

Lesson Plan: Day 1

Unit Name: Civil Rights Movement

School District: Andover

Date:

Class and Grade: 10th grade, 20th Century: United States and the World

State framework standard: USII.25 Analyze the origins, goals, and key events of the Civil Rights movement, and, USII.26 Describe the accomplishments of the civil rights movement.

Historical thinking standard: 3, Historical Analysis and Interpretation (compare and contrast differing sets of ideas).

Leadership:

Enduring Understanding: The United States has long struggled with racism, and despite legal and social improvements, racism persists.

Essential questions: Are there races of human beings? What is racism? What are the causes and roots of racism?

Development and selection of activities and resources:

1. Students write a definition of race and racism.
2. Conduct a silent conversation as groups, using markers and newsprint (BIG paper).
3. Share the accompanying sheet, Handout 1.1 “The Meaning of Race”.
4. Students share their thoughts and discuss.
5. Students write a response to the questions: What is racism and what are its causes?
6. Introduce the information from Handout 1.2, specifically from the “What is Racism?” excerpt.
7. Students respond (orally/written) to this information.

Content: (contained on next two pages)

Assignment: Answer the essential questions using at least three references to the sources presented.

The Meanings of Race

Definition 1

The Only Race Is the Human Race: No Biological Basis for Race

New data from the mapping of the human genome reveal that all humans are incredibly similar — in fact, we are 99.9% genetically identical. **We are all members of one species, *Homo sapiens*.** Scientists have confirmed, as they long suspected, **that there is no genetic or biological basis for race.** Genetic variation between people within the same “racial” group can be greater than the variation between people of two different groups. Many people of African descent are no more similar to other Africans than they are to Caucasians.

Genetic

distinctions between Asians and Caucasians are less pronounced than those between groups from, for example, parts of East and West Africa. No matter how scientists today scrutinize a person’s genes, they can’t determine with certainty whether an individual is from one “racial” group or another. **Differences of culture and society** distinguish one group from another, but these distinctions are not rooted in biology.

“Mapping the DNA sequence variation in the human genome holds the potential for promoting the fundamental unity of all mankind.” –Dr. Harold P. Freeman

American Museum of Natural History, “The Genomic Revolution,” 2001 exhibition

Definition 2

In 1997, the American Anthropological Association (AAA) issued a statement summarizing its own research and the research of others on race. After noting that race has no scientific meaning and that research based on racial categories has resulted in “countless errors,” the organization concluded that race is a social invention — “a worldview, a body of prejudgments that distorts our ideas about human differences and group behavior.” The AAA noted, “At the end of the 20th century, we now understand that human behavior is learned, conditioned into infants beginning at birth and always subject to modification and change.”

Definition 3

Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary

race *n* a division of mankind possessing traits that are transmissible by descent and sufficient to characterize it as a distinct human type.

Definition 4

Poet Lori Tsang

Race is the myth upon which the reality of racism is based, the wild card the racist always keeps up his sleeve. The racist has the power to determine whether the card will be a diamond or spade, whether a Chinese is black or white. Like water, race takes on the shape of whatever contains it — whatever culture, social structure, political system. But like water, it slips through your fingers when you try to hold it.⁷

⁷Quoted in *Half and Half*, ed. By Claudine Chiawei O’Hearn. Pantheon Books, 1998, 209-210.

© 2005 Facing History and Ourselves

Racism

Causes of:

- Stereotyping/False Perceptions
- Unfamiliarity/Ignorance
- Selfishness
- Genes and Environment
- Resentment of past (events, treatments, etc.)
- Identification with a group
- Unwillingness to change perceptions

Perceptions and Interpretations can be accurate, or wildly inaccurate. They are thoughts, and are therefore not always correct.

What Is Racism? (excerpted from <http://www.anitra.net/activism/racism>)

A more universal definition of racism is "Prejudice or discrimination by one group toward others perceived as a different 'race', plus the power to enforce it." Groups may be almost identical physiologically, yet be divided against each other on the basis of culture, language, religion, nationality, or any combination of the above.

Racism requires four elements:

1. The belief in separate, definable and recognizable "races."
2. The belief that one "race" is superior to others.
3. Possession of power by the "superior race" to act against "inferior races" without effective defense or redress.
4. Action that is both arbitrary and harmful.

Prejudice that remains an attitude can be emotionally painful and demoralizing, but it is not racism until it is put into action. The actions of individuals, in turn, are harmful to the degree that they are supported by power. Imagine, for example, that a Muslim applied to rent an apartment from a Hindu landlord. If the landlord hates Muslims personally but rents the apartment and treats the tenant on an equal basis with any other in charging rent, maintaining the apartment, etc, that is an example of prejudice but not of racism. If the landlord refuses to rent the apartment to a Muslim, the landlord's action is individual racism, but can be only a temporary setback if it is not supported by the society. If, however, the rest of the tenants and neighbors support the landlord's decision, if no local media find it to be news, if the applicant finds no official avenue for appeal or redress, that is institutionalized racism.

Roots of Racism

Historically, almost every group of human beings who managed to cultivate a cultural identity did so partly by defining themselves as better than any other group, setting sharp boundaries to how much they would interact with other groups (including intermarriage) and limits to how much of their resources and power they would share.

Groups that were isolated by natural borders – like the Klingit (Eskimo), native Caribbean tribes, and Australian aborigines – did not have to develop traditions of hostility to strangers to protect their tribal identity. Natural obstacles provided all the hostility to invaders they needed; the people themselves could be generous and hospitable to the survivors, who often ended up absorbed into the tribe.

Those with extremely strong cultural identities – as, for example, Jews and Roma (gypsies) – have been able to exist within other cultures without behaving with hostility, although they have often suffered hostilities. This behavior has changed, however, in the rare times when such a group has found itself in a position of power. In Moorish Spain and in modern Israel, for example, Jews have demonstrated that they can be as violent as anyone else in defense of "cultural identity" – persecuting heretic Jews as well as non-Jews.

Defenders of "racism" (who seldom call it "racism") have put forward several motivations:

"Racial purity," or the maintenance of a cultural identity and status quo. Some proponents of "racial purity" maintain that their own "race" is the highest and best, source of all major advances in civilization, and should therefore be kept free of contamination by others. Other proponents claim that all ethnic groups have their own value, make their own special contributions to humanity, and therefore should be kept "separate but equal" for the sake of all.

Control of scarce resources by a group considered to have the most right to them, and/or the ability to best use them.

Some proponents claim a version of "Social Darwinism" in which "to the victor belong the spoils."

Other proponents argue the "White Man's Burden." Non-white races do not have the ability to use power or resources responsibly. They must be controlled, resources dealt out to them, as they are "educated" and "civilized." When they have learned to thoroughly emulate white culture, they may share the benefits of it.

Self-protection. "They outnumber us and if we don't keep them down they'll destroy us."

Revenge (or "justice.") "They put us down, now the tables are turned."

Opponents analyze the motivations of racism differently:

Human psychological needs for:

- A scapegoat, someone to project all evil and all fears onto; someone to look down on, so that no matter how low we feel there's somebody lower;
- Certainty that our own religion, laws and way of life are beyond question.
- Perception of scarcity, in land and resources, and a human tendency to prioritize "our people"

for such resources.

- Greed. Using arguments of racial and cultural superiority to justify appropriating resources is based not just on true need and fear of scarcity, but more often on greed for excess.
- Power. Racist arguments are used in both the creation and maintenance of power. Tolerance is seen as a threat to power.
- Justification for harm we have done to others. Great Britain's economic exploitation of its colonies and subject kingdoms (including Ireland, Scotland and Wales) made it emotionally impossible for them to accept natives of such places as social equals. After Blacks had been enslaved, white society had to continue to practice discrimination toward Blacks and evolve "scientific" and "religious" arguments in defense of it. For white America to accept Native American culture and citizens as fully equal, it would have had to accept the full weight of guilt for evils committed during the conquest of Native America.
- Fear of retaliation for harm done to others.
- Culturalization and identification. In a racist society, children are brought up with racist assumptions, whether they identify with the "oppressed" or with the "oppressor."

Whatever the roots of racism may be, it tends to perpetuate itself. A group of people is defined as "lesser" and denied access to resources, then the results of such denial are used to justify defining them as "lesser."

Lesson Plan: Day 2

Unit Name: Civil Rights Movement

School District: Andover

Date:

Class and Grade: 10th grade, 20th Century: United States and the World

State framework standard: USII.25 Analyze the origins, goals, and key events of the Civil Rights movement, and, USII.26 Describe the accomplishments of the civil rights movement.

