



DEMOCRACY AND RACIAL MINORITIES

ADDRESS

by

HONORABLE FRANCIS BIDDLE

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

before the

JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA

on

November 11, 1943

Waldorf-Astoria

New York City

(C:30 P.H.)

I propose to discuss tonight some of the broader aspects of presently existing minority problems in our American democracy, particularly as they concern three racial groups, whose relation to the greater body of our nation has been brought into sharp focus by two years of war. I refer to the Japanese, the Jews and the Negroes.

I note with interest that the Seminary is broadening the scope of its work to consider questions that touch not only the Jewish Community, but its relationship to our national life. And the emphasis of my theme tonight is that the approach of all of us to these troublesome problems of minorities cannot any longer be local or provincial, or in the terms even of the difficulties facing any particular group, or for evolving the traditions or the tenets of any single race or any one religion. For the war has shown that at least certain of the more acute minority problems are national in their scope, and, what is even more important, national in their effect on our American integrity. Not any longer, then, can the difficulties of any particular minority be the sole concern of that minority. It is the very nature of our American democracy that it is made up of minorities - Catholic, and Jewish, Negro and Japanese, Quakers and Indians, organized labor and farmers. This is peculiarly true of us, because our American heritage draws strength from the fact that our shores have since the beginning held invitation and asylum to those minorities driven out from other countries by the oppressions of the majority - from the majority power of landlord, or religious sect, or government - and come here to find tolerance and acceptance. Is it not of our American essence and tradition that these dissenters against suppression have found that they could and did live side by side under the sky of a democracy that welcomed

differences because it believed in the practice of freedom? Minorities are then inherent in our national life, more than in most of the older nations; and that here they could be united is our pride and the admiration of our friends. We have achieved union without insisting on uniformity.

I suggest to you that the problem of minorities is today of deep spiritual significance to your religion, for it stems from the religious tradition of the dignity of man as man. The importance of the human personality is a fundamental concern on their highest levels of both Jewish and Christian faiths. It is profoundly a religious idea that is now gravely imperiled throughout the world. And our religious bodies can afford the whole world a moral leadership in this conception, so close to the democratic faith - but only if that leadership is bravely exercised first here in our own country.

It is a curious paradox that although during this war certain civil liberties have suffered less than in the first World War, the tensions arising from the place of these three racial minorities in the national life have greatly increased. In the last war the rights of alien enemies, particularly of course Germans who were living in our country, and of those radicals who opposed the war, and our entry into it, were little respected. National prejudice then ran against anyone of German ancestry, no matter how long he had lived here or how loyal he was to us. It ran, too, against anyone who showed opposition to the war. Freedom of speech was less tolerated, and more newspapers were suppressed on the ground that they were seditious. There were many more prosecutions, both state and federal, often on ill-considered and petty grounds. And the years that directly followed the war were characterized by mass raids that expressed a blind resentment

against foreigners, who were too often classed in the popular mind as radical and therefore un-American.

These attacks have not recurred in this war or at least to a far less degree. The Italians and the Germans in the United States have not felt the brunt of popular hatred (I do not include our treatment of the Japanese, which I shall discuss later).

There are obvious explanations for this. National, state and local governments have acted more wisely, and have not permitted the war psychology to whip them into harsh and unnecessary measures of repression,

Actually there were far fewer Italians and Germans in 1941 than in 1917. There are no accurate census figures of the number of Germans and Italians in this country in 1917. But we have the 1920 figures, which give us a fairly accurate picture for purposes of comparison. In 1920, there were 458,388 German aliens in the United States. In 1940, when they were registered under the Federal law, there were 314,432. And under the alien certification program of 1942, the number had dropped to 270,556. In terms of percentage, to population, the change of relation would of course be much more marked. With our quota limitation system we were rapidly absorbing the foreign-born. It may be also that in some ways the American public itself has changed, has grown more tolerant in this quarter century, is more unified, less unstable, more mature and less prone to treat the alien as a whipping boy.

On the other hand our treatment of Japanese American citizens hardly accords with these other signs of greater tolerance.

