

WHY SEGREGATION IS RIGHT

A PAPER BY WILLIAM J. SIMMONS

Editor of THE CITIZEN, Official Journal of the Citizens' Councils
of America

Presented at

NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY

SOUTH BEND, INDIANA

Thank you for inviting me to Notre Dame. Frankly, it's an unexpected privilege for a Southern Baptist to find himself before a group of students at your University.

Let me point out that I am not here under a federal court order--but as your guest.

If you had not invited me, I wouldn't be here. I would not have gone into court with a battery of high-priced lawyers, claiming that my "civil rights" had been violated. Nor would I have run to the Civil Rights Commission with pitiful tales of discrimination and lack of equal opportunity.

No--if you hadn't asked me to visit Notre Dame, I would have done what any of you would do in similar circumstances--I would have simply stayed home.

This illustrates in a very mild way one of the basic facts of human nature at issue in the integration-segregation controversy. It is unnatural and against all codes of heretofore acceptable conduct for anyone to force his way, especially through the coercive power of government itself, into an institution or a group where he is not wanted. The sensible person who respects the rights of others goes only where he is accepted.

I appreciate your wish to hear the subject of segregation discussed. And I appreciate the honor of having been asked to bring you a Southerner's point of view.

To put the whole matter in perspective, perhaps I should point out at the beginning that the system of segregation--which is nothing but social separation of the Caucasian and negro races--has a history of long and almost universal acceptance in the United States.

In fact, among countries having large bi-racial groups, the successful development of segregation in the United States has been one of the outstanding characteristics of our country, as distinguished from most of Latin American countries, or India, for example, where caste systems based on varying degrees of color have been the rule.

Segregation is of course emotionally identified with the South. But in fact, it has been and is accepted and practiced by the overwhelming majority of people in all sections of our country which have a sizeable colored population.

Segregation was so well established as a way of life in the United States that, although informed persons had been aware of the growth of pro-integration forces for many years, the general public did not realize that the system would be seriously threatened until after World War II, and more particularly until after the Korean Conflict.

You may say that the North had integration before this time, and legally you have a point. But it was not until the late 1940's and 1950's that the negro population became sufficiently large outside the South, coupled with the increased aggressiveness of so-called "civil rights" organizations, that the North really began to feel the impact.

A recent example will serve to illustrate the point. At Hammond, Indiana, just to the west of us, some negro parents brought suit in Federal court charging

racial discrimination in the Gary school system. The situation resulted from the fact that Gary's 39 per cent negro population is largely concentrated, as it is throughout the North. The school enrollment in Gary is 53 per cent colored. This suit is believed to be the first in the North involving an entire school system.

The judge found that the segregated school conditions resulted from segregated housing. And, in a display of judicial probity, which I doubt the U. S. Supreme Court will allow to stand, he denied the suit. Pointing out the obvious, the judge said that when a large negro population is concentrated in a single neighborhood, "it is almost inevitable that a racial imbalance will result in certain schools."

Concluding, the U. S. district judge made the very sound observation that he saw no reason to destroy and abandon a neighborhood school system for this reason. He said that the neighborhood school "is a long and well established institution in American public school education" and had obvious social, cultural and administrative advantages.

This is the kind of reasoning, however, which is anathema to the pro-integration forces. In New York City, for example, they have forced the school authorities to haul negro children all the way across town and white children all the way in the opposite direction for the sole purpose of putting them in school with members of the opposite race.

How is it possible that such a weird state of affairs could come about?

I submit that it is primarily because the political power of the negro pressure groups has grown so great. The response of the Federal government to this power has resulted in a general policy of racism that is fantastic. But its fantasy is clothed in clever semantics which so mislead the people, that they scarcely realize what is happening.

The most extreme indication of this Alice-in-Wonderland approach is the injection of the question of racial inequality into the law as a basis of determining so-called "civil rights." The Federal government has very obviously adopted a pro-negro program of guaranteeing all kinds of "rights" such as FEPC, school and housing integration, etc. We shall pass over the fact that Congress has steadfastly refused to legislate in these fields, and that the government's activity may be of doubtful legality.