Historical thinking standard: 5, Historical Issues-Analysis and Decision-Making.

Leadership:

Enduring Understanding: The United States has long struggled with racism, and despite legal and social improvements, racism persists.

Essential questions: What conditions caused African Americans/Blacks to seek equal civil rights with whites? Why did white Americans reject the Civil Rights Movement?

Development and selection of activities and resources:

1. Students divided into two groups: Group 1 examines/reads the African American/Black perspectives, Group 2 examines/reads the white perspectives.
2. Groups prepare to hold a simulation town meeting, during which each side presents its position, and faces questions from the opposing side.

Content:

Group 1 reads:

- Handout 2.1 (page 7) Negroes' Most Urgent Needs
- Handout 2.2 (pages 8&9) Trying to Vote in Mississippi
- Handout 2.3 (pages 10&11) Taking It For Ourselves

Group 2 reads:

- Handout 2.4 (page 12) White Citizens' Council
- Handout 2.5 (page 13) Montgomery City Code
- Handout 2.6 (page 14&15) Interview with Ross Barnett

Assignment: During the simulated town meeting students will explore the essential questions.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Trying to Vote In Mississippi

At the center of Mississippi's struggle for power was the black vote. Deprived of a political voice, blacks were subjected to the whims of the powerful white elite. In some counties, blacks outnumbered whites four to one, yet almost none of them were registered to vote. In a state known for its extreme segregationist tradition, black activists Moore, Evers, and Moses struggled to register black voters. They and other black activists hoped that under the leadership of President John F. Kennedy, the US Justice Department would force the state of Mississippi to protect the federally mandated rights of its black citizens. Yet, because Southern senators had dominated the federal judiciary committee for years, legal challenges to the state's discriminatory policies were routinely blocked or ignored. Fearing any change to the Jim Crow system, these senators used their power to pressure the president to appoint segregationists to become federal court judges. One of the most notorious of those judges was Justice William Harold Cox of the Fifth Circuit.

In 1961, Gerald Stern, a young, white Southern Jewish lawyer from Memphis, Tennessee, joined the civil rights division of the Justice Department. He was assigned to investigate voter discrimination and intimidation in Mississippi. Stern interviewed activists about their attempts to register black citizens and worked with his colleagues to bring those cases to court. Stern described several of them in an essay called "Mississippi" from the book *Outside the Law: Narratives on Justice in America*: [...] In Walthall County, John Hardy, a young black college student from Nashville, Tennessee, along with some other students set up a voter registration school to teach local blacks how to register. For three weeks they conducted classes for several hours a day, teaching from twenty-five to fifty Walthall County residents each evening how to fill out registration forms and explaining sections of the Mississippi Constitution. Finally, John Hardy accompanied the first five blacks to try and register to vote in Walthall County. At that time, none of the county's 2,490 black persons of voting age were registered to vote, while a substantial majority of 4,536 voting age white persons were registered. The first five black applicants were rejected, as were the three who tried the next time, and the one who tried the next time. The next effort, by two blacks accompanied by John Hardy, marked the last time blacks would try and register in Walthall County for a long time.

An elderly black man, Mose McGee, had been in town on that last day and had seen what had happened to John Hardy and the two black applicants. I found Mose McGee way back in the hills, plowing his fields behind a mule with the plow lines hitched over his shoulders. He was embarrassed for me to see him like that. He did not utter a single word. He just unhitched himself from his plow, went into his shack, cleaned up, and then came out. He said, "It's not right for anyone to be seen as an animal. I want you to see me as a human being." He wanted to tell me what he had seen in town that day. He wanted blacks to get the right to vote so they could force the county supervisors to pave his dirt road and the dirt roads that led to other black people's homes like they paved the roads to white men's property. He said his dirt road became impassably muddy when the rains came. One day a black neighbor's baby got sick. No doctor could get up the road to them. And they couldn't drive out to get to the doctor. So he had bundled the baby up and walked over the hills, for miles and miles, to get to town. The baby died in his arms before he got there. Mose McGee said John Hardy had accompanied Mrs. Edith Simmons Peters, a sixty-three-year-old black woman who owned an eighty-acre farm, and Lucius Wilson, a sixty-two-year-old black man who owned a seventy-acre farm, to register to vote. When they got to the registrar's office, he refused to allow them to apply. When the registrar saw John Hardy, he went into his office, got a gun from his desk, and ordered him to leave the office. As John Hardy turned to leave, the registrar followed him and struck him on the back of the head with his

gun, saying, "Get out of here you damn son-of-a-bitch and don't come back in here."³ John Hardy, bleeding from the head, staggered out of the building, helped by Mrs. Peters and Lucius Wilson, where he was soon met by the sheriff. When he told the sheriff what had happened, the sheriff pointed to Lucius Wilson and said, "If that boy wants to register he know how to go down to that courthouse and he don't need you to escort him. You don't have a bit of business in the world down there." Then the sheriff arrested John Hardy "for disturbing the peace and bringing an uprising among the people." After some legal wrangling, the case against Hardy was dropped. Stern then requested Judge Cox to order Whithall County to cease discriminating against black voters. Judge Cox rejected Stern's motion, arguing that the reason only two of the 2,490 blacks in the county were registered was due to the fact that blacks "have not been interested in registering to vote." He also summarily dismissed evidence that the sheriff's actions against Hardy had scared people who wanted to register: "that incident did not frighten or deter any Negro in the county from registering or attempting to register."⁴ Stern explained:
The Department of Justice continued to pursue these voter discrimination cases, county by county, case by case, but it was obvious that there had to be a quicker, more effective way than battling Judge Cox and the Mississippi legislature while they constantly erected new barriers to black voter registration.⁵

<http://www.facinghistory.org/sites/facinghistory.org>

Taking It For Ourselves

Due to the severity of segregation in Mississippi, black residents could not register to vote through normal channels. In their efforts to increase black voter registration, local and national civil rights leaders formed the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party as an alternative to the official, but all-white Mississippi Democratic Party. The MFDP adhered to all the rules and guidelines of the Democratic Party in the hopes that they would be officially accepted at the Democratic National Convention (DNC). The COFO, SNCC, and Freedom Summer volunteers registered tens of thousands of black Mississippians through the MFDP. The MFDP then selected delegates to attend the 1964 DNC in Atlantic City, New Jersey and pleaded their case as the true democratic representatives of Mississippi's voters to the DNC's Credential Committee. Fannie Lou Hamer was among the MFDP delegates. In the following excerpt she describes her journey from sharecropper to MFDP delegate:

I was born October sixth, nineteen and seventeen in Montgomery County, Mississippi. My parents moved to Sunflower County when I was two years old, to a plantation about four and a half miles from here, Mr. E. W. Brandon's plantation. [...] My parents were sharecroppers and they had a big family. Twenty children. Fourteen boys and six girls. I'm the twentieth child. All of us worked in the fields, of course, but we never did get anything out of sharecropping. [...] My life has been almost like my mother's was, because I married a man who sharecropped. We didn't have it easy and the only way we could ever make it through the winter was because Pap had a little juke joint and we made liquor. That was the only way we made it. I married in 1944 and stayed on the plantation until 1962 when I went down to the courthouse in Indianola to register to vote. That happened because I went to a mass meeting one night. Until then I'd never heard of no mass meeting and I didn't know that a Negro could register and vote. Bob Moses, Reggie Robinson, Jim Bevel and James Forman were some of the SNCC workers who ran that meeting. When they asked for those to raise their hands who'd go down to the courthouse the next day, I raised mine. Had it up as high as I could get it. I guess if I'd had any sense I'd a-been a little scared, but what was the point of being scared? The only thing they could do to me was kill me and it seemed like they'd been trying to do that a little bit at a time ever since I could remember.

Well, there was eighteen of us who went down to the courthouse that day and all of us were arrested. Police said the bus was painted the wrong color—said it was too yellow. After I got bailed out I went back to the plantation where Pap and I had lived for eighteen years. My oldest girl met me and told me that Mr. Marlow, the plantation owner, was mad and raising sand. He had heard that I had tried to register. That night he called on us and said, "We're not going to have this in Mississippi and you will have to withdraw. I am looking for your answer, yea or nay?" I just looked. He said, "I will give you until tomorrow morning. And if you don't withdraw you will have to leave. If you do go withdraw, it's only how I feel, you might still have to leave." So I left that same night. Pap had to stay on till work on the plantation was through. Ten days later they fired into Mrs. Tucker's house where I was staying. They also shot two girls at Mr. Sissel's.