When in April of 1942, the United States Army decided to exclude the 110,000 persons of Japanese origin, citizens and non-citizens alike, from

the West Coast as a military precaution to protect our Western Defense Command, the treacherous attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor was four months fresh, and there had been movements of airplanes and submarines which indicated the possibility of an attack. On June 3, 1942, Japanese planes raided Dutch Harbor in Alaska. The Japanese in the United States were concentrated in vital spots along the West Coast - in Portland, San Francisco and Los Angeles. It was not surprising that public opinion in those States where Japanese were concentrated in great numbers was deeply disturbed over the possibility of sabotage and reacted violently against all persons of Japanese origin, loyal and disloyal alike. The legal theory on which they were excluded was that anyone - citizen and alien alike - could be moved out of a war area for its protection. The theory was valid enough. But, like most theories, its ultimate test depended on the reasonableness of its exercise. To say that citizens could be moved out of a war area might depend on the size of the area. If they could be moved away from the two coasts, away from possible points of attack, how far inland could they be taken? Could citizens be retained in any specified part of the country? Roughly two-thirds of the persons moved were American citizens by reason of their birth in the United States, under the provisions of the American Constitution which protected them as effectively as it protected other citizens, irrespective of the color of their skins or the nationality of their ancestry. But in terms of public antipathy no distinction was drawn between citizens and aliens, between loyal and disloyal. In the eyes of the public, all persons of Japanese ancestry were Japs; and we had seen what the "Japs" had done to our soldiers.

The relocation centers were not designed as places of internment but as a refuge. In most instances local communities at first would not have

them, at least in substantial numbers. Today the loyal Japanese who are American citizens are being gradually reestablished outside the centers in places where they may gain tolerance and acceptance. The Relocation Authority has no power to intern American citizens; and constitutionally it is hard to believe that any such authority could be granted to the Government. The decision of the Supreme Court in the Hirabayashi case, decided last spring, indicates this conclusion. The Court sustained the validity of curfew orders applied by the military authorities prior to the evacuation of the Japanese on the West Coast. The validity of the evacuation orders was not even considered, let alone the far more difficult problem of detention. Even the curfew order was said by Mr. Justice Murphy in his concurring opinion to go "to the very brink of constitutional power."

I emphasize this particular problem - very special in its aspects - because it is far from solution; and public opinion, often hostile or indifferent, has made its solution infinitely more difficult.

We have too casually accepted, I think, this perhaps necessary but obviously temporary meeting of the problem. We have hardly recognized its serious consequences and the fact that it has never occurred before. Would anyone, before the war, have complacently accepted the proposition that the Government could move 75,000 American citizens out of their homes, and hold them with enemy aliens for relocation?

I do not believe that among those of Japanese parentage born and bred in America, graduated from our public schools, many of them speaking nothing but English, there are not men and women and young people who are loyal to our country. Of course 18 months in detention camps may have made some of them waver in their loyalty. But I am glad of the policy of the Relocation

Authority which is directed towards sorting out the loyal citizens and returning them back into the community.

Last August a group of Japanese aliens in one of the internment camps operated by the Department of Justice at Crystal City, Texas, was repatriated. This was a "family" camp, so-called because wives and children of the interned alien enemies were allowed to live with them in family groups. Among them was a Japanese family whose two sons, American-born, had already been released on their stated desire to remain in the United States, even though their family was returning to Japan. The morning the repatriates were scheduled to leave, the two Japanese boys returned to the camp to say goodbye to their parents. Just at sunrise, as the American flag was being raised, and as the entire population of the camp gathered about the flag-pole for a farewell ceremony, the two young Japanese-Americans stepped forward, saluted the flag and sang "God Bless America". They then left to join the American Army.

Recently a report from Fifth Army headquarters made special mention of Japanese Americans fighting side by side with other Americans in Italy. I am told that more than five thousand men of Japanese origin are today enrolled in our Army. Neither Japan nor Germany can boast of American battalions in their ranks. The Fifth Army says of these Japanese-Americans: "They obviously believe in what they're doing, and look calmly secure because of it." Our sons are today fighting side by side with the sons of Italians, of Germans, and of Japanese. Is anything more needed to entitle the loyal Japanese Americans to recognition?

For this is the essence of our democracy in practice. The Washington Evening Star in a recent editorial, reporting the dispatch I have mentioned,

made this admirable comment: "All races, all colors, make us up. And when wars like the present one engulf us, all races and all colors take up arms for America. When we strike back at our enemies, the American kin of those enemies do the striking - Americans of Italian extraction, of German extraction, even of Japanese extraction. We are of almost every extraction conceivable, black, white and yellow, and so we are tied together not by any mystical philosophy of blood or common ethnic traits, but solely and simply by an idea - the idea of democracy, of individual freedom, of liberty under law, of a justice before which all of us stand equal."