The point here is that the extending of these "rights" to negroes means that it is done at the expense of the whites.

The general term which is employed to describe this concept is of course "civil rights."

So, if you will bear with me, I think it will be useful to analyze this term in some detail, for there has been much confusion and misinformation as to the true and historical meaning of the words that are at the very heart of our nation's most dangerous domestic problem.

Most persons cannot define "civil rights" in a legal sense. Usually, they make a guess at it, and then end up by admitting they are not exactly sure.

Is it any wonder, then, that numbers of well intentioned persons are misled by the steady stream of pro-integration propaganda which fills our media of mass communications?

The thinking of many, especially in Northern areas where there are few if any colored people, has been well expressed by a columnist for the Cincinnati Enquirer. He illustrates it like this:

"Yes, I am well aware that the citizens of each state have the constitutional right to run their schools according to their own ideas. I know, too, that Congress

has never passed a law giving the Federal government any authority in the field of education, nor has there been any change in the United States Constitution affecting education.

"But these facts are relatively unimportant to me if a negro's 'civil rights' as a citizen of the United States are violated when he is denied the privilege of attending public school classes with white students."

Carleton Putnam, author of the best seller Race and Reason--A Yankee View, has described the situation like this:

"The North has been sold a bill of goods by advocates of the equalitarian dogma that the South has committed an injustice against the negro by refusing to integrate. The North has therefore been willing to see the Constitution strained to the breaking point in order for the South to be forced to correct what the North conceives to be a denial of the negro's 'civil rights.'"

The line of reasoning indicated by these two illustrations is one with which I am sure you are familiar. I dare say it has been repeated thousands of times. I know that I have certainly encountered it frequently enough outside the South.

The argument contained in this line of reasoning contains a faulty premise, and therefore any conclusion drawn from it would also be faulty.

Many of you may have detected the faulty premise already. It is that "a negro's 'civil rights' are being violated if he is not permitted to attend public school classes with white students." Or, to put it in the broader sense, "the negro's 'civil rights' are being violated if he is not socially integrated into white society," for that is what the argument is all about.

The entire legal case for integration hinges upon this view. So, if we can show that there is no relationship between "civil rights" and education, the case

collapses because it has no constitutional foundation.

The collectivist establishment has built "civil rights" into a mirage which embraces a whole spectrum of "rights," a magic cure-all for alleged "wrongs" visited upon minorities.

In reality, this is no more than a mirage.

As a beginning, let's consider the Fourteenth Amendment, the so-called legal base upon which all "civil rights" agitation is built.

Parenthetically, I should state here that the Fourteenth Amendment was never legally submitted or adopted, as has been pointed out repeatedly by legal scholars.

But, be that as it may, since it is regarded by the interracial pressure organizations as their primary source of legal authority, an examination of the meaning of "civil rights" in connection with the Fourteenth Amendment will shed light on the question which concerns our nation today.

Since "civil rights" are not even mentioned in the controversial amendment, we must go back--we must "turn back the clock," as a well known Supreme Court decision did not do--to the period just after the Civil War when the Civil Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment were under consideration.

Students of history may recall that the subject was red hot in those days. Many people in the North as well as in the South felt that the term "civil rights" was too broad in scope, and demanded that it be defined in specific terms.

As if they had the gift of prophecy, some argued that it might eventually be used as a lever to break down state laws forbidding school integration and interracial marriages.

The pressure for clarification was intense, and finally won out, for the

politicians feared that their legislation was doomed as long as doubts remained.

Senator Lyman Trumbull of Illinois, who introduced the Civil Rights bill in the Senate, defined "civil rights" as:

"The right to make and enforce contracts, to sue and be sued, to give evidence, to inherit, to purchase, sell, lease and hold property, and to convey real and personal property."

Senator Trumbull said his bill had nothing to do with social or political rights.

