

CIVIL RIGHTS: A MORAL ISSUE

Remarks Prepared for Delivery  
b y

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.)

50th Anniversary Convention of the  
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People  
New York City  
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

I deem it an honor to be here this morning to help commemorate the 50th anniversary of the NAACP.

In a very real sense, I have grown up with the NAACP. Your lifetime just about spans my own. Your goal of absolute equality for all people is my goal. Your work has been my work -- all the way back to 1946 when, as Mayor of Minneapolis, I cooperated with the NAACP to help enact the first municipal Fair Employment Practices Act in the United States.

I have learned much from my association with your organization and its leaders

Your Walter White taught me that the moral principle of human equality lies at the very heart of the democratic idea.

Your Clarence Mitchell taught me that if one believes in human equality strongly enough and works for it with all the force at his command, this great moral principle must one day triumph.

Your Roy Wilkins, a product of our wonderful University of Minnesota, teaches us every day how to face rude and vulgar attack with calm dignity, how to meet violence with confidence in the processes of law and how to answer hatred with love for one's fellow men.

Your organization daily teaches all of us what can be accomplished in a democratic society when men and women who care deeply about a moral ideal such as human equality band together to make that ideal a reality.

As we mark the 50th anniversary of the NAACP at this great Convention, let us here and now rededicate ourselves to the job of eliminating second-class citizenship in the United States and let us gather strength from the advances of the past fifty years for the enormous tasks that still lie ahead.

I would like to talk to you this morning about foreign policy and what our country should and must do if we are to keep the peace.

I would like to talk to you this morning about economic policy, about programs for full employment, housing, health, education, social security and a fuller life for every American.

But, instead, I am going to talk to you this morning about civil rights, for this is both foreign policy and economic policy rolled into one. An effective foreign policy requires a nation united in human dignity. An effective economic policy requires that every citizen have the opportunity to contribute his best to the nation's welfare. So in a true sense my message this morning is a synthesis of foreign policy, of economic policy, of civil rights and of political morality.

The Negro has won recognition of his basic rights primarily in the field of legal battle. All Americans are indebted to the NAACP for its belief in progress through law; no group in history, who have suffered so much indignity at the hands of their fellow men, have so consistently rejected retaliatory violence and have so completely dedicated themselves to fellowship and legality. This is real Americanism -- respect for law and order.

All Americans are deeply indebted to our federal courts for enforcing the rule of law in our democracy. But the courts should not be asked to carry the burden

alone. At the present time, about 200 cases involving desegregation issues are pending in federal and state courts.

The heavy burdens imposed upon the courts can be relieved only by the President and the Congress assuming their share of the responsibility. The Constitution did not create a separation of powers for the purpose of paralyzing our government. All three branches of government must cooperate to make our system workable and to effectuate the humanitarian principles of the Constitution.

It is not enough to say that the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions, whether we like them or not, must be obeyed simply because they are the supreme law of the land. More than a question of law enforcement is involved. At stake is a basic moral issue which underlies our very conception of democracy.

Thomas Jefferson struggled with this moral principle in drafting the Declaration of Independence. He was acutely aware that Negro slavery contradicted the principles enunciated in that Declaration.

On the floor of the very First Congress of the United States, Representative Josiah Parker deplored the treatment of the Negro and urged that the "inconsistency in our principles, with which we are justly charged, should be done away, that we may show, by our actions, the pure beneficence of the doctrine we hold out to the world in our Declaration of Independence." And in the Fourth Congress, Representative James Hillhouse of Connecticut said that he knew of "no principles that made a difference between the natural rights of a white or black man." He reminded the Congress that "the first principle that is laid down in the rights of man is, that all men are born free and equal; it does not say all white men."

This moral principle of human equality is written into the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to our Constitution, the decisions of the Supreme Court implementing these Amendments and the Charter of the United Nations.

Do we not have the right then to expect that the President and the Congress will affirm the great moral principle of human equality and brotherhood by defending the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions on moral grounds? The fate of the desegregation program depends upon a deep understanding of the moral issue by our people, an understanding that can only be developed through the leadership of all branches of government.

The Supreme Court is playing a magnificent role in teaching the fundamental principles for which America stands. But the President and Congress, too, should be instruments of national education.

This was a function of the Presidency which Franklin Roosevelt understood so well. "I want to be a preaching President -- like my cousin," he once said. We could use a little preaching from the White House right now -- preaching the gospel of desegregation because it is right and moral.

I am saddened that in the more than five years since the historic desegregation decisions, we have yet to hear from the White House one simple declaration that these decisions were correct and moral. Indeed, anyone studying the statements coming out of the Administration today would think that the only thing that mattered was balancing the financial budget. I suggest that once in a while this Administration consider the importance of balancing our moral budget.

And I regret to report that the record of Congress is little better.

In 1947 President Truman's Civil Rights Committee said, "The time for action is now." It is twelve years later and except for the Civil Rights Act of 1957, pared down under threat of Senate filibuster to avoid any support whatever for the desegregation decisions, the Congress has done nothing to balance the moral budget.

Oh, I know all the arguments being used against Presidential and Congressional action in support of the desegregation decisions.

Let us be patient and take things slowly, say the standpatters. But five years have elapsed since the desegregation decisions and Congress has failed to take one single step to support the Court.

There is still discrimination in the North, say the standpatters, so why talk about segregation in the South. No, we're not perfect up North -- far from it.

There is lots of work to be done to end racial inequality in our big Northern cities. And incidentally I've got a package of bills pending in Congress right now to do just that. But the fact that the North isn't perfect doesn't give any part of the nation a right to flout the law of the land. And don't ever forget this difference between Mississippi and Minnesota -- the law demands inequality in Mississippi; it seeks to protect the individual in Minnesota.

Above all, argue the standpatters, a change in the hearts of men will have to occur before the problem of segregation will be solved.

I am the first to grant that nothing would be as effective in achieving racial equality as a change of heart in the people who harbor racial prejudice. But it is grievous error to assume that governmental action can do nothing to cause a change of heart. The editors of the Catholic magazine Commonweal were moved by this argument to comment that on the whole, "the history of the Negro in America makes clear that his lot has been improved by decisions and actions taken on the political and economic levels, rather than on the 'moral and spiritual plane'."

"The Negro's most effective help," Commonweal maintained, "has come from the court-house not the church." "The 'basic' element remains what it has always been -- legislation aimed at interracial justice, and the vigilance of the courts over the execution of such legislation."

The argument that we must rely exclusively on moral and spiritual regeneration overlooks the distinction between prejudice and discrimination. Discrimination involves behavior, action and choice; prejudice is a matter of belief, attitude and involuntary feeling. We seek by law directly to attack discrimination, not prejudice. If we succeed in eliminating discrimination by law, we have reason to expect that the lessening of prejudice will be a by-product of our success.

Studies conducted during World War II and after show that American soldiers, whether they came from the North or the South, were prejudiced against the Negro as a Negro, so long as they had no experience in integrated units. But once they lived and fought and died side by side with Negroes in integrated units, their prejudice declined. Studies of integrated labor unions, factories, offices and housing developments corroborate these findings.

Prejudice seeks to justify itself because of the alleged inferiority of the Negro. But it is discrimination which deprives the Negro of equal opportunity and condemns all too many to poverty and ignorance upon which the charges of inferiority are based. Just as discrimination, therefore, fills the wells of prejudice, so the elimination of discrimination will pump them dry.

