purple Heart for injuries received in action against the enemy in Normandy, France, on June 6, 1944 (D-Day), Presidential Distinguished Unit Citation for extraordinary heroism and outstanding performance of duty in action in the initial assault on the Coast of France, Bronze Arrowhead for service as a member of the Assault Troops landing in enemy-held territory, France on D-Day, Five Battle
Stars for campaigns in Normandy, Northern France, Rhineland, Ardennes, and Central Europe, the Cross of Military Service by United Daughters of the Confederacy for faithful and honorable service, Selective Service Medal for patriotic services, Cross of the Officer of the Order of the Crown by the Belgian Government for services to the cause of freedom, Croix de Guerre avec Etoile de Vermiel by the French Government for exceptional services of war rendered in the course of the operations for the liberation of France, medals for service in the American, European and Pacific Theaters, and the Victory Medal.

Upon release from the Army he returned to the Circuit Bench; resigned from the Bench when he announced for Governor on May 15, 1946; and in the race for Governor was elected over ten opponents; has served in such varied capacities as Superintendent of the Baptist Sunday School, County Chairman of American Red Cross, President of the Clemson College Alumni Association, Trustee of Winthrop College (the South Carolina College for Women), State Councillor of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, President of the Lions Club, Vice-President of the South Carolina Bar Association, delegate to the National Democratic Conventions of 1932 and 1936, and member of State and National Defense Committees of American Legion; is also a member of the American Bar Association, Reserve Officers Association, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Veterans of Global Wars, Military Order of the World Wars, Masonic Order, Woodmen of the World, Knights of Pythias, Loyal Order of Moose, Sons of American Revolution, South Carolina Historical Society (Charleston), Grange and South Carolina Farm Bureau; honorary member of the Clarisophic Literary Society of the University of South Carolina, the Strawberry Leaf Club (Forensic) of Winthrop College and Tiger Brotherhood and the Blue Key (Leadership fraternities) of Clemson College; a prominent street in Edgefield was named for him, and also “Thurmond Hall” the new Home Economics Building at Winthrop College; member Executive Committee of National Governors’ Conference and Chairman Freight Rate Committee of Southern Governors’ Conference; Baptist; Democrat.

Recommended as candidate for President of the United States by Conference of States’ Rights Democrats, Birmingham, Alabama, July 17th, 1948.

Officially nominated as candidate for President of the United States by the State Democratic Parties of Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina and so notified by representatives of the Parties of these states in Houston, Texas, August 11th, 1948.

Accepted the nomination for President of the United States in Houston, Texas, August 11th, 1948.
Address by J. Strom Thurmond, Governor of South Carolina, Accepting the States' Rights Democratic Nomination for President of the United States at Houston, Texas, 8:55 P. M. CST, Aug. 11, 1948

My Fellow Americans:

Destiny brings us to the great State of Texas on this battleground for freedom. We sound a call for a return to constitutional government in America.

The Democratic Convention in Philadelphia rejected a resolution, offered by a distinguished Texan, to rededicate the Democratic Party to its time-honored and traditional principles of States' Rights, home rule and local self-government. That convention rejected that resolution and adopted in its place a program of mis-named Civil Rights, calling for a police state in this country. The Democratic Convention repudiated the principles of the Democratic Party and followed a pattern fashioned by the nominee of the Republican Convention held in the same city, and a blue-print prepared by the nominee of the communistic Progressive Party for lifting the face of America and giving us the “new Russian look.”

How beautiful it is for such brethren—Dewey, Truman and Wallace—to dwell together in unity!

The mis-named Civil Rights Program, which calls for a police state, is embraced by the nominee of the Republican Convention, advocated by the nominee of the Democratic Convention and championed by the nominee of the communistic Progressive Convention. All are committed to make a scramble of constitutional government in America in exchange for a block of disgruntled votes. We hold that it is reprehensible for those who influenced the three Philadelphia Conventions to offer to trade constitutional and fundamental rights for political power.

If America is to remain free, her people must never submit to any candidate undertaking to barter away any part of our constitution for political advantages.

States Rights Americans resist this shameful betrayal of our national charter. States Rights Americans stand beside the constitution of the United States with drawn sword. States Rights Americans are ready to stand, even at the expense of life itself, as Crockett, Bowie and Houston stood in Texas, for individual liberty and freedom, for the right of the people to govern themselves. States Rights and local self-government are older than the constitution. They existed before the Union was formed and were recognized and protected by Thomas Jefferson and the other founding Fathers when they wrote the constitution itself.

The preservation of the prerogatives of the people of a sovereign state, their right to deal exclusively with domestic problems, and the absolute and unqualified denial of a totalitarian state in the United States; these principles are just as vital as, and more intimately affect the welfare of every man, woman and child in America than, even such important
questions as foreign policy, labor-management relations, public housing, European relief, price control, and all other serious questions which we face today, important as those issues are. All of these questions can be solved with justice to the nations of the world and to our people at home, if constitutional government is maintained and preserved in America. But if the right to rule and govern ourselves in such domestic matters as voting and qualifications for voting, segregation, law enforcement and private employment are to be bartered away for a political price, no man can visualize the chaos, the confusion, the disaster and the ruin which will follow in the wake of such a cowardly surrender of blood-bought rights and such a brazen betrayal of the liberty of a free people. The proposed federal police state, directed from Washington, will force life in each hamlet in America to conform to a Washington pattern. Russia is ruled from Moscow. May God forbid that your state and my state, your county and my county, your city and my city, your farm and my farm, shall ever be subjected to Washington Bureaucratic police rule.

We may develop the best foreign policy a nation ever enjoyed. We may create labor-management relations that will be the envy of the world. We may build a mansion for every man and bind up the wounds of Europe and make that war-torn, devastated land a "garden of Eden." We may control prices until the profiteer and blackmarketeer disappear from the face of the earth. But if we lose States Rights, which safeguard the most precious of all human rights—the right to control and govern ourselves at home, the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—then may we ask: "For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

No, my friends, if this nation, the nation to which the world is looking for leadership, abandons the principles of government that have given us the capacity to lead; if we jettison or throw overboard the compass that has guided us to the port of greatness; then we are headed for the rocks of totalitarianism and the persecution and cruelties of a totalitarian state.

This is no sectional or regional matter. It is as important to the people of Arizona as it is to the people of Alabama; as important to the people of California as it is to the people of Connecticut; as important to the people of Montana as it is to the people of Maine, as important to the people of the world as it is to the people of Texas; as important to people yet unborn as it is to you and me today.

No citizen of any state is safe, if any political party is allowed to go unchallenged when it undertakes to barter away this sacred constitutional right for political advantage.

Our American way of constitutional government, and its guarantees of liberty and the right of local government, is a heritage handed down to us by our forefathers. Our men marched beneath the burning sun in Africa; swam ashore at Salerno; stormed the rocky beach at Normandy; and planted the Stars and Stripes on the highest peak of Iwo Jima, to uphold and defend the constitution of the United States, which is the only
protection that human rights have in a world menaced by dictators and almost wrecked by politicians’ greed for power. The platforms and programs adopted by the three Philadelphia conventions repudiate the essential right of local self-government and treat as a scrap of paper our constitution which millions of our American boys fought to uphold and defend. This is a pronounced step toward the police state.

We must establish to the satisfaction of the world, as well as to politicians of little faith at home, that the basic fundamental rights of the people of the several sovereign states are not for sale and cannot be sold or exchanged, even for the Presidency itself.

Every section of this nation, your section and my section, favors human rights. Everybody favors human rights. But it is a fraud on the American people to pretend that human rights can long endure without constitutional restraint on the power of government. Millions of people living today have seen this truth written in blood in recent human history. Hitler offered the people of Germany a shortcut to human progress. He gained power by advocating human rights for minority groups. Under his plan, the constitutional rights of the people were destroyed. We oppose these disciples of political expediency who, today, emulate Hitler and who offer the ill-fated European experiment, as a shortcut to human progress, which ended in tears, blood, disillusionment and tragedy.

Mussolini also tried this shortcut to human progress without regard to constitutional government. In the end, the people of Italy were brought to despair and destruction.

Stalin today is one of the greatest advocates of his conception of human rights, and the one man in the world who least respects constitutional government. Can you say that the people of Russia enjoy human rights? Shall we be so blind as to follow those who today would lead our people down that gloomy road of disillusionment along which Hitler led the people of Germany; Mussolini led the people of Italy; and along which Stalin is leading the people of Russia? Each of them was supported by a federal police force, and each of them made of his country a police state. God forbid that we permit our America so to degenerate.

The proposal to take from you your right to deal with your local problems in a way that is satisfactory to you, and to invest the right to deal with those problems in Washington in a way that is wholly unsatisfactory to you, is so antagonistic to our form of government, and so contrary to everything that we have stood for since 1776, that it is obliged to be communistic in concept, un-American in principle, and un-Democratic in execution.

Now let us examine this so-called Civil Rights program which is so heartily supported by the three nominees of the Philadelphia conventions.

First is the Federal Anti-Poll Tax Bill. By this bill, Congress invades the power of the states to elect their own officials and would control elections within the states by taking this power from the people.

It is fundamental in the whole American system that, if liberty is to be retained in this country, the control of our elections must remain at
home. There can be no tyrant, there can be no dictator, in America, if the people in the communities of the nation control their elections, fix voting qualifications, and say who can and who cannot vote. This is historic Americanism.

LYNCHING

There is pending in the Congress an Anti-lynching Bill. Of course, everyone is against lynching. The Reds, the Pinks and the subversives are making use of the horror which American people hold for this form of murder to try to change our system of government.

If the Anti-lynching Bill were enacted, the Congress would seize the power to punish for crimes committed within a state.

When one reads the notes of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, he realizes that it was fundamental that the police power must be controlled at home. Local control of the police power was conceived by the founders of the country as the basic safeguard of human liberty in the United States. They deliberately and intentionally denied to the federal government any police powers, because they realized that centralization of police power is the certain road to dictatorship, to tyranny, and to oppression. Without exception, every country which the communists have taken over from "within," and every country which has come under control of a dictator, has lost its freedom through central control of the police powers and the creation of a centralized police system.

In the anti-lynching bill the federal government, under the guise of preventing lynching, is trying to take their police power from the states. We have President Truman's word that he is now training federal police to enforce it, federal police to go in each hamlet of the country and impose the will of a strong federal government upon the people. Federal police! What could be more un-American? When this occurs, the last vestige of local control of the police and local exercise of the police power, so essential if we are to remain a free people, will have been destroyed.

Second—Separation of the Races. The people in a local community have the right to use the means and methods that will best promote harmonious relations. Some may determine that separation of the two races is the way to accomplish their purpose. This is a method employed to establish and maintain better race relations. In some states segregation is provided by law. In other states segregation is prohibited by law. In still other states there is no law treating with the subject. The will of the people is reflected in the laws enacted by their own legislative bodies. Each state has the right—a right that should not be denied by any power—to avail itself of the best method of promoting harmony between the people of different races within its boundaries. Every right-thinking American wants good racial relations. If the interests of the people of New York are better served under laws prohibiting segregation, then they should have the right to prohibit segregation. If the people of Georgia are better governed under segregation laws, then they should have the right to enact segregation legislation. If a state does not need legislation
for or against segregation, then federal laws on the subject should not be imposed on that state. The states which have segregation laws are not seeking to impose segregation on the states that have no segregation laws. Neither is there any clamor in states that prohibit segregation for abolishing segregation in other jurisdictions. The clamor comes from agitators and socially maladjusted persons who do not care about or understand the conditions existing in the many communities in the United States where people of different races work and live together. Even in states where there are anti-segregation laws, the people voluntarily establish segregation; otherwise, there would be no Harlem in New York City, no Chinatown in San Francisco, no South Side in Chicago, and no similar segregated communities in Philadelphia, Detroit and other densely populated cities.

The tragedy that lies in the willingness of the professional politician, seeking office, to usurp power is well illustrated by the horrible example given lately by the nominees of the Republican, Democratic and Progressive Parties, Dewey, Truman and Wallace—all willing to break down the separation of the races in the armed forces, even at the sacrifice of the morale of the soldiers and the safety of the country itself, against the advice of the military leaders charged with the defense of the nation. Our boys in service should not be subjected to an unnecessary hazard. The American people do not want their sons placed in such a position, when the military leaders say it is unsafe, simply, to allow politicians of this country to appeal to bloc votes.

THE F. E. P. C.

The proposed federal Fair Employment Practices act, calling for a federal Fair Employment Practices Commission, generally known as the FEPC, was introduced in the United States Senate by Senator Ives as Senate Bill 984. This proposed law would make it unlawful to discriminate in matters of employment on account of "race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry." The proposed American FEPC was patterned after a Russian law written by Joseph Stalin about 1920, referred to in Russia as Stalin's "All-Races Law." It outlaws discrimination in matters of employment on account of "race, color or national origin." The Russian law does not include the word "religion" because Stalin did not want to admit the existence of religion in Russia at the time he wrote the law. The proposed American law, to that extent, is broader than the Russian law in that it outlaws discrimination in the matter of employment on the ground of "race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry." Stalin was commissar of Nationalities at the time that he wrote this law, and he used it as a means of advancing himself to supreme dictator of Soviet Russia. The administrative and judicial provisions in the proposed FEPC faithfully follow the Russian pattern in Stalin's "All-Races Law."