The Senator, who incidentally was not kindly disposed toward the South, insisted at the time that the right to go to school is not a "civil right" and never was.

The Judiciary Committee studied the proposed bill and recommended it. The chairman of that committee gave an interesting opinion on the phrases "full and equal benefits of all laws" and "civil rights and immunities." He said:

"... They do not include social and political rights. Negroes and whites attending the same schools are not civil rights or immunities."

Even Thaddeus Stevens, who advocated the most stringent kind of Reconstruction legislation, lamented:

"It (the Fourteenth Amendment) covered only civil rights... it does not touch on social or political rights."

Lest anyone think these are isolated examples, the records of debates in Congress and public statements offer copious substantiating evidence.

There are also public acts which provide additional proof that "civil rights" were never intended to have anything to do with the right of a state to operate its schools or other social institutions.

The same Congress which approved the Fourteenth Amendment established

segregated schools in Washington, D. C. Eleven state legislatures in the Northern and Border states likewise provided for segregated schools. These were: California, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

Two years after the Fourteenth Amendment was in effect, Indiana and Maryland established segregated schools, and Governor Oliver P. Morton of Indiana remarked with amazing prescience: "Placing white and colored children together in schools would cause conflict and impair the usefulness of the schools."

Could the evidence be more clear, more specific, or more overwhelming?

There is not, and never was intended to be, any correlation whatsoever between so-called "civil rights" and school integration.

"Civil rights" simply give the negro equal status with the white man in the courts of our land, a point which is not at issue anywhere.

I hope you have borne with me during this rather detailed discussion of the definition of "civil rights." I have felt it necessary to do so, because the air needs to be cleared of the smokescreen of confusion deliberately thrown up by those who want to destroy the racial integrity of the United States.

We are now prepared to see just how far the novel concept of special negro "rights" has gone. It has gone so far, in fact, that the color of a man's skin entitles him to do practically anything he desires.

Thus, the armed might of the United States guarantees that he may enter the University of Mississippi solely because he is black. It is inconceivable that any white person denied admission could call upon the government to secure his entry, even if he could show that the denial was unfair. I submit that this state of affairs is wrong. It is artificial and cannot endure.

You may say that this happened in Mississippi, and does not affect you.

But let's consider another illustration as to where this same kind of thinking by the government can lead.

The First Amendment to the Constitution guarantees certain rights to Christians. The government, under this first of the Bill of Rights, is committed to use its force to see to it that there is no interference with the free exercise of the Christian religion.

The U. S. Supreme Court, however, has distorted this principle in the same way it has the racial angle and interpreted it so as to make the government guarantee its force to protect the atheist in his objection to Christian worship. The arguments presented in the Baltimore case before the Supreme Court last week are a dramatic illustration of what is happening. An atheist is pleading for the government to guarantee that he is not offended in his atheism by Christians. It is not enough that he is not required to attend the reading of Bible verses and recitation of the Lord's Prayer. For he does have the freedom of being excused. No. The Christians are to be prohibited in the free exercise of religion, contrary to the Constitution, so that the alleged rights of the atheist may be paramount.

The court is being consistent in this line of reasoning when it raises race as a criterion of legal guarantees.

So, we come to the point now where we can look at the issue clearly. We have all of the cards face up on the table.

In practice then, "civil rights" do not mean some alleged mystical legal claim which the colored people have somehow inherited.

They really mean nothing more and nothing less than complete social integration of two widely different races in this country.

And that, gentlemen, means a profound social revolution whose consequences could well be disastrous.

Once our definitions are made clear, and we know what we are talking about on this point--social integration of the races--there is not much basic difference between the Northern and Southern points of view.

Until now, the principal difference has been that the South knows more about the problem from first hand experience, and is less inhibited in facing it. The North has known less about the problem, and has been quite inhibited in facing it--hence, the use of evasive terms like "race relations" and "civil rights."

One of my colleagues put it once: "The South has the problem, and the North has the solution."

