ADDRESS OF SENATOR STROM THURMOND (D-SC) ON POLITICAL MOTIVATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION AND NORTHERN VERSUS SOUTHERN SYSTEM OF SEGREGATION ON SENATE FLOOR, APRIL 1, 1960.

Mr. President, when so-called "civil rights" legislation is before the Congress, emotion plays an increased part in the thinking of lawmakers, and good judgment is noticeably impaired—as is evident from the very fact that this issue is now before this body in the form of legislative proposals.

I have serious doubt that the American public, generally, understands the pressures and forces which prompt the continuous effort of many lawmakers to obtain enactment of just as vicious, and just as drastic, legislation in this field as can be forced down the throats of the Southern Members of Congress. I strongly suspect that there are many in Congress who would prefer that this lack of understanding on the part of the American public continue, for the true motives underlying the consideration of this matter surely fall in the class of dirty linen.

The window-dressing that accompanies the efforts to pass legislation in this field surpasses in deceit the wildest claim of a carnival sideshow huckster. These vicious proposals are cleverly clad in propaganda cloaks containing all the bright and appealing colors of the spectrum of virtuous motives from humanitarianism to constitutionalism. The skill with which this camouflage is applied and exhibited is exceeded only by the zeal of the proponents in concealing at all costs the lining of tyranny and oppression of which the substance of the garment is comprised.

This deceit, unfortunately, is astoundingly effective even when viewed at close range. Undoubtedly there are those in this body whose support of these proposals stems from the most worthy of
motive. So intense is the ardor of these misguided legislators that they are blinded by the very heat of their passions to all but the bright flash of the mock altruism which typifies the anguished cries that sympathize with the agitating minority.

In the fact of objectivity, the guise of humanitarianism is thinner than the corporate veil utilized by a bogus-stock peddler. Such phrases as "civil rights," "human rights," and "individual dignity" are so often bantered but seldom respected as to raise presumption of hypocrisy in connection with the user.

For those who are truly imbued with altruistic motives and sympathetic understanding for those who may enjoy a lesser opportunity for exercise of basic human rights, the field of opportunity for application of their efforts are many, and these fields are ripe for harvest; but as the saying goes, the reapers are few. Consider, if you will, the plight of the American tribal Indian. This once proud and noble man was subjugated by our foreparents, and as a consequence of his defeat in battle, was deprived of his birthright of rich treasures that this bountiful land would have supplied in the absence of the white man's coming.

Our government, acting--from the viewpoint of the Indian--like a benevolent despot, awarded the Indians certain rather limited areas of real property in return for his promised good behavior. The unbounded generosity of the Great White Father even went so far as to make these tribal lands tax-exempt--and because of this tax exemption, the tribal Indian is, almost without exception, disenfranchised. As a consequence of his acceptance of this noble act of generosity, the tribal Indian is subjected to perhaps the greatest concentration of administrative absolutism in our government's structure. As a practical matter, he is a captive.
Yet even a casual reference to the lot of these first Americans is rare. His subjugated status obviously strikes no chord of sympathetic understanding in the hearts of what I prefer to denominate as our politically inspired humanitarians. Perhaps it is the thought that the tribal Indian has the alternative of renouncing his heritage along with his membership in the tribe and his slender right in the land so graciously provided by the Great White Father in order to go into the world of the white man to exercise his civil liberties that mollifies the consciences of our politically inspired humanitarians. I suppose that it would be too much to expect that these great crusaders for human rights would be shocked into action at the supreme price put on the tribal Indian’s exercise of what we consider the very essentials of human dignity.

Or, consider if you will the plight of the labor union captive. It is hard to imagine a more practically essential right than the right to work. The subservience of those workers of the country who are enslaved to labor racketeers fairly shouts for legislative champions to deliver them from their bondage at a lesser price than the loss of their right to earn a livelihood or the payment of tribute. It should be highly significant to the American public that the most demanding of the so-called civil rights advocates are blind to the sufferings of these poor souls and have not even a crocodile tear to shed upon reading the abominable and abundant evidence of the existence of this deprivation which has been uncovered by the McClellan Committee.