That was a rough winter. I hadn't a chance to do any canning before I got kicked off, so didn't have hardly anything. I always can more than my family can use 'cause there's always people who don't have enough. That winter was bad, though. Pap couldn't get a job nowhere 'cause everybody knew he was my husband. We made it on through, though, and since then I just been trying to work and get our people organized.

I reckon the most horrible experience I've had was in June of 1963. I was arrested along with several others in Winona, Mississippi. That's in Montgomery County, the county where I was born. I was carried to a cell and locked up with Euvester Simpson. I began to hear the sound of licks, and I could hear people screaming. [...]

After then, the State Highway patrolmen came and carried me out of the cell into another cell where there were two Negro prisoners. The patrolman gave the first Negro a long

blackjack that was heavy. It was loaded with something and they had me lay down on the bunk with my face down, and I was beat. I was beat by the first Negro till he gave out. Then the patrolman ordered the other man to take the blackjack and he began to beat. [...] After I got out of jail, half dead, I found out that Medgar Evers had been shot down in his own yard.

I've worked on voter registration here ever since I went to that first mass meeting. In 1964 we registered 63,000 black people from Mississippi into the Freedom Democratic Party. We formed our own party because the whites wouldn't even let us register. We decided to challenge the white Mississippi Democratic Party at the National Convention. We followed all the laws that the white people themselves made. We tried to attend the precinct meetings and they locked the doors on us or moved the meetings and that's against the laws they made for their own selves. So we were the ones that held the real precinct meetings. At all these meetings across the state we elected our representatives, to go to the National Democratic Convention in Atlantic City. But we learned the hard way that even though we had all the law and all the righteousness on our side—that white man is not going to give up his power to us. We have to build our own power. We have to win every single political office we can, where we have a majority of black people.

The question for black people is not, when is the white man going to give us our rights, or when is he going to give us good education for our children, or when is he going to give us jobs—if the white man gives you anything just remember when he gets ready he will take it right back. We have to take for ourselves.

The DNC nominated Lyndon B. Johnson (who had assumed office after President John F. Kennedy was assassinated on November 22, 1963). Under pressure from Johnson, the Credential Committee rejected an appeal for an open vote on the MFDP petition, and offered, instead, to seat two of the MFDP delegates. Disappointed, the MFDP delegation returned to Mississippi.

John Lewis, the onetime head of SNCC, believed, as did many others, “that had the decision to seat the MFDP delegates reached a floor vote, especially after Fannie Lou Hamer’s testimony, the Mississippi regulars would have been ousted and replaced.” Many activists saw the MFDP delegation to the DNC as the culmination of many years of hard work, and the refusal of the Democratic Party even to vote on the issue shook their confidence in the US political process as a whole. Lewis recalled the devastating impact the dismissal of the MFDP had on SNCC and many other civil rights activists: As far as I’m concerned, this was the turning point of the civil rights movement. I’m absolutely convinced of that. Until then, despite every setback and disappointment and obstacle we had faced over the years, the belief still prevailed that the system would work, the system would listen, the system would respond. Now, for the first time, we had made our way to the very center of the system. We had played by the rules, done everything we were supposed to do, had played the game exactly as required, had arrived at the doorstep and found the door slammed in our face. [...] That loss of faith would spread through Lyndon Johnson’s term in office, from civil rights and into the issue of Vietnam. [...] That crisis of confidence, the spirit of cynicism and suspicion and mistrust that infects the attitude of many Americans toward their government today, began, I firmly believe, that week in Atlantic City. Something was set in motion that week that would never go away.

<http://www.facinghistory.org/sites/facinghistory.org>

White Citizens' Council

FIVE POINT ACTION PROGRAM

1. *Prevent Race-Mixing.* Racial integrity is essential to civilization and liberty. The fate of the white man (and woman) in the Congo and other new African nations is a stern warning!
2. *Avoid Violence.* Experience has proved that where integration occurs, violence becomes inevitable. Peaceful operation of segregated schools in the South proves that social separation of the races is best for all concerned.
3. *Maintain and Restore Legal Segregation.* As growing disorder in Washington, D.C., shows, if segregation breaks down, the social structure breaks down. The Communists hope to achieve [this] in America!
4. *Defend States' Rights.* The states are the source of all governmental power, local and Federal. Under the Tenth Amendment, the states have the reserved power to decide questions of segregation. Federal usurpation of any such power is a violation of the Constitution.
5. *Reverse the "Black Monday" Decision.* The Supreme Court's school integration decision of May 17, 1954 is a patent perversion of the Constitution, based on false "science": If it stands, social segregation and laws against racial intermarriage will be subject to judicial condemnation. Such a prospect is intolerable!

JOIN THE CITIZENS' COUNCIL

Organization is the Key to Victory! WORK ... HOPE ... PRAY FOR WHITE MONDAY!2

http://www.facinghistory.org/sites/facinghistory.org/files/05_MississippiIsThisAmerica_1962-1964.pdf

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

This is an interview with Ross Robert Barnett (Governor of Mississippi 1960-4) held May 8, 1971, by Dr. Neil McMillen in the law office of Ross Barnett.

Dr. McMillen: Your administration was given high marks by the state press for the handling of the Freedom Ride controversy. How did you prepare for that, Governor? What orders did you give?

Gov. Barnett: Well, we saw what a terrible scrap they had in Alabama. They had a world of trouble in Alabama, you know - fights, shooting scrapes, so we got ready for it here. I had the cooperation of the Highway Patrol, the Jackson Police, the Mayor, Allen Thompson, and we had meant to meet them at the Alabama line, and bring them in, and when they'd violate our laws we would just put them in jail, one right after another. And when the jails all got filled here, we had 32 down in what they call the chicken coops down on the fairgrounds. With an order from the Board of Supervisors, I sent all 32 of them to Parchman and put them in maximum security cells. And that was the last of the Freedom Riders.

Dr. McMillen: And no more came to the state?

Gov. Barnett: No, they didn't come back here. But, putting them at Parchman in maximum security cells I think helped a great deal.

Dr. McMillen: And you had one other great problem with the race problem, that was in 1962.

Gov. Barnett: That was James Meredith. That's true. I had a lot of trouble for several weeks. It was an ordeal. Judge Sidney Mize entered a Court order that James Meredith was not qualified to enter Ole Miss. He held that he was a plain trouble maker and that he wouldn't approve of entering him at Ole Miss. And, so I told the people that I would fight it to a finish, and I did. I went as far as any Governor could go. We blocked him about four times. But President Kennedy called me and he said, "Mr. Governor, you've blocked him your last time." And he said, "He's going in Ole Miss within the next 48 hours, if it takes the whole Army of the United States and he said, "All we want to know of you is are you going to cooperate and keep order." I said, "Certainly. I will try to keep order and I'll do the very best I can." . . .and I did. I even sent all of the Highway Patrolmen up to Oxford, except about fifty, trying to keep order. I didn't think that the Federal government had any right at that time; and I still don't think it has any legal right to tell a state how to operate its school. The 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States plainly says that the powers not delegated by the Constitution to the Federal government and when not prohibited by the Constitution to the States, belong to the states. Well, we all know that the word school is not mentioned in the Constitution; the word education is not mentioned in the Constitution. And the acts of the federal government are beyond the scope of its authority. And I'll never believe anything else. I went down the line trying to maintain the theory that the states have a right to control and direct their own activities in the public schools. Governor Tom Dewey of New York was a good friend of mine; and he helped me to get some industry in Mississippi. He asked the legislature of New York to pass a law giving the trustees of the public schools the power to fire a school teacher - if they learned that the teacher - was a Communist. And the law passed by the legislature of New York states, gave the trustees of the public schools of that state the power to fire a school teacher if they decided the school teacher was a Communist. But Chief

Justice Warren and other members of the U. S. Supreme Court said that New York had no right to pass such a law. And this ruling has been a disgrace to the whole nation. The Court held that the state had no right to say that "a Communist cannot teach your children." I think that's getting pretty low down.

...

Gov. Barnett: I testified for two hours and forty minutes, July 10, 1963, before the United States Commerce Committee; and I told them then that all these marches and undignified acts and sit-ins are backed by the Communist Party. And when I said that, Phillip Hart, Senator from Michigan, jumped up and said, "You're making a mighty serious charge there, Governor." I said, "Well, I mean for it to be serious and I mean every word of it." And I said, "It is backed by the Communists in my opinion." He said, "I think you owe us an explanation." And I said, "Well, I'm glad you asked for the explanation." I reached in my briefcase and pulled out a picture of Martin Luther King, I said, "He's your leader, isn't he?" And he said, "Yes." I said, "Here he is sitting with three or four known Communists listening to a Communist lecture at Mount Eagle, Tennessee." "They want to get us divided, race against race, brother against brother, and finally get us so divided that they'll take over."