But that situation is changing. For the Northward migration of our colored population is proceeding so rapidly that we will have an opportunity to share problems as well as solutions.

Consequently, the North is now beginning to face the necessity of devising an amicable system of race relations (used in the true sense) on a massive scale.

The South faced that problem many years ago, and developed a system which has proved very successful. It is generally known as "segregation," and is based on an acknowledgment of the obvious fact that the races get along best when they are not forced to mingle socially.

But let's look now for a few minutes at the extent of the problem which is beginning to confront the North, and see how the "solution" of integration has worked.

During the ten year period from 1950 to 1960, the net migration of negroes from the South totalled 1,653,000. This number amounted to almost 17 per cent of the South's entire 1960 negro population, a truly sizeable figure.

In the same ten years, the negro population of eight large Northern cities increased by 2,572,000. New York now has more negroes than any other state in the nation--1,417,500. And Washington, D. C. has the highest percentage of any city in the nation--54 per cent--up 19 per cent over 1950.

There are several factors which account for the shift of the color problem to the North--the magnetic attraction of easy transportation, preachments of "civil rights," public housing, lavish welfare, open avenues to political power, and pressure groups to further special negro interests. The exodus from the South is given impetus by the large-scale displacement of farm labor by mechanization.

The soaring negro birth rate multiplies the rate of change. In the North, the negro has tended to concentrate almost wholly in the large industrial cities. Normally, urbanization has resulted in declining birth rates, but the negro has proved to be a marked exception to other ethnic groups. The negro birth rate has attained its largest gains during a time when the race has become increasingly urban.

To help you visualize the magnitude of the problem we have learned to live with, and which is rapidly moving your way, let's compare our two states.

Mississippi had a 1960 population of 2,178,141. Of this total, 915,743, or 42 per cent, were non-white.

Indiana had a 1960 population of 4,662,498. Of this total, only 269,275 or 5.8 per cent, were non-white.

Now, for you to live under the same conditions which we have in Mississippi, the negro population in Indiana would have to increase almost eight times, to a total of 1,958,250, with a corresponding exodus of whites.

On the basis of experience wherever two diverse ethnic groups exist in such large numbers, I think it is safe to say that the white people of Indiana would develop some

kind of segregated system not dissimilar from ours. In fact, where there are large concentrations of negroes, you have already done so, especially through geographical segregation. Failing that, the lessons of history indicate that your present high level of culture would decline, as has been the case wherever the two races have amalgamated.

Northern segregation might not be based openly on race, at first. It might be partially disguised as residential restrictions and by other devices, as we have seen. Later, as the white people here gain first-hand knowledge of the problems involved in living among large numbers of negroes, I think a more frank and open acknowledgement of the facts of life will emerge.

In our section, segregation works quite well. It consists of easily acquired customs and a pattern of correct behavior between the races which have evolved out of the demands of necessity and a respect for obvious race differences. Northerners who move South readily adapt to the system, because they see the natural wisdom of it.

It is essential here to point out a truth which has been badly obscured by the smoke of much propaganda. It is that the present segregation laws in the South do not cause segregation. They simply give legal support to a condition of nature. Separation or segregation is apparently a well established instinct in man (if it were not, we would have become a blend long ago) and racial integrity will be sought by one means or another.

The laws do not create this condition, and could not possibly bring it about. In the North, where there are no laws on the subject, you still have segregation. And where the laws prohibit it, you have "bootleg segregation."

The laws merely set up standards for the orderly observance of separation and practical means peculiar to local conditions of preventing violence. The removal of such laws does not result in integration--it results in disorder.

Segregation in the South is based on separation in social institutions and practices. These include schools, churches, public gatherings, hotels, parks, swimming pools, restaurants, etc., and the usual social activities such as parties, dances and dating. In other words, segregation determines behavior in those relationships which are strictly social in nature.

In other aspects of everyday life, we mingle more freely and more amicably, as far as I have been able to observe, than is the case outside the South.