This single-mindedness of purpose of the so-called civil rights proponents cannot be explained in terms of philosophy. The answer lies entirely in the field of politics. Even a casual study of the
purely political history which conceived the type of humanitarianism
that now continuously spawns vicious anti-South legislation reveals
clearly the reasons for the constant one-track approach. One fact
stands out like the flare of a red neon light. Only those minorities
with a bloc vote comprising, or substantially contributing to, the
balance of political power in key areas are eligible for the smile
of favor from this peculiar brand of do-gooder. Even so, efforts
in behalf of the favored minority are essentially limited to those
which can be carefully aimed against relatively politically
important areas—almost invariably the South.

Thus the Negro minority obtained the advantage—a very dubious
advantage, in actuality—of the concern of the politically inspired
humanitarians. Unquestionably it is the Negro of the North who
has qualified his minority for this particular concern. This we
must admit. The concentration of the minority is a basic
requirement for this type of political favor. Unfortunately for
the Northern Negro, such a concentration is almost invariably a
concentration in squalor and poverty—a condition of existence
exemplified by unemployment and under-employment, meager welfare
handouts, uncontrolled crime and immorality, and an abysmal absence
of the opportunity to improve his condition. As compensation for
these conditions—and not incidentally, his vote—the Northern Negro
receives the avid and belligerent advocacy of such legislation as
has been offered in Congress this session.

Keep one thing ever in mind. The favor of the so-called civil
rights advocates is not—in fact, politically it cannot be—
directed at the unfortunate plight of the Northern Negro; for to
correct the dismal conditions suffered by the Northern Negro might

well arouse the righteous indignation of the fellow constituents of
the Northern Negro and thus create a new group to upset the balance
of political power in these key areas of population concentration.

It is axiomatic, therefore, that the efforts of the so-called civil
righters must be directed at the plight, whether good or bad, of only
the Negro minority which exists in an area of relative political
impotence. Since 1936, the Southern States have been, to an increas-
ing extent, the area which meets this qualification.

Since the War for Southern Independence and reconstruction days,
the South has directed its political efforts—with a few notable
exceptions—through the channels of the Democratic Party. Prior to
1936, the two-thirds rule prevailed in the National Democratic
Convention, and thus the Southern States were able, by their
practical power, to veto a nomination for President by the Democratic
Party in order to protect to some extent their political interests.

Certainly as long as the power attending the two-thirds rule existed,
the South did not qualify as an area of relative political impotency.

Since no other alternative presented itself, the Northern Negro
concentration of bloc votes was pacified by pious promises of
concern for their politico exaggerated exploitation. In 1936,
the two-thirds rule in the National Democratic Convention went
down the drain. With it went much of the South’s political potency—it
seemsthat as far as the Democratic Party organization is concerned,
almost all of it. Since that time, only the most vigorous defensive
efforts by the Members of Congress from the Southern States have
prevented a complete rape of the South.

Thus, has the South become the political whipping boy of the
nation. The bid for the favor of the Northern Negro has progressed to
the extreme extent that it has replaced the pre-1936 maxim that no
Serious candidate for President must not only be a non-Southerner, but must, indeed, have demonstrated forcibly his anti-South attitudes. When, as at present, we have so many would-be Presidential candidates in the Congress, it appears that a contest to determine who can prove the "mostest" hateful deeds against the South is inevitable.

As I have mentioned, Mr. President, there are some truly altruistically motivated proponents of the so-called civil rights bills who are tainted only ever so slightly by political motives, they not being Presidential candidates. I do not doubt that these persons have a genuine desire to help the Southern Negroes. Assuming then that they do not share the political inspiration of their fellow proponents—whom I suspect greatly outnumber them—and that their motives are unimpeachable, let us turn to an examination of the practical effects of the proposals of these well-intentioned do-gooders to help the Southern Negro.