I do not mean to say that we should not try to understand prejudice and do what we can to attack it directly, too. Our spiritual leaders, Catholic, Protestant and Jew, are dedicating themselves to this honorable task. But the fight against discrimination cannot wait until prejudice is eradicated. We need a concerted effort against prejudice and discrimination on both moral and legal grounds by all branches of our government and by all institutions of our society.

Congress should act now -- in this session. We cannot go home again having done nothing. We must enact legislation to prevent another case of September sickness when the schools open this fall. We cannot ignore the deeper meaning and challenge of the lynching at Poplarville, the rape at Tallahassee, and the 530 instances of racial violence, reprisal and intimidation since the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. We must act now to pass a bill that supports the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions and insures law and order for the nation.

Fortunately such a bill is before both houses of Congress. In the Senate it was introduced by a bipartisan group including Senators Douglas, Javits and myself. In the House it was introduced by Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee.

I was for the principles of this bill in 1957, but we lost out under threat of filibuster.

I was for this bill in 1958, but we couldn't get it out on the floor of either house.

I am for this bill now in 1959, and I am willing to stay in session until Christmas in order to break a filibuster and get it enacted.

And if that doesn't work, I'm prepared to fight for this bill in 1960 -- in

Congress, in the political campaigns, everywhere.

Let's not have a quarter-loaf civil rights bill -- a bill whose only claim to the name "civil rights" is in the title. We want a bill that will support and implement the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions. It's too late in the day to rely just on conciliation as a means of making constitutional rights a reality.

The passage of the Douglas-Humphrey bill will put the full force of the federal government behind the processes of desegregation; it will be a signal to all the world that this is indeed the land of equality and of opportunity for all. In my judgment, there are few things that would do more to raise the prestige of our nation throughout the world and thus contribute to the cause of peace.

And there is another thing that we can and should do to contribute to the cause of peace. We are wasting our greatest human resource in the diplomatic field -- our Negro citizens. It is a sad fact that in a world two-thirds colored our own Negro leaders are almost totally unused in the diplomatic field. Unofficial travelers like Marian Anderson, Louis Armstrong, the Globetrotters and others have demonstrated what could be accomplished by an Administration with the imagination and drive to use all our human resources.

My friends, I came here this morning as a spokesman for civil rights, not as a spokesman for the Democratic Party. But as the only Democratic Senator on your program, there is something I would like to say to you about our party. Yes, we have our differences. Most of the Northern Democrats work hard for civil rights legislation. Most of the Southern Democrats work hard against it. But I submit to you that this is a far more honorable estate than the Republican practice of having the same people on both sides of the civil rights fence.

What, I ask, has that summer soldier of civil rights from Whittier, California, whose voice sounded forth on civil rights in July of 1957, been doing on the civil rights front these past two years? What is the use of having a Contracts Compliance Committee that has never once withdrawn a contract from an employer who won't stop discriminating against Negroes?

Where, I ask, is the Administration in the big battle now looming before the Congress to enact the Douglas-Humphrey bill and give the Attorney General authority to sue to enforce civil rights?

Why, I ask, does Republican Chairman Morton fight shy of the Douglas-Humphrey bill while Democratic Chairman Paul Butler goes all the way with us?

But take heart, my friends. Despite all the obstacles and difficulties, we are winning the fight for human rights.

Oh, I know that there are heart-rending attacks upon your organization. I know there are many parts of the country where you are harassed by state laws exposing your members to reprisals and banning them from public employment, prohibiting financial support of litigation to enforce Negro rights, excluding your organization as a "foreign corporation," investigating your organization, levying excessive license fees and taxes, and other things. But these attacks upon you are a measure of your great success in the courts and elsewhere -- wear these attacks with honor.

Keep up the fight. Keep the moral flag of civil rights flying. Together we cannot fail.

**UAW**

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
1126 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.  
EXECUTIVE 3-7761

*sp file: NAACP*  
*July 15*  
*N.Y.C.*

*V. / Speech file*  
July 27, 1959

Dear Bill:

REC'D JUL 29 1959

As promised, here is the transcript  
of Humphrey's address to the NAACP convention.

Regards,



Terry Corum



(Verbatim Transcript)

ADDRESS BY SEN. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
TO THE 50TH CONVENTION OF THE N. A. A. C. P.,  
NEW YORK COLISEUM, NEW YORK CITY,  
JULY 15, 1959

Thank you very much, Mr. Berry; I believe I can say Mayor Berry. The very fine distinguished public servant, Mr. Spingarn, our illustrious friend of many battles in the cause of human rights; my fellow Americans.

I couldn't help but pay special attention to the characterization of your present speaker: John the Baptist of civil rights. Now, my biblical-studying friends, you may recall what happened to John the Baptist. (Laughter and applause) But I must add that if one is to lose his head, I can think of no more worthy cause. (Applause) And then, may I remind you who are a little more prosperous and affluent than others, that the head was, indeed, on a golden platter.

This is a very wonderful occasion for me. I'm with many old friends, some to whom I shall make brief reference. Just a moment ago I was privileged to meet a new public official, one that had been elected to the House of Representatives in the state legislature of the 49th state of the union, the state of Alaska -- Rep. Blanche McSmith. (Applause) And I've already asked Representative McSmith to take my greetings back to Mayor Lounsberry of

Humphrey - page 2

of Anchorage, with whom I spent a very pleasant afternoon with out in Los Angeles at the Mayors' Conference; and back to one of my good friends, a former Minnesotan, Helen Fisher, back in Alaska. So, Blanche, you take those messages, will you?

It's an honor to be here this morning. An honor to help commemorate the 50th anniversary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. And might I add that to be here this morning is not only an honor, but for me who is a late starter, it's really even somewhat of a sacrifice, and for you too.

But I'll tell you that it was my desire to speak this morning rather than this afternoon, simply because this afternoon in Washington we're going to have a vote on a great civil rights issue: home rule for the District of Columbia. (Applause) And I'm going to be there to cast a vote for the right to vote for local self-government, for equal rights, for the better than one million citizens of the District of Columbia, the great Federal city, where the Federal government ought to set the example of good government. (Applause)

Now in a very real sense, I've grown up with the NAACP. Your lifetime just about spans my own; your goal of absolute equality for all people is and has been and continues to be my goal. Your work has been my work, all the way back to 1946, when as Mayor of the city of Minneapolis, Minnesota, it was my privilege to cooperate with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, to help enact the first municipal Fair Employment Practices Act in the United States of America. (Applause)

And there's a friend of mine here on the platform, Cecil Newman, the editor of the Minneapolis Spokesman and the St. Paul Recorder, who will recall very well those difficult days. And he'll also recall that the present Governor of the state of Minnesota, who was then a young man 26 years of age, was the lawyer who prepared the ordinance, wrote the language, and helped fight it through the Minneapolis City Council for a FEPC. (Applause) And I refer to our own Governor, who has stood with me throughout these years in politics and all matters, as a matter of fact, Gov. Orville Freeman, a friend, may I say, of human rights in Minnesota and throughout the nation. (Applause)

That's the same Governor, who, by the way, appointed another dear friend of mine as a municipal judge in the city of Minneapolis, and I refer to a gentleman who I'm proud to call friend, and who has been kind enough to let me call him friend, Judge Howard Bennett of Minneapolis, Minnesota. (Applause)

Now my friends from St. Paul, I haven't forgotten you. Oh, we have a wonderful delegation here from the St. Paul chapter of the NAACP. And when they write and ask me to buy a membership, I have to write back and say, now look, I want to be a member of the St. Paul chapter, I want to be a member of the Minneapolis chapter; why don't you just have a state chapter so I can have one membership.