Dr. McMillen: What about the future of states' rights, Governor? What would your advice be to Mississippians to protect their states' rights?

Gov. Barnett: Every Mississippian should talk states rights. They ought to talk it every time they get an opportunity, and encourage people to get back to local self-government and the rights of the states. And to take away from Washington powers what Washington does not have. Local people in Hattiesburg or Jackson know more about local affairs than somebody 1200 miles away. They know more about what we need than somebody in Washington, in my opinion.

<http://anna.lib.usm.edu/%7Espcol/crda/oh/ohbarnettrp.html>

Lesson Plan: Day 3

Unit Name: Civil Rights Movement

School District: Andover

Date:

Class and Grade: 10th grade, 20th Century: United States and the World

State framework standard: USII.25 Analyze the origins, goals, and key events of the Civil Rights movement, and, USII.26 Describe the accomplishments of the civil rights movement.

Historical thinking standard: 2, Historical Comprehension.

Leadership: (see activity #3 in Development and selection section below)

Enduring Understanding: The United States has long struggled with racism, and despite legal and social improvements, racism persists.

Essential questions: What was it like to be involved in or against the Civil Rights Movement? What types of actions were the most effective?

Development and selection of activities and resources:

1. Students will read and evaluate several primary and secondary sources (listed below under Content).
2. Students will compare and contrast the information and arguments presented in the sources.
3. Students will write a letter or diary entry from the point of view of a Civil Rights Movement participant, focusing on the dilemmas and opportunities facing such a person, and including an assessment of how such a person displays leadership.
4. Discuss the unique position of female Civil Rights participants.
5. Examine several stations, each with a different Selma, Alabama voting campaign flyer. Analyze the content and tone of each flyer

Content: Documents to be considered are the following:

- Handout 3.1 Interview with Unita Blackwell
- Handout 3.2 The First Day of School
- Handout 3.3 Bus Boycott Conference
- Handout 3.4 Women Working Together
- Handout 3.5 Integrated Bus Suggestions
- Handout 3.6. Freedom Rides
- Handout 3.7 Nashville Lunch Counter Sit-Ins
- Handouts 3.8 Example flyers from the Selma voting rights campaign

Assignment: Briefly detail another type of action that could be used in the broad struggle to achieve equality, including the possible strengths and weaknesses of this type of action.

Interview with Unita Blackwell

This is the second interview with Mayor Unita Blackwell of Mayersville, Mississippi, being conducted in her home in Mayersville, the twelfth of May, 1977. The interviewer is Mike Garvey.

Mr. Garvey: Well, since ya'll all rested up from your nights' sleep, let me start off by asking you, the last time that we talked, you told me of a period you went through, where you were despondent, and you felt your situation in life was hopeless, and all that. When did all of that change? When did you decide to go out and do something about the way you were living, the way your people were living. Is there a turning point there? □□

Ms. Blackwell: I think that it's maybe that hopeless period, that you term hopeless. It just was a way of life, you know, because that period from growing up and trying to go to school, and you know, then you come out of school. Course you dropped out and get involved in trying to figure out a way to live. And then you get to travel around, and trying to see how is you going to live. It's just become a way of life. Because you don't have the opportunities. At least I didn't have the opportunities, you know, that is needed for that. I didn't have the education, and so you just feel, really, you're just trying to survive. It's just a survival. But in coming on up into that period of time, trying to survive, just to eat, and sometimes you wasn't doing that, because of the way the system was created, you know. Blacks, you know, couldn't hardly make it, and the masses of us was in this condition. And I'm part of the masses, you know. You'll find a few blacks that had some education, or you can find a few blacks with a job or two, and was doing pretty well, but the masses of the people just did not have it. You know, we all came out of plantationism and so forth. As I was saying earlier, in 1964 when I got involved, I was still doing sort of the same thing. You go to the field, you chop some cotton around here. I've chopped for the lady down here, just as you enter the town. Her husband is dead now. I went out there and chopped cotton. So that's all you was to do, you know, you're trying to find a way to exist. In 1964, people came in and said you had a right to register to vote, that this would change the way that you are living, and the house that I was living in was falling down, and I didn't have no job, you know, that was paying anything. Pick some cotton or chop some cotton or something like that. And so for me, that opened up another avenue. And maybe this would solve some of the problems that we had been having, you know, all my life. It had become a way of life. I never like it, my way of life. But you just decide to make out, you know, make do or whatever. So in 1964, people came in, as I said earlier, and that's what happened in that part of life. □□

Mr. Garvey: What set you apart from the others? Even though the gains that were made during the '60s were impressive, there was still the majority of the black community [that] never participated in voting or registration or anything else, or tried to improve their station. What set you apart from them? Why did you get active and why did you go to work, when the rest of them weren't? □□

Ms. Blackwell: Well, I guess then, I don't have an answer for all of that. Some people just get involved in, get highlighted I suppose in that involvement. We are still trying to figure out why some people, you know, when we go into organizing communities and so forth, you'll have one block and it's always, somebody will show up. A family or something will emerge out of that group that will carry the ball. And so that's what happened, you know. That I just kept going, and then I had people that would come, and I'm a person that I just love knowledge, you know. So I'm always learning. And I just open up to it. Because I didn't get the full education that I desired, you know, as far as academic education. But I kept learning from everybody and everything that I came in contact with. And you're going to find that in any community. And I don't know whether if it's just the black community, cause the black community was cut off so badly, was pushed into a situation where it didn't feel it could emerge. But I had a whole lot of people that had me by the arm, you know, through these periods of years, that would help me come out. For instance, like Dr. Henry, Dr. Aaron Henry, you know, you never thought you'd sit and talk with a doctor. And he was educated, you see, but he was talking on a level that I could understand. And made you thirsty for more information, you know. He would sit and talk to somebody like Mrs. Hamer, you know, she was not highly educated, academically, but she had wisdom and knowledge, you

know; you would be thrilled just to listen to these people and how they would talk about how we do things politically and could talk things from a parliamentary standpoint of view. And he knew how to do all that stuff, and we all would just sit up and look at him, you know, going through it. Like he told us in Atlantic City, New Jersey, you know, I'm with ya'll, whatever ya'll decide I'm with ya'll. Well, that was the difference, because we had some of the other big shots to come in, in Atlantic City, New Jersey, and told us, do not take that seat. I mean to take those two seats. And Aaron, we'd ask Aaron, should we take it, or should we not take it. And he said, "I'm with ya'll, I'm not for it or against it." I think he was wavering at that time, you know. Cause so much excitement was going on that he and Dr. King was the people that they were talking about giving the seats to, to fit. And so your head can get so large during all of this debating going on but he studied stuff with his folks by saying, "Well, I'm with you all, you know. Ever what ya'll decide, that's what we going to do," and that's what happened, see. So these axe the kinds of things that you see as far as learning in communities, that somebody will move out, and I guess that's what happened to me, you know. For instance in Mize, Mississippi, you may not have a mass group of people doing the same thing I'm doing, but each person has its turns of leadership, his level of leadership. I got several people, you know, that I know [have] different kinds of leadership roles. And so that's what we talk about in terms of leadership. Some emerge out in the open and some don't. My criteria for leadership is to spot other leadership, you know. Because if you are not a leader, if you can't spot what group of people that could move this, and another group of people lead, you know, move that. But just somebody following in behind you, you know, down the road somewhere is not leadership all the time. And so I found out that that was not leadership, and that's what I'm not. Cause I don't lead a big group nowhere half the time, you know, but most of the time people become alienated with you, because of your position, but that's leadership; you take a stand for right and for fairness and whatever is, what I believe is right. And that's what has happened in even this community, cause I take a stand, I don't care if the blacks get mad, because I say I'm for people, and I want the whites to have a fair representation and so forth down the line. That's the way I think. And then people respect that kind of leadership; you're not telling them what to do; I'm just telling them what I think should be done. And then they have to act on whatever, you know, comes out.

This is an oral history interview for the University of Southern Mississippi Oral History Program. This interview is with the Honorable Unita Blackwell, being conducted at her home in Mayersville, Mississippi, on the twenty-first of April, 1977. The interviewer is Mike Garvey.

Mr. Garvey: Let me back up and talk about the period of time when you were a field worker, a SNCC field worker. Making what, ten dollars a week, wasn't it? □□

Ms. Blackwell: No, we made eleven dollars, that's what it was.

Mr. Garvey: Eleven dollars a week? □□

Ms. Blackwell: Every two weeks. We got eleven dollars.