The reason for this, I believe, is that we in the South, both white and black, enjoy the protection of an established system of "race relations" and "civil rights" which everyone understands and respects.

We are not, therefore, thrown upon purely personal resources, or deprived of the protection of the law, when dealing with individuals of the other race, as you are presently in the North.

One illustration of the advantage of well established social segregation is that white people in the South do not suffer from a physical fear of the negro, as I have had occasion to observe so often in the North--in Harlem, for example, or in certain sections of Chicago.

Conditions in the euphemistically-termed "transitional" neighborhoods which are changing from white to black almost defy description. White people flee as if in terror.

One person has, with bitter humor, described integration as that period between the arrival of the first black and the departure of the last white.

I have seen entire blocks in Washington, D. C., and other large Northern cities completely deserted. They were in the path of an expanding negro slum.

Unless some sensible method is devised, such as we have in the South, for protecting the interests of the whites, the future of large cities in the North appears very dark indeed.

For there is a transformation taking place which is unlike anything this country has ever known.

I mentioned previously that eight large Northern cities had gained 2,572,000 negroes between 1950 and 1960.

Not included in the group, but perhaps more typical from an overall view of the problem, is Newark, New Jersey.

The negro population of Newark jumped from 17.1 per cent in 1950 to 34.7 per cent in 1960. That is only slightly less than the 35.7 per cent colored in my home town of Jackson, Mississippi, a drop incidentally, from 40.9 per cent in 1950.

I refer to Newark, because there are some very interesting data available concerning race relations in that community. It is of further interest here because its ethnic makeup is similar to that of Gary.

The city employed the Market Planning Corporation of New York to make an objective study of population changes and attitudes since 1950. Released April 5, 1959, the report revealed that in the eight years from 1950 to 1958, 93,000, or a third of its white population had left Newark. During the same period, the negro population had more than doubled, rising from 68,000 to 142,000. Spreading from one downtown slum area in 1950, the negroes had moved into one white section after another, which by 1958 had become mixed, and then all colored.

A public opinion survey by the Market Planning Corporation showed some very significant results, which I think should certainly be taken into account in evaluating the problem.

Real estate values fell when negroes moved into white neighborhoods, according to 83 per cent of the whites responding to the survey. Two-thirds opposed negroes moving into their areas. Of the whites expecting to move next year, a whopping 68

per cent of the respondents said they would go to the suburbs or completely away from Newark. The prevailing white attitude was one of social aloofness. Three-fourths were willing to accept negroes only on a basis of speaking acquaintance, and a mere 15 per cent would accept them as close personal friends. It is noteworthy that this 15 per cent said they would accept negroes as close personal friends--apparently none, or an insignificant number, had already done so. Another 15 per cent said they would have nothing to do with negroes at all.

Let's remember that we are talking about a Northern city--not a Southern city. But it is one which has a percentage of negro population comparable to that which has existed in the South for many years.

The conclusion which may logically be drawn from the example of Newark is that where Caucasian and negro races are present in large numbers, the white attitude will vary little, whether it be in the North or South.

Bearing in mind the pattern of residential segregation which prevails in all Northern cities, there is nothing to suggest that the viewpoint of the white people in Newark is exceptional.

From this example and others given, it would therefore appear that the heavy outflow of negroes from the South will bring about an increasing acceptance of segregation as the most practicable solution in the North.

There is ample historical precedent for Northern segregation.

As I am sure you know, President Lincoln had serious doubts about the political capacity of negroes, and he had no appetite whatsoever for social equality.

Northern intellectuals of that period, such as Charles Francis Adams and Professor Louis Agassiz of Harvard, reflected the general inequality view.

Even William Lloyd Garrison and Thaddeus Stevens, the leaders of the Reconstruction

Revolution, had a low opinion of the negroes they used for cynical political ends.

And Charles Sumner, the egghead of the Abolition movement, had such a shocking reaction to them that you would scarcely credit it to a highly cultured New England liberal.