Now more seriously and directly to the purpose of this morning's gathering.

I've learned a great deal from my association with your organization and its great leaders. Your Walter White, and may we remember him and may we bless his memory; and my good friend, Walter White, taught me the moral principle of human equality lies at the very heart of the democratic idea. (Applause) And your own Clarence Mitchell, a former Minnesotan, may I say, taught me if that/one believes in human equality strongly enough, and works for it with all the force at his command, that this moral principle must one day triumph. (Applause) And your Roy Wilkins, my friend, and may I add, a product and a good first-class, gilt-edged product of our own wonderful University of Minnesota, teaches us every day how to face rude and vulgar attacks with calm dignity, and how to meet violence with confidence in the processes of law and order, and how to answer hatred, my friends, with love for one's fellow man. (Applause)

I'm sure some of you can now see why I'm here. Not only because of what your organization stands for, which within itself would be enough to bring me to your conference, not only because I was given a kind and cordial invitation, but because some of your most distinguished leaders today and in the past have come from the state where - the state which I'm privileged to represent in the United States Senate - and some of your leaders have been close personal friends of Mrs. Humphrey and myself. Your organization teaches daily all of us what can be accomplished in a democratic society when men and women care deeply about a moral ideal such as human equality, ban together to make that ideal a living reality.

Humphrey - page 5

And as we mark the 50th anniversary of the NAACP at this great convention, an anniversary which has been heralded, as I say, by the press of this city and of other great cities, let us here and now rededicate ourselves to the job of eliminating, once and for all from American life, second-class citizenship in the United States. (Applause)

And let us gather strength from the advance, the progress, of the past fifty years for the enormous tasks that still lie ahead.

I wish to extend my compliments and congratulations to the NAACP for its everlasting vigilance, and its everlasting constructive methods, to make America a better land for all the peoples of all races, colors and creeds. (Applause)

Now many of you know that I have a great interest in the field of foreign policy, and it's an interest which is surely needed. And I would like to talk to you this morning about American foreign policy, and what our country should do, and must do, if we are to keep the peace - peace with freedom, peace with justice.

I would like very much to talk to you this morning about economic policy, about programs of full employment, health, education, housing, Social Security, and a fuller life for all Americans. Yes, I'd like to talk to you this morning about housing for every American without bias and housing without restrictive covenants, for example.

But instead, I'm going to talk to you this morning about civil rights. For this, my fellow Americans, is both foreign policy and economic policy rolled up into one. (Applause)

Why do I say that? because an effective foreign policy requires a nation united in human dignity, and effective economic policy requires that every citizen have the opportunity to contribute his best, his utmost, to the nation's welfare.

In this cruel contest of the cold war, we're going to need the energy, the output, the ability of every American at full capacity. If you don't believe it, go around the Coliseum and see the exhibit of another nation. We're going to need everyone in this nation at full steam ahead for years to come. (Applause)

So in a very true sense, my message this morning is a synthesis of foreign policy and economic policy and civil rights and of political morality. This is the only way that I know, dear friends, to really be a nation worthy of our heritage.

I couldn't help but note when I came in, the pamphlets and the literature on one of the tables just outside the door of this hall. And I saw a picture there of a dear friend of mine from Africa, Tom Mboya. I had him as my guest in Washington. And may I say to my friends of the fourth estate: we had him before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and he talked to us about the problems of Africa and the aspirations of their people for freedom.

And I serve notice this morning, not in the form of any kind of criticism or of even sharp comment, but I serve notice that America's future may well depend upon our relationships with Asia and Africa in the days to come. (Applause)

Humphrey - page 7

And the one way that I know to strengthen this nation's relationships with those great continents and the peoples of those continents is by practicing democracy to its utmost and to its fullest measure here on the American scene itself.

(Applause)

Now the American Negro has won recognition of his basic rights primarily in the field of legal battle. All Americans are indebted to the NAACP and to its legal counsels for its belief in and dedication to progress through law. No group in American history who have suffered so much indignity at the hands of their fellow men have so consistently rejected retaliatory violence, and have so completely dedicated themselves to fellowship and legality. (Applause) And might I add, no group in American history has suffered such indignities and repudiated and rejected communism and forces of totalitarianism as have the people who are our Negro citizens of America. (Applause)

And may I say to you in my capacity as a United States Senator: I am ever grateful, and I pay you tribute, and I compliment you and thank you for what you've done to set the pattern of how to turn bitterness into understanding, and hatred into love, and violence into law and order. For this you can always be proud. (Applause)

Now this is real Americanism. This is the kind of Americanism that ought to be heralded in the halls of Congress: respect for law and order and your faith in the ultimate victory of free institutions and free men.

All Americans are deeply indebted to our Federal courts for upholding and enforcing the rule of law in our democracy. But the courts should not be asked to carry this burden alone. At the present time about 200 cases involving desegregation issues are pending in Federal and state courts; and many more cases involving civil rights and civil liberties cases are pending in the courts.

The heavy burdens imposed upon the courts can be relieved only by the President and the Congress assuming their fair share of the responsibilities.

Now the Constitution did not create a separation of powers for the purpose of paralyzing our government. All three branches of government must cooperate to make our system workable and to effectuate the humanitarian principles of the Constitution.

It is not enough to say that the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions, whether we like them or not, must be obeyed simply because they are the supreme law of the land. More than a question of law enforcement is involved. At stake is the very basic moral issue which underlies our conception of democracy.

Thomas Jefferson struggled with this moral principle drafting the Declaration of Independence. He was acutely aware that Negro slavery contradicted the principles enunciated in that Declaration. In the very first Congress of the United States, Rep. Josiah Parker deplored the treatment of the Negro and urged that "the inconsistency of our principles with which we are justly charged should be done away that we may show by our actions the pure beneficence of the

doctrine that we hold out to the world in our Declaration of Independence." Now those are the words of a congressman in the first Congress of the United States.

And then in the fourth Congress a few years later, Rep. James Hillhouse of Connecticut said that he knew of, quote, "no principles that made a difference between the natural rights of a white or a black man." End of quote. He reminded the Congress that the first principle that is laid down in the Rights of Man is that all men are born free and equal, and it does not say, said Congressman Hillhouse, it does not say all white men are born free and equal. (Applause)

Now this moral principle of human equality is written into the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to our Constitution, and the decisions of the Supreme Court implementing these Amendments and the Charter of the United Nations.

Then, for goodness sakes, why do any of our Americans seem to pull away from the implementation of those principles? Do we not have a right then with this historical background, do we not have a right to expect that the President of the United States and the Congress will reaffirm the great moral principle of human equality and brotherhood by upholding and defending the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions, not only on legal grounds but, I say to you, upon moral grounds? (Applause)

The fate of the desegregation program depends upon a deep understanding of the moral issue by the people, and understanding that can only be developed

Humphrey - page 10

through the leadership of all branches of government. The Supreme Court has played, and is playing, a magnificent role in teaching the fundamental principles for which America stands. But the President and the Congress, too, should be instruments of national education and national policy. (Applause)

Now this was the function of the Presidency which Franklin Roosevelt understood so well. Listen to what he said. Hear the wonderful words from Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He said, "I want to be a preaching President like my cousin," referring back to Teddy Roosevelt.