With this history and background, it would have been natural for the American people to have expected the nominees of the Philadelphia conventions to oppose this proposed collection of communistic ideas, dish ed up to the American people as a Fair Employment Practices act, instead
of calling for its enactment. States Rights Democrats oppose this American edition of the Russian FEPC, because it violates every concept of the right of employers and employees under the constitution of the United States. This illustrates the extent to which communistic ideas and cooperative comrades have infiltrated into the United States. If the records of certain government officials, demanded by Congress, were made available by the President, as requested, it may be that we would have a better idea of how much American legislation is influenced by the Soviet Republic. The Executive Department of our government should not shield the communistic connections or the activities of any person connected with our government. The Chief Executive, of all men, should fearlessly expose all available information of that nature.

The FEPC is admirably suited to the Russian form of government, where the thoughts, activities and ambitions of the people are controlled from Moscow, and they live and move at the whim and caprice of a dictator. It will not work in free America or in any free country where the dignity and worth and liberty of the individual is respected.

We have recently learned of the infiltration of communist spies into our government and our critical industries. You may rest assured that the communists will use the FEPC law to serve their purposes. It will afford them a way of forcing their agents and saboteurs into every tool and die room, every machine shop and every industrial plant and laboratory, atomic or otherwise, in America. The FEPC was made to order for communist use in their designs upon our national security. The FEPC might well be entitled a law to sabotage America.

The FEPC contains a fundamental threat to our American way of life. This proposal calls for an army of federal police, empowered to spy into the affairs of each business enterprise in the United States, to control the hiring and firing of employees, promotion and demotion of employees, and to enforce rules and regulations which govern the relations between employer and employee.

From the point of view of the employee, he or she will no longer have the right to choose his or her associates, either on the job or in the labor organizations. The employer is deprived of his right to employ people who will best serve his business. He cannot promote and demote as his judgment demands. From the point of view of all of us, whether employer or employee or other private citizen, the net effect of FEPC will be to force all business and business relationships in this country into a Washington pattern, guided and enforced by a federal Gestapo, with dangerous powers over the lives of all our people.

The Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice is to be reorganized to enforce this so-called Civil Rights program. Its agents would circulate throughout the land, meddling with private business, policing elections, intervening in private lawsuits, breeding litigation, and keeping our people in a constant state of apprehension and harrassment. Liberty quickly perishes under such a setup, as we have seen in Europe in our own time. The people do not want the Federal government to usurp the police power, and thereby sow the seeds of a Gestapo in America.
I assure you that the danger is deadly in its seriousness. There is no question but that this follows in detail the pattern used in Germany and Italy by the dictators to destroy the liberties of those people. There is no question but that this method was used first to capture the labor unions, then to destroy them, in those unfortunate lands.

There are millions of Americans who subscribe to the principles we are fighting for. There are millions of Americans who want both parties returned to fundamental principles. There are millions of Americans who put loyalty to the constitution above any obligation to a politician or a political party. There are millions of Americans who recognize that the preservation of the principles and rights we have discussed is indispensable to the Democracy and our democratic way of life. The voice of these people must be heard. We want them heard through the Democratic organizations in each state, if those organizations will make it possible for them to be heard. If any organization is boss-ridden or boss-controlled, to the extent that it will not allow the people in that state to express themselves, then we call on States Rights Americans everywhere to take the steps necessary under the laws of the state in which they live to make their voices heard. Dewey offers no hope to a voter who believes in States Rights and constitutional government. Truman offers you no hope. Wallace has destroyed any hope of his doing anything but following the communist party line.

For 45 years our country elected presidents and vice-presidents without a national party convention. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson were elected without conventions, because the people in each state made themselves heard. All of them were great presidents, and all of them championed states rights and stood immovable for constitutional government.

Conventions that repudiate the people, and the rights of the people, should be repudiated by the people. States Rights Americans appeal to you to repudiate the radicalism, the rampant disregard of constitutional government advocated and approved at Philadelphia, by all three of the conventions, and to join with us in the defense of the American way of life.

To me has come a great honor and a great responsibility. The people of Alabama, Mississippi and South Carolina, through their organized Democracies, have asked Governor Wright, with whom it is my particular privilege to be associated, and myself, to lead in this fight to preserve the freedom secured by our forefathers, the freedom without which there can be no peace, no happiness, no future in this republic, for us or for our children—the heritage beyond price, which is the American way of life.

With humility, with the knowledge that the greatness of the cause must overshadow all its servants, I accept the nomination for president, and promise an utter dedication to the limit of all power that is within me, under God and His mercy, to this cause of freedom in this land of ours.
GOVERNOR FIELDING L. WRIGHT
States' Rights Candidate
for
VICE-PRESIDENT
of the United States
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FIELDING LEWIS WRIGHT

Wright, Fielding Lewis—Formerly Attorney-at-Law, at Rolling Fork, Mississippi; born May 16, 1895, at Rolling Fork (Sharkey County); son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry J. Wright; married Miss Nan Kelly, July 16, 1917; two children, Fielding L. Wright, Jr., and Elaine Wright; graduate of Webb School, Bebuckle, Tennessee and University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; from 1928-1932 served as member of the Mississippi State Senate; 1932 to 1940 as member of the Mississippi House of Representatives; was Speaker of the House of Representatives from 1936-1940; from 1940-1944 resumed private practice of law, voluntarily withdrawing from public office; 1944-1946 served as Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi and presiding officer of the State Senate; 1946-1948: On November 2, 1946, he automatically became Governor of Mississippi due to the death of Governor Thomas L. Bailey, whose term expired in January 1948; 1947 was overwhelmingly elected Governor of Mississippi in his own right over three opponents in the first primary; 1948-1952, serving as Governor of Mississippi for a full four year term; is one of few men to serve in both legislative branches in Mississippi; as Speaker of the House, as presiding officer of the Senate, as Lieutenant Governor and as Governor; is a member of the Methodist Church; a veteran of World War I; a Mason; a Rotarian; a VFW; member of the American Legion; was first to sound warning of pending invasion of States' Rights in Inaugural Address on January 20, 1948 and has actively fought the foes of States' Rights since that date; led Mississippi's delegation to the National Democratic Convention, Philadelphia, July 12-14 and on the evening of July 14th, 1948 led the delegation in its famous "walkout" from that convention.

On July 17th, 1948 he was recommended by the Conference of States' Rights Democrats, Birmingham, Alabama, as candidate for Vice-President of the United States.

Officially nominated as candidate for Vice-President of the United States by the State Democratic Parties of Alabama, Mississippi and South Carolina and so notified by representatives of the Parties of those states in Houston, Texas, August 11th, 1948.

Accepted the nomination for Vice-President of the United States in Houston, Texas, August 11th, 1948.

Address by Fielding L. Wright, Governor of Mississippi, Accepting States' Rights Democratic Vice-Presidential Nomination at Houston, Texas, 8:34 P. M. CST, August 11, 1948.

My Friends and Fellow Citizens:

I am happy to be here today in the magnificent State of Texas and in this outstanding City of Houston, in itself a symbol of the growing economic, cultural and social might of this Nation. But above all else, I am happy and proud to be given the opportunity of fighting publicly and on behalf of my fellow citizens for the great truths of government in which I so firmly believe.

States Rights is a phrase which has become familiar to all in this country, but, unfortunately, to many its true meaning has been lost by
too much familiarity with its use and too little understanding of its basic concept. Reduced to its simplest terms, government is merely a control of men by men. Man, by his nature, though capable of the highest form of devotion to duty and responsibility, is likewise subject to all of the infirmities of a human being. Under our system of government, in our villages, towns and cities, the citizens select those few who are necessary to control the relationships of the persons in that community. They are chosen to take charge of the necessary public services and to see that the inhabitants are given the opportunity of pursuing their callings in peace and in order, and no other power is conferred on them by the people. The right to work or to loaf, to choose your vocation and change your job, to guide the education of your children, to attend the church of your choice, to work with whom you please, to go where you choose, are only illustrative of the great mass of rights and privileges retained by the people.

Where there are no villages, towns or cities, the people in a region co-operate to select their local county government. Whether it be city, town, village or county, those who are placed in office are selected from the rank and file of the persons living in the community. They are men and women known to the people. Their faults, their virtues, their abilities and integrity is an open book. Actions taken by them are subject to the personal scrutiny and knowledge of their neighbors. There is no mystery connected with the government they give. It is known, weighed, criticized, appreciated, praised or condemned by those who possess this knowledge, and the men who are so selected are truly familiar with and cognizant of the particular problems to be faced in the individual community. They are in constant touch and contact with their neighbors and their fellow citizens and they are fully aware that they will have to account to them for their success or their failures. This is the essence of local self-government and it is what a majority of the people of this country are convinced is the best form of government on earth.

The moment that government becomes remote, distant, mysterious and beyond the comprehension of the people themselves, danger arises and we subject ourselves to the possibility of abuse of power and ultimate dictatorship. This ever-constant peril is visible to us at all times. In our large cities and more populous areas, machine politicians and self-seeking officeholders have obtained and held an unrelenting grip on their municipalities.

This threat of seizure of control by big city bosses and their henchmen is today greatly augmented and increased by the three million federal jobholders, none of whom are elected by the people other than the President and Vice-President.

With this cardinal precept in mind and ever conscious of existing dangers, the various communities of this country bound themselves into regions designated as states. Each community possesses all of the power necessary to deal with any problem that arises within its borders.

When the United States of America was formed and the constitution was written, the people were insistent and demanding that local government be forever preserved in all of its dignity and with all of its safeguards. In the drafting of the constitution, it was specifically provided that the right and authority of the State to conduct its own affairs should
be preserved inviolate, and there was conferred upon the Federal Government only so much power and authority as was necessary to control and regulate the relationships of the states, one with another, and the conduct of this nation's foreign affairs and unified defense. Ratification of the constitution by the original states was obtained only after the citizens in each state received definite and positive assurances that this fundamental concept of government was recognized by the constitution.

For almost 100 years now the South has given consistent and persistent loyalty to the Democratic Party. Such loyalty over so long a period of time has not been unreasoning and without justification. The preservation of States Rights ever since the organization of the Democratic Party has been one of its dominant principles. The first party platform of the Democrats, adopted in 1840, resolved that "Congress has no power under the constitution to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several states, and that such states are the sole and proper judges of everything pertaining to their own affairs not prohibited by the constitution."

Down through the years this principle has continuously been recognized and maintained by the Democratic Party until the present generation. At the Philadelphia convention for the first time in its long history this doctrine was completely and finally repudiated. Chief Justice Marshall, one of the greatest justices of the United States Supreme Court, in a famous decision said that "No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the states and compartment the American people into one common mass." With all his genius, Marshall could not foresee the "wildness" of those who pose as party leaders today.

Is this principle of States Rights an archaic doctrine, as insisted by those who seek the concentration of power in Washington? I say to you that it is a living principle, as vital and essential today as it was in the foundation days of the Republic; the doctrine of free society and free men as opposed to regimentation of thought and action. It is as alive as totalitarianism is alive—and save for America, the world is in slavery today. It is the only alternative to abject subjection to the tyranny of dictatorship.

The three Philadelphia conventions succeeded in an amazing way in frustrating the voice of the people. Dewey is not the choice of the Republican rank and file. Truman, an acknowledged loser, certainly does not represent organized Democracy. Wallace represents Russia and its ideology. Millions of our people are anxiously seeking a candidate who really thinks the thoughts of America and who places principle before political expediency. They are disgusted with the antics of Truman. Neither do they want Dewey or Republicanism. They know that in the long run there is no hope for America there.

Ever since its inception as the Federalist Party and its evolution into the Republican Party, that political group has always favored a strong national government, centralized to the greatest degree, and completely dominant over the individual states. There has been no material change of recent years in the advocacy of this principle by the Republican Party. As a result, you and I and the other thoughtful citizens of this land, con-
scions of the fact that the disappearance of local self-government is the first step to dictatorship, cannot support either the Republican or the Democratic platforms as they are now constituted. Until such time as the machine politicians, the big city bosses, and the so-called liberal elements have been cleaned out of the Democratic Party, we must, under the banner of States Rights, carry this fight to every crossroad of this nation.

Democracy is not a thing of Washington. Democracy is a thing of the crossroads. It is at the crossroads that the people of this nation live. It is at the crossroads that their children are born; that they go to church on Sunday; that the schools are placed; that the average American citizen lives his life and is finally taken to his father. It is at the crossroads that the life of America takes place—not in Washington. All of those things that touch him most closely happen at the crossroads. The exercise of democracy is there. Let his local officials become overly ambitious and interfere with his rights, he knows it immediately and he acts. Let any local dictator seek to establish himself, he knows it immediately, and the methods and the means to strike that man down are in his hands. The base of democracy is there; there it will endure or die. There it is strong, tenacious of life, resistant to degeneration or decay. There it lives, resurgent, determined, strong.

The heads of the various pressure groups which have become so powerful in our American life know this. They know it and they fear it. They know that, if the world is to be changed from that American life which has made this nation great and to be molded in accordance with the pattern of some crackpot reformer, it must be done away from the crossroads. It is for that reason that the typical power-hungry politician and the typical head of the pressure group seek to concentrate all power in Washington, where they have to contend with one Congress and not with 48 state legislatures; where the means of working their own ends are far more easily reached.