Mr. Garvey: Did it take you away from your family a lot? Was there any overnight travel or were you just working in this region? Issaquena and Sharkey Counties? □□

Ms. Blackwell: Well, I traveled during the state; I've been on in all those counties all down South Mississippi, Southwest Mississippi, and all during this time. During the time, you know, the voter registration drive for the State of Mississippi cause this was the first break open-I'm going all over, so I end up in a whole lot of counties, have rallies, speaking, going from door to door and getting people out. Sometimes when you go into another county, I end up more or less the colored coordinator now for voter registration for the area here, Issaquena, Sharkey, six counties, I'm picking up my six counties. Stokely was the Second Congressional District Coordinator, and under him came all these different coordinators to get the vote out. And Muriel Tillinghast was over us at another level. And so, you know, we would end up in meetings in Atlanta. I done a lot of work here in Issaquena and Sharkey counties getting people to register. And I have a lot of people under me, you

know, cause I was over them. Getting the vote out, trying to get people to register, not to vote out, cause you're trying to get them to go down there, cause they was turning them away. But after the bill got passed, we did get people registered.

Mr. Garvey: What sort of resistance did you meet with the black sharecroppers when you were working as a field worker? □□

Ms. Blackwell: Well, you found people had fear. We're back to this fear again. There was fear of not having a place to stay. Quite a few people-through an American Friends Service-a house had to be found for them, and we end up buying a couple of pieces of little land around here, where people could get a lot. Cause some people was put off the plantation. People were thrown out of jobs; all these things happened because of this order. Some folks never did get settled again; it sort of threw them off psychologically, you know; they went out and tried to vote and stuff like this, try to register, and they'll vote and things like that, but they still remember just being told to get out, get off, you know. And so they are still bitter, you know, about some of this stuff, but I think we did it true.

Mr. Garvey: Did you, when you would go out and talk to them, you almost had to do it on an individual basis, didn't you? You almost had to go door to door to door. □□

Ms. Blackwell: Well, that's how we did it. Even when we had meetings in the churches, we'd sing, go and sing in groups and everything else. I guess that's the reason why at the funeral I sang this song, cause that's what it reminded of, Mrs. Hamer, you know, we'd stand up and go to singing and get everybody loosened up, and we'd sing and pat our hands, and then we'd talk about the Lord want us to register and this kind of thing, you know, and folks would say I'll be ready in the morning, and so they'd be ready in the morning, some would back out and some would keep on, you know, that kind of thing. The church was the only place we could get in; a lot of them we couldn't get in, because the ministers were told by the plantation owners, and some of the white community to tell us to stay out, and we would sit down and talk to us and tell [us to] leave this stuff alone, let the Lord fix it. And so we all [had] these ups and downs, you know. Kinds of problems. We had the black community movement, and you look around, some of the blacks would go tell it, you know, what we were planning to do to the whites, and then the whites would be there to cut us off, thinks like that. □□

Mr. Garvey: Did you know, Amzie Moore talked to me about this, about the blacks that were taking money from the whites in passing information back and forth. Did you know who these people were? □□

Ms. Blackwell: Yes. The same thing happened here, you know. Not only here but all across the state, because I done this work all across the state. □□

Mr. Garvey: I asked you if you knew who these people were. The question I was leading up to is, when you would identify these people and say, now look, this is what is going- □□

Ms. Blackwell: Sometimes, when we would know. We started off with that whole conversation ourselves, of calling people "Toms," you know, and stuff like that; we've learned better as time went on on how to really identify that whole thing. We would say, you know, going back and get the story straight, now we want you to tell it right, don't want you to mess it up. And sometimes, we'd call names, and sometimes we wouldn't. We'd just leave it there. And I remember one incident: we was getting ready to desegregate the schools; the suit came across, nineteen hundred and sixty-five, and they was sitting there, you know, making sure they get the stuff together what we had planned to do, go tell it, and this person left before we switched. I knew they was going to leave early, so when we finished with the meeting, they were gone. And I said just before you leave, let us not go to the school tomorrow morning, let us do it Friday. And you know what happened? They had dogs and roads blocked; they had everything there waiting for us. And what happened was that the story got messed up and this person never did tell another thing. <http://www.lib.usm.edu/legacy/spcol/crda/oh/blackwell.htm>

The First Day of School

In 1955, Virgil Blossom, the Little Rock, Arkansas school superintendent, announced a plan to integrate the state's schools gradually, beginning with Little Rock Central High School. The school board selected nine outstanding black students to be the first to attend the all-white institution. Among the nine was 15 year-old Elizabeth Eckford. The night before the first day of school, Governor Orval Faubus delivered an inflammatory speech to incite white segregationists to protest the integration attempt. Rumors of riots spread across town, but Elizabeth Eckford could not be contacted and warned. The next morning she arrived by herself, unprotected. Segregationists crowded the streets leading to Central and surrounded her. Facing taunts, racial epithets, and threats, Eckford only narrowly escaped physical harm. In the excerpt below, she recalled the dreadful day:

I am part of the group that became known as the Little Rock Nine. Prior to the desegregation of Central, there had been one high school for whites, Central High school, and one high school for blacks, Dunbar. I expected that there may be something more available to me at Central that was not available at Dunbar; that there might be more courses I could pursue; that there were more options available. I was not prepared for what actually happened. I was more concerned about what I would wear, whether we could finish my dress in time. [...] What I was wearing, was that okay? Would it look good? The night before when the governor went on television [September 2] and announced that he had called out the Arkansas National Guard, I thought he had done this to insure the protection of all the students. We did not have a telephone. So, inevitably we were not contacted to let us know that Daisy Bates of NAACP had arranged for some ministers to accompany the students in a group. And so it was I that arrived alone. On the morning of September 4th, my mother was doing what she usually did. My mother was making sure everybody's hair looked right and everybody had lunch money and notebooks and things. But she did finally get quiet and we had family prayer. I remember my father walking back and forth. My father worked at night and normally he would have been asleep at that time, but he was awake and he was walking back and forth chomping on a cigar that wasn't lit. I expected I would go to school as I did before on a city bus. So, I walked a few blocks to the bus stop, got on the bus, and rode to within two blocks of the school. I got off the bus and I noticed along the street that there were many more cars than usual. And I remember hearing the murmur of a crowd. But, when I got to the corner where the school was, I was reassured seeing these soldiers circling school grounds. And I saw students going to school. I saw the guards break ranks as students approached the sidewalks so that they could pass through to get to school. And I approached the guards at the corner, as I had seen other students do, they closed ranks. So, I thought maybe I am not supposed to enter at this point. So, I walked further down the line of guards to where there was another sidewalk and I attempted to pass through there. But when I stepped up, they crossed rifles. And again I said to myself maybe I'm supposed to go down to where the main entrance is. So I walked toward the center of the street and when I got to about the middle and I approached the guard he directed me across the street into the crowd. It was only then that I realized that they were barring me so that I wouldn't go to school. As I stepped out into the street, the people who had been across the street start surging forward behind me. So, I headed in the opposite direction to where there was another bus stop. Safety to me meant getting to the bus stop. I think I sat there for a long time before the bus came. In the meantime, people were screaming behind me. What I would have described as a crowd before, to my ears sounded like a mob.³

<http://www.facinghistory.org/sites/facinghistory.org>

Handout 3.3 (next page) Bus Boycott Conference (newspaper article)
<http://www.archives.state.al.us/teacher/rights/lesson1/doc3.html>

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Women Working Together

The long bus boycott in Montgomery took a heavy toll on black citizens, yet they chose to walk the many miles to and from work rather than succumb to continued humiliation. Some white women who relied on black domestic help supported the boycott. While the police attempted to crack down on people who provided transportation for the marchers, a system of carpooling quickly developed to offset some of the effects of the boycott. Virginia Durr and her husband Clifford bailed Rosa Parks out of jail after her arrest and were among the most public white supporters of the boycott. In this interview with the producers of *Eyes on the Prize*, Virginia Durr described the strange interplay between blacks and whites in the boycott:

The strange thing that happened was a kind of a play between white women and black women, in that none of the white women wanted to lose their help. The mayor of the town issued an order that all the black maids had to be dismissed to break the boycott. Well, their reply was, "Tell the mayor to come and do my work for me, then." So the white women went and got the black women in the car. They said they did it because the bus had broken down, or any excuse you could possibly think of. And then the black women, if you picked one of them up who was walking, they'll tell you that they were walking because the lady that brought them to work, her child was sick. So here was this absurd sort of dance going on. I saw a woman that worked for my mother-in-law, and they were asking her, "Do any of your family take part in the boycott?" She said, "No ma'am, they don't have anything to do with the boycott at all." She said, "My brother-in-law, he has a ride every morning and my sister-in-law, she comes home with somebody else, and they just stay off the bus and don't have nothing to do with it." And so when we got out of the room, I said to Mary, "You know, you had been really the biggest storyteller in the world. You know everybody in your family's involved in the boycott." And she says, "Well, you know, when you have your hand in the lion's mouth, the best thing to do is pat it on the head." Always thought that was a wonderful phrase.