Well, my good friends, we could use a little preaching from the White House right now. (Applause) I guess John the Baptist here has a right to say that, doesn't he? (Laughter) Preaching the gospel of desegregation, preaching the gospel of equal rights because it is right, because it is moral.

Now I'm saddened that in the more than five years since those historic desegregation decisions, we have yet to hear from the White House one simple declaration that these decisions were correct, or that they were moral. Indeed, anyone studying the statements coming out of the Administration today would think that the only thing that mattered was balancing the national budget. And I suggest that once in a while, this government and this Administration consider the importance of balancing our moral budget. (Applause)

Now I deeply regret to report the record of Congress is little better. In 1947, President Truman's Civil Rights Committee said, "The Time for action is now."

Humphrey - page 11

Well, it's twelve years later. And except for the Civil Rights Act of 1957, which act I do not underestimate, it was an accomplishment, pared down under the threat of Senate filibuster to avoid any support whatever for the desegregation decisions, the Congress has done little or nothing to balance the moral budget to which I referred.

Oh, I know all the arguments being used against Presidential and Congressional action and support of these decisions. "Let us be patient," they say, "and take things slowly." That's what the standpatters admonish us.

But five years have elapsed since the desegregation decisions, and Congress has failed to take one single step to support the Court.

There is still discrimination in the North, say the standpatters. Well, why talk about segregation in the South? My answer is: no, we're not perfect up North, a long way from it. There is a lot of work to be done to end racial inequality and discrimination and bigotry in our big northern cities. And, incidentally, I've got a package of bills pending in Congress right now that would sure go a long way to help do just that job.

But the fact that the North is not perfect does not give any part of the nation a right to flaunt the law. And don't ever forget the difference between Mississippi and Minnesota. The law defends inequality, I regret to say, in Mississippi; and in Minnesota it seeks to protect individuals.

I'm not trying to indicate that we do it perfectly because we don't. We have much to be found wanting; we're guilty of many sins. And I'm not here to accuse. I'm here, may I say, to help.

Above all, argue the standpatters, the change in the hearts of men will have to occur before the problem of segregation will be solved. I think you've heard that. Now, I'm the first to grant that nothing would be as effective in achieving true racial equality as a change of heart in the people who harbor racial prejudices. But I say it is a grievous error to assume that government action alone can do nothing because a change of heart --the editors of a great magazine, the Catholic magazine, *Commonweal*, were moved by this argument to comment, and I now quote from the magazine, that, "On the whole, the history of the Negro in America makes clear that his lot has been improved by decisions and actions taken on the political and economic levels rather than on moral and spiritual planes." End of quote. "The Negroes' most effective help," *Commonweal* maintains, "has come from the courthouse not the church," I didn't say that. *Commonweal* said it. (Applause)

Now listen to this, listen to this. "The basic element remains what it always has been: legislation aimed at racial justice and the vigilance of the courts over the execution of such legislation." End of the quote from *Commonweal*.

Now lest I be misunderstood, let me say this: That some of our great spiritual leaders - Catholic, Protestant and Jewish - have held high the banner of human equality in the North and in the South and in the East and West. And I for one want to say that without the help of these great spiritual leaders, that our situation today would literally be impossible. And I know that you realize that with me, and we owe them a debt of gratitude. (Applause)

The argument, however, that we must rely exclusively on moral and spiritual regeneration overlooks the distinction between prejudice and discrimination. Discrimination involves behavior, action and choice; prejudice is a matter of belief, attitude and involuntary feelings.

We seek by law to attack discrimination, not prejudice. If we succeed in eliminating discrimination by law, we have reason to expect the lessening of prejudice will be a by-product of our success. (Applause)

Now there were studies made during World War Two, which this morning I won't take time to allude to though I have indicated them in my prepared message, and those studies reveal just what I'm saying -- the differences between discrimination and prejudice, and what you can do by action to remove discrimination which, in turn, does something to lessen prejudice.

You see, prejudice seeks to justify itself because of the alleged inferiority of the Negro. But it is discrimination which deprives the Negro of equal opportunity and condemns all too many, as you people well know, to poverty, to

ignorance, to sickness, upon which the charges of inferiority are based. And just as discrimination, therefore, fills the wells of prejudice, so the elimination of discrimination will pump those wells dry of prejudice. (Applause)

Now I do not say that we should not try to understand prejudice. We try to do what we can to attack it directly. You people know of my sincere belief in working on, literally, the minds and souls of man to rid him of this sickness of prejudice.

I can't tell you how I'm gripped with this thought in any more direct terms than to tell you that it seems to me that the composite of all evil is when one's soul and mind and spirit and action is filled with racial intolerance, discrimination and religious bigotry. There's no room in America for these three evils and diseases which seem to consume all too much of our strength and our vitality. (Applause)

Yes, our spiritual leaders - Catholic, Protestant and Jew - are dedicating themselves to this honorable task of ridding our bodies and minds and spirits of these cancers of intolerance and bigotry and discrimination.

We need a concerted effort against prejudice and discrimination on both moral and legal grounds by all branches of our government and by all institutions of our society.

And Congress should act now in this session. We cannot go home again having done nothing on this civil rights front. We must enact legislation to prevent

Humphrey - page 15

a case of September sickness when the schools open this fall. (Applause) We cannot ignore the deeper meaning and challenge of the lynching of Poplarville, the rape at Tallahassee, and the 530 instances of racial violence, reprisal and intimidation since the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. In fact, my friends, those cases represent all parts of America, showing you the complexity of our task.

We must act now to pass a bill that supports the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions and assure us the processes for law and order for the nation.

Fortunately, such a bill is before both houses of the Congress. In the Senate, it was introduced by a bipartisan group involving Sen. Paul Douglas of Illinois, Senator Javits of New York, myself, and several others. (Applause) In the House, it was introduced by Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee.

I was for the principles of this bill in 1957. But we lost out on the threat of filibuster. I was for this bill in 1958, but we could not get it out on the floor of either house. I'm for this bill in 1959, and I'm willing to stay in session as long as it's required, yes, to Christmas, in order to break a filibuster and get it in action. (Applause) And may I add, that if that does not work, I'm prepared to fight for this bill in 1960 in Congress, in political campaigns, everywhere, any place. (Applause)

Now let's not be going around having any quarter-loaf, dried up old biscuit, civil rights bill. (Laughter) A bill whose only claim to the name civil rights is the title. We want a bill that will support and implement the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions. It's too late in the day, friends, to rely only - and I underscore the word only - on conciliation as a means of making constitutional rights a reality. It's going to take more than that. (Applause)

Now the passage of the Douglas-Javits-Humphrey bill will put the full force of the Federal government, the prestige of our Federal government, the honor and the dignity of our Federal government, behind the processes of desegregation. And it will be a signal to all the world that this is indeed the true land of opportunity and equality for all.

In my judgment, there are very few things that we could do more to raise the prestige of our nation throughout the world, very few things that we could do more to strengthen America's foreign policy and her defense in this world, than to contribute on the field of civil rights and thereby to contribute to the cause of peace. (Applause)

Now there's another thing that we could do quickly to contribute to the cause of peace. And may I digress, dear friends, there is no more noble cause in the world than the cause of a just and an enduring peace with freedom and justice.