With these reasons in mind and with a full consciousness of these eternal truths and the dire necessity for immediate and aggressive action, I am most happy to accept the nomination for Vice-President of the United States this day tendered to me by the Democratic Parties of South Carolina, Alabama and Mississippi. It will be a distinct privilege and a happy pleasure to be associated with my esteemed friend, Governor Thurmond.

Today the present Democratic and Republican Parties are philosophically bankrupt. They are mere vehicles for getting into and holding onto office. They veer from point to point without regard to principle, but only with an insensate desire to pander to any minority for votes. Government by bloc, by vociferous minorities, is a cowardly thing. It is a disgrace to America. It paves the way for ultimate dictatorship or socialism. Only a return to American principles, to local self-government, can halt the unseemly spectacle we are now witnessing.

Wherever there are men and women of responsibility, of thought, of action, of a true desire to see the great American form of government fulfill its manifest destiny, there we will find supporters for this great movement of ours. You men and women assembled here today have furnished the leadership. You shall find countless thousands of your fellow citizens rallying around our banner!
Concluding Remarks of Inaugural Address of
GOVERNOR FIELDING L. WRIGHT
Of Mississippi
Jackson, Mississippi—January 20, 1948
In Which He Sounded The First Warning Of The Threatened In­
vasion Of States’ Rights And The Individual Liberties
Of The Citizens Of This Nation.

****Facing the future, as your Chief Executive, I would be remiss in
my responsibilities if your attention were not directed to the fact that we
are living in unsettled, uncertain and even perilous times. One need not be
a diplomat nor a student of international affairs to see the many danger
flags flying throughout the world in the field of international relations
as democracy clashes with communism in a struggle which will determine
whether or not these two ideologies can live together in cooperation or
if we must once again maintain our heritage and our freedom in the
cold and cruel crucible of war. Nor need one be an economic prophet
to realize that the inflation running rampant in this country today—if
allowed to continue its mad flight unchecked—will eventually, and in the
not too far distant future, lead us into the depths of another great de­
pression.

But, serious as these problems may be, they can be met and solved
if approached in the spirit of common sense, honesty and unselfishness
which has characterized our efforts in so many difficult and trying times
in the past.

And as we search for the answers to these problems, there is yet
another most serious conflict being thrust upon the people of Mississippi
and our beloved Southland; thrust upon us in the Congress of the United
States and through press and radio services throughout the country. That
is the campaign of abuse and misrepresentation being levelled against our
section by those who seek to tear down and disrupt our institutions and
our way of life. They are using as their tools such infamous proposals
as FEPC, antilynching legislation, anti-poll tax bills, and now the anti­
segregation proposals.

The charge of dereliction of duty could be hurled at me by the
citizens of this State were I to fail to direct your thoughts to the vicious
effect of the proposals of the Committee appointed by the President of
the United States to study and make recommendations under the guise of
preservation of civil liberties. Those of you who read and studied the re­
port recognize in it a further, and I might say, the most dangerous step,
towards the destruction of those traditions and customs so vital to our
way of life, particularly in our Southland.

These measures, and the proposals of this Committee are delibera­
tely aimed to wreck the South and our institutions. But they are far more
sinister than being mere pieces of anti-Southern legislation and recom­
mendations, for, hidden under their misleading titles and guarded phra­
seology, are elements so completely foreign to our American way of living
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and thinking that they will, if enacted, eventually destroy this nation and all of the freedoms which we have long cherished and maintained.

The advocates of today’s anti-Southern legislation disregard the great instrument creating this government which makes of us a union of sovereign states. This nation, of which we are so justly proud, has grown great amid our very many differences of ideas. Each of our forty-eight states has made singular and specific contributions to the national whole because while they are different the people had the individual leeway to decide their own best methods for solving their local problems. Individuals in this nation have achieved the heights because they had the right to use their own personal talents, and no man was standardized or limited to any given level of attainment or service to or among his fellows.

With this record of achievement which has made our country the greatest in the world—with our structure of republican government which has enabled our sovereign states to live together in relative harmony and progress, and which has brought to all our people a standard of living never before achieved in human history—I cannot understand why there are those in this land today and in the Congress of the United States who would begin its disintegration by such types of nefarious legislation as I have previously mentioned. The legislation to which I have referred flagrantly invades the sovereign rights of the individual states. It undertakes to destroy our proper privilege of solving our own individual problems in the light of all our circumstances.

Aside from this fundamental right, such legislation violates the very experience of man, namely, that the problems of human relationships are so varied and diverse that we can never begin to solve all of them by laws. They can only be answered by education and continued progress in the light of truth as God may give us wisdom to see and embrace the truth. And they can only be solved by the people who understand and know and are familiar with the problem.

Here in Mississippi and the South may be found the greatest example in human history of harmonious relationships ever recorded as existing between two so different and distinct races as the White and the Negro, living so closely together and in such nearly equal numbers. The uninterrupted progress which has been made will be continued in an orderly, effective manner if both races are left alone by those unfamiliar with the true situation. This problem is being solved by Mississippians and by Southerners in a wholesome and constructive manner. We know that human relationship cannot be equalized and balanced by legislation, unless through such legislation the power of the state is exercised to force all men into a pattern—a rigid pattern which would operate to destroy the freedoms of all and cut off our march of progress.

We believe that the people of each of the forty-eight states—North, South, East, and West—are the most capable of judging their own respective local needs and meeting them. We know that this was the program set up by our founding fathers and guaranteed in our Constitution.

In Mississippi, and I think in the other states known as the South, we feel that our rights are being threatened by enemies of the South
who are in fact also enemies of the nation. We are convinced that in
upholding our position in this current struggle, we are in fact main-
taining the interests of all the American people and each of the forty-
eight states. Yes, we are confident that we are by our position upholding
the rights of the members of all races and sections.

As a life-long Democrat, as a descendant of Democrats, as the Gov-
ernor of this nation's most Democratic State, I would regret to see the
day come when Mississippi or the South should break with the Democratic
party in a national election. But vital principles and eternal truths
transcend party lines, and the day is now at hand when determined action
must be taken.

We have repeatedly seen the proposal of various measures in the
Congress which were not for the best interests of the nation but defi-
initely designed to appeal to certain voting groups holding the balance
of power in other states. We of the South will no longer tolerate being
the target for this type of legislation which would not only destroy our
way of life, but which, if enacted, would eventually destroy the United
States. The time has come for the militant people of the South and
nation, who have never shirked any patriotic responsibility, to band to-
gether for the preservation of true Americanism. United in our cause,
we serve not only ourselves and our neighbors, but all of our fellow
citizens throughout the nation.

As we face this particular task, I invite the patience, calm delibera-
tion, counsel, and cooperation of all men of good will and true Ameri-
canism, wherever they may be. We are Democrats; we have been loyal
to the Democratic Party at all times, in its periods of success as well as
in the dark days of despair. We voted the Democratic ticket when no
other section stayed with the banner. We have never shirked, nor have
we ever faltered in our loyalty to our Party. There are some who sub-
scribe to the belief that due to this record of faithful service we are taken
for granted and are not deemed worthy of consideration in formulating
party policy and platforms. A continuation of the harassing and unfair
legislation to which I have referred will compel all of us to such a con-
clusion.

This is a new day in state and national politics, and circumstances
may make necessary a new, and, we hope, a temporary approach to na-
tional politics by our State and Southland. We have always remained
true to the traditions of our Party, and will continue to do so, but when
the national leaders attempt to change those principles for which the
party stands, we intend to fight for its preservation with all means at
our hands. We must make our national leaders fully realize we mean
precisely what we say, and we must, if necessary, implement our words
with positive action. We warn them now, to take heed. Drastic though
our methods may be, and as far-reaching as the results may prove, we
are certain that the ultimate consequence will fully justify any temporary
set-back that may follow our action. ****
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Keynote Address Of
J. STROM THURMOND
Governor Of South Carolina
Before States’ Rights Democratic Conference
Jackson, Mississippi, May 10, 1948

Governor Wright, Governor Laney, and Fellow Democrats of the South:

We have gathered here today because the American system of free constitutional government is in danger.

We are here because we have been betrayed in the house of our fathers, and we are determined that those who committed this betrayal shall not go unpunished.

We intend to meet the challenge and save constitutional government in the United States.

We shall discharge our responsibility as Democrats true to the principles of our Party, and demonstrate to the Nation that the spirit which kindled this Republic still lives in the South.

Whenever a great section of this country is regarded as so politically impotent that one major political party insults it because it is “in the bag”, and the other party scorns it because there is no chance of victory, then the time has arrived for corrective and concerted action.

When this campaign is over, leaders in both political parties will realize we no longer intend to be a door mat on which Presidential candidates may wipe their political shoes every time they want to appeal to minority groups in doubtful states.

We are sick and tired of the meretricious leadership that now dominates our Party. We have stripped decks for action. The fight is on and we will not lay our armor down until the present leadership of the Democratic Party is repudiated and the South is again recognized as a political entity of these United States.

I appreciate more than I can tell you the honor which you have bestowed upon me on this important occasion.

I told Governor Wright during the Southern Governors’ activity I would be glad to attend this meeting in Mississippi, and do what I could for the cause. In accepting his invitation I did not expect to be honored by being asked to make your keynote address. I have enjoyed working with Governor Wright and also Governor Laney. Both have rendered outstanding service in this movement.

We believe in the cause for which the South is fighting, and we are determined that we shall win.

We of the South are a proud people. We come from a stock that has never truckled even in the face of defeat or rule by Federal bayonet.

We meet here today with no apology. We want no one to be mistaken or misled. We are going to fight, as long as we have breath, for
the rights of our states and our people under the American Constitution; and come what may, we are going to preserve our civilization in the South.

In these days when some of our leaders, yes, leaders of our own Democratic Party, think it popular to insult the South and strike at the heart of our institutions, I would remind them again of the contribution the South has made in the building of this Nation.

From the Southern states first came the call for a declaration of independence. It was the great Southerner, Thomas Jefferson, who wrote that immortal document. What the sage of Monticello proclaimed by pen, another great Southerner, George Washington, won with his sword.

After we had won our independence we were without the machinery of government to preserve and perpetuate it. From the South came the movement that resulted in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Over that Convention Washington presided. The main principles which the delegates wrote into the Constitution were taken from plans drawn up by James Madison of Virginia and Charles Pinckney of South Carolina.

We have only to read the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention to know the part played by the states we represent in creating our government.

We do not forget that of the first 25 Presidents, the South contributed 10. In those critical formative years of our Republic, Southern Presidents held the reins of government for 53 years.

Not only in the affairs of government, but in economics, in science, in social development, in education, in religion, and in every field of endeavor that contributes to human progress, the South has made its full contribution in the building of our country.

Our progress was set back many decades by the War Between the States. We are not here to fight that war over again. It is only fair to say, however, that even in those days the South suffered from vicious propaganda. No effort was spared to make it appear that we fought to perpetuate human slavery, and thereby obscure the fundamental constitutional and economic issues which brought on that unhappy conflict.

When the war was over, we were subjected to the bitter Reconstruction period. We experienced first hand the ordeal of a conquered and occupied land. Our economy was destroyed, and we had to rebuild on the foundation of a shattered civilization. The slaves who had been freed as a war measure were left as a millstone around our neck. The burden of recovery was made more difficult by the necessity of caring for these former slaves while overcoming the dislocation and destruction left in the path of war.

Throughout the whole period which has elapsed since that time, we of the South, and we alone, have cared and provided for the Negroes in our midst, and the progress which has been made by that race is a tribute to the efforts of Southerners, and of Southerners alone. The “emancipators” have done absolutely nothing to make this task easier.
On the contrary, both races have suffered in the economic struggle to overcome artificial barriers to our recovery and growth imposed upon this part of the Nation from without. The wonder is, not how little we have done, but how much we have been able to do for our people under such crushing handicaps.

It was not long after Reconstruction that a freight rate structure was instituted with discriminatory sectional differentials. The industrial progress of the Southeast, for instance, was thwarted by a 39% rate differential on manufactured goods as compared with the Eastern section of the country. The effect of these discriminatory freight rates was to keep the South in a "crown colony" status, producing raw materials for the industrial East, but unable to compete in the establishment of industries to raise our own economic level.

It was not until 1947, after the Southern Governors won their freight rate fight in the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts, that we began to get some measure of relief from the destructive effect of this situation.

Our economy was also subjected to another hard blow. In Benjamin Harrison's administration, when the Republicans had to make good their campaign promises to the industrialists of the East who had financed their election, the high tariff was enacted. By means of this device, we in the South were buying our finished goods from the Eastern manufacturers who were protected against price competition from the rest of the world, while at the same time the raw materials which we raised were not so protected; and we had to sell them to the Eastern manufacturers at a price kept lower by foreign competition.

It is of interest here to recall that when the high tariff was proposed in Congress, there also appeared in that body another Force or "Civil Rights" bill, having for its purpose the renewal of reconstruction activities in the Southern states.

Propaganda designed to convince the country that the Southerners were remiss in the discharge of their duty to the Negroes, was heard throughout the land. There was strong Southern resistance to the high tariff legislation, because it would be ruinous to the economic progress of the South in our efforts to increase the level of life of both the white and the colored races alike. Finally, however, the tariff was passed and the Force bill pigeon-holed. Economic advantages were given to the East at the expense of the South, but we escaped the Force bill.