What has rendered peculiarly acute any mistreatment of racial minorities - Japanese, Negro, Jewish - is our reiterated insistence on democratic equality of opportunity, irrespective of race, and the total nature of this war compared to the last. Far more now than then, every man, white or black, Jew or Gentile, is enlisted to fight or to work for the common cause. But how can every man believe that the cause is a common one including him as well as another, if he sees discrimination against him as a member of a race or of a religion; discrimination in the Army in which he must fight, in industry, in the civil offices of the Government? I do not believe that many will deny the discrimination, or its evil effects on our democratic ideals, except those whose prejudices, though honestly held, blind them to the tragic contradictions involved in such behavior.

I know that there are those who contend that any discussion of these tense and difficult relationships in the midst of a war is unwise. Why

stir up trouble - so the argument runs - and give ammunition for propaganda and the appearance of disunity to our enemies? Why not put off an attempt at solution until the war is over? If those conditions were sporadic or local in their origin the argument would have more weight. But they are not. They involve many sections of our country, and are creating a national psychology of intolerance that makes them infinitely more difficult and serious. Moreover the appearance of national disunity on the outside, serious as it is, seems to me less evil than the actual disunity inside our ranks. It is not exact to say that the recent outbreaks of racial violence in America have been fostered by Axis propaganda. But it is certainly true to conclude that the effect of such violence serves well the enemies' purpose. Immediately after they occurred the Detroit race riots were reported and commented on from short-wave radios in Germany and Japan; and the news soon traveled into Africa and China and India.

But when all is said and done, I am less concerned about how the United States looks to her enemies. What I care about is what she looks like to her friends; to those who love and believe in her; to Americans in the field who fight and die for her; to Americans at home and abroad who want to be able to speak with pride and without any mental reservation when they say with Thomas Jefferson "this government, the best hope of man."

I am not seeking to fix responsibility in any group or in any class for these unhappy conditions. The blame is universal, for surely all Americans must share the responsibility for this so-un-American condition in a country which is, I believe, on the whole, honestly dedicated to democratic living. And just as the blame must be shared by all alike,

so it concerns us all - government, society, the churches, whose function here is indistinguishable from the democratic concept; labor, and the employers of labor, the press and the school and college.

Too often in the past the Negro problem has been thought of and talked about as if it were sectional, as if it existed in certain states in the South and was not a problem in the North. Whatever once was true, it is perfectly clear that the problem is now national in its scope and is not confined to any particular part of the country. The Los Angeles disorders, the Detroit riots, the New York disorders, all of recent months, show that racial clashes since the war started do not occur only in the South and do not spring only from the ancient prejudices and hatred and fears inherited from the Civil War, and from the outnumbering of the Whites by Negroes in certain parts of the South, but are implicit in great industrial societies that have never known slavery or the inherited memories of a slave relationship.

War unifies a country, not merely by giving expression to a common effort, but by throwing together vast masses of young men who in their training at the camps exchange ideas and the points of view of other parts of the country. A large proportion of the camps, obviously for practical reasons, has been built in the South; and the Negro officers and soldiers trained there have without doubt been treated in many cases with discrimination, rudeness and even brutality by white civilians and white police officers. The result among the Negroes is bitter disillusionment and anguish, as anyone knows who has talked to colored troops or read the letters they have sent home. The Army has been alive to the serious effect of this treatment on morale, and has made efforts to improve it. An article in

the August Infantry Journal deals frankly with this form of race prejudice. Let me quote from it: "Sometimes the prejudice against the Negroes flares up in the Army. It is not a problem, however, in a camp where it is well understood that a soldier in the United States uniform is a soldier, not a white or a Negro, Christian or Jew, rich man or poor, but a soldier, and as such as worthy of respect."