The emphasis right now seems to be on the vote. The hue and cry at the present is that voting rights constitute the key—give the Southern Negro the power of the ballot, and all the other rights and benefits due him will follow more or less easily after that. Voting, then, is not looked upon as an end in itself, really, but as a means to more important ends. No one could quarrel with that concept, as a matter of fact. In a practical sense, voting is inherently, by its very nature, a means to various ends rather than something of substantial inherent value in itself.

Now what are these ends, these ultimate objectives, to which mass voting on the part of Negroes is supposed to be a means.
One that is sometimes mentioned, though usually given only secondary and very scanty attention, is the economic betterment of the Negro. Certainly, so far as this is an objective, no one could quarrel with it. It should be pointed out, of course, that the Southern Negro was making very substantial headway economically, without the assistance of any so-called civil rights legislation; and that the pressure for so-called civil rights legislation, and other related policies, threaten to retard, rather than promote, his economic advancement. I shall not take time now, however, to pursue further this line of argument and show why this is so.

To repeat what I was saying, insofar as the economic advancement of the Southern Negro is the end sought, no one could seriously quarrel with this—least of all the South. The better off the Negro is economically, the less burden on the health, welfare and social agencies of our States; and greater purchasing power on the Negro's part would be of great benefit to the Southern economy.

And if the Negro could improve his economic status and alter some of his economic attitudes, he would be helping himself in many ways besides the purely economic one. This, indeed, is the sort of approach which the late Booker T. Washington advocated for the Southern Negro.

But the trouble is, Mr. President, that this approach is not looked upon with much favor by the present-day Northern Negro leadership. As I said, this objective of economic improvement of the Southern Negro is, if mentioned at all by the backers of so-called civil rights legislation, mentioned only very briefly and secondarily—almost incidentally. The present-day radical Negro leadership in the North has in fact very little use for Booker T. Washington. They tend rather to despise him for not having been more militant.
No, Mr. President, it is not economic advancement that is the real objective of the so-called civil rights leaders. What they are really interested in, what they consider to be the real end to be served by mass Negro voting, can be summed up in one word—integration.

And, Mr. President, by "integration" this modern Negro leadership does not have in mind merely the integration of one or two Negroes in each white public school. Nor are they limiting their thinking to schools merely. They aim for the total integration of the Negro into American society.

It is an ironic and tragic fact that, just at this time when the rest of the Negro world is emerging and moving ahead, the American Negro is being led by the NAACP leadership down this path of self-destruction. Unfortunately, the fact that the NAACP will fail of its ultimate objective will not spare the American Negro a great deal of needless anguish and misery. And the NAACP will fail, of course. Its leaders, though they pride themselves on being modern and progressive, are in actuality many years behind the times: They are trying to run counter to the trend of all the rest of the Negro world that is now making itself felt throughout Negro Africa. Just at the time when the Negro world as a whole at last has developed a sense of racial self-respect, when Negroes are at last beginning to take pride in being Negroes—
just at this time, the NAACP begins to mount the final stages of its campaign to obliterate the American Negro as an entity.

That the result of their effort is actually going to be rather the other way—and it will be the other way, Mr. President, from that intended by the NAACP leadership; for already the mounting white reaction to the NAACP's integration pressure is causing an American Negroes a sense of rejection that is inevitably forcing them into a self-conscious group-awareness, quite different from that which they formerly have had; and this sense of rejection, this defensive awareness of themselves as a group will increase in direct proportion to NAACP efforts to force integration on an unwilling white society. We are already witnessing strong evidences of this trend, in certain recent developments in Harlem and in the increasing growth of the black-nationalist Muslin Cult in the larger cities of the North and East. (See U. S. News and World Report, August 3, 1959.) That the result of the NAACP's campaign will not be at all what was intended does not, however, alter the fact that the intention, the objective sought is the total integration of the Negro into American society.
While there may exist some occasional exceptions here and there in the United States, we must face the fact that there are places and around the edges and fringes of white society, as a general and final proposition the people of this country are going to maintain segregation—if not de jure, then de facto. This is beyond discussion, Mr. President—the only point of concern is: what type of segregation?