Under the galling yoke of freight rates and tariff, the South has struggled on to regain its rightful economic position in the Nation. While progress has necessarily been slow, it has been steady. Today industry has learned of the many advantages of climate, native labor, industrial peace, favorable taxation, natural resources, and stable government, which our states have to offer. We see giant factories and plants being constructed on all sides. We also hear the wails of other sections over the loss of industries which they possessed for so many years as a result of our defeat in war.
Now, once again, Force bills have made their appearance in the national Congress. Again the American people are being propagandized to believe that Southerners have been mistreating the Negroes in our midst, and that we are unfit for local self-government. Again, there is the stirring of old embers, the arousing of old fears, the laceration of old wounds. Every controversial issue which has rocked the Congress since Reconstruction days has been put into the pot.

We hear not a word of the tremendous efforts which we have made through the years to give both races in the South the opportunity to improve and progress.

We hear not a word of the undeniable fact that economic underprivilege in the South has known no color line, and that it has fallen heavily on both races alike.

We hear not a word of recognition of the progress which the Negro in this country has made since slavery days as a result of the efforts of the Southern people.

We are given no credit for the rebuilding of our once devastated section, accomplished without the aid of anything faintly resembling a Marshall Plan.

We are once again disturbing the economic status quo of the industrial East, and this does not suit some people.

Once again legislation is being promoted in the Congress calculated to throw us into confusion and distract our attention from our industrial program, in which our efforts have been succeeding so markedly in recent years.

My friends, I abhor sectionalism. I detest anyone who undertakes to create minority political groups among American citizens.

I stand for the government of the United States, as established in our Constitution, and I am proud of every section of our Nation and its history.

But I would remind you that sectionalism has been practiced against us in the Southern states. We have been singled out on more than one occasion in our history for special and sectional treatment unfavorable to the South.

It is discouraging to us that in this enlightened year 1948, it is still attractive for candidates for public office to bid for the votes of minority blocs and groups in some sections of the country by putting on a show of straightening out the South again.

We slip backward, we lose ground in human and economic progress, when this occurs.

The greatest offense of those who have engaged in this vile performance is the jeopardy into which their ill-considered activities has thrown the forward strides which have been achieved in liberal and progressive thought and viewpoint in the Southern states. The catering in high places to the favor of professional agitators and mercenary missionaries of ill will has recklessly set the stage for a recurrence of reaction-
ism, almost entirely stamped out over the years by the increasingly enlightened public opinion of our people.

Those of us in the South who have worked hard in the cause of liberalism and constructive endeavor in the field of human and economic progress have been forced to turn aside for a time to meet this upsurge of reactionism.

History takes infinitely longer to live than to read. Many overlook this stubborn fact. The task of the liberal in the South today is to save the hard-won ground which we have gained from destruction by ill-advised and irresponsible meddling from without.

The fight which has been thrust upon us is a governmental one, and not a racial one, all of the high-powered propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is the forward-looking and the liberal-thinking men and women of the South who will carry to a conclusion the solution of our racial as well as our economic and political problems, and the misguided or self-seeking interference to which we are constantly subjected will never contribute anything to that end except confusion and delay.

In our fight against Federal encroachment on state sovereignty, we are sustained by the highest precedent and the best considered opinion which American history has known. We are amazed that people in other states and sections of the country do not more completely realize that their own rights and their own essential liberties are in danger of being diminished and perhaps destroyed by the governmental precedents which the enactment of these new Force bills would establish.

Let us see just how old are the principles on which we stand and how sound is the basis of our opposition.

In his Farewell Address, George Washington, the first President of the United States, stated our case:

"The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country, and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution, or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

Thomas Jefferson, in his first Inaugural Address, stated the creed of the Democratic Party to which it has adhered consistently until this very day, in these words:

"The support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies."
Coming down to our own day and generation, it is peculiarly appro-
priate to remember the eloquent statement by the late President Frank-
lin D. Roosevelt, who gave this forceful warning:

"... to bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as de-
mocracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and
control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sove-
eignty of our states must first be destroyed, except in mere minor matters
of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from
the principles on which the country was founded just so long as the in-
dividual home rule of the states is scrupulously preserved and fought for
whenever it seems in danger."

How different from this clear statement of fundamental principles
is the action of the man who is filling out the term of office for which
President Roosevelt was elected! He has claimed to be carrying out a
Roosevelt policy, and yet neither Franklin D. Roosevelt nor any other
American President ever sent to the Congress any such message as the
so-called Civil Rights proposals of President Truman.

Franklin Roosevelt was in the White House longer than any other
President in history, yet I challenge Harry Truman, or anyone else, to
cite a single public utterance where the late President ever advocated the
enactment by Congress of any one of the proposals made by President
Truman in his so-called Civil Rights Message.

It has been said that the South is in revolt against the Democratic
Party.

That is not true. The South is in revolt against the present leader-
ship of the Democratic Party which has repudiated the historic principles
upon which the Party was founded and has flourished.

Since the President's proposals were made, and the people have
made known their resentment and pointed out the constitutional sound-
ness of their opposition, efforts have been made to create the impression
that such proposals do not violate state sovereignty. Let us see how re-
diculous that claim is.

One of the proposals is the anti-poll tax law. We all know that the
poll tax does not burden the right to vote. It is a minor revenue meas-
ure yielding comparatively little money, and I have advocated that we re-
peal it in my State. Only seven states now have a poll-tax voting require-
ment, and the proposed Federal law would accomplish so little that many
think it harmless legislation.

The danger is the precedent which would be set by the Congression-
al assertion of the right to pass this law. If Congress can use this law
to establish the power to deal with the right of the American people to
vote, it can establish a form of Federal suffrage. It can exercise control
over the ballot boxes of the Nation. As practical men and women we
know that ultimately it would have much to say, not only about who
would be President, but also about who would be in the United States
Senate and House of Representatives.

When this occurs, the states could lose their effective voice in the
national legislative halls as surely as did the Southern states in Recon-
struction days when our ballot boxes were surrounded by Federal soldiers. The way would be open for the conversion of our system of popular government into a centralized and concentrated government in Washington, far distant from the people governed by it.

Such power was deliberately withheld from the Federal Government when the Constitution was adopted. It has always been felt that the right of local self-government depended upon state regulation of the right of suffrage.

When the Senate Rules Committee a few days ago voted 7 to 2, to allow the pending poll-tax legislation to be considered by the Senate, the majority of the Committee admitted that its constitutionality presented a serious question, but stated that the Congress has already decided the point by passing the voting law for members of the armed forces during the war. Let those who doubt the danger of a precedent reflect upon this absurd use made by the Committee of the action taken in time of war under the war clause of the Constitution!

Another law recommended is an anti-lynching law. The Federal government does not have the constitutional right to deal with crimes occurring within the states. It can deal only with Federal crimes.

The Federal courts have uniformly held that there is not even a Federal common law. The states, in governing themselves, are responsible for public peace and order. All the states have laws against murder. Many have specific laws against lynching, which is a cowardly form of murder.

This proposed law is unnecessary because enlightened public opinion has virtually stamped out this crime. It has never been a sectional crime, although some would create the contrary impression for propaganda purposes. In one year, 75% of the persons lynched throughout the United States were white.

Taking advantage of the emotional appeal springing from the horror felt for this crime by every decent person in every section of the Nation, the proposal is made that the Congress assert the power to deal with any crime within the states. This would be a radical invasion of the right of local self-government. It would be a bold extension of the power of the Federal government over the individual citizens. Nothing would be more effective in bringing about the destruction of the governmental functions and prerogatives of the states of the Union. The division of powers between the Federal government and the states, provided in the Constitution, would be virtually destroyed, if this precedent were created and thereafter carried to its possible conclusion.

Another proposal is the legislation regulating employment, promotion and discharge of the employees of private business and industry within the several states, commonly referred to as the FEPC law. This legislation applies with equal force to our labor organizations and to our businesses and industries. It would enable the Federal government to invade a local field clearly foreclosed to it by the Constitution. The bureaus and commissions created by it would be given power to harass and interfere with business, large and small, and to intrude into the policies and practices of labor unions.
There is no limit to the irritation and annoyance which would result throughout the Nation from this law. Every man's private business would almost be made a public one. If he exercised his right to employ whom he pleased, he would always face the possibility of a call from a government agent, inquiring into why he did not hire someone else; he could be hauled before a Federal commission to explain himself; he could be ordered to stop choosing his employees as he saw fit, and to hire someone he did not want; he would not be allowed a jury trial on the issues of fact between him and the government; and his case would not even go to the Federal Court in his own state, but would be heard ordinarily in a court in another state. The mind of man can hardly conceive of more duress and apprehension than this would produce!

Does this sound like an American concept to you? Does this kind of thing coincide with your ideas of liberty and freedom which we have fought for and thought we had? If the government in Washington can pass this law, it will have like power to intrude itself into every phase of the daily lives of our people and regulate them in all things, great and small.

Another phase of the President's proposals deals with the field of the separation of races.

We in the South know that the laws dealing with the separation of the races are necessary to maintain the public peace and order, where the races live side by side in large numbers. We know that they are essential to the protection of the racial integrity and purity of the white and Negro races alike. We know that their sudden removal would do great injury to the very people sought to be benefited.

We also know that the solution of the racial problems of the South will follow the solution of its economic problems, and that we are making great strides in solving these problems. A little more practical help on economic lines, and a little less fallacious racial theory, would accomplish a great deal more for the improvement of the level of life and opportunity of all our people of whatever race.

The most alarming part of the President's program is the creation of a Federal police system to enforce it. The concept of a Federal police working within the states is utterly foreign to the Constitution of the United States. Gestapo-like, its agents would rove throughout the Nation; policing elections; meddling with private businesses; intervening in private lawsuits; breeding litigation; keeping the people in a state of duress and intimidation; and bringing to our people all the potential evils of a so-called police state. We have only recently seen in Europe how quickly liberty perishes under such a government.

One of the most astounding theories ever advanced is that the Federal government by passing a law can force the white people of the South to accept into their businesses, their schools, their places of amusement, and in other public places, those they do not want to accept.

What is so ridiculous about all of this is that most of the support for the new Force bill is coming from a section of the country which defied the Federal government when an effort was made, not by legislation, mind you, but by a constitutional amendment, to outlaw alcoholic
beverages. If the Federal government could not stop people from drinking, then how can a Federal law force people to break off social customs and traditions as old as civilization itself?

These big city machine bosses and their puppets in office, as well as those who think everything can be done by a law from Washington, should once and for all realize that on the question of social intermingling of the races our people draw the line. No decent and self-respecting Negro would ask for a law to force people to accept him where he is not wanted. They themselves do not want social intermingling. They are entitled to equality of opportunity, and they will get it through our efforts. But all the laws of Washington, and all the bayonets of the Army, cannot force the Negro into our homes, our schools, our churches, and our places of recreation.

And here and now I want to pay tribute to the colored people of the South.

During the influx of racial agitators, our colored people are continuing with their daily tasks, and are not following off after these false prophets who want to create misunderstanding in the South.

We are working and living side by side in peace and understanding. We are struggling together for a bigger and better South, with greater educational and economic opportunity for all of our citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color.

I would like to drive that message home to every American, in every state.

I hope Democrats everywhere will not forget that the South has kept the fires of Democracy burning when other sections deserted the Party.

We have consistently kept Democrats in Congress and held the Party together. Without the South the Democratic Party long ago would have ceased to function as a major political party.

In return for this unswerving loyalty and devotion, we of the South have asked little. We have stood by the Democratic Party, and we expected the Democratic Party to stand by us in preserving our institutions and customs, which are absolutely essential to peaceful living in our section and to the continued development and progress of the South.

Never did we dream that a Democratic President would stab us in the back, and in one fell swoop seek to impose Federal laws more detrimental to the South and the Nation than those proposed in the Reconstruction period by the Republican Party. What makes the stab more humiliating is the fact that the hand that held the dagger received its power not from an election by the people, but from a minority, which, through pressure applied at the 1944 Democratic Convention, blocked the nomination of a Southerner for Vice-President. We know this from the recent book of Ed Flynn, the Bronx political boss, who boasts of his part in this intrigue.

I love South Carolina and I love the South. I treasure our American system of government. I fought under Eisenhower in Europe and
I have always tried to be a good Democrat, but above loyalty to party I have always placed allegiance to country.

As Democrats, our objective must be to restore the Democratic Party to the principles which have made it great. To accomplish this end we must prepare and take bold and courageous action.

We must be practical. We must realize that a sitting President can, if he so desires, well nigh force his nomination. I had hoped that Harry S. Truman would realize that he had led the Democratic Party to the brink of disaster; that he himself had absolutely no chance of reelection; and that he would withdraw and permit the Democrats to nominate a candidate who can lead the party to victory.

Apparently the Democratic Party is not to be so blessed.

So far as I am concerned the die is cast and the Rubicon is crossed. I care not whether I ever hold another public office. I am looking for no Federal job. No one has any strings on me.

As the Governor of a sovereign state, I do not intend that the rights of my people shall be sacrificed on the block of blind party loyalty.

Pressure was brought on me at Tallahassee not to offer the resolution which sparked the revolt in the South against the Civil Rights program. No power on earth could have silenced me at Tallahassee. I thought it was the duty of the Southern Governors to speak out, and thank God, they have spoken out.

What has happened since Tallahassee and what is taking place here today show that we mean business.