Why doesn't our country make this its living symbol so that the whole world will know beyond a shadow of a doubt our desire is not merely to have defense, but that our desire is to lead for peace and justice and freedom at home and abroad? (Applause)

You know, we're wasting one of our greatest resources in the diplomatic field. Our citizens of different race, creed and color - our Negro citizens, for example - but not just the Negro; there are many others. It is a sad fact that in a world two-thirds colored, our Negro leaders are almost totally unused in the diplomatic field. Thank goodness for a Ralph Bunche. Thank goodness for him. (Applause) Unofficial travelers like Marian Anderson - remarkable woman - and Louis "Satchmo" Armstrong, a remarkable man. (Applause) I don't know how much good music you folks like. Or the Globetrotters - remarkable athletes - and others have demonstrated what could be accomplished with just a little imagination and drive to use all of our human resources.

But more important in our diplomatic field, we need the people of every race, creed and color to represent the true mosaic image of America.

Now I came here this morning as a spokesman of civil rights, not a spokesman only of my party, the Democratic Party. But as the only Democratic senator on your program - I understand that you're to have a Republican senator, for which I'm very grateful - there is something I would like to say to you about our party. Yes, there's one nice thing about the Democratic Party: we sure do

Humphrey - page 18

have our differences, and everybody knows about them. (Laughter) And when anybody has any doubt about it, why, we even enunciate those differences from the highest offices in the party, in and out of Congress, in and out of the National Committee.

Now most of the northern Democrats work hard for civil rights legislation, seriously, conscientiously, persistently. And may I say with equal candor, most of the southern Democrats work hard against it, seriously, conscientiously and with vigor. (Laughter) You know where they are; you don't have to go around with a microscope; and they're not changing spots.

But I submit to you that this is a far more honorable estate - and this is about my only partisan reference, folks, please forgive me, but you couldn't expect me to come up here and not make one (Laughter) - I submit to you that this is a far more honorable estate than the Republican practice of having the same people on the same side, both sides, of the civil rights fence at the same time. (Applause)

Now what, I ask, has that summer soldier of civil rights from Whittier, California, whose voice sounded forth on the civil rights bill on July, 1957, been doing on the civil rights front these past two years? Don't misunderstand me. I want his help. I'm frank to tell you that I'm here in New York to ask for it. I'll ask for it in Washington, too. I worked with him in '57; I'd like to work with him in '59.

Now where, I ask, is the Administration in the big battle looming before the Congress to enact the Douglas-Javits-Humphrey bill, and give the Attorney-General authority to do, to enforce, civil rights? This is the so-called Section Three. (Applause)

And why, I ask, does the Republican chairman, Mr. Merton, fight shy of the Douglas-Javits-Humphrey bill - it's bipartisan - while the Democratic chairman, Paul Butler, goes all the way with us? (Applause) That's not an easy lot.

But take heart, my friends, despite all the obstacles and all the intra-party troubles and inter-party troubles - and we have a full measure of both - we're winning this fight for human rights. (Applause)

The other day I was on a radio-television show, and someone asked me one of those "toughie" questions, you know, and they said to me, "Well, Senator, haven't you changed on civil rights since that fiery speech of yours in 1948?" And my reply is no, I haven't changed but, thank God, the country has come a long ways. (Applause) Many of the things that we dreamed up in '48 have at least started down the long road of reality; dreams are beginning to become fact.

I haven't change, my friends, one bit. And one of the reasons I'm here is I want friend and foe alike to know I haven't changed. (Applause) Because I will never change my belief that God created man in his own image, and I will

never change my belief in the dignity, the spiritual, political dignity of every human being. And I'll never change in my belief in the fatherhood of God and dignity of man. And that's what we mean by civil rights. (Applause)

And I might add, if a change in these beliefs and those convictions is the price of political success, then I refuse to pay that price - and I want you to know that. (Applause)

And I'm happy to report to you, the people of Minnesota don't ask that price; they ask performance and they'll get it.

Oh, I know that there are heart-rendering attacks, my friends, on your organization. I know that there are many parts of the country where you are harassed by state laws, exposing your members to reprisals, and banning them from public employment, prohibiting financial support with litigation to enforce human rights, excluding your organization as a foreign corporation, investigating your organization and levying excessive fees and taxes and other things. I know that you've gone through all of this humiliating experience.

But, fellow Americans, these attacks upon you are a measure of your great success in the courts and elsewhere. And I say to you, wear these attacks as a badge of honor. (Applause)

Yes, fellow Americans, I appeal to you: keep up the fight. Maintain this true course of law and order, of the search for justice, of the search and the everlasting quest for opportunity and equality, never give up, never slacken

Humphrey - page 21

in your efforts. Remember that what you are doing is within the traditions of this country. It is the fulfillment of the promise of the Declaration of Independence. It is the living Constitution. It is dedication to the Emancipation Proclamation. It is the Charter of the United Nations. It's Jefferson and Washington. It's Lincoln and Roosevelt. My friends, it's America and the United Nations. And I ask you to keep up the good fight for the moral cause.

Thank you.

(Applause)

\* \* \* \*

*Mr Spingarn*

001346

*Ted Berry*  
*nee Mayor*  
*Carver*

CIVIL RIGHTS: A MORAL ISSUE

Remarks of  
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey  
at

50th Anniversary Convention of the  
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People  
New York City  
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

*my fellow Americans*

~~I deem it~~ an honor to be here this morning to help com-  
memorate the 50th anniversary of the NAACP.

*Very Early (Jacked)*  
*D.C.*  
*Home Recd*

*Rep  
Blanche  
Mc Smith  
Anchorage Alaska  
It is*

In a very real sense, I have grown up with the NAACP.

Your lifetime just about spans my own. Your goal of absolute

equality for all people is my goal. Your work has been my

work -- all the way back to 1946 when, as Mayor of Minneapolis,

I cooperated with the NAACP to help enact the first municipal

Fair Employment Practices Act in the United States.

*(Remember Cecil?)*

I have learned much from my association with your organiza-  
tion and its leaders.

Your Walter White taught me that the moral principle of  
human equality lies at the very heart of the democratic idea.

*and my good friend*

*Cecil Newman*  
*Judge Howard Bennett*

*John*  
*The Baghead*

*Minneapolis  
group  
St Paul  
NAACP*

(former Minnesota)

001347

Your Clarence Mitchell taught me that if one believes in human equality strongly enough and works for it with all the force at his command, this great moral principle must one day triumph.

Your Roy Wilkins, a product of our wonderful University of Minnesota, teaches us every day how to face rude and vulgar attack with calm dignity, how to meet violence with confidence in the processes of law and how to answer hatred with love for one's fellow men.

Your organization daily teaches all of us what can be accomplished in a democratic society when men and women who care deeply about a moral ideal such as human equality band together to make that ideal a reality.

As we mark the 50th anniversary of the NAACP at this great Convention, let us here and now rededicate ourselves to the job of eliminating <sup>from it</sup> second-class citizenship in the United States and let us gather strength from the advances

001348

of the past fifty years for the enormous tasks that still

lie ahead. - Compliment NAACP or Advances!

Now I would like to talk to you this morning about foreign policy and what our country should and must do if we are to

keep the peace. - Peace with freedom - with justice!