Just as there are in this country two main, and quite distinct, cultures, a Northern (or, more properly, a Greater New England) culture and a Southern culture, so there are in this country, Mr. President, broadly speaking, two different species of the genus segregation. There is the Northern type, and there is the Southern type.

In the South, the separation of the races—this is the more accurate term, though for the sake of habit and convenience we shall continue to say "segregation"—is a matter of public policy, regulated by law as well as by custom. Segregation in the South is honest, open and above-board. It is a less severe form of segregation than that which prevails in the North. While in the North there is almost always an actual physical, geographical separation of Negro residential areas from white, this is not so in the South—it is not necessary. Since law and custom both require that the races shall be separate in certain spheres of activity, there is simply no need to have the races living in total
geographical separation. This is why, in many Southern towns and cities, one will often find Negro families occupying houses in the same block with whites, with no accompanying decline in property values and no white exodus. In short, one finds perfectly stable residential areas inhabited by both races—a condition which often elicits comments of surprise—and frequently of disapproval—from Northerners visiting the South or moving there permanently.

The Southern system of segregation also permits a great deal of warm friendship across the color line between white and colored individuals. Under the Southern code, everyone knows exactly where he stands, the white man as well as the colored man. Since each side knows where the line is drawn, warm personal friendship across the color line is both easy and frequent.

Nor, it should be added, does the existence of such friendship and goodwill necessarily require on the part of the Negro acquiescence in an inferior position. Such a position on the Negro's part is, of course, quite common, as would be expected in Southern society in its present stage of transition, in which the master-servant relationship is, understandably, still quite widespread. But, I repeat, the fact that this is the usually-existing circumstances does not mean that it is necessarily so.

Nor, Mr. President—if I may take a few moments to digress somewhat into a closely-related topic—does the fact that the separate facilities provided for Negroes have sometimes not been equal—this fact cannot by any stretch of the imagination lend itself to the absurd proposition that separate facilities are necessarily or inherently unequal. Admittedly, in some parts of the South, up until recently at least, facilities may not have in
every case been completely equal; but this can in no logical way
be used to condemn their being separate—just because the term
"separate" and the term "equal" have commonly been joined together
in the phrase "separate but equal." This term—and I wish to take
a moment to emphasize this, Mr. President, for I feel that it is
rather an important point—this term "separate but equal" is a
poor one. As a citizen of my State recently pointed out,
"separate but equal" seems to place the two words in opposition to
each other; it somehow tends to give a connotation that one
condition, which is bad, is balanced by another, which is good—
that "separate" is balanced, and justified, by "equal." Thus there
is a false implication that separateness is basically undesirable.
This is certainly not the feeling or intent or belief of the
Southern people. The term which accurately and correctly express
our view toward segregation is not "separate but equal," but
rather "separate and equal." This is the term which ought to be
used, and in the future I shall use it in place of the other.
Now it is true that in the implementation of our separate and
equal policy in the South, the equal has not always in every case
been lived up to. The answer in such a case, however, is not to
tear down the separate but rather to build up the equal—that is,
to make the facilities in question truly equal. And it is this
that the South has been striving to do, with, I might note, ever-
increasing success; the school equalization program in our own
State of South Carolina being an early and outstanding, though no
longer an unusual, example.
Even with such imperfections as may still exist, however, our
Southern type of segregation, which has stood the test of time,
has proved itself to be a boon to the white man, to the colored man, and to society as a whole. Now let us look, Mr. President, at the other species of the genus segregation. Let us take a look at the Northern segregation system, which may be defined as the system prevailing everywhere in the United States, outside the South, where Negroes comprise any substantial proportion of the population.

In contrast to the honest, above-board, and definite Southern system, the Northern type of segregation is founded on hypocrisy and deceit, and fundamentally on geographical separation which is either total or as near-total as the Northern ingenuity can make it in the face of mounting Negro immigration. The prevailing pattern in the North is segregation by flight. The Negro is told that he is equal, that he has all his rights, and that he will not be discriminated against; then he is simply avoided. The whites flee to the suburbs, and, through the housing pattern, de facto segregation is maintained, except in a few unfortunate fringe areas which degenerate into centers of tension and crime and whose whites leave just as soon as they can accumulate sufficient funds to do so.