In general, I recommend to you that the procedure proposed by the Southern Governors' Conference be carried out as far as possible.

In particular, I say to you that, while it is our duty to send delegates to the National convention, it is important that we see that our people are not hobbled in the November election.

We should recommend that the State Democratic organization see to it that the credentials of their delegates contain a proviso setting forth the reservations under which they will participate in that convention, or that notice of such reservations be given in writing to the National Committee before they take their seats.

Such a proviso should clearly set forth that the people of the state will not be bound to support the nominees for President and Vice-President if such nominees or the Party itself should advocate the so-called Federal Civil Rights Program.

If we do this, no one will be able to say that we are bolting or breaking faith with the Party if our people should subsequently cast their electoral votes for others than such nominees.

Should the National convention choose nominees who do not meet this test, or should Party itself favor such program, then the State
Democratic organizations of the several states should immediately take action to see that the electoral votes of the Southern states shall be jointly cast in such manner as shall carry out the manifest will of the people of their states.

We know, and the enemies of state sovereignty know, that the Electoral College affords us a powerful weapon to restore the prestige of the South in the political affairs of this Nation and preserve the American system of free constitutional government.

Make no mistake about it, the South is prepared to use this weapon. Already, Alabama and Florida have spoken. Other states will take similar action. The leadership of the Democratic Party may as well realize that the South’s electoral votes are no longer “in the bag” for the Democratic nominee.

The party bosses and ward heelers who have kidnapped the Democratic Party and deserted its principles may force the nomination of Harry Truman, but they cannot force the South or the Nation to accept him. Harry S. Truman has never been elected President of the United States and he never will be.

True to the Party’s principles, we must and shall see that our electoral votes are cast for those who adhere to those principles, and there are many distinguished men in the South and in the Nation from whom we can choose those we shall center upon.

When we shall have done this we shall restore our people to their rightful place in the political life of the Nation, which they lost through bind political faith in the Party leadership.

We shall have broken the chains binding us to those who have betrayed our trust.

We shall re-establish our autonomy and self-respect, so that no one will ever again assume that we have none.

We shall attest our faith in governmental principles which can never be willingly surrendered by a people who intend to be and remain free and self-governing.

We shall place our sound case before the people of the Nation, Democrat and Republican alike, so that we shall no longer fight alone in resisting encroachments upon the fundamental rights of the people by power-seeking Federal bureaucrats.

We shall win again the struggle for free constitutional government in America which was won before at Yorktown.

We shall uphold, protect and defend the way of life which the Constitution of the United States was ordained to guarantee to the American people throughout our Nation.

On principle, we can do nothing else and be true to our heritage. Our cause is right and just. We shall honor ourselves by pressing it to the end.

I know in my heart what the Southerners who have gone before us would do in the crisis which faces us.

Let us remain true to the trust which they handed to our care, and carry on to final victory.
FELLOW DEMOCRATS:

Mississippi is proud and happy to be your host today. As Governor of this great State, I am privileged to extend to you a most cordial hand of welcome. As an individual citizen, I am happy and honored to participate in this conference and to greet you in my native Commonwealth. All of the people in Mississippi warmly trust that you will fully enjoy every moment of your stay in our midst. They are deeply appreciative of the spirit of neighborliness, of mutual respect and confidence which brings us together. They are overwhelmingly in support of you. They are one with you in determination to see that every opportunity is given to you to conduct your deliberations in pleasant and congenial surroundings, and they are all of one mind to back you up solidly and with courage and persistence in the final course of action you plan.

There is no need for me to remind any person here present of the very serious, grave and imminent danger we face. All of us are fully conscious of the tremendous implications of the rush of events now taking place. The eyes of this entire South and of this Nation are focused upon this gathering. The course of history can and must be determined here. In this time of crisis, it is with pleasure that we stand shoulder to shoulder facing our common perils in fellowship, in friendship, and in unity of resolve.

Approximately 75 years ago our forefathers were then in the midst of the most trying, the most horrible, the most vicious period of our history. Misery and hardships pressed relentlessly upon them. They smarted under the humiliation of military and "carpetbagger" control. Indignities and indecencies were insultingly heaped upon them. In that crisis men of stature, of learning, of indomitable spirit, of flaming patriotism arose in all parts of the South to lead our people out of the wilderness of chaos and confusion and into a world of peace, of dignity and back to law-abiding, good government. theirs was a tremendously difficult task pursued in the teeth of great odds, hampered and restricted on all sides by the crushing weight of the national government. Never daunted, with firm courage, resourcefulness and foresight, they triumphed over such evil forces. Today these same forces are loose once again, straining and striving to impose their harsh will upon us. Once again they threaten to engulf our beloved Southland with the flames of bitterness, conflict and prejudice. Without knowledge, without understanding, in some instances sincere but in all instances wrong, these forces would drastically and overnight upset and overturn the only possible solution to the problem we have. Over the past two decades we have watched these forces at work, gaining ground here, reaching out there, and constantly probing and seeking out weak spots in our armor. We have watched them impress national officials with their political influence; we have watched them ostensibly wield the balance of power in certain of the states and other regions.
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With increased and growing concern, our attention has been shocked by the spectacle our highest public officials toady ing and c urring to their insistent, unreasonable and excessive demands and ultimatums. Our power and our influence has been gradually but definitely circumscribed and diminished until today we find the national head of the party, of which we have for so many years been a faithful part, utterly and contemptuously disregarding and flaunting the principles which are so vital and so essential to us.

For nearly 100 years the South has been almost entirely solid in its allegiance to the Democratic Party. This political unity was predicated upon the substantial unity of purpose and thought which existed in the Democratic party through the years. We have protected, in many instances feebly, in others loudly against those influences which have gradually undertaken to usurp the power, authority and leadership of the Democratic Party, but always national elections have seen the majority of the Southern states in the Democratic column. As a result of this long history of verbal protest without effective action we have put ourselves into the position of crying "Wolf". The manipulators, the opportunists, in the Democratic party have been convinced that no matter how loudly we cry out, how volubly we express our opposition to their political actions, we will never repudiate our party leadership. With this viewpoint dominant in their thoughts and in their actions, they have become increasingly bold in advocating measures diametrically opposed to our fundamental interests. Unless called to account by drastic steps, this will continue to be their attitude and their conviction.

Now, we are faced with one of the most vicious, far-reaching thrusts against us by these influences. If we accept this with mere verbal protest, we will forever and finally fix in their minds a deep and abiding conviction that there is no course that they can pursue, no action they can take, no measure they can advocate which will drive our electoral votes from their nominee unless we stand up now and fight with every ounce of energy we possess to a final and complete determination, never again can we expect our united voice to be heard in the councils of the Democratic party and in the halls of Congress. It is now or never. We cannot afford to wait nor can we afford to be weak and vacillating. We must teach the party leaders and the nation once and for all that we mean what we say and that from henceforward we will no longer tolerate slanderous, unwarranted attacks upon us and our customs. They must and they shall remain inviolate, free and untrammeled.

It is with pride in my fellow Mississippians that I report to you their intense willingness to lend this organization and this convention every assistance within their power. Mississippians are in this fight to the finish and you need have no apprehension whatsoever as to their loyalty, courage and stamina. We have, however, great respect and admiration for the views and ideas of our neighbors. We fully comprehend the advantages to be derived from concerted, planned action, evolved from the combined talents of all.

Single and alone, it would be impossible for us to wield the influence and authority we now need. It is up to you men and women of this convention to utilize to the fullest the talents at your disposal. As
for me, I have supreme confidence, as do all Mississippians, in your ability and your integrity. Yours is a solemn task. In your hands lies the future of our children and succeeding generations. We can not afford to err; we cannot afford to falter; we cannot permit ourselves to be divided; we cannot sacrifice principle for political gain. All of us must submerge any thought of self into an overwhelming desire to chart a course which will bring the greatest measure of success to our efforts.

If we will—and we must, this day will henceforth take its place among the cherished memories in the long, glorious, courageous history of the South, and future generations will bless you for your work.

Minority Report On States' Rights Amendment To Platform Presented By Mr. Walter Sillers And Mr. Knox Huff, Of Mississippi; And Mr. J. M. Bonner Of Alabama, Members Of Committee On Platforms And Resolutions.

To the 1948 National Democratic Convention

Mr. Chairman—

After due notice and consent as provided by the rules of this Convention this “ Minority Report” is respectfully submitted.

The undersigned members of the Committee on Platform and Resolutions of this Convention dissent from the action of the committee in rejecting the amendment offered to the platform and designated “ States Rights Plank” herein after set out, which said amendment was offered as a substitute to the amendment offered by Governor Dan Moody, member of the Committee from Texas, wherein it was sought to insert a “States Rights” plank in the party platform: Substitute for Moody Amendment:

“States Rights Plank”

“The Democratic Party reaffirms and pledges strict adherence to those fundamental principles of Constitutional Representative Government laid down by Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the party, among which are the doctrines of States Rights, Free Enterprise and Private Initiative.

And the party declares that the several states shall exercise, free from federal interference or encroachment by legislation, directive or otherwise, all the rights and powers reserved to them by the Constitution, among them being the power to provide by law for the qualifications of electors, conduct of elections, regulation of employment practices within the states, segregation within the states, and define crimes committed within their borders and prescribe penalties therefor, except such crimes which under the grant of power by the Constitution to the federal government may be defined by it.”

The aforesaid Moody Amendment, for which this amendment was offered as a substitute, sought to amend the platform by inserting on page 6 of the mimeographed copy thereof after the words “Domestic Policy” so as to include in the platform a “States Rights” plank.
The undersigned dissenting members of the Committee Respectfully submit that the aforesaid amendment should be adopted and the States Rights Plank therein contained inserted in the party platform.

It is essential to the success of the party and the preservation of our government of free institutions that the principles declared in this plank should be reaffirmed and strictly adhered to.

This plank tracks the Constitution and advocates for each state the right of local self government within the bounds of that great document. It asks for no greater rights or privileges than those guaranteed under the Constitution and readily granted to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Island, Guam and Samoa, wherein for the latter three the platform declares "and the maximum degree of local self government." But by the rejection of this States Rights plank the party denies to the several states of the nation those freedoms in government which it so readily and enthusiastically advocates for these islands.

This platform contains planks favorable to every minority group which has appealed to the committee for recognition; it declares—in effect—for free elections and local self government for all freedom loving states of the world; but denies to the several states this simple request that the party reaffirm the true principles of Jeffersonian Democracy and declare in its platform that it will protect them in the exercise of their constitutional rights of local self government.

We respectfully submit that the majority report of the committee on this amendment be rejected and that this minority report be adopted in lieu thereof and the said "States Rights Plank" be inserted in the platform.

Respectfully submitted,

WALTER SILLERS, Member from Mississippi
KNOX HUFF, Member from Mississippi
J. M. BONNER, Member from Alabama

Speech Of Mr. Walter Sillers Of Rosedale, Mississippi In Support Of Minority Report Offering State Rights Plank To Be Inserted In The Party Platform. Delivered On The Floor Of The National Convention In Philadelphia
July 14, 1948.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION:

In presenting this "States Rights" plank, we do not offer it solely as a Southern measure, nor do we advocate it on sectional grounds, but we present it to you and the American people as a nationwide necessity to uphold the integrity of the Constitution, guarantee the sovereignty of the states and the principle of local self-government, preserve the independence and liberty of the people, and maintain the dignity and strength of the union as a nation.

This plank goes to the heart of Constitutional government and applies not merely to the South but directly to every state in the Union. It is fundamental to the American form of government and can nowise
be classified as sectional or as appealing to class discrimination, hatred or prejudice. It simply declares that the Democratic Party re-affirms its adherence to those fundamental principles of government upon which the Party was founded, and demands for the people and the states only those rights and powers reserved and guaranteed to them by the Constitution.

Can it be said by any loyal American, and particularly a true Jeffersonian Democrat, that we ask for anything to which we are not entitled? Would you deny to the American people, and to every state in the Union, this simple declaration for those fundamental rights, merely because it is sponsored by delegates from the Southern states, whose only offense seems to be obstinate and continuous devotion, loyalty and support of the Democratic Party, in season and out, in adversity as well as success, and in spite of the fact that during the past sixteen years Democratic control little if any measures were adopted favoring the South or devised to remove unjust and discriminatory economic measures, which have impoverished the Southern people for more than three quarters of a century, but on the contrary many policies have been inaugurated objectionable and obnoxious to them, but notwithstanding these facts they have remained loyal to the Democratic Party.

So much cannot be said of the National Party and its Leaders, particularly the President, with reference to their attitude toward the South and Southern Democrats.

By this amendment we ask for no more than is granted to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Samoa, contained in the following plank which was enthusiastically adopted and recommended to the Convention by the Committee on Platform and Resolutions, and to which I, and the other members of the Committee from the Southern states, offered no objection:

"We urge immediate statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; immediate determination by the people of Puerto Rico as to their form of government and their ultimate status with respect to the United States; and the maximum degree of local self-government for the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Samoa".

An amendment was offered by a member of the Committee from Alabama and supported by other Southern members, to insert the following at the end of the last paragraph: "And to the several states in the Union", but it was ruled out of order and defeated by the Committee. If this amendment had been adopted, it would have granted the same powers to the respective states as are granted to these islands.

