as (I quote) "a notorious international Communist" was made assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American affairs. He was taken into the State Department from his job as lieutenant colonel in the Communist International Brigade. Finally, after intense congressional pressure and criticism, he resigned in 1946 from the State Department—and, ladies and gentlemen, where do you think he is now? He took over a high-salaried job as Chief of Cultural Activities Section in the office of the Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations. . . .

This, ladies and gentlemen, gives you somewhat of a picture of the type of individuals who have been helping to shape our foreign policy. In my opinion the State Department, which is one of the most important government departments, is thoroughly infested with Communists.

I have in my hand 57 cases of individuals who would appear to be either card carrying members or certainly loyal to the Communist Party, but who nevertheless are still helping to shape our foreign policy. . . .

As you hear this story of high treason, I know what you are saying to yourself, "Well, why doesn't the Congress do something about it?" Actually, ladies and gentlemen, one of the most important reasons for the graft, the corruption, the dishonesty, the disloyalty, the treason in high Government positions—one of the most important reasons why this continues—is a lack of moral uprising on the part of the 140,000,000 American people. In the light of history, however, this is not hard to explain.

It is the result of an emotional hang-over and a temporary moral lapse which follows every war. It is the apathy to evil which people who have been subjected to the tremendous evils of war feel. As the people of the world see mass murder, the destruction of defenseless and innocent people, and all of the crime and lack of morals which go with war, they become numb and apathetic. It has always been thus after war.

However, the morals of our people have not been destroyed. They still exist. This cloak of numbness and apathy has only needed a spark to rekindle them. Happily, this spark has finally been supplied. . . .

198

Governor Herman Talmadge's Statement on the *Brown* Decision (1954)

Beginning in the mid-1930s, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) began to challenge school segregation in the hopes of ending the Jim Crow laws of the South. Their efforts culminated in the unanimous Supreme Court decision, Brown *v.* Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas *(1954), which ended the "separate but equal" doctrine of racial segregation in public schools. Positive and negative responses to this decision were immediate. Georgia Governor Herman E.*

Talmadge, Jr. was among the first southern politicians to issue a public statement, which came the day after the Brown *decision. Talmadge had deep political roots in Georgia: His father was elected governor three times, and the son filled the remainder of his father's last term, and then was elected governor. Talmadge was proud that he spent more on public education for blacks and whites in his six years as governor than all previous administrations combined. In 1956, he was elected to the Senate and became a prominent opponent of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. His* Brown *decision statement, offered following, reflected the sentiments of many whites in the lower South.*

Questions to Consider

1. On what basis did Herman Talmadge attack the Supreme Court's decision?
2. What is Georgia's "accepted pattern of life"?
3. Why did the NAACP choose public education to challenge existing segregation laws?
4. In what ways did the South resist the *Brown* decision?

The U.S. Supreme Court by its decision today has reduced our Constitution to a mere scrap of paper. It has blatantly ignored all law and precedent and usurped from the Congress and the people the power to amend the Constitution and from the Congress the authority to make the laws of the land. Its action confirms the worst fears of the motives of the men who sit on its bench and raises a grave question as to the future course of the nation.

There is no constitutional provision, statute or precedent to support the position the court has taken. It has swept aside 88 years of sound judicial precedent, repudiated the greatest legal minds of our age and lowered itself to the level of common politics.

It has attempted in one stroke to strike the 10th Amendment from the Constitution and to set the stage for the development of an all-powerful federal bureaucracy in Washington which can regulate the lives of all the citizens in the minutest detail.

The people of Georgia believe in, adhere to and will fight for their rights under the United States and Georgia constitutions to manage their own affairs. They cannot and they will not accept a bald political decree without basis in law or practicality which overturns their accepted pattern of life.

The court has thrown down the gauntlet before those who believe the Constitution means what it says when it reserves to the individual states the right to regulate their own internal affairs. Georgians accept the challenge and will not tolerate the mixing of the races in the public schools or any of

"Talmadge Text," *Atlanta Constitution*, May 18, 1954, p. 3.

its public tax-supported institutions. The fact that the high tribunal has seen fit to proclaim its views on sociology as law will not make any difference.

If adjustments in our laws and procedures are necessary, they will be made. In the meantime all Georgians will follow their pursuits by separate paths and in accepted fashion. The U.S. and Georgia Constitutions have not been changed. The Georgia Constitution provides for separation of the races. It will be upheld.

As governor and chairman of the State Commission on Education I am summoning that body into immediate session to map a program to insure continued and permanent segregation of the races. . . .

I urge all Georgians to remain calm and resist any attempt to arouse fear or hysteria. The full powers of my office are ready to see that the laws of our state are enforced impartially and without violence.

I was elected governor of Georgia on the solemn promise to maintain our accepted way of life. So long as I hold this office it shall be done.

199

An African-American Newspaper Editorial on the Little Rock Crisis (1957)

The Supreme Court's unanimous decision in the case of Brown *v.* Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas *(1954) generated cautious hope among African Americans that public facilities would be integrated. Although a few school districts in the South began integrating black and white students shortly after the decision, most remained segregated. State legislatures passed laws to circumvent the court's ruling, and white opposition groups formed to prevent integration. One of the first major tests of school integration came in Little Rock, Arkansas, in September 1957. When the school board moved to integrate nine black children into the all-white Central High School, Governor Orville Faubus called out the Arkansas National Guard to prevent the integration. When a mob of angry white protestors greeted the nine students, the event generated national attention and compelled President Dwight Eisenhower to act. The* Pittsburgh Courier *was one of the most widely respected and circulated African-American weekly newspapers. It had raised funds for the NAACP's legal battle to end segregation in public schools. The* Pittsburgh Courier *offered the following editorial on the Little Rock crisis.*

Questions to Consider

1. What were the critical issues in Little Rock, Arkansas, that prompted Eisenhower to act?
2. What actions did President Eisenhower take?