By and large, the Northern system is eminently successful. It may be ruthless, it may be hypocritical and deceitful; but it works. It is tough on the Negroes crowded into the crime-filled ghettos, it is tough on the comparatively few whites who are left in the fringe areas adjacent to these ghettos. But never mind this:

By and large, the system is a complete success. It works: The overwhelming majority of Northern whites is enabled by this system to avoid almost all contact with the Negro.
Mr. President, of the two systems, or styles, of segregation, the Northern and the Southern, there is no doubt whatever in my mind which is the better. Our Southern system too has stood and passed the pragmatic test: it works. And this time-tested Southern system of ours has the advantage, so conspicuously absent from the Northern system, of being both humane and honest, rather than hypocritical and deceitful.

Of our Southern system of segregation, of the South's treatment of the Negro in general, it has been wisely and truly said:

"The South has shared its countryside and its cities with him [the Negro] in amity and understanding, not perfect by any means, and careful of established folk custom, but far exceeding in human friendliness anything of the kind to be found in the North. Not segregation of the Negro race as the Indian is segregated on his reservations--and as the Negro is segregated in the urban Harlems of the North--but simply separation of the white and Negro races in certain phases of activity is what the South has always had and feels that it must somehow preserve...." Mr. President, in view of these undeniable advantages, to both races, of our Southern system, as opposed to the hypocrisy and deceit inherent in the Northern system, we of the South would infinitely prefer to continue our Southern style of segregation.

Make no mistake about it, we, like the North, are going to have segregation, in one form or the other. We are all going to practice segregation, North and South. Our Southern type of segregation is, in our opinion, far preferable to Northern-style segregation; and we want very badly, for the Negro's sake as well as our own, to keep our own style of segregation.

It may be, Mr. President, that we shall not be permitted to maintain our own style of segregation. We Southerners are a realistic people; history has made us so. We know that this is not the first time in history that a small people have been forced
by their aggressive and numerically-superior neighbors to make certain changes in their way of life. The Southern people had to yield once before—though it took overwhelming force to make them yield, and in essentials of spirit and mind they yielded nothing.

We will not abandon our own, superior, tested type of legal segregation lightly. If it is ever abandoned at all, some people are going to know that it was fought for, as things which are worth preserving and deeply believe in are always fought for.

Should our fight not be successful, reluctantly—very reluctantly—we would be forced to abandon our Southern type of segregation and adopt instead, not integration—I have already pointed out, that is an alternative which will not be accepted by white American society, North or South, and discussion of actual integration, in any meaningful sense of the word, is an academic waste of time—not integration, but Northern-style segregation.

We would of course retain our own distinctive attitudes and our sense of kindness to, and responsibility for, the Negro; but in certain essentials we would be forced to adopt the Northern system of complete physical and geographical separation.

This trend is already evident in some of the States of the Border South, notably in Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri. There, the integration decrees have only speeded up and accentuated a process which was already under way, for industrialization and urbanization had long tended toward concentrating the Negro populations of those States in their larger cities, and in well-defined portions thereof. The cases of Kansas City and St. Louis in Missouri, Louisville in Kentucky, and Baltimore in Maryland
afford examples of areas which are in transition, or have almost
completed the transition, from segregation Southern-style to
segregation Northern-style--the latter often euphemistically
termed "integration."