The Committee not only inserted this plank in the platform at the request of those representing Alaska and the islands mentioned, but it embraced with approval and granted the pleas of nearly every minority group which appeared before it, approving unanimously the Marshall Plan and the administration’s foreign policy, which among other things stands for the rights of the people of every country and nation of Europe, Asia, and the world over, to determine the form of government under which they wish to live, and a guarantee of free elections thereunder—local self-government.
Will the Democratic Party deny to the 48 states of the Union that which it so readily grants to these islands?

**Points Covered by Plank**

1. This plank revives those fundamental principles of government upon which the Democratic Party was founded by Thomas Jefferson, upon which this country has thrived and grown to be so great.

2. It places the Party back on the solid grounds of Constitutional government, where it has stood ever since it was founded.

3. It again declares for a representative form of government of the people, for the people, and by the people, which recognizes the right of the individual to engage in private business, own property, conduct his own affairs, and enjoy the fruits thereof, without unwarranted interference by the government.

4. It recognizes the dignity of the individual and his right to liberty and freedom of action in the pursuit of happiness.

5. It stands for local self-government, which is the very essence of liberty, and without which no government can survive as a free state, but is doomed to failure and ultimate slavery.

6. It negatives Communism, Fascism, Naxi-ism and those ideologies which lead to totalitarian dictatorship.

7. It declares for States Rights and against the Civil Rights program recommended to Congress by the president.

8. It is a platform of pure Americanism.

9. If you vote against this plank, and in its stead adopt the Civil Rights Program submitted in the minority report filed by members of the Committee from Wisconsin, California and Minnesota, you vote down the Constitution of the United States, and will turn millions of true and loyal Democrats against the party and its candidate in the November election.

---

**Governor Frank M. Dixon Keynote Address**

**States' Rights Democratic Conference**

**Birmingham, Alabama, July 17, 1948**

It is an honor to be called upon to make this keynote speech to this great gathering today—an honor I deeply feel. For this is a gathering of militant followers of those democratic principles near and dear to us all.

The meeting is a continuation of the Jackson Convention which was held on May 10th, and in which nearly all of the Southern States were represented. In the resolutions of that Convention, it was provided that if Truman was the nominee of the Democratic Party, or if a platform was adopted at Philadelphia hostile to the South, then the Birmingham meeting should be held.

You are familiar with what happened in Philadelphia. You know that the definite decision was made there by the National Democratic Party to
approve Truman's actions in trying to enforce a social revolution in the South. You heard the jeers of the followers of the city machines of the North when the fine Southerners of Alabama and Mississippi walked out of that Convention. You heard the demands for the destruction of the social structure of the South coming from Democrats in sections where not one single elective public officer is a Democrat,—not even a justice of the peace. I cite the case of Minnesota. You heard the deliberate adoption of a program meant to destroy us.

Everyone in America is familiar with the history of Democratic action so far as this civil rights program is concerned. Not all are familiar with the personnel of the Truman Committee on Civil Rights. Suffice to say, without attempting to go into the various personalities, that it was a committee stacked for the purpose of rendering the report which it did, a committee biased and prejudiced in advance. Its appointment, with that personnel as if it were a committee to make an impartial investigation, was a sham and a fraud on the American people. The report which it rendered required no deliberation—it required simply the stenographic services necessary to write down the prejudices and animosities of its members.

What is this so-called Civil Rights Program which Truman, our Democratic President, has recommended to Congress? I do not want any misunderstanding about it among the Southern white people. Here is part of what it means:

First: the elimination of segregation in the public schools from grade schools through colleges. Your children are to be required to work and play in the company, with the forced association, of Negroes. Negroes are to teach them, guide them. What will that mean to your children, to your hopes for them? What will it mean in immorality, in vice, in crime? Just what it means in those slum areas of the northern cities where like conditions prevail, with results fatal to decency.

Second: the elimination of segregation in private and ultimately in denominational schools, such as Millsaps, Mississippi, Howard, as to students and teachers as well. I am using local, Mississippi institutions as examples, but the application is not solely to them. The effect is to be the same in all schools, boys' and girls' as well, from Maine to California. Suppose that you are determined not to subject your children to bi-racial schools, and are willing to make any sacrifice to that end. You are helpless, since even private schools are to be forced to permit Negroes to attend.

Third: the elimination of segregation in trains, busses, restaurants, theatres, beauty shops, hotels, swimming pools, ball games, churches, and everywhere else people congregate. Picture life with us, men and women, when every time we leave our homes these conditions are forced upon us. Picture the stores, the street cars, the busses, restaurants, the churches. Picture the bitterness, the racial hostility, the violence which will follow.

Fourth: the elimination of segregation in places of residence and homes. This means that Negroes can build in any neighborhood, live in any apartment house.

Fifth: the employment of Negroes in every business establishment, office, factory and store, in the same numerical proportion that the Negro
race bears to the white. While the ratio is not written into the report, we well know from the operation of the wartime F.E.P.C. of infamous memory that this is the aim and that the tools of oppression will be devoted to that end. In my own County of Jefferson there are 43% Negroes, in Alabama generally 35% in some counties 6 to 1. A department store in Jefferson County that has 100 clerks must have 43 Negroes among them; a restaurant or beauty shop employing 10 must have 4 to 5; a plant employing 1000 must have 430. If this ratio does not now prevail, then enough white employees must be fired to make it possible. How else can it be obtained? Any law office, any physician's office, comes under the law just as much and no more than any other place of business.

Sixth: there is to be an upgrading in jobs, and promotions on an equal basis, and the ratio must apply to all levels. There must be as many Negro foremen, as many department heads, as many bosses, as the ratio calls for. They are to be over whites and Negroes alike, mixed together without regard to the wishes of anyone.

Seventh: there is to be no segregation in hospitals, either as to physicians, patients or nurses. White men and women who must necessarily use the hospitals, public and private, are to be attended by Negro physicians and nurses, as well as by white.

Eighth: all segregation in labor unions and professional associations such as the Bar Association and the Medical Association is to be done away with.

Ninth: the poll tax is to be eliminated, all Negroes to be registered to vote without regard to intelligence or capacity, and all segregation is to be done away with in the armed services.

Is all this a real threat, or is it just politics? Are these so-called democrats actually determined to destroy our way of life? I assure you that the danger is deadly in its seriousness.

The Civil Rights section of the Department of Justice is to be reorganized to enforce it. Constant police inspection and supervision, through a Federal Gestapo, is recommended, without waiting for complaints. The law is to be changed to make conviction easy. Enforcement is to be taken away from the local officials. Civil court orders, punished as contempt of court, are to supplement the criminal proceedings enforceable by the F.B.I. Criminal penalties are to be by fine up to $5,000, and imprisonment up to ten years. Every local police officer and deputy sheriff is to be subject to Federal criminal and civil laws, and under constant scrutiny.

Tax exemption privileges are to be taken away from the private and ultimately denominational schools which resist, and from the churches.

Federal grants in aid are to be taken from states or cities which resist.

Fines and jail terms are to be the part of local officials or private citizens who resist.

This vicious program means to eliminate all differences, all separation between black and white. It so declares itself, in words. It means to create a great melting pot of the South, with white and Negroes intermingled socially, politically, economically. It means to
reduce us to the status of a mongrel, inferior race, mixed in blood, our Anglo-Saxon heritage a mockery; to crush with imprisonment our leadership, and thereby kill our hopes, our aspirations, our future and the future of our children.

It seems to me to be useless to repeat the arguments as to the unconstitutionality of the proposed enactment by Congress of an anti-lynching act. Such an act was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States in the '70's, when it bore the nomenclature of the force bill. Such an act has been fought by some of the best and most distinguished Americans of other sections of the country—men of the character of President McKinley, and Senators Norris and Borah. The proposed anti-lynching act, as recommended by the Committee and as supported by Truman, goes far beyond the old iniquitous force bills. It was written patently and obviously to buy the Negro vote in the doubtful states—we of the South know that there is no lynching in the South. They of the North know it. And they also know that the race riots and the killings which have made some northern cities famous in these last few years have no duplicate in any state or city in the South.

They know, also, these who seek to create a police state, that the surest way to do it is to take over the enforcement of criminal law. Lynching is murder. There is a law in every state against it, and these laws are enforced. Bring the Federal Government into the field of local law enforcement and you have broken down one of the great safeguards of personal freedom. Break this first one, and the precedent has been laid for persecution against which no citizen is safe.

With this the program of the National Democratic Party, do we belong to it? If this is the meaning of the plank adopted at Philadelphia are our people to remain in it? Are they to say to the nation: "All right, we don't like it, but we choose, and our people choose, to wear the shackles of this kind of slavery rather than to break with the national democracy, rotten though it may be, and the avowed enemy of our people."

Is this civil rights program constitutional? Not under any decisions of the courts in the past, not with any court save possible our Supreme Court as at present constituted. The Tenth Amendment to the Constitution reads as follows: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." The powers of local self government are not given to Congress, but are reserved to the states, and these include every feature of the so-called civil rights program. We are fundamentally sound in this fight, whatever the present-day politics of the doubtful states, for whose benefit we are being sold down the river.

The term "states' rights" means much more than simple theory—it means the preservation of democracy and freedom itself. The oldest form of government in the world is the highly centralized one, with all power concentrated, as in Washington. There were tyrannies in the dim mists of history. It is only with the founding of this country that democracy developed, and it came, and this country grew great, because the federal government was locked and tied down by the Constitution to the point that it could not impose its will on the people in their daily lives.
Schools are local affairs, as is the police force, the fire department, the city and county governments, the habits of the people, the building of roads, the conduct of local business, all the myriad affairs of daily life. The right to work or to loaf, to choose your vocation, and change your job, to guide the education of your children, to attend the church of your choice, to work with whom you please, to go where you choose, these are not inherent and divine rights. They are ours solely because the Federal government was denied the power to interfere with them.

In this so-called civil rights program, Truman advocates granting the power to the Federal government to invade these and all other freedoms. The program is aimed at us, of course, since it is to secure Negro votes in the doubtful states. But those leaders hostile to us will find their people, as well as we, come under such a program. They will find that their freedom, as well as ours, is gone. Properly understood in all its viciousness and danger, this program will receive the condemnation of right thinking people everywhere. We will not stand alone in this fight.

How is it possible for a man who calls himself a Democrat, for a man who is a follower of the principles which have made the Democratic Party great, to lend himself to any scheme meant to aggrandize the power of the Federal Government in Washington and to permit the formation of a gestapo charged with the mission of revolutionizing the social life of the nation. The Democratic Party has been a tower of strength throughout the years in the maintenance of the personal freedoms of the individual. The Democratic Party has believed forever in the limited powers of the Federal government under the Constitution. The great men through the pages of history who have been placed in high positions by the Democratic Party have been men who were firm in their refusal to permit the seizure of power in Washington.

Government essentially is a dangerous thing. There is no truth more fundamental than that power seeks always to increase. Human nature is a compound of many things. Its sole, continuously recurring characteristic is the desire deep in the hearts of all for power. Government is a dangerous thing, and the great leaders of the past except the military men who have been despots, the great leaders since there came into existence the theory of the rights of men, have with universal tongue cautioned the people against the danger of power in the hands of the government. This was understood and completely understood by the great founders of this Republic. It was understood and completely understood by the founders of the party of Democrats. And yet, in this day and generation, the national Democratic Party has sunk so low as to be willing to barter, for the votes of racial minorities in doubtful states, the liberties of all of us.

The term "States' Rights" is an unfortunate term. It does not express the meaning of the thought which is in our minds. In the beginning of this Republic, the states were supreme. They surrendered a portion of their power to the Federal government in order that the Union might exist. But there were 3 great bodies of rights. There were the rights which the state had over its citizens—there were the rights which the states surrendered to the Federal Government—there were the great body of rights which neither state nor federal governments ever had over its citizens, those rights which contain personal liberty and the freedoms which
make life worthwhile. When the Federal Government moves against rights which the states had, then the term “States’ Rights” is applicable. When it moves against that great body outside any government to control, as it is doing now, then it becomes the enemy of every free American. That will not stop government—that thought, since government lives and thrives on power. But it behooves those of us over our citizens in a Republic still free to be on guard always against this invasion of our freedoms and to remain determined to resist to the end.

I have never been one of those who fomented hatred between the two races. There is room for both, separate and apart. Segregation is our way of life, essential to peace and good will. There are many Negroes among us completely worthy of full citizenship, honest, decent, self-respecting and God-fearing people. They are being given the vote; they live their own lives, leaders among their own. They wish no forced association with which elections are to be purchased—cynically betraying their own blood and heritage for political spoils.

We are faced by facts, not theories. We have worked out a way of life, in difficult circumstances, between the two races. The Negro race has progressed further in three score years than any race in history. It has progressed because it has had the sympathetic help of the Southern white people of good will. It can continue to progress only with a continuance of that sympathetic help. That assistance is based on segregation, on keeping the races apart, a system necessary for white as well as blacks. Destroy it and chaos will result.

The question is continually asked—“What can we do?—Where are we going?” This is what the convention is here to decide. We have several possible courses of action. I will mention only two. We can name a candidate for president and vice-president and recommend to the people of the several states that they elect electors pledged to those nominees. It is thought by some that this is the proper method of procedure. Another route which can be followed is to suggest to the various southern states the selection of free electors. This is the system that we have followed in Alabama, and in the beginning of this movement, we planned that the electors from Alabama should, after the general elections in November, meet with the electors from the other southern states and agree upon a candidate for whom their votes should be cast. This was the system which was planned by the Founding Fathers of this Republic, and this is the system which we in Alabama have wanted to follow. We are not, however, determined to follow any course that will not fit the needs and necessities of the other southern states. We are willing to go to any length to secure unanimity of action.