The boycott took off some of the terrible load of guilt that white southerners have lived under for so many generations, such a terrible load of shame and guilt that we won't acknowledge. But you can't do things like that to people and pretend to love them too. It's created such a terrible schizophrenia, because when you're a child, particularly if you have blacks in the house, you have devotion to them. Then when you get grown, people tell you that they're not worthy of you, they're different. And then you're torn apart, because here are the people you've loved and depended on. It's a terrible schizophrenia. That's why I think so much of the literature of the South is full of conflict and madness, because you can't do that to people. You can't do that to children. At least under the Nazis they never even pretended to like the Jews, but in the South it was always that terrible hypocrisy. You know, we love the blacks and we understand them and they love us. Both sides were playing roles which were pure hypocrisy. So I thought the boycott was absolutely marvelous.

<http://www.facinghistory.org/sites/facinghistory.org>

Handout 3.5 (next page) Integrated Bus Suggestions

Source: <http://www.archives.state.al.us/teacher/rights/lesson1/doc7.html>

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Freedom Rides

During the spring of 1961, student activists launched the Freedom Rides to challenge segregation on interstate buses and bus terminals. Riding from Washington, D.C. to Montgomery, Alabama, the rides met violent opposition in the Deep South, garnering extensive media attention and eventually forcing federal intervention from the Kennedy administration. Although eventually successful in securing an Interstate Commerce Commission ban on segregation in all facilities under their jurisdiction, the Freedom Rides aggravated tensions between student activists and Martin Luther King, Jr., who publicly supported the riders, but did not participate and privately questioned undertaking such a physically dangerous campaign.

The Freedom Rides were first conceived in 1947 when the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and the Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) organized an interracial bus ride across state lines to test a Supreme Court decision that declared segregation on interstate buses unconstitutional. Called the Journey of Reconciliation, the ride only challenged segregation on buses and was limited to the upper South to avoid the more dangerous Deep South. The ride, however, failed to elicit much national attention or the results CORE had hoped for. Fourteen years later, however, in a new national context of sit-ins, boycotts, and the emergence of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), the Freedom Rides were able to harness enough national attention to force federal enforcement and policy changes.

In 1960, the Supreme Court ruled in *Boynton v. Virginia* that segregation within interstate travel was illegal. This decision extended the 1947 ruling by also declaring segregation in bus terminals, waiting rooms, restaurants, rest rooms, and other interstate travel facilities unconstitutional. Shortly after the decision, two students from Nashville, John Lewis and Bernard Lafayette, tested the ruling by sitting at the front of a bus and refusing to move. After this first ride, they received a letter from CORE asking them to participate in a Freedom Ride, a longer bus trip through the South to continue testing the enforcement of *Boynton*. While Lafayette could not participate because his parents refused to give permission, Lewis joined twelve other activists to form an interracial group that underwent extensive training in nonviolent direct action before launching the ride.

On 4 May 1961, the Freedom Riders left Washington, D. C. in two buses and headed to Virginia. While they met resistance and arrests in Virginia, it was not until the riders arrived in Rockhill, South Carolina that they encountered violence. There, Lewis and

another rider were beaten and another rider was arrested for using a white restroom, attracting widespread media coverage. Days following this incident, the riders met with King and other civil rights leaders in Atlanta for dinner. During this meeting, King whispered prophetically to Jet reporter Simeon Booker, "You will never make it through Alabama."

The ride continued to Anniston, Alabama, where on 14 May they were met by a violent mob of over one hundred people. Before their arrival, Anniston local authorities had given permission to the Ku Klux Klan to strike against the Freedom Riders without fear of arrest. As the bus pulled up, the driver yelled outside, "Well, boys, here they are. I brought you some niggers and nigger-lovers." After a series of standoffs, one of the buses was firebombed, and its fleeing passengers were forced into the angry white mob. The violence continued at the Birmingham terminal where Eugene "Bull" Connor's police force offered no protection. While the violence garnered national media attention, the series of attacks prompted James Farmer of CORE to end the ride. The riders flew to New Orleans, the original destination, bringing to an end the first Freedom Ride of the 1960s.

The decision to end the ride frustrated some student activists. Diane Nash objected in a phone conversation with Farmer, arguing that "We can't let them stop us with violence. If we do, the movement is dead." Under the auspices and organizational support of SNCC, the Freedom Rides continued. SNCC mentors were weary of this decision, including King, who had declined when asked by Nash and Rodney Powell to join the rides. Farmer maintained his doubts, questioning whether continuing the trip was "suicide." With fractured support, the organizers had a difficult time securing financial resources.

Nevertheless, on 17 May 1961, seven men and three women rode from Nashville to Birmingham to resume the Freedom Rides. Just before reaching Birmingham, the bus was pulled over and Bull Connor directed the bus to the Birmingham station, where all the riders were arrested for defying segregation laws. These arrests, coupled with the difficulty of finding a bus driver and other logistical challenges, left the riders stranded in Birmingham for several days.

Quiet federal intervention began to take place behind the scenes, as Attorney General Robert Kennedy called the Greyhound Company and demanded that it find a driver, and John Seigenthaler, a Justice Department representative accompanying the Freedom Riders, met with reluctant Alabama Governor John Patterson to try to diffuse the dangerous situation. This maneuvering resulted in the bus leaving for Montgomery the next morning with a full police escort.

At the Montgomery city line, as agreed, the state troopers left the buses; but the local police that had been ordered to meet the Freedom Riders in Montgomery never showed up. Unprotected when they reached the terminal, riders were beaten so severely by a white mob that some sustained permanent injuries. When the police finally arrived, they served the riders with an injunction barring them from continuing the Freedom Ride in Alabama.

During this time, King was on a speaking tour in Chicago, but returned to Montgomery upon learning of the violence. There, he staged a rally at Ralph Abernathy's church. In his speech to the rally, King blamed Governor Patterson for "aiding and abetting the forces of violence" and called for federal intervention, declaring that "the federal government must not stand idly by while blood thirsty mobs beat nonviolent students with impunity." As King spoke, a threatening white mob gathered outside. From inside the church, King called Attorney General Kennedy, who assured him that the federal government would protect those inside the church. Kennedy mobilized national guardsmen who used tear gas to disperse the mob.

King became one of the rides major spokesmen as the violence and federal intervention propelled the action to national prominence. Some activists, however, began to criticize King for his willingness to offer only moral and financial support but not his physical presence on the rides. In a telegram to King, the President of the Union County NAACP Branch in North Carolina, Robert F. Williams, urged King to "lead by example," continuing that "If you lack the courage [to ride], remove yourself from the vanguard." In response to Diane Nash when she confronted King at a meeting, he replied that he was on probation and could not afford another arrest. Many students did not accept this position, and as SNCC advisor Ella Baker later recalled, the incident caused some students to begin "to look at him as a man, and a man not with all the godlike qualities that had been...attributed to him."

On 29 May, the Kennedy administration announced that it had directed the Interstate Commerce Commission to ban segregation in all facilities under its jurisdiction, but the rides continued. Students from all over the country purchased bus tickets to the South and crowded into Mississippi jails. With the participation of northern students came even more press coverage. King's involvement in the Freedom Rides, however, waned after the federal intervention. The legacy of the rides, however, remained with him. He, and all others involved in the campaign, saw how provoking white southern violence through nonviolent confrontations could attract national attention and force federal action. The Freedom Rides also exposed leadership and tactical rifts between King and more militant students and activists that would continue in nonviolent resistance campaigns that followed.

http://www.stanford.edu/group/King/about_king/encyclopedia/freedom_rides.htm

Nashville Lunch Counter Sit-Ins

The sit-in movement brought a new generation of mobilized college students into the civil rights struggle. These students began to systematically challenge segregation in college towns throughout the South. Lunch counters in Greensboro, North Carolina were only their first target. Students held sit-ins, boycotted segregated stores, and entered “whites only” restaurants where they demanded service for both blacks and whites at lunch counters.