What has been happening in the States of the Border South will
soon be happening, on a lesser scale and with certain modifications,
to be sure, in the South proper. That is, increasing industriali-
zation and urbanization will tend, in fact are already tending,
toward concentration of many hitherto rural Negroes in urban
centers. Integration decrees directed at the public schools of
these urban centers would--assuming that resistance was unsuccessful
and the decrees were enforced--make for residential racial
demarcation within these urban centers, after the same pattern as
precedes in Northern and Border cities. And school integration
decrees directed at the rural areas would have a threefold effect:
First, the flow of rural Negroes to the Northern cities would
increase. Second, there will be some acceleration of the
already-considerable movement of rural Negroes into Southern urban
areas. And third, there will develop in the rural areas a pattern
of much stricter geographical separation of the races, that is,
a separation between those Negroes who choose to remain in the
rural areas and the rural whites. Thus, eventually, there would
emerge in the South, in both town and country, a pattern based on
geographical separation, with the bulk of the Negroes in the
cities, and with the system of Northern-style segregation prevailing.

This picture I have just painted is what will happen in the
South if the South should be unsuccessful in resisting along its
chosen lines, that is, unsuccessful in its fight to retain the
the traditional Southern-style segregation. Should the South lose its fight, everyone would be the loser, and most of all the Southern Negro. As I have tried to point out, he faces a certain amount of dislocation and readjustment anyway, due simply to increasing industrialization and urbanization in the South. A considerable portion of our colored population, so long associated with the land, is already having to move to the cities to find employment. But at least the Southern Negro still has, even in the city, the same easy, warm and friendly relations with his white fellow-citizens, which the Southern code of segregation makes possible. Should the South lose its fight, however, the Negro will find that he has only traded the gentle Southern form of segregation for segregation Northern-style: A residential and housing pattern, segregated to a rigid extent that he has never before known in the South, will seal him off—just as it now does in the North—from virtually all contact with white people. The friendly, day-to-day, interracial contact which has always formed such a feature of Southern life would disappear, as the old informal, here-and-there, haphazard residential pattern gave way to the concept, and the reality, of the Negro Ghetto—the "Harlem Concept," as developed in the North. In short, in its race relations pattern, on the surface at least, the South would become a replica of the North.

And now, Mr. President, we have come to the heart of the matter. What I set out to examine in this part of my address today, as I pointed out at the beginning, was the basic and underlying psychology behind the so-called civil rights drive. And now I believe we have found it. We have come to the important point, the central motivating factor (aside from politics) that animates the proponents of this type of legislation.
I have said that, if events should take a certain turn—a turn which is entirely possible, though it is one which we still believe we can avoid—the South would become, in its race-relations pattern, a replica of the North. And I venture to predict that, when and if this should happen, the pressure for so-called "integration" that has been so intensively applied against the South for the past five years and more will die down almost completely.

I say this, Mr. President, because what the North is really insisting that the South do is, not actually to integrate—for, as I have pointed out and as the facts of American life constantly bear out, American white society will not practice, nor tolerate, real integration—but to adopt the Northern form of segregation.

The prevailing spirit in the North does not object to the South's having segregation; what it objects to is the South's having a different kind of segregation from the kind the North has. And if the South would just adopt, on the surface at least, the same approach to race relations as prevails in the North—which is, of course, a far cry from true integration—then the Northern mind would be satisfied and Northern pressure against the South on the racial front would cease.

The basic motivating psychological factor behind the North's attempt to impose so-called civil rights programs, and racial integration, on the South is this powerful subconscious desire to make the South conform. This is nothing new, Mr. President. I do not know why it is, exactly, that the North so strongly objects to the South's being different; I only know that the North does object and that for more than a century it has attempted to make the South conform to Northern ways.
Lest anyone gain the impression that this observation is original with me, let me hasten to point out, Mr. President, that this strange feeling on the North's part, this seeming resentment of the South's differentness, has long been noted by many respected and competent observers of American civilization.

As an example, let me quote briefly from the well-known study, *The Mind of the South*, by the late W. J. Cash. I do not agree with all Mr. Cash's conclusions about the South; but he was certainly a keen and perceptive observer, and his analysis of the fundamental causes of the War Between the States and Reconstruction is indeed. Here is what he had to say on the subject of the North's motives in its dealings with the South a century ago:

"The Civil War and Reconstruction represent in their primary aspect an attempt on the part of the Yankee to achieve by force what he had failed to achieve by political means: first, a free hand in the nation for the thievish aims of the tariff gang; and secondly, and far more fundamentally, the satisfaction of the instinctive urge of men in the mass to put down whatever differs from themselves—the will to make over the South in the prevailing American image and to sweep it into the mainstream of the nation."