Should this be a Republican year, then of course we will have accomplished nothing, save to enforce our demands for recognition in the Democratic Party. Should the party of Truman succeed between now and the general election in gaining enough strength to be a real contender,
then this movement could easily become the deciding factor in the American political scene, since we would have approximately 129 electors and might easily be able to throw the election into Congress. There is not such satisfaction with Dewey among the Republican states. There is not much satisfaction with Truman among the Democratic states. Congress might easily turn to an outstanding American selected by us for the next president of the United States.

A word of caution also to those who are of the opinion that this is not a “Grass roots” movement. I have been in receipt of hundreds of telephone calls, most of them from so-called “little people”, not office holders, not people of particular prominence. There is a firm conviction in their minds that they are not being properly represented by those who are in positions of authority over them. There is a feeling in their minds that the office holder is more afraid of the loss of his job and of his perquisites than he is enthusiastic for the call of the people. I have been amazed at the intensity of this action. There may be those among the occupiers of high public positions in the South who think that they can weasel their way through and weather the storm. But if I am any political prophet, our people are more aroused than they have been in many, many years, and they will repay by retirement to private life the efforts of any so-called southern leaders who hope to carry them into the camp of Harry S. Truman in the coming election.

We the people of the South have had our divisions. The nation was treated to a sample of those divisions at the Philadelphia Convention, when a portion of the Alabama delegation and the Mississippi delegation in a body walked out, while other states with people just as truly Southern and as truly loyal as ours remained in their seats after the adoption of the plank approving this iniquitous so-called civil rights legislation. We have our divisions in Alabama politics, every southern state has divisions within itself in its political life These are part of the workings of Democracy itself. These divisions, however, cease in the face of a common danger to us and to our wives and children. These divisions cease in the face of the threat to our very existence. We who are active in this movement want the help of every man and woman and child—we want all divisions forgotten. We want the strength that comes with unity. We want and we must have, if we are to have any hope of success, the men and women of the South united, determined, self-sacrificing, devoted to this common cause.

The people of the South are still a proud people, and they are determined not to submit to those who have repudiated the doctrines which have been those of Democracy throughout all the years. They are determined not to submit to those who would wreck and destroy their civilization and mongrelize our people. They are determined, thank God, to preserve the basic principles of Democracy and to prevent the establishment in this land of ours of a police state, vicious as all police states are vicious, and to prevent the end of human and personal freedom throughout this land.
AMERICA'S ANSWER TO—

Boss Dominated Conventions And Masters Of Political Intrigue

"Exalt the citizen. As the State is the unit of government, he is the unit of the State. Teach him his home is his castle, and his sovereignty rests beneath his hat. Make him self-respecting, self-reliant and responsible. Let him lean on the State for nothing that his own arm can do, and on the government for nothing that his State can do. Let him cultivate independence to the point of sacrifice, and learn that humble things with unbartered liberty are better than splendors bought with its price."

—Henry W. Grady.

HISTORICAL

The platform of each of the major parties is tainted with Communism. Each has taken the first step towards a totalitarian state.

The Republican convention nominated a man not wanted by 75 percent of the rank and file,—a man who had already been rejected by the people.

The Democratic convention nominated a man not wanted by 90 percent of the rank and file,—a man hopelessly incompetent from any standpoint.

Both conventions were boss-dominated and manipulated by masters of political intrigue so ruthlessly that the voice of the people who wanted Tatt or Stassen or Eisenhower or MacArthur for President was disregarded.

It was not a question of what the people wanted. It was a question of what the bosses wanted. The will of the bosses prevailed.

Both nominees now propose to wreck Constitutional government in America for the negro vote in Harlem, Chicago and New York.

Each nominee has a knife labeled "civil rights" ready to plunge into Uncle Sam's back. Wallace and his crowd of political vultures are circling, ready to feast on the corpse as soon as the body falls.

GEORGE SOKOLSKY

The NEW YORK SUN, a leading Republican paper, in an editorial by George Sokolsky, states the case thusly. We quote:

"By what is euphemistically called 'Civil Rights' in this campaign is meant the Negro question. And let us call it that from here on. Since the War Between the States the Negro question has been a major American problem inadequately discussed and considered except by Southerners who had to live with it and in recent years by the Communists and their fellow travelers and competing liberals who hope to garner votes out of it.

"Under our Constitution and within the sanctions of moral law, the legal equality of Negroes and whites cannot be questioned. Historical-
ly and traditionally the question is not so simple either in the North or the South. Those Northern Democrats who make such a terrific to-do about racial discrimination in the South are generally liars—they will not live in Negro areas in their cities; they do not entertain Negroes in their homes; they do not hire Negro secretaries or clerks, except political ones which is part of the vote-getting technic; they do not encourage association between their children and Negro children.

"In a word, none of them practices in their private lives what they preach for others. It is a simple matter for a resident of Minnesota or Wisconsin to grow powerfully indignant about a problem that does not face him but that does face a citizen of Alabama or Mississippi. Minnesota's Negro population, according to the 1940 census was 9928; Wisconsin's, 12,158; Alabama's 983,290; Mississippi's 1,174,578.

"If the Civil War had not ended in the Reconstruction Era, during which Thaddeus Stevens created an unassimilable minority for political advantage, we should perhaps today not be facing this problem as the principal campaign issue of 1948. Perhaps had Abraham Lincoln not been assassinated the emancipated Negro slave would have been brought into American Life without malice, with charity for all.

"But that did not happen. Instead the Northern carpetbagger and his Negro associates left in the South a heritage of bitterness which has continued to the present time. Franklin D. Roosevelt tried to solve this problem by exporting Negroes from the South to the North, placing them on relief rolls and forcing them into industrial enterprises on a quota basis. Thus, in many Northern and Western areas the Negro population increased startlingly.

"The Northerners met the problems by segregating Negroes into ghettos. Make no mistake about that: In the North the Negro is as segregated as in the South, in spite of the lies Northern politicians tell. Harlem is a Negro ghetto; the Bedford district of Brooklyn is a Negro ghetto the South Side of Chicago is a Negro ghetto. The technique employed in New York is for the whites to clear out as soon as the Negro moves in. If you want to see that process at work you can study it if so inclined, in the East Bronx of New York.

"I am not justifying these conditions either on moral or legal grounds; I am only describing conditions as they exist and I am protesting against lies and liars. The politicians who are shrieking civil rights are seeking Negro votes in the Northern cities. They are appealing to prejudice and indignation and they are fanning the flames of race antagonisms not because they want to improve the condition of the Negro in Mississippi, but because they want the votes of the Negro in Harlem and South Chicago.

"The anxiety of the Northern Democrats to be recorded as voting for the civil rights plank of the Democratic platform, after a voice vote has passed it, their insistence upon Senator Barkley's announcement of how they voted was for the consumption of the Northern
Negro voter. They fear that if they do not get that vote, Wallace, who represents Soviet racial concepts, will.

"Were that the entire story, it would be little more than an appeal for the Irish, the Jewish or the Italian vote. But this Negro question is pitched on a high emotional level and can result in riots and death. It requires thoughtful and considerate handling. It requires sympathy and understanding. It comes upon us acutely when we dare not have internal disturbances. Those who have gambled upon it may also have gambled upon the domestic peace of the United States."

STATES RIGHTS AMERICANS

North and South, East and West, have rallied in defense of fundamental principles. They have sounded a call for a return to Constitutional Government.

We hold that the maintenance of States Rights is indispensable to the preservation of Human Rights. That once the right of a sovereign state to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over a local problem is lost, human rights, liberty, and freedom, will perish in the catastrophe.

There is no such thing as a vacuum in politics or government. The people must either rule or they will be ruled. If the rights of a sovereign state are taken away they will be replaced by a totalitarian government—a police state.

Only our Constitution stands between the people and a dictatorship. If politicians are allowed to circumvent, cripple, or disobey the Constitution, then Constitutional Government is in jeopardy, and the liberty and freedom and right of every citizen to the pursuit of happiness is menaced.

This is no sectional or regional matter. It is as important to the people of Arizona as it is to the people of Alabama. As important to the people of Montana as it is to the people of Maine. As important to the people of California as to the people of Connecticut.

No citizen of any State is safe if any political party can get away with an offer to destroy basic rights for a bloc of votes.

This question transcends in importance, and more intimately affects the welfare of every man, woman and child in America, than any question of foreign policy, labor-management relations, European relief or price control. All of those questions can be solved under the Constitution. They cannot be solved after the Constitution has been wrecked or destroyed. First things must come first.

"What doth it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

A State that loses the right to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over its own affairs loses its political soul.

THE RACE QUESTION

We must face the race question frankly and fairly, as we have learned to face the question of venereal disease in this country. It must be examined by those who regard the interest of the nation as paramount. It is too important to be overshadowed by any effort at political advantage.
The first step towards a Communized America is the invasion of States Rights by greedy politicians, ambitious for power, and determined to make life in each State conform to a Washington pattern.

If we start out with the self-evident proposition that the whites and blacks are different, we will not experience any difficulty in reaching the conclusion that they are not and never can be equal. It is no crime to be different. A Horse and a cow, for instance, are not equal. Food that will enable a horse to perform a day's work will dry up a cow. They are not equal and cannot be treated equally, if the best interests of both are to be served. Gold and silver, both precious metals, are not equal. They are unequal in almost every way.

Justice—not equality—is the only thing possible under the law. No law man can enact can make gold and silver equal.

"The theory of equality is a communistic theory. It reduces all to a dead level. From a racial standpoint, the practical effect of the general acceptance of this theory, when carried to its logical conclusion, is the merging of all the peoples and races of the world into one race."

CULT OF EQUALITY (LANDRY)

The fifteenth amendment was a ghastly mistake and is so regarded by the ablest students of government.

The approach to the problem was at a time and under conditions when a rational approach was impossible. Passions were aroused, and tension so high that a calm, deliberate, consideration of the effect of mongrolizing the vote of America was impossible.

The approach was either (1) vindictiveness towards the South or maudlin sympathy for the negro, one or both. No one seems to have considered the question: What is best for the country?

THE POLL TAX

The Constitution of the United States does not confer the privilege of voting on anyone, neither does it prohibit the states from disfranchising one who does not voluntarily pay an insignificant tax. It is, therefore, a clear and palpable invasion of the right of a State to regulate its own voting, for the federal government to undertake to nullify the action of a state with respect to a poll tax.

No one advocates universal suffrage. All agree that immature youth, felons, and the insane must not be allowed to vote. In other words there are classes of people who would be a menace to good government if allowed to vote. Next to immature youth, the largest class that should not be entrusted with the ballot is that class who will not voluntarily support our government. Those who look on government as something to be exploited instead of supported. A purchaseable, corrupt, illiterate ballot is a dangerous ballot, but a ballot that will strike down instead of maintain those principles which have made America great is thrice dangerous.

Recognizing their inability to deny the right to vote, under the fifteenth amendment, "on account of race, color or previous condition of
servitude” some states, North and South, where conditions call for it in the judgment of the states involved, hit upon a plan that results in a large, undesirable element, undesirable because of their attitude, history, background, illiteracy, and nature, disfranchising themselves. That plan was the poll tax.

It might not affect New York for the negroes in New York to vote because the ratio of negroes to whites is insignificant. But if a half million negroes were allowed to vote in Alabama the state would be in bankruptcy in a short time and business would be driven beyond its borders.

Haiti, Liberia, and the South under negro rule following the civil war are all examples of the chaos that follows in the wake of negro rule. Negro voting means negro rule in some of the finest sections of the South because the negroes out-number the whites in those sections some times as much as ten to one.

In many counties throughout the South a few thousand whites operate farms, business and industry and furnish employment to hundreds of thousands of negroes. If those negroes voted and elected their kind of officials, which would happen if they voted, there would not be a business or industry operating in the county twelve months after they took over—unless violence was resorted to for the protection of business and industry and farming against the improvident acts of incompetent and corrupt administration. Certainly no right thinking American wants to wreck any section of our country.

This situation does not prevail in the North and West and states in those sections may not need a protective measure like a poll tax that is absolutely indispensable, at this time, in some of the southern states. Likewise some of the southern states may be able to dispense with the poll tax, at this time, because of other protective remedies. The conditions in no two states are exactly the same. All of which demonstrates that only the states can properly handle a problem of that kind with justice to all. There can be no uniform law, nation-wide, that will operate justly on all people and on all sections. The founding fathers recognized that when they left the qualifications of voters in the several states exclusively to the states. To violate that arrangement is to violate and jeopardize the pursuit of happiness in many states.

The significance of the poll tax so far as the negro and certain whites are concerned is this:

The poll tax must be voluntarily paid. No penalty is imposed if it becomes delinquent. Past due installments do not draw interest. No fee or other compensation is paid any officer for collecting the tax and no one is allowed to resort to coercive measures to collect it. On the basis of the social value of voluntary cooperation we have developed the highest civilization known to man. The negro is a native of the tropical climate where fruits and nuts are plentiful and where clothing is not required for protection against the weather. The negro has never been under the necessity of producing anything through voluntary cooperation. The essen-
tials of society in the jungle are few and do not include production, transportation and marketing of goods. His racial constitution has been fashioned to exclude any idea of voluntary cooperation on his part. For this reason the negro, and some whites who are lacking in this virtue, will never voluntarily pay any tax. By refusing to do so they indicate an unwillingness to voluntarily support the government. The poll tax screens the unwilling, non-supporters, of the government from the voluntary supporters of the government.