I would like to talk to you this morning about economic policy, about programs for full employment, housing, health, education, social security and a fuller life for every

American. (yes, housing without loans, without restrictive covenants)

But, instead, I am going to talk to you this morning about civil rights, for this is both foreign policy and economic policy rolled into one. An effective foreign policy

requires a nation united in human dignity. An effective economic policy requires that every citizen have the opportunity to

contribute his best to the nation's welfare. So in a true

sense my message this morning is a synthesis of foreign policy,

We need everyone at full capacity!

*Tom Mboya*

*Africa - Asia & U.S*

001349 /

of economic policy, of civil rights and of political morality.

The Negro has won recognition of his basic rights primarily

in the field of legal battle. All Americans are indebted to

the NAACP for its belief in <sup>dedication to</sup> progress through law; no group in

history, who have suffered so much indignity at the hands of

their fellow men, have so consistently rejected retaliatory

violence and have so completely dedicated themselves to fellow-

ship and legality. This is real Americanism -- respect for

law and order.

*faith in the ultimate victory of freedom institutions.*

All Americans are deeply indebted to our federal courts

<sup>upholding &</sup> for enforcing the rule of law in our democracy. But the

courts should not be asked to carry the burden alone. At the

present time, about 200 cases involving desegregation issues

are pending in federal and state courts.

*and Many More Cases involving Civil Rts & Civil Liberties.*

The heavy burdens imposed upon the courts can be relieved

only by the President and the Congress assuming their share

of the responsibility. The Constitution did not create a

*Relieving the Courts!*

001350

separation of powers for the purpose of paralyzing our govern-  
ment. All three branches of government must cooperate to make  
our system workable and to effectuate the humanitarian prin-  
ciples of the Constitution.

It is not enough to say that the Supreme Court's desegre-  
gation decisions, whether we like them or not, must be obeyed  
simply because they are the supreme law of the land. More than  
a question of law enforcement is involved. At stake is a basic  
moral issue which underlies our very conception of democracy.

Thomas Jefferson struggled with this moral principle in  
drafting the Declaration of Independence. He was acutely  
aware that Negro slavery contradicted the principles enunciated  
in that Declaration.

On the floor of the very First Congress of the United  
States, Representative Josiah Parker deplored the treatment  
of the Negro and urged that the "inconsistency in our principles,"

001351

with which we are justly charged, should be done away, that

we may show, by our actions, the pure beneficence of the

doctrine we hold out to the world in our Declaration of

Independence." And in the Fourth Congress, Representative

James Hillhouse of Connecticut said that he knew of "no

principles that made a difference between the natural rights

of a white or black man." He reminded the Congress that "the

first principle that is laid down in the rights of man is,

that all men are born free and equal; it does not say all

white men."

This moral principle of human equality is written into  
the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation,  
the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to our Constitution, the  
decisions of the Supreme Court implementing these Amendments  
and the Charter of the United Nations.

001352

Do we not have the right then to expect that the President and the Congress will affirm the great moral principle of human equality and brotherhood by defending the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions on moral grounds? The fate of the desegregation program depends upon a deep understanding of the moral issue by our people, an understanding that can only be developed through the leadership of all branches of government.

The Supreme Court is playing a magnificent role in teaching the fundamental principles for which America stands. But the President and the Congress, too, should be instruments of national education.

This was a function of the Presidency which Franklin Roosevelt understood so well. "I want to be a preaching President -- like my cousin," he once said. We could use a little preaching from the White House right now -- preaching the gospel of desegregation -- because it is right and moral.

Equal

Rts

001353

I am saddened that in the more than five years since the historic desegregation decisions, we have yet to hear from the White House one simple declaration that these decisions were correct and moral. Indeed, anyone studying the statements coming out of the Administration today would think that the only thing that mattered was balancing the financial budget. I suggest that once in a while this Administration consider the importance of balancing our moral budget.

And I regret to report that the record of Congress is little better.

In 1947 President Truman's Civil Rights Committee said, "The time for action is now." It is twelve years later and except for the Civil Rights Act of 1957, pared down under threat of Senate filibuster to avoid any support whatever for the desegregation decisions, the Congress has done nothing to balance the moral budget.

001354

Oh, I know all the arguments being used against  
Presidential and Congressional action in support of the  
desegregation decisions.

Let us be patient and take things slowly, say the  
standpatters. But five years have elapsed since desegregation  
decisions and Congress has failed to take one single step to  
support the Court.

There is still discrimination in the North, say the  
standpatters, so why talk about segregation in the South.

No, we are not perfect up North -- far from it. There is  
lots of work to be done to end racial inequality in our big  
Northern cities. And incidentally I've got a package of bills  
pending in Congress right now to do just that. But the fact

that the North is not perfect does not give any part of the  
nation a right to flout the law of the land. And don't ever

forget this difference between Mississippi and Minnesota --

001355

the law demands inequality in Mississippi; it seeks to protect the individual in Minnesota.

Above all, argue the standpatters, a change in the hearts of men will have to occur before the problem of segregation will be solved.

I am the first to grant that nothing would be as effective in achieving racial equality as a change of heart in the people who harbor racial prejudice. But it is grievous error to assume that governmental action can do nothing to cause a change of heart. The editors of the Catholic magazine Commonweal were moved by this argument to comment that on the whole, "the history of the Negro in America makes clear that his lot has been improved by decisions and actions taken on the political and economic levels, rather than on the 'moral and spiritual plane'."

"The Negro's most effective help," Commonweal maintained, "has come from the court-house not the church." "The 'basic' element remains what it has always been -- legislation aimed

001356  
at interracial justice, and the vigilance of the courts over  
the execution of such legislation."

↳ The argument that we must rely exclusively on moral and spiritual regeneration overlooks the distinction between prejudice and discrimination. Discrimination involves behavior, action and choice; prejudice is a matter of belief, attitude and involuntary feeling. We seek by law directly to attack discrimination, not prejudice. If we succeed in eliminating discrimination by law, we have reason to expect that the lessening of prejudice will be a by-product of our success.

↳ Studies conducted during World War II and after show that American soldiers, whether they came from the North or the South, were prejudiced against the Negro as a Negro, so long as they had no experience in integrated units. But once they lived and fought and died side by side with Negroes in integrated units, their prejudice declined. Studies of integrated labor

cut

001357

labor unions, factories, offices and housing developments

corroborate these findings.

Prejudice seeks to justify itself because of the alleged inferiority of the Negro. But it is discrimination which deprives the Negro of equal opportunity and condemns all too many to poverty and ignorance upon which the charges of inferiority are based. Just as discrimination, therefore, fills the wells of prejudice, so the elimination of discrimination will pump them dry.

I do not mean to say that we should not try to understand prejudice and do what we can to attack it directly, too. Our spiritual leaders, Catholic, Protestant and Jew, are dedicating themselves to this honorable task. But the fight against discrimination cannot wait until prejudice is eradicated. We need a concerted effort against prejudice and discrimination on both moral and legal grounds by all branches of our government and by all institutions of our society.

001358

Congress should act now -- in this session. We cannot go home again having done nothing. We must enact legislation to prevent another case of September sickness when the schools open this fall. We cannot ignore the deeper meaning and challenge of the lynching at Poplarville, the rape at Tallahassee, and the 530 instances of racial violence, reprisal and intimidation since the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. We must act now to pass a bill that supports the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions and insures law and order for the nation.

Fortunately such a bill is before both Houses of Congress. In the Senate it was introduced by a bipartisan group including Senators Douglas, Javits and myself. In the House it was introduced by Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee.