Further on, in showing that the North's attempt to remake the Southern mind was, despite military success, a dismal failure, Cash again pinpoints this basic motivating intent. He speaks of, as being "the most fundamental drive behind the Yankee's behavior," "that will to wean the South from its divergences and bring it into the flow of the nation."

The North may have failed, but no one could accuse it of not trying. After the bayonets came the first great American attempt at brainwashing. As Frank Lawrence Owsley has written:

After the South had been conquered by war and humiliated and impoverished by peace, there appeared still to remain
something which made the South different—something intangible, incomprehensible, in the realm of the spirit. That too must be invaded and destroyed; so there commenced a second war of conquest, the conquest of the Southern mind calculated to remake every Southern opinion, to impose the Northern way of life and thought upon the South, write 'error' across the pages of Southern history which were out of keeping with the Northern legend, and set the rising and unborn generations upon stools of everlasting repentance. Francis Wayland, former president of Brown University, regarded the South as 'the new missionary ground for the national school-teacher,' and President Hill of Harvard looked forward to the task for the North of spreading knowledge and culture over the regions that sat in darkness.

Mr. President, this old attitude of the North, this obsessive desire to remodel the South in the North's image, which manifests itself so strongly today, never really died down, even after the failure of Reconstruction. Southerners who ventured into Northern regions always came face to face with this strange obsession, this resentment of the South. Harry Ashmore, liberal editor of an Arkansas newspaper, and a South Carolina native, describes in his recent book the first time, of many, that he encountered this attitude. Attending a gathering of newspaper people in New York many years ago, he was introduced to a Northern editor. The editor opened the conversation with the words, "I hope you won't take this personally, but as it happens I hate Southerners."

"There followed a diatribe," writes Ashmore. "It was not only the Southern treatment of Negroes that outraged him. His complaint was formless and passionate, more than anything else a sort of reverse counterpart of the Southern mystique. The South's very existence offended him, and to it he attributed most of his country's ills."

The type of mind which has been portrayed in these passages, Mr. President, is a mind which cannot tolerate differences. The holder of this type of mind has been described as "unhappy unless he feels that he is making the world over... For different opinions and ways of life he has not respect, but hostility or
contemptuous indifference, until the day when they can be brought around to conform with his own." To label this "the Northern mind" might perhaps be a generalization; but it is clear that this is the type of mind that has prevailed in the North during the past hundred years and more. The prevailing feeling of the North seems to be that the United States has to comprise one monolithic culture, that distinctive regional cultures cannot be tolerated.

Not that the Northern mind is always vindictive in its approach to the South. To the contrary, very often there seems to be more of sympathy than of venom. Many Northerners actually seem to feel that there is something quite sad, something very unfortunate, about the South's not being exactly like the rest of the country: they feel sympathetic toward us, rather than vengeful. They seem to consider it almost their duty, as a favor to us in the South, to change us, to mold us in the national image. For instance, there is the senior Senator from Illinois, of whose views I spoke in my testimony before the committee last year. Certainly his attitude toward the South is a "conquered province" attitude, but at least it is a "conquered province" attitude that is tempered by feelings of genuine sympathy. I am sure that the distinguished Senator really feels that by stamping the South with the image of the North, divesting it of its own character and making it just like the rest of the country, he would be doing us an enormous favor. And as for the senior Senator from New Jersey, there is absolutely no doubt that he feels that making the South just like the rest of the country would be doing a great favor to the South. Early in last session, in advocating the enactment of so-called civil rights legislation--"legislation not vengeful in any sense," as he put it--the able and distinguished New Jersey Senator
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declared that one reason why such legislation was desirable was be-

cause it would—and I quote from the Record (of Friday, January 9, at 1959)—"make it possible for a great section of the country to
become wholly a part of the country."