We must realize then that the problem of the relation of the white to the Negro, in fact the problems of most racial minorities, are national in their scope. They concern all of us, for they go to the roots of our democratic standards. I have emphasized the Negro soldier, for mistreatment or disrespect of the Negro citizen in uniform, who fights to defend our flag, is disavowal of those things for which our flag is the symbol - a free nation under God. To this promise of American life we have two commitments which we cannot revoke, which we cannot disregard. Our national Constitution guarantees equality of treatment and opportunity to all. More recently we have assumed obligations of defending the democracy elsewhere in the world attacked by totalitarian aggression. These principles and promises must be fulfilled in the due course of the evolution of our democratic life. Nor can we assume the obligations of a defense of world democracy if our example of democracy at home, in this fundamental aspect, is neither consistent nor courageous. Race intolerance is no longer a matter merely of domestic concern. For it undermines our moral authority as a nation which apparently can profess but cannot practice democracy.

The injustices that have been done, that are being done the Negro, are obviously recognized throughout the country. But the implications of

this treatment, I am certain, are not generally realized. We have too long accepted discrimination to achieve in any short time or with any determined resolution the will to change an injustice that has to some extent formed the pattern of habit. I do not mean that the need is agitation, which but tends to accentuate the bitterness; or any campaign for immediate reform of every evil on all sides at once. But the agitation is here already, emerging from the flame of the war which has suddenly brought out the difference to which I have referred - the difference between our profession and our performance.

I suggest that what is greatly needed is a broader and more intelligent use of the moral and educational influences of the community. Most Americans are honest in their belief in equality of opportunity. But intellectual honesty in such a field of prejudice and ancient folk ways can be achieved only by the slow and steady impact of education.

Just as the responsibility for existing conditions cannot be fixed in any one group, or in any single section of the country, so the change must come from the efforts of all stable and progressive elements of our society. The recent outbreak of anti-semitism among Boston public school children shows how great is the part educational institutions must play in the picture. One of the striking features of the Detroit riots was that there were no racial clashes in the plants where a well-disciplined union had insisted that it would not tolerate the refusal of whites to work side by side with Negroes. But in some unions discrimination against Negroes is practiced by not permitting them to vote; from some unions they are excluded, and in others prevented from rising into skilled jobs.

The Government - national, state and local - must of course bear its share of responsibility for existing conditions.

I cannot tonight take time to discuss in any detail the steps which the Department of Justice is taking to help the situation. Our particular field is the enforcement of the Federal criminal statutes which may be violated. On this score there seems to be a very wide misunderstanding, particularly among these minority groups, as to the extent of our jurisdiction. Briefly considered there are two types of Federal statutes that are sometimes applicable. The first includes the so-called "civil rights" sections of the criminal code which make it a crime to conspire to deprive citizens of their rights guaranteed by the Federal Constitution, and for officers of the law, acting under color of law, to deprive them of such rights. These statutes were adopted soon after the Civil War, and have been very seldom invoked until the last three or four years. The Civil Liberties Section of the Criminal Division was organized to enforce them. We have obtained a number of indictments, though less convictions, under their provisions. Ordinary crimes of violence by individuals or with collaboration by the police such as criminal assaults, murder, and mob violence generally, do not come within the Federal jurisdiction. I shall presently cite one striking instance where this Federal jurisdiction was successfully invoked:

The other group of Federal offenses to which I refer deals with the war, such as resisting selective service and sedition. Anti-racial acts and utterances are not seditious in this criminal sense. As far as criminal enforcement is concerned, therefore, most acts of racial or mob violence are punishable under the laws of the State where they occur. Of course if it can be shown that these acts are the result of a conscious effort or conspiracy intended to hamper the war effort, or to use a current

phrase, are "Axis inspired", the Federal Courts would have jurisdiction. There has been no evidence or even indication of this in any of the recent riots and lootings in Los Angeles, Detroit or New York.

In any event government, Federal or State, must have the support of public opinion. But let me go further. It must have not only the indignation of the public generally against racial discriminations and outrages, but the insistence of the leaders of public opinion in the particular community involved, where the trouble occurs, that it is vital for their good to enforce the law and to prevent violations of law. And it is at this point that the influence of the church, of the press, of local leaders in all walks of life, can be felt. Ultimately government can do little without the support of that community public opinion. And the problem is not only national, it is necessarily local as well.

Let me give you two instances of what I have in mind. I have referred to the Federal statute that makes it criminal for law enforcement officers acting under the color of law to deprive anyone of his rights guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States. Recently a jury in Newton, Baker County, Georgia, convicted the county sheriff, a deputy sheriff and a Newton policeman under this statute for beating a Negro to death under cover of a forged warrant charging larceny of an automobile tire.

Newton is the county seat of Baker County. The county has a population of seven or eight hundred people. It is one of the few counties in the United States where there is no railroad.