In this *Eyes on the Prize* interview, Diane Nash, who with Ella Baker, Marion Berry, James Lawson, and John Lewis helped found the SNCC, recalled her introduction to the sit-in movement. A Chicagoan who transferred to Fisk University, located in Nashville, Nash remembered her first experiences with Southern segregation and her search for methods to protest the unjust system:

Because I grew up in Chicago, I didn't have an emotional relationship to segregation. I understood the facts and stories, but there was not an emotional relationship. When I went south and saw the signs that said “white” and “colored,” and I actually could not drink out of that water fountain or go to that ladies' room, I had a real emotional reaction. I remember the first time it happened was at the Tennessee State Fair. I had a date with a young man, and I started to go to the ladies' room. And it said, “white” and “colored,” and I really resented that. I was outraged. In Chicago, at least, I had had access to public accommodations and lunch counters. So, my response was, “Who's trying to change these things?” I remember getting depressed because I encountered what I thought was so much apathy. At first I couldn't find anyone, and many of the students were saying, “Why are you concerned about that?” They were not interested in trying to effect some kind of change, I thought. And then I talked to Paul LePrad, who told me about the nonviolent workshops that Jim Lawson was conducting. They were taking place a couple of blocks off campus. Jim had been to India, and he had studied the movement [of] Mohandas Gandhi. He also had been a conscientious objector and had refused to fight in the Korean War. He really is the person that brought Gandhi's philosophy and strategies of nonviolence to this country. He conducted weekly workshops where students in Nashville, as well as some of the people who lived in the Nashville community, were trained and educated in these philosophies and strategies. There were many things I learned in those workshops that I have used for the rest of my life. I remember realizing that with what we were doing, trying to abolish segregation, we were coming up against governors of seven states, judges, politicians, businessmen, and I remember thinking, “I'm only 22 years old. What do I know? What am I doing?” I felt very vulnerable. So when we heard that other cities had demonstrations, it really helped, because there were more of us. And I think we started feeling the power of an idea whose time had come. The sit-ins were really highly charged, emotionally. In our nonviolent workshops, we had decided to be respectful of the opposition and try to keep the issues geared toward desegregation. And the first sit-in we had was really funny, because the waitresses were nervous. They must have dropped \$2,000 worth of dishes that day! I mean, literally, it was almost a cartoon. I can remember one in particular. She was so nervous, she picked up the dishes and dropped one, and she'd pick up another one and drop it. It was really funny, and we were sitting there trying not to laugh, because we thought that laughing would be insulting. At the same time, we were scared to death. The day that the police first arrested us was interesting, too. They had made a decision they were going to arrest us if we sat in that day, and so they announced to us, “O.K., all you nigras, get up from the lunch counter or we're going to arrest you.” And of course we were prepared for this. So they said, “Well, we warned you, you won't move. Everybody's under arrest.” So everybody who was at the lunch counter was arrested. [...] And then they turned and they looked around the lunch counter again, and the second wave of students had all taken seats. They were confounded [...] and said, “Well, we'll arrest those, too,” and they did. No matter what they did and how many they arrested, there was still a lunch counter full of students. They didn't quite know how to act and pretty soon it just got to be a problem for them. [...] The movement had a way of reaching inside me and bringing out things that I never knew were there. Like courage, and love for people. It was a real experience to be seeing a group of people who would put their bodies between you and danger. And to love people that you work with enough that you would put your body between them and danger. I was afraid of going to jail. I said, “I'll do telephone work, and I'll type, but I'm really afraid to go to jail.” But when the time came to go to jail, I was far too busy to be afraid. And we had to go, that's what happened. I think it's really important that young

people today understand that the movement of the sixties was really a people's movement. The media and history seem to record it as Martin Luther King's movement, but young people should realize that it was people just like them, their age, that formulated goals and strategies, and actually developed the movement. When they look around now, and see things that need to be changed, they should say: "What can I do? What can my roommate and I do to effect that change?"

*** CORE was established in 1941 by an interracial group that drew its inspiration from the philosophy of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi as well as religious traditions that espoused peaceful resolutions of social conflicts. They pioneered the application of Gandhi's tactics in America and inspired King to adopt them. The first interracial bus rides were carried out by CORE. In 1947, CORE placed black and white volunteers on buses in a "Journey of Reconciliation" to challenge local authorities in the South to uphold the recent Supreme Court decision to desegregate interstate bus travel.

**** The Ku Klux Klan (KKK) is a hate organization that seeks to assert the supremacy of Christian whites through symbolic displays, which include ceremonial garb of white gowns and hoods, church and cross burning, intimidation campaigns, and ritualized killings known as lynchings. Such antisemitic, anti-Catholic, and anti-black organizations originated in the middle of the nineteenth century when members of the former Confederacy established branches of the KKK to resist the emancipation of slaves. A revival of the KKK was sparked with the release of D. W. Griffin's racist silent film *Birth of a Nation* in 1915.

<http://www.facinghistory.org/sites/facinghistory.org>

<http://www.crmvet.org/docs/selmaf.htm>

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Lesson Plan: Day 4

Unit Name: Civil Rights Movement

School District: Andover

Date:

Class and Grade: 10th grade, 20th Century: United States and the World

State framework standard: USII.25 Analyze the origins, goals, and key events of the Civil Rights movement, and, USII.26 Describe the accomplishments of the civil rights movement.

Historical thinking standard: 5, Historical Issues-Analysis and Decision-Making, and 3, Historical Analysis and Interpretation.

Leadership: Consideration of Whites in position of leadership, often those who were opposed to civil rights and equality.

Enduring Understanding: The United States has long struggled with racism, and despite legal and social improvements, racism persists.

Essential questions: Why did many whites continue to oppose desegregation despite court decisions and other legal measures requiring the expansion of civil rights? What type of leadership did whites provide either for or against the Civil Rights Movement?

Development and selection of activities and resources:

1. Students will read selections written by whites during the period.(described in the Content section below).
2. Students will identify the issues brought up by the whites.
3. Students will create a similarities and differences chart or web encompassing the expressions and opinions from the readings.

Content: Documents to be considered are the following:

- Handout 4.1 (excerpts from) George Wallace speech on the Civil Rights Movement (entire speech attached)
- Handout 4.2 Letter from Jerry Tanton (Minister) to Governor Wallace
- Handout 4.3 Letter from Tuskegee Institute Young Democrats Club to Governor Wallace
- Handout 4.4 We Did It All
- Handout 4.5 Alabama Senate Resolution No. 28
- Handout 4.6 Northrop Space Lab letter to Gov. Wallace
- Handout 4.7 Letter from Carleton Lentz to Gov. Wallace
- Handout 4.8 Letter from Central Methodist Church to Gov. Wallace

Assignment: (see step 3 above)

George C. Wallace, "The Civil Rights Movement: Fraud, Sham, and Hoax"

(Speech given on July 4, 1964)

We come here today in deference to the memory of those stalwart patriots who on July 4, 1776, pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to establish and defend the proposition that governments are created by the people, empowered by the people, derive their just powers from the consent of the people, and must forever remain subservient to the will of the people.

Today, 188 years later, we celebrate that occasion and find inspiration and determination and courage to preserve and protect the great principles of freedom enunciated in the Declaration of Independence.

It is therefore a cruel irony that the President of the United States has only yesterday signed into law the most monstrous piece of legislation ever enacted by the United States Congress.

It is a fraud, a sham, and a hoax.

This bill will live in infamy. To sign it into law at any time is tragic. To do so upon the eve of the celebration of our independence insults the intelligence of the American people.

It dishonors the memory of countless thousands of our dead who offered up their very lives in defense of principles which this bill destroys.

Never before in the history of this nation have so many human and property rights been destroyed by a single enactment of the Congress. It is an act of tyranny. It is the assassin's knife stuck in the back of liberty.

With this assassin's knife and a blackjack in the hand of the Federal force-cult, the left-wing liberals will try to force us back into bondage. Bondage to a tyranny more brutal than that imposed by the British monarchy which claimed power to rule over the lives of our forefathers under sanction of the Divine Right of kings.

Today, this tyranny is imposed by the central government which claims the right to rule over our lives under sanction of the omnipotent black-robed despots who sit on the bench of the United States Supreme Court.

This bill is fraudulent in intent, in design, and in execution. It is misnamed. Each and every provision is mistitled. It was rammed through the congress on the wave of ballyhoo, promotions, and publicity stunts reminiscent of P. T. Barnum.

It was enacted in an atmosphere of pressure, intimidation, and even cowardice, as demonstrated by the refusal of the United States Senate to adopt an amendment to submit the bill to a vote of the people.

To illustrate the fraud--it is not a Civil Rights Bill. It is a Federal Penal Code. It creates Federal crimes which would take volumes to list and years to tabulate because it affects the lives of 192 million American citizens.