Mr. President, I should like for the Senator from New Jersey,

the Senator from Illinois, and those of like mind, to know that

we of the South appreciate their sympathy and concern for our
unfortunate and pitiable state; that we understand their well-

meaning desire for us "to become wholly a part of the country."

We realize that, to the Northern mind, there is something almost

abhorrent about the South's being different in its fundamental

essentials from the North.

But, Mr. President, these gentlemen might just as well realize,

here and now, that, not only is the South different, but we do not

really object to being different—in fact, we are rather glad to

be different—and that, in any event, we intend to continue to

be different. As a matter of fact, what the South has fought for

all along, "throughout a great part of its history, fundamentally,

be simply the right to be different.

And these gentlemen who would remake the South might as well

accept the fact, at long last, that—despite all the superficial

changes, the new industry, the factories, the superhighways, the

glass-fronted suburban shopping centers—the South is going to

continue to be, in its essentials, very different from the North.

The South, in short, is here to stay.

Despite all the physical destruction and death that violence

accomplished, the North failed to destroy the South spiritually

by violence in the War and Reconstruction. Nor did the period
which followed—the so-called New South period, which saw the early rise of the textile industry and the first phase of commercialization in the South—nor did this period have the effect which was expected and desired by the North and which was feared by some in the South. Somehow, despite the mills and the railways and the tall new office buildings which were superficially so similar to the North—somehow, the South remained the South. The reason, of course, is this—and this forms the major theme of Cash's study, The Mind of the South: The true differences between the North and the South are deep-seated and fundamental, rooted in the basic philosophies of the two regions; and so long as the base—the Southern mind—remained intact, the North's pouring in of soft materials at the top could have little real effect on the South. Again today, in this second and greatly stepped-up phase of the so-called "New South," we have the same situation. Since the end of the Second World War, and especially throughout the 1950's, industrialization and urbanization have been proceeding at an unprecedented rate in Dixie; on the surface there appears to be a growing similarity between the South and other regions. Yet, because the mind of the South, the fundamental philosophy of Southern civilization, is still intact and has even been strengthened, what a perceptive Virginia editor stated recently is very true: namely, that the South is actually becoming more Southern, not less so.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of the facts which I have outlined here today, I should like to make these recommendations to the Northern proponents of so-called civil rights legislation and racial integration:
First, I say to these proponents in the North, engage in a little frank self-analysis and realize that the Northerner's basic animating motive in his approach toward the race problem in the South is this resentment of the South's differentness, this desire to reshape the South in the nation's image—what Cash calls "the will to make over the South in the prevailing American image and to sweep it into the main current of the nation."

Second, study the history of the United States since 1820, and realize that all attempts from then, up to the present, to make the South conform to the national pattern—the War, Reconstruction, the attempted reeducation, the process of industrialization—all have been failures, so far as essentials and fundamentals have been concerned; the reason being, of course, that the real difference between North and South was never a matter of mere superficial qualities but rather of basic philosophies of life, and that the North has never been able really to get at the Southern mind.

Finally, realize—for the ultimate sake of the Southern Negro, mainly—that the same will be true of this new attempt in the racial field, this attempt to make the South give up its own form of segregation and adopt the Northern form. Even if the South should finally be forced to conform, on the surface, to the Northern racial pattern, the South's basic attitudes will remain unchanged; in essentials, the South will remain, as it has always been, something different, set apart.

And therefore, since your attempt to remold the South in the national image will ultimately result in failure, so far as essentials are concerned, spare the Southern Negro the misery you are about to thrust upon him. Do not add to his already difficult
problem, his problem of uprooting himself from the land and adapting himself to city ways--do not add to this the additional agony of having the Southern form of segregation, to which he is accustomed, replaced by the harsh, unfamiliar, and impersonal form of segregation that has been developed in the North.

The Southern Negro deserves better than that. He has been for centuries an integral part of Southern life, and he has been our friend. And we, the white people of the South serve warning now upon you of the North, that what you are about to try to do to the Southern Negro, in this new and futile attempt to reshape the South in the Northern image, will be sternly and steadfastly resisted by us.