Bob H. , a Negro, owned a pearl-handled automatic forty-five pistol. Deputy Sheriff Jones wanted it, and got it. After a month Hall appealed to the Sheriff, and finally to the grand jury, who under instructions from

the Solicitor General of the Circuit ordered the gun returned. But the Sheriff would not return it. On the morning of January 29 of this year the Sheriff received a letter from Hall's lawyer demanding the return of the gun. On the evening of January 29th Hall met his death at the hands of the three defendants. The State brought no prosecution. The Federal Government did. And on October 7, 1943, a local jury in this little town in Georgia, all of whom must have personally known the Sheriff, his deputy, and the policeman, convicted all three. The defendants were sentenced by Judge Bascom S. Deaver to the maximum penalties under the law, three years' imprisonment and a fine of \$1,000 each. It is significant that the Judge, the members of the jury, the United States Attorney and his staff, my special assistant whom I detailed to help the United States Attorney, and even the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents who collected the evidence, were all native Georgians.

The Government showed that on the day of the killing the defendants had been drunk for nearly six hours; that they boasted they were "going to get" a Negro who had "lived too long", who had got too smart and gone before a grand jury and employed a lawyer to recover his gun; that they arrested Hall, handcuffed his hands behind his back, brought him to the courthouse square and there beat his head with a blackjack; and that they dragged Hall by the feet through the Square into the jail where he was left in a dying condition. Hall died a few minutes after he was taken from the jail to a hospital.

The defendants tried to show that they had arrested Hall under a warrant, that Hall tried to shoot them, and that in self protection they had to use a blackjack. The jury did not believe this; but what is more,

the jury were not carried away by the arguments of defense counsel who tried to inflame their prejudices by injecting into the case the issues of race and "Yankee interference" in their community. This is the first time a conviction of this kind has ever been obtained in Georgia.

I take this occasion to say all honor to these twelve white men, who saw their duty and did it, under a wise and courageous charge from Judge Deaver, enforcing their law, the Federal law of their Government.

The Atlanta Journal said, commenting on the result: "Georgia's justice must become a synonym for equal justice for all, colored or white, humble or mighty." And the Atlanta Daily World, in another editorial: "The determination of Baker County's most distinguished white citizens. . . lends a new and encouraging stand against mob violence and brutality in the South."

While the punishment in this case scarcely fits the crime, it is the maximum under the Federal law involved, and the action of this Federal judge and jury is what I mean by leadership exercised within the community.

I suggest another example. The Federal Public Housing Authority is vitally interested in building homes for low wage workers particularly in congested areas in the great and often dangerously overcrowded industrial centers. It is often very difficult to get the local authorities to agree on locations for housing for Negroes. Often delays of many months intervene while the housing situation becomes more acute, as recently in Baltimore where a decision to select four sites, agreed on by the city authorities, after many months of negotiation, has been finally worked out. The program totals 1750 units, both temporary and permanent. The final plan had the approval of the city and county authorities and was

developed to complement plans contemplated by private builders for Negro housing. The importance of community leadership in such practical and urgent problems is readily apparent. Without such leadership accomplishment becomes well nigh impossible.

Axis propaganda in this country took the form of vicious anti-Semitic teachings. There were a number of Fascist groups preaching disunity and race antagonism in the name of patriotism. Some of their members have been convicted of sedition, more are presently under indictment. Not all of these groups were directly Axis-inspired; but, led by violently bitter and prejudiced persons, they deliberately aroused in their publications and at their meetings the hatreds of the crowd against Negroes, against Jews, against foreigners, against liberals, against all who believed in a tolerant and generous democracy. They appealed to the maladjusted, to the ignorant, to the prejudiced. And their activities were not unprofitable. Contributions flowed in from frightened souls who believed the lies about Jewish domination or labor dictatorship, and from the thousands of little people who saw themselves saving their country, seizing a pathetic color of importance by joining movements and starting imaginary crusades. Most of these wretched little pools of discontent and hatred have been dissolved or have disappeared under the great forward sweep of the country united in the war effort. But the fruit of their teaching is still with us. For all of them under different labels of patriotism or Americanism advocated hatred and violence, directed against one minority group or another. Our democratic institutions have at other times had to contend with similar attacks - the A.P.A., the Know-Nothings, the Ku Klux Klan. Today as in the past they incite men's hatreds into channels of violence

and mob action against the orderly processes of the law. They set one group against another - Catholic against Jew - white against Negro. They try to disrupt the very essence of our democracy. They occur, where misunderstanding and prejudice have the first play; where these weaknesses have been stirred from the dark places of human nature into need for violent expression, and whipped into action; where the forces of education and religion have been unable to persuade or to control. Violence can be swiftly roused; reason and tolerance are the products of patience and the background of a decent way of living.

