

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND (D-SC) ON SENATE FLOOR,
FEBRUARY 23, 1960.

Mr. President, for years the great majority of the press, radio and television in parts of the nation other than the South has operated on a double standard. They persist in espousing a holier-than-thou attitude in the field of so-called civil rights. Closing their eyes to their own prejudice, they concentrate exclusively on what they term "racial prejudice", which they perceive to exist only in the South.

In the first place, racial prejudice probably exists to a greater extent in other parts of the country than it does in the South. Certainly, outbreaks of violence between the races are more frequent and vicious in the population centers of the Northeast than any that occur in the Southern States.

Behind the Paper Curtain the word "prejudice" has been narrowed in definition to a brand of "racial prejudice" as seen in the eyes of the holier-than-thou do-gooders who publish the anti-South periodicals. These very publications are themselves the epitome of prejudice against the white people of the South. Their biased and vicious half-truths and exaggerations concerning the people of the States which comprised the late Confederacy find no equal in bigotry.

Foremost among the papers whose editorial policy reflects the intense degree of prejudice against the South to which I refer is The Washington Post. On Monday, February 22, The Washington Post published an editorial entitled "Fair Security Procedure". In general, the Post editorial approved of the new Industrial Security Program inaugurated by the Executive Department and bitterly condemned the procedures which were contained in Department of Defense Regulation 441 for industrial security programs; the latter having been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court last year in the case of Greene v. McElroy partially on the grounds that there was no provision in the regulation for confrontation of the accused by the prosecuting witnesses and no right of cross-examination.

With respect to security cases, The Washington Post finds the rights of cross-examination and confrontation to be essential and basic rights of the individual. In extolling the right of cross-examination, as applied to security cases, of course, the Post editorial said:

"The right of cross-examination grows not out of a sentimental concern for accused persons but out of a recognition, distilled from experience, that it is an indispensable means of discovering the truth. This is why testimony in criminal trials is invariably subjected to it. It is especially important and useful, as Chief Justice Warren pointed out in the Greene case, 'where the evidence consists of the testimony of individuals whose memory might be faulty or who, in fact, might be perjurers or persons motivated by malice, vindictiveness, intolerance, prejudice or jealousy.' Cross-examination protects the Government no less than an accused individual. For it safeguards justice. It ought to be given full application in the Federal Employee Security Program as well as in the Industrial Security Program."

The rights of confrontation and cross-examination have recently been raised in a setting where, not suspected security risks, but State and local officials, are the ones denied the rights of confrontation and cross-examination. I refer, of course, to the case of Margaret M. Larche v. John A. Hannah, et. al., which originated in the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana. In this instance, it was the rules of the Civil Rights Commission which were contested before the court. Both the District Court for the Western District of Louisiana and a special three-judge federal court of appeals have found that the rules of the Civil Rights Commission were unconstitutional because they did not provide for the rights of confrontation and cross-examination. The lack of concern for the basic due process in this instance by The Washington Post is a prime example of the double standard to which I refer. The Washington Post can find in its editorial heart great concern for the lack of due process on behalf of security risks, and many an editorial tear has been and will be shed on behalf of these security risks. Not before the proverbial cold day in the hot place, Mr. President, will The Washington Post express concern over the deprivation of due process to white citizens of the Southern States, for they, in the eyes of the Post, are to be relegated to the position of second-class citizens in keeping with the double standard which permits the existence of the Yankee Paper Curtain.

-END-