At the end of the Civil War, when his vote ruled the South, three-fourths of the Northern states denied the negro the vote. He was welcome nowhere. Racial hostility had been evidenced in the North in savage explosions of mob violence during the war itself.

Today, we see increasing signs of racial hostility developing in the North, and qualified observers are fearful of the consequences. In recent years there have been race riots in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia and Detroit. Those areas are virtual powder kegs during the long, hot summers. The Thanksgiving Day riot in Washington is eloquent testimony to the utter failure of integration in our nation's capital. As you know, the schools there, after an incredible period of chaos, have become almost completely resegregated.

In Gary last week there was a racial brawl which resulted in the three upper grades of Calumet Township High School being closed.

All of this turmoil is quite difficult for us to understand in the South, because we have no such situations of tension, except those few artificially generated by the

politicians for the sake of negro votes in the North.

It is becoming more and more apparent that unless some sensible settlement of the race problem is worked out in the North, which is satisfactory to the whites, there will be great trouble to come.

We are frankly disturbed when we read of the teen age gang wars in Harlem and other negro slums in the North. And we are amazed at what we learn of schools becoming blackboard jungles in the great cities.

Such conditions are completely unknown south of the Mason-Dixon line. There are no organized gangs terrorizing students and teachers. I do not know of a single incident where police have ever been needed to keep order in a Southern segregated school, white or black.

The negro has always posed a special problem in the field of law enforcement. In fact, his contribution to major crimes of violence--murder, non-negligent manslaughter, aggravated assault, robbery and rape--has remained remarkably constant since the early 1800's at about three times the national average.

And the negro crime rate in the North has held steadily three times as high as in the South. Myrdal showed that the negro crime rate in the South in 1939 was 185 per cent of the regional average, but in the North and West it was 463 per cent. Similar calculations for 1950 confirmed the trend.

Last spring, on April 28 to be exact, Federal Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger said that drug addiction among negroes is much greater in northern cities than in the South. He said in a televised interview, "We do not find addiction among negroes south of the Potomac except some in Houston, San Antonio and New Orleans." He urged a study to determine why an incredible 59 per cent of the nation's addicts are negroes, virtually all of them in the North.

Thus, in the matter of law enforcement, segregation has been proven to be highly beneficial.

There are other areas of life where we could make similar comparisons.

Finally, let's get right to the heart of the question, and ask why we have segregation in the first place.

We have segregation because there are distinct differences between the white and black races which make it advisable. I am not talking about total inferiority or superiority--I'm talking about differences.

To those of us who have lived among negroes all of our lives, the differences are so apparent to anyone with the capacity for learning from the most elementary evidence of his senses that a serious discussion of the matter seems superfluous.

However, the equalitarian dogma which originated with the Boas school of social anthropologists at Columbia has been disseminated so widely in academic circles during recent years that the scientific aspects of race differences should at least be mentioned.

The field is so large that a major address limited to that subject alone by a person qualified to discuss it, which I am not, could only serve as an introduction. So I will merely say that much concern is felt among some scientists because of the deleterious effects they foresee on our civilization resulting from the Supreme Court's school integration decision. Their concern is such that moves are now being made to challenge the false science upon which the Supreme Court's integration decision was based.

For those who wish further information on the subject, I strongly recommend the recently published monograph The Biology of the Race Problem by Dr. W. C. George of the University of North Carolina.

To summarize, we have seen that "race relations" and "civil rights" are misleading terms for racial integration, in the double-talk of today.

From a Southern point of view, integration has proved that it does not and will not work. As the North gains experience, I think we will agree.

On the other hand, segregation has proved that it will work. Segregation is not the result of a starry-eyed idealism unrelated to facts. It is based on the truth. No system which ignores the truth of human nature and life can long endure. It can cause only pain and chaos.

Segregation is not perfect, even as no human effort is perfect. But it works, and the South will keep it.

The evidence suggests that the North will also find a similar solution.

It has been a pleasure to be with you.

Thank you again for inviting me.

###