I was for the principles of this bill in 1957, but we lost out under threat of filibuster.

I was for this bill in 1958, but we could not get it out on the floor of either House.

I am for this bill now in 1959, and I am willing to stay in session until Christmas in order to break a filibuster and get it enacted.

And if that does not work, I am prepared to fight for this bill in 1960 -- in Congress, in the political campaigns, everywhere.

Let's not have a quarter-loaf civil rights bill -- a bill whose only claim to the name "civil rights" is in the title.

We want a bill that will support and implement the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions. It is too late in the day to rely <sup>only</sup> on conciliation as a means of making constitutional rights a reality.

The passage of the Douglas-Humphrey bill will put the full force of the federal government behind the processes of desegregation; it will be a signal to all the world that this is indeed the land of equality and of opportunity for all. In my judgment,

001360

there are few things that would do more to raise the prestige of our nation throughout the world and thus contribute to the cause of peace.

And there is another thing that we can and should do to contribute to the cause of peace. We are wasting our greatest human resource in the diplomatic field -- our Negro citizens.

It is a sad fact that in a world two-thirds colored our own Negro leaders are almost totally unused in the diplomatic field.

*Thank God for  
Ralph  
Bunche!*

Unofficial travelers like Marian Anderson, Louis Armstrong, the Globetrotters and others have demonstrated what could be accomplished ~~by the Administration~~ with ~~the~~ imagination and drive to use all our human resources.

My friends, I came here this morning as a spokesman for civil rights, not as a spokesman for the Democratic Party. But as the only Democratic Senator on your program, there is something I would like to say to you about our party. Yes, we have had our

001361

differences. Most of the Northern Democrats work hard for  
civil rights legislation. Most of the Southern Democrats  
work hard against it. But I submit to you that this is a  
far more honorable estate than the Republican practice of  
having the same people on both sides of the civil rights fence.

~~What, I ask, has that summer soldier of civil rights from  
Whittier, California, whose voice sounded forth on civil  
rights in July of 1957, been doing on the civil rights front  
these past two years? ~~What is the use of having a Contracts  
Compliance Committee that has never once withdrawn a contract  
from an employer who won't stop discriminating against Negroes?~~~~

Keep

Where, I ask, is the Administration in the big battle  
now looming before the Congress to enact the Douglas-Humphrey  
bill and give the Attorney General authority to sue to enforce  
civil rights?

001362

Why, I ask, does Republican Chairman Morton fight shy  
of the Douglas-Humphrey bill while Democratic Chairman Paul  
Butler goes all the way with us?

But take heart, my friends. Despite all the obstacles  
and difficulties, we are winning the fight for human rights.

Oh, I know that there are heart-rending attacks upon  
your organization. I know there are many parts of the country  
where you are harassed by state laws exposing your members to  
reprisals and banning them from public employment, prohibiting  
financial support of litigation to enforce Negro rights, ex-  
cluding your organization as a "foreign corporation", investigating  
your organization, levying excessive license fees and taxes,  
and other things. But these attacks upon you are a measure of  
your great success in the courts and elsewhere -- wear these  
attacks with honor.

Keep up the fight. Keep the "moral flag" of civil rights  
flying. Together we cannot fail.

7/13/59

*B-12* ~~by~~ Monday  
**United States Senate**

---

MEMORANDUM

Mimeograph Monday--send copies to  
NAACP in New York, as well as  
galleries and all negro publications

Give batch to Vi to go to New York  
with Senator Tuesday night

---

*after mimeo,  
Have Reading copy  
typed*

---

FOR RELEASE: Wednesday p.m.'s  
July 15, 1959

CIVIL RIGHTS: A MORAL ISSUE

Remarks of

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

50th Anniversary Convention of the

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

New York City, Wednesday, July 15, 1959

I deem it an honor to be here this morning to help commemorate the 50th anniversary of the NAACP.

In a very real sense, I have grown up with the NAACP. Your lifetime just about spans my own. Your goal of absolute equality for all people is my goal. Your work has been my work -- all the way back to 1946 when, as Mayor of Minneapolis, I cooperated with the NAACP to help enact the first municipal Fair Employment Practices Act in the United States.

I have learned much from my association with your organization and its leaders.

Your Walter White taught me that the moral principle of human equality lies at the very heart of the democratic idea.

Your Clarence Mitchell taught me that if one believes in human equality strongly enough and works for it with all the

force at his command, this great moral principle must one day triumph.

Your Roy Wilkins, a product of our wonderful University of Minnesota, teaches us every day how to face rude and vulgar attack with calm dignity, how to meet violence with confidence in the processes of law and how to answer hatred with love for one's fellow men.

Your organization daily teaches all of us what can be accomplished in a democratic society when men and women who care deeply about a moral ideal such as human equality band together to make that ideal a reality.

As we mark the 50th anniversary of the NAACP at this great Convention, let us here and now rededicate ourselves to the job of eliminating second-class citizenship in the United States and let us gather strength from the advances of the past fifty years for the enormous tasks that still lie ahead.

I would like to talk to you this morning about foreign policy and what our country should and must do if we are to keep the peace.

I would like to talk to you this morning about economic policy, about programs for full employment, housing, health, education, social security and a fuller life for every American.

But, instead, I am going to talk to you this morning about civil rights, for this is both foreign policy and economic policy rolled into one. An effective foreign policy requires a nation united in human dignity. An effective economic policy requires that every citizen have the opportunity to contribute his best to the nation's welfare. So in a true sense my message this morning is a synthesis of foreign policy, of economic policy, of civil rights and of political morality.

The Negro has won recognition of his basic rights primarily in the field of legal battle. All Americans are indebted to the NAACP for its belief in progress through law; no group in history, who have suffered so much indignity at the hands of their fellow men, have so consistently rejected retaliatory violence and have so completely dedicated themselves to fellowship and legality. This is real Americanism -- respect for law and order.

All Americans are deeply indebted to our federal courts for enforcing the rule of law in our democracy. But the courts should not be asked to carry the burden alone. At the present time, about 200 cases involving desegregation issues are pending in federal and state courts.

The heavy burdens imposed upon the courts can be relieved only by the President and the Congress assuming their share of the responsibility. The Constitution did not create a separation of powers for the purpose of paralyzing our government. All three branches of government must cooperate to make our system workable and to effectuate the humanitarian principles of the Constitution.

It is not enough to say that the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions, whether we like them or not, must be obeyed simply because they are the supreme law of the land. More than a question of law enforcement is involved. At stake is a basic moral issue which underlies our very conception of democracy.

Thomas Jefferson struggled with this moral principle in drafting the Declaration of Independence. He was acutely aware that Negro slavery contradicted the principles enunciated in that Declaration.

On the floor of the very First Congress of the United States, Representative Josiah Parker deplored the treatment of the Negro and urged that the "inconsistency in our principles, with which we are justly charged, should be done away, that we may show, by our actions, the pure beneficence of the doctrine we hold out to the world in our Declaration of Independence." And in the Fourth Congress, Representative James Hillhouse of Connecticut said that he knew of "no principles that made a difference between the natural rights of a white or black man." He reminded the Congress that "the first principle that is laid down in the rights of man is, that all men are born free and equal; it does not say all white men."

This moral principle of human equality is written into the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to our Constitution, the decisions of the Supreme Court implementing these Amendments and the Charter of the United Nations.