The most dangerous abscess on the body politic is a class of people who will not voluntarily support the government. Every state owes the national government an obligation to protect it against those who would exploit it instead of support it. The poll tax is not an abscess on the body politic. It is political penicillin for an abscess on the body politic. As long as the matter of poll tax is a voluntary matter practically all negroes and many white people who have the wrong attitude towards our government will exclude themselves from the franchise by refusing to pay it.

The fact that Negroes, Indians, Chinese, Japanese and Whites are different, demonstrates that while each is entitled to justice under the law, they cannot be dealt with as equals. The problem of dealing with them in a political way is obviously a local problem. Some states have a high percentage of negro population. Others have comparatively no negroes at all. Arizona and New Mexico have large numbers of Indians and Mexicans. California large numbers of Japanese and Chinese, and so on.

Negro voting presents no problem to the people of Minnesota. It cannot possible make any difference to them whether a negro votes in Georgia or not. But negro voting in Georgia may be the most serious problem that confronts the people who live in Georgia.

Indian voting presents no problem to the people of Mississippi, South Carolina or Virginia. There are few, if any, Indians in those states. It cannot affect the people in those states. But Indian voting may be a most serious problem in New Mexico or Arizona.

Alabama or Florida will not be affected by Japanese or Chinese voting. But the people of California, or Oregon or Washington may be vitally affected by a Japanese or Chinese vote.

No one can deny that the people in each State are the best judges of what a local problem is and how it should be handled.

Some say it is wrong for a state to make a person pay a tax in order to vote. The answer is the state does not make the person pay the tax. The payment of poll tax is entirely voluntary. No one makes a person join the church. But church membership is accepted as evidence of the member's belief in the tenets of the Christian religion and a willingness to voluntarily participate in a spreading of the gospel.

If the federal government can say a poll tax is unfair it can say license to engage in business is unfair. It is as logical to argue that a
person should not be required to pay a tax for the privilege of engaging in business and making money as it is to say that the payment of a tax should not be required for the privilege of voting.

**SEGREGATION**

Of all the problems that confront the American people segregation is the most exclusively local problem one can imagine.

Segregation is established by law in some States, prohibited by law in others, and in still others there is no law on the subject, the matter being left entirely to local taste and custom.

The right to segregate, to choose one's associates, to have business and social relations with people of one's choice, to refuse to accept or deal with others is of the very essence of personal liberty and freedom in this country.

It is in no sense any infringement on the rights of a citizen to say that he shall not force his attentions on others who do not want to accept him. It is a species of involuntary servitude to say that one citizen must serve another against his will or provide another with accommodations against his will.

"The right to segregate in a sense is the same as the right to assemble. The right to assemble peacefully is guaranteed by the Constitution. The right to segregate is a natural right, and when it is abrogated we are no longer free. America is the land of segregationists. Americans want the right to segregate."

---

**CULT OF EQUALITY, P. 269 (1)**

In seventeen southern states and the District of Columbia, negroes attend separate schools. Professional men have their organizations such as bar associations and medical societies. There are occupational groups, unions, lodges, churches, and so on. We separate males from females in school, children from grown people. Catholics segregate in their own schools voluntarily. If they are permitted to do that, why isn't it reasonable for a larger group of Caucasians (including Catholics) to segregate so as to exclude Negroes.

Whenever negroes buy residences in sections where white people live the value of the property immediately declines. Any real estate man, bank or mortgage company will confirm that statement.

"In financing the Stuyvesant Town development to be constructed on the East Side around 14th Street in New York City, a 50-million dollar postwar housing project which will cover nearly twenty blocks, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. insisted that its mortgage contract carry a clause which states that no Negro tenants are to be admitted into any of these apartments."

Segregation is worldwide. India for example.
No white man is permitted to settle in certain sections of South Africa without permission of the Governor General.

In Liberia only a negro can vote and own property. Segregation works no hardship, it prevents tension. It protects black as well as white.

But, it may be said, that it is unjust to refuse the negro public accommodations, such as hotels, cafes, taxicabs, theatres, brabershops, beauty parlors and the like and to force the negro to ride in a Jim Crow car.

The charge of injustice will not bear close examination. White people have a right to engage in business and to deal with white people only. Negroes have a right to engage in business and to deal with negroes only. There is no obligation on a white man to spend his money providing public accommodations for negroes. There is no obligation on negroes to spend their money providing public accommodations for white people.

White people are entitled to the accommodations they are willing to provide for themselves. Negroes are entitled to the accommodations they are willing to provide for themselves. To compel either to furnish accommodations for the other would be an imposition on the one coerced. It is difficult to understand how any person can contend that a negro in a one-hundred per cent negro city like Mount Bayou, Mississippi, cannot operate a restaurant and serve negroes only or why a white person may not serve whites only, if they want to do business that way. To require either to operate contrary to the way they desire to operate is to deny them liberty and wreck their human rights.

Railroads and other common carriers furnish the negroes the accommodations their patronage calls for. Certainly no railroad would be expected to run dining cars or sleeping cars unless the patronage justified the operation. If the negro is to be mixed and mingled with whites in dining and sleeping cars, whites will quit patronizing that service in such numbers that dining and sleeping cars will not be operated at all. There is not enough negro patronage to justify the operation of such service for negroes alone. Can the negro complain, if enough negroes do not travel in sleeping cars to justify the operation of a negro sleeping car? If enough white people did not travel to justify the operation of a white sleeping car the operation of white sleeping cars would be discontinued. If the public accommodations available to negroes are not satisfactory to them, their remedy is to put up the money and provide themselves with desired accommodations just as white people have done for themselves—not to confiscate and appropriate accommodations that others have provided for themselves.

There is no limit in this country on what negroes may provide for themselves. They may, without let or hinderance, provide for themselves restaurants, hotels, theatres, and other accommodations equal or superior to any existence—if they want to. If they do not choose to do for themselves, they have no right to complain because white people do not do for them what they do not choose to do for themselves.
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Recently the press of our Nation, especially the Northern press, has been filled with stories and headlines whenever some misguided negro leader or communistic crackpot denounced segregation and States Rights and praised the misnamed Civil Rights program. This was news, hot news for the Republican and Truman vote gathering grist mills.

Recently the Danville, Virginia Register published an editorial referring to an article written by Davis Lee, Negro publisher of the Newark, New Jersey Telegram. Although this newspaper has over 500,000 negro readers in the Southern States and its publisher is unquestionably one of the outstanding leaders of his race there was little publicity given to his views on this hot issue by the uncivil rights advocates and their mouthpieces. This article states in part, "The whites in the South stay with their own and the Negroes do likewise. This one fact has been the economic salvation of the Negro in the South. Atlanta, Ga., compares favorably with Newark in size and population. Negroes there own and control millions of dollars' worth of business. All of the Negro business in New Jersey will not amount to as much as our race has in one city in Georgia. This is also true in South Carolina and Virginia.

New Jersey today boasts of more civil rights legislation than any other State in the Union, and State government itself practices more discrimination than Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Georgia. New Jersey employs one Negro in the motor vehicle department. All of the States above-mentioned employ plenty."

Our own distinguished Senator, Harry F. Byrd in requesting that this illuminating article be inserted in the Congressional Record states, "I regard this statement as one of the most accurate and clearest presentations I have ever seen of the racial controversy. I think it is especially timely and fitting and should be read by every patriotic American who is so deeply interested in the problems confronting our Nation."

We heartily agree with Senator Byrd and we are reprinting, "A Negro Looks At Civil Rights" elsewhere on this editorial page for your benefit.

This negro editor is by no means the first leader of his race to find wisdom in the States Rights Policy of the Southern States. Booker T. Washington once said, "Brains, property and character for the negro will settle the question of civil rights. The best course to pursue in regards to the civil rights bill in the South is to let it alone. Let it alone and it will settle itself."

For the benefit of our Republican friends as well as those misguided and misnamed Democrats who are supporting President Truman and his platform we would like to quote a great Republican and a greater American, Abraham Lincoln.

When Mr. Lincoln was inaugurated on March the fourth 1861 he read to both the North and South the platform plank of the original Re-
publican party in the first election it ever won and upon which he had been elected, "Resolved that the maintenance inviolate of the right of states, and especially the right of each state to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political structure depend. I have no purpose, directly or indirectly to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so."

Mr. Thomas Jefferson's opinion in regard to States Rights are too well known to require repetition.

Oh! where today is the Republican party of Lincoln and the Democratic party of Jefferson.

It would seem that the South and the South alone is still faithful to their sacred trust.

It is with Jefferson and Lincoln and this States Rights Party of the South that we take our stand. We believe you will be with us too when the chips are down.

---

HERE IS DAVIS LEE'S EDITORIAL:
"A NEGRO LOOKS AT CIVIL RIGHTS"

It is unfortunate that most of the news discussing race relations comes from professional agitators who have, or think they have, something to gain from creating animosity while talking rabidly about discrimination and, in the same voice, good will.

As a publisher of a newspaper with a large circulation and a corresponding influence, Davis Lee, Negro publisher of the Telegram, of Newark, N. J., which has some 500,000 Negro readers in the Southern States, grew less willing to accept the preachments of agitators concerning racial relations in the South. He decided to do a bit of investigating personally. Last Sunday he reported to his readers in a comprehensive article on the editorial page. Some excerpts which reflect his objective approach to the problem and provide sound counsel were called to our attention by the Bedford Democrat, which also was impressed by Publisher Lee. Keeping in mind that the comment is that of a distinguished champion of Negro advancement, and that it was printed in New Jersey, the Telegram editorial takes on added significance.

"I have just returned from an extensive tour of the South. In addition to meeting and talking with our agents and distributors who get our newspapers out to the more than 500,000 readers in the South, I met both Negroes and whites in the urban and rural centers.

"Because of these personal observations, studies and contacts, I feel that I can speak with some degree of authority. I am certainly in a better
position to voice an opinion than the Negro leader who occupies a suite in downtown New York and bases his opinions on the South from the distorted stories he reads in the Negro press and in the Daily Worker.

"The racial lines in the South are so clearly drawn and defined there can be no confusion. When I am in Virginia or South Carolina I don't wonder if I will be served if I walk into a white restaurant. I know the score. However, I have walked into several right here in New Jersey where we have a civil-rights law, and have been refused service.

"The whites in the South stay with their own and the Negroes do likewise. This one fact has been the economic salvation of the Negro in the South. Atlanta, Ga., compares favorably with Newark in size and population. Negroes there own and control millions of dollars' worth of business. All of the Negro business in New Jersey will not amount to as much as our race has in one city in Georgia. This is also true in South Carolina and Virginia.

"New Jersey today boasts of more civil-rights legislation than any other State in the Union, and State government itself practices more discrimination than Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Georgia. New Jersey employs one Negro in the motor vehicle Department. All of the States above-mentioned employ plenty.

"No matter what a Negro wants to do, he can do it in the South. In Spartanburg, S. C., Ernest Collins, a young Negro, operates a large funeral home, a taxicab business, a filling station, grocery store, has several busses, runs a large farm and a night club.

"Mr. Collins couldn't do all that in New Jersey or New York. The only bus line operated by Negroes is in the South. The Safe Bus Co. in Winston-Salem, N. C., owns and operates over a hundred. If a Negro in New Jersey or New York had the money and attempted to obtain a franchise to operate a line he would not only be turned down, but he would be lucky if he didn't get a bullet in the back.

"The attitude of the southerners toward our race is a natural psychological reaction and aftermath of the Civil War. Negroes were the properties of these people.

"Certainly you could not expect the South to forget this in 75 or even a hundred and fifty years. That feeling has passed from one generation to another, but it is not one of hatred for the Negro. The South just doesn't believe that the Negro has grown up. No section of the country has made more progress in finding a workable solution to the Negro problem than the South. Naturally southerners are resentful when the North attempts to ram a civil-rights program down their throats.

"The entire race program in America is wrong. We expend all our energies, and spend millions of dollars trying to convince white people that we are as good as they are that we are an equal. Joe Louis is not looked upon as a Negro but the greatest fighter of all time, loved and admired by whites in South Carolina as much as by those in Michigan. He convinced the world, not by propaganda and agitation, but by demonstration.
“Our fight for recognition, justice, civil rights and equality, should be carried on within the race. Let us demonstrate to the world by our living standards, our conduct, our ability and intelligence that we are the equal of any man, and when we shall have done this the entire world, including the South, will accept us on our terms. Our present program of threats and agitation makes enemies out of our friends.”

The findings of Publisher Lee are just what any well-informed southerner, white or colored, has known all along. The only difference is that Publisher Lee has chosen to state plainly facts which agitation distorts, and which any Negro leader of lesser standing could not declare without subjecting himself to vituperation and charges of being “a white man’s Negro.”

Both white and colored people of the Nation must come to understand, and quickly, that much of the agitation attempting to break up their friendship and cordial relations is inspired by persons at home and abroad who have no interest whatever in seeing southern whites and Negroes march toward a firmer economic base and to higher economic base and to higher standards of living for both races.
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