I have spoken tonight chiefly of the Japanese and Negroes, and have said almost nothing of the increase of anti-Semitism which so particularly concerns a Jewish audience. By this omission I do not mean to indicate that I am not deeply concerned with the cruel and dangerous form it is taking. It is profoundly shocking that it should have developed among school children, who, left to themselves, could hardly have turned against other children merely because they were Jewish. The desecration of Jewish cemeteries is hideously like what we have seen in those countries which have been conquered by the Germans. As Americans we must not tolerate this outbreak of the Axis pattern in our own country. It must be met, as it occurs, by firm law enforcement, at the same time that efforts are directed towards the eradication of its underlying causes.

But the efforts of government, whether in the field of law enforcement or elsewhere can do little, as I have said, without the support of public opinion. The President when he created the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, whose practical duty it is to remove barriers of discrimination which deny war jobs to available and needed workers, had this in mind

when he stated, in the Executive Order, "that the democratic way of life within the nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders."

It has been suggested from time to time that there should be established by the Administration a council which should deal with these crucial minority problems. Basic to all these suggestions is the idea of research and education for the formation of public opinion. But I do not believe that the Government should in any way attempt to mould public opinion, even in this field, by any such organized approach. It is said that if men of outstanding reputation were appointed on such a council or committee their work would be unpolitical and objective. Perhaps; and yet I do not think that government should institute or organize such a movement. The idea has creative possibilities for good. But the impulse should rise from the private sources. The idea warrants exploration in these terms. The purpose of such a group would be primarily one of education. A good deal of research has been done. Possibly more is required. The need as I see it is not merely to collect the information and to distribute it, as objectively as possible, but by discussion, teaching, education, and cooperation on the Community level to bring to our people an immediate realization of the tragic implications of these disunities. Already local groups have done effective work, as for instance at the Durham, Atlanta and Richmond conferences. The need is for a sustained effort, and a national approach.

I have great faith in the effectiveness of discussion and negotiation, particularly when it involves the leaders of the community itself, and where it is grounded on local interests, cleared from agitation and pulled

out of the clouds of any philosophy, or theory of government. The men of Baker County, Georgia, whose action I have described, have done more for their community and for their State than anyone outside of Baker County could have accomplished.

I remember when I was Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board in 1934-1935 we laid great emphasis on settlements of labor disputes by negotiation locally before they reached the stage of formal presentation to the board, when they were often overcharged with emotion. In several of the great cities we organized local panels of the leaders of industry and of labor, with a public chairman, who acted promptly and were immediately available to prevent labor disputes before they came to an issue, or to settle them after the disputes broke out. It was day-to-day work; and you could see the way representatives on each side grew to respect the other point of view, as prejudices gradually fell away under the impact of disinterested and humane cooperation for a common end - industrial peace.

If such a Committee or Council were formed to deal, let us say, with the minority problem of the Negro, it should be of course bi-racial in membership, with Negroes playing an equal part with whites. For the reason for its being would not be that whites were doing something for Negroes, but that both Negroes and Whites were working for the common good of their country. And although it should be national in scope, and have in its ranks men and women from every section of the country, it must build through those who are the leaders of the local communities in the schools, in the labor unions, in groups of employers, in women's clubs, in churches of all faiths. It would seek to develop a local pride of

tolerance and fair play that would not permit such assaults in our American way of life.

We have talked much of democracy, of the American way of life, in these last few years. But surely it cannot grow into the fullness of realization, as long as we, through indifference or through fear, permit these bitter injustices to continue. What we do today will write the history of the years to come. Do you remember what Walt Whitman said:

"We have frequently printed the word Democracy.

Yet I cannot too often repeat that it is a word the real gist of which still sleeps, quite unawaken'd, notwithstanding the resonance and the many angry tempests out of which its syllables have come, from pen or tongue. It is a great word, whose history, I suppose, remains unwritten, because that history has yet to be enacted."