Do we not have the right then to expect that the President and the Congress will affirm the great moral principle

of human equality and brotherhood by defending the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions on moral grounds? The fate of the desegregation program depends upon a deep understanding of the moral issue by our people, an understanding that can only be developed through the leadership of all branches of government.

The Supreme Court is playing a magnificent role in teaching the fundamental principles for which America stands. But the President and Congress, too, should be instruments of national education.

This was a function of the Presidency which Franklin Roosevelt understood so well. "I want to be a preaching President -- like my cousin," he once said. We could use a little preaching from the White House right now -- preaching the gospel of desegregation because it is right and moral.

I am saddened that in the more than five years since the historic desegregation decisions, we have yet to hear from the White House one simple declaration that these decisions were correct and moral. Indeed, anyone studying the statements coming out of the Administration today would think that

the only thing that mattered was balancing the financial budget. I suggest that once in a while this Administration consider the importance of balancing our moral budget.

And I regret to report that the record of Congress is little better.

In 1947 President Truman's Civil Rights Committee said, "The time for action is now." It is twelve years later and except for the Civil Rights Act of 1957, pared down under threat of Senate filibuster to avoid any support whatever for the desegregation decisions, the Congress has done nothing to balance the moral budget.

Oh, I know all the arguments being used against Presidential and Congressional action in support of the desegregation decisions.

Let us be patient and take things slowly, say the standpatters. But five years have elapsed since the desegregation decisions and Congress has failed to take one single step to support the Court.

There is still discrimination in the North, say the standpatters, so why talk about segregation in the South.

No, we're not perfect up North -- far from it. There is lots of work to be done to end racial inequality in our big Northern cities. And incidentally I've got a package of bills pending in Congress right now to do just that. But the fact that the North isn't perfect doesn't give any part of the nation a right to flout the law of the land. And don't ever forget this difference between Mississippi and Minnesota -- the law demands inequality in Mississippi; it seeks to protect the individual in Minnesota.

Above all, argue the standpatters, a change in the hearts of men will have to occur before the problem of segregation will be solved.

I am the first to grant that nothing would be as effective in achieving racial equality as a change of heart in the people who harbor racial prejudice. But it is grievous error to assume that governmental action can do nothing to cause a change of heart. The editors of the Catholic magazine Commonweal were moved by this argument to comment that on the whole, "the history of the Negro in America makes clear that his lot has been improved by decisions and actions taken on

the political and economic levels, rather than on the 'moral and spiritual plane'."

"The Negro's most effective help," Commonweal maintained, "has come from the court-house not the church." "The 'basic' element remains what it has always been -- legislation aimed at interracial justice, and the vigilance of the courts over the execution of such legislation."

The argument that we must rely exclusively on moral and spiritual regeneration overlooks the distinction between prejudice and discrimination. Discrimination involves behavior, action and choice; prejudice is a matter of belief, attitude and involuntary feeling. We seek by law directly to attack discrimination, not prejudice. If we succeed in eliminating discrimination by law, we have reason to expect that the lessening of prejudice will be a by-product of our success.

Studies conducted during World War II and after show that American soldiers, whether they came from the North or the South, were prejudiced against the Negro as a Negro, so long as they had no experience in integrated units. But

once they lived and fought and died side by side with Negroes in integrated units, their prejudice declined. Studies of integrated labor unions, factories, offices and housing developments corroborate these findings.

Prejudice seeks to justify itself because of the alleged inferiority of the Negro. But it is discrimination which deprives the Negro of equal opportunity and condemns all too many to poverty and ignorance upon which the charges of inferiority are based. Just as discrimination, therefore, fills the wells of prejudice, so the elimination of discrimination will pump them dry.

I do not mean to say that we should not try to understand prejudice and do what we can to attack it directly, too. Our spiritual leaders, Catholic, Protestant and Jew, are dedicating themselves to this honorable task. But the fight against discrimination cannot wait until prejudice is eradicated. We need a concerted effort against prejudice and discrimination on both moral and legal grounds by all branches of our government and by all institutions of our society.

Congress should act now -- in this session. We cannot go home again having done nothing. We must enact legislation

to prevent another case of September sickness when the schools open this fall. We cannot ignore the deeper meaning and challenge of the lynching at Poplarville, the rape at Tallahassee, and the 530 instances of racial violence, reprisal and intimidation since the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. We must act now to pass a bill that supports the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions and insures law and order for the nation.

Fortunately such a bill is before both houses of Congress. In the Senate it was introduced by a bipartisan group including Senators Douglas, Javits and myself. In the House it was introduced by Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee.

I was for the principles of this bill in 1957, but we lost out under threat of filibuster.

I was for this bill in 1958, but we couldn't get it out on the floor of either house.

I am for this bill now in 1959, and I am willing to stay in session until Christmas in order to break a filibuster and get it enacted.

And if that doesn't work, I'm prepared to fight for this bill in 1960 -- in Congress, in the political campaigns, everywhere.

Let's not have a quarter-loaf civil rights bill -- a bill whose only claim to the name "civil rights" is in the title. We want a bill that will support and implement the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions. It's too late in the day to rely just on conciliation as a means of making constitutional rights a reality.

The passage of the Douglas-Humphrey bill will put the full force of the federal government behind the processes of desegregation; it will be a signal to all the world that this is indeed the land of equality and of opportunity for all. In my judgment, there are few things that would do more to raise the prestige of our nation throughout the world and thus contribute to the cause of peace.

And there is another thing that we can and should do to contribute to the cause of peace. We are wasting our greatest human resource in the diplomatic field -- our Negro citizens. It is a sad fact that in a world two-thirds colored our own Negro leaders are almost totally unused in the diplomatic field. Unofficial travelers like Marian Anderson, Louis Armstrong, the Globetrotters and others have demonstrated what could be accomplished by an Administration with the imagination and drive to use all our human resources.

My friends, I came here this morning as a spokesman for civil rights, not as a spokesman for the Democratic Party. But as the only Democratic Senator on your program, there is something I would like to say to you about our party. Yes, we have our differences. Most of the Northern Democrats work hard for civil rights legislation. Most of the Southern Democrats work hard against it. But I submit to you that this is a far more honorable estate than the Republican practice of having the same people on both sides of the civil rights fence.

What, I ask, has that summer soldier of civil rights from Whittier, California, whose voice sounded forth on civil rights in July of 1957, been doing on the civil rights front

these past two years? What is the use of having a Contracts Compliance Committee that has never once withdrawn a contract from an employer who won't stop discriminating against Negroes.

Where, I ask, is the Administration in the big battle now looming before the Congress to enact the Douglas-Humphrey bill and give the Attorney General authority to sue to enforce civil rights?

Why, I ask, does Republican Chairman Morton fight shy of the Douglas-Humphrey bill while Democratic Chairman Paul Butler goes all the way with us?

But take heart, my friends. Despite all the obstacles and difficulties, we are winning the fight for human rights.

Oh, I know that there are heart-rending attacks upon your organization. I know there are many parts of the country where you are harassed by state laws exposing your members to reprisals and banning them from public employment, prohibiting financial support of litigation to enforce Negro rights, excluding your organization as a "foreign corporation," investigating your organization, levying excessive license fees and taxes, and other things. But these attacks upon you are a measure of your great success in the courts and elsewhere -- wear these attacks with honor.

Keep up the fight. Keep the moral flag of civil rights flying. Together we cannot fail.

\* \* \*



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)