Every person in every walk and station of life and every aspect of our daily lives becomes subject to the criminal provisions of this bill.

It threatens our freedom of speech, of assembly, or association, and makes the exercise of these Freedoms a federal crime under certain conditions.

It affects our political rights, our right to trial by jury, our right to the full use and enjoyment of our private property, the freedom from search and seizure of our private property and possessions, the freedom from harassment by Federal police and, in short, all the rights of individuals inherent in a society of free men. Ministers, lawyers, teachers, newspapers, and every private citizen must guard his speech and watch his actions to avoid the deliberately imposed booby traps put into this bill. It is designed to make Federal crimes of our customs, beliefs, and traditions. Therefore, under the fantastic powers of the Federal judiciary to punish for contempt of court and under their fantastic powers to regulate our most intimate aspects of our lives by injunction, every American citizen is in jeopardy and must stand guard against these despots.

Yet there are those who call this a good bill.

It is people like Senator Hubert Humphrey and other members of Americans for Democratic Action. It is people like Ralph McGill and other left-wing radical apologists.

They called it a good bill before it was amended to restore the right to trial by jury in certain cases.

Yet a Federal judge may still try one without a jury under the provisions of this bill. It was the same persons who said it was a good bill before the amendment pretending to forbid busing of pupils from neighborhood schools. Yet a Federal judge may still order busing from one neighborhood school to another. They have done it, they will continue to do it. As a matter of fact, it is but another evidence of the deceitful intent of the sponsors of this bill for them to claim that it accomplished any such thing.

It was left-wing radicals who led the fight in the Senate for the so-called civil rights bill now about to enslave our nation.

We find Senator Hubert Humphrey telling the people of the United States that "non-violent" demonstrations would continue to serve a good purpose through a "long, busy and constructive summer."

Yet this same Senator told the people of this country that passage of this monstrous bill would ease tensions and stop demonstrations.

This is the same Senator who has suggested, now that the Civil Rights Bill is passed, that the President call the fifty state Governors together to work out ways and means to enforce this rotten measure.

There is no need for him to call on me. I am not about to be a party to anything having to do with the law that is going to destroy individual freedom and liberty in this country.

I am having nothing to do with enforcing a law that will destroy our free enterprise system.

I am having nothing to do with enforcing a law that will destroy neighborhood schools.

I am having nothing to do with enforcing a law that will destroy the rights of private property.

I am having nothing to do with enforcing a law that destroys your right--and my right--to choose my neighbors--or to sell my house to whomever I choose.

I am having nothing to do with enforcing a law that destroys the labor seniority system.

I am having nothing to do with this so-called civil rights bill. The liberal left-wingers have passed it. Now let

them employ some pinknik social engineers in Washington, D.C., To figure out what to do with it.

The situation reminds me of the little boy looking at the blacksmith as he hammered a red-hot horseshoe into the proper shape.

After minutes of hammering, the blacksmith took the horseshoe, splashed it into a tub of water and threw it steaming onto a sawdust pile.

The little fellow picked up the horseshoe, dropped it quickly. "What's the matter, son," the blacksmith said, "is that shoe too hot to handle?"

"No sir," the little boy said, "it just don't take me long to look at a horseshoe."

It's not going to take the people of this country long to look at the Civil Rights Bill, either.

And they are going to discard it just as quickly as the little boy tossed away the still hot horseshoe.

But I am not here to talk about the separate provisions of the Federal Penal Code. I am here to talk about principles which have been overthrown by the enactment of this bill. The principles that you and I hold dear.

The principles for which our forefathers fought and died to establish and to defend. The principles for which we came here to rededicate ourselves.

But before I get into that, let me point out one important fact. It would have been impossible for the American people to have been deceived by the sponsors of this bill had there been a responsible american press to tell the people exactly what the bill contained. If they had had the integrity and the guts to tell the truth, this bill would never have been enacted.

Whoever heard of truth put to the worst in free and open encounter? We couldn't get the truth to the American people. You and I know that that's extremely difficult to do where our newspapers are owned by out-of-state interests. Newspapers which are run and operated by left-wing liberals, Communist sympathizers, and members of the Americans for Democratic Action and other Communist front organizations with high sounding names. However, we will not be intimidated by the vultures of the liberal left-wing press. We will not be deceived by their lies and distortions of truth. We will not be swayed by their brutal attacks upon the character and reputation of any honest citizen who dares stand up and fight for liberty.

And, we are not going to be influenced by intellectually bankrupt editors of the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, one of whom has presided over the dissolution of the once great Atlanta Constitution.

We can understand his bitterness in his bleak failure, but we need not tolerate his vituperative and venomous attacks upon the integrity and character of our people. These editors, like many other left-wingers in the liberal press, are not influenced by tradition. Theirs is a tradition of scalawags. Their mealy-mouthed platitudes disgrace the honored memory of their predecessors--such men of character as Henry Grady, Joel Chandler Harris, and Clarke Howell, men who made the name of the Atlanta Constitution familiar in every household throughout the South. They are not worthy to shine the shoes of those great men.

In this connection I want to pay my highest respects and compliments to the dedicated men of Atlanta and of

Georgia who gave to the people of their state what is destined to become the true voice of the south. I have reference to the great newspaper the Atlanta Times.

It is a sad commentary on the period in which we live that it is necessary for the people of a great city to start their own newspaper in order to get the truth.

I hope you have some success in this venture and I assure you that there will be many subscribers in the State of Alabama including myself.

As I have said before, that Federal Penal Code could never have been enacted into law if we had had a responsible press who was willing to tell the American people the truth about what it actually provides. Nor would we have had a bill had it not been for the United States Supreme Court.

Now on the subject of the court let me make it clear that I am not attacking any member of the United States Supreme Court as an individual. However, I do attack their decisions, I question their intelligence, their common sense and their judgment, I consider the Federal Judiciary system to be the greatest single threat to individual freedom and liberty in the United States today, and I'm going to take off the gloves in talking about these people.

There is only one word to describe the Federal judiciary today. That word is "lousy."

They assert more power than claimed by King George III, more power than Hitler, Mussolini, or Khrushchev ever had. They assert the power to declare unconstitutional our very thoughts. To create for us a system of moral and ethical values. To outlaw and declare unconstitutional, illegal, and immoral the customs, traditions, and beliefs of the people, and furthermore they assert the authority to enforce their decrees in all these subjects upon the American people without their consent.

This is a matter that has been of great concern to many legal authorities. The Council of State Governments composed of representatives of the fifty States sponsored the proposal just last year seeking to curb the powers of this body of judicial tyrants. The Conference of Chief Justices of all of the state Supreme Courts of this nation has also issued an historic statement urging judicial restraint upon the Court.

This latter group said, "the value of a firm statement by us lies in the fact that we speak as members of all the state appellate courts with a background of many years experience in the determination of thousands of cases of all kinds. Surely there are those who will respect the declaration of what we believe.

"It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast."

In addition, the state legislatures have for years flooded the Congress with resolutions condemning usurpations of power by the Federal judiciary.

The court today, just as in 1776, is deaf to the voices of the people and their repeated entreaties: they have become arrogant, contemptuous, highhanded, and literal despots.

It has been said that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. There was never greater evidence as to the proof of this statement than in the example of the present Federal Judiciary.

I want to touch upon just a few of the acts of tyranny which have been sanctioned by the United States Supreme Court and compare these acts with the acts of tyranny enumerated in the Declaration of Independence.

The colonists objected most strenuously to the imposition of taxes upon the people without their consent.

Today, the Federal judiciary asserts the same tyrannical power to levy taxes in Prince Edward County, Virginia, and without the consent of the people. Not only that, but they insist upon the power to tell the people for what purposes their money must be spent.

The colonists stated, "he has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only."

Today, the Federal judiciary, in one of its most recent decisions, has deprived the American people of the right to use the unit system of representation in their own state governments for the accommodation of large districts of people, and has itself prescribed the manner in which the people shall structure the legislative branch of their own government, and have prescribed how the people shall allocate the legislative powers of state government. More than that they have even told the American people that we may not, with a majority of the people voting for the measure, or with two-thirds of those voting, or even if by unanimous consent, adopt a provision in our state constitutions to allocate the legislative power of state government in any manner other than as prescribed by the court.

One justice of the United States Supreme Court said in this connection, and I quote, "to put the matter plainly, there is nothing in all the history of this Court's decisions which supports this Constitutional rule. The Court's draconian pronouncement which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the fifty states finds no support in the words of the constitution in any prior decision of this court or in the 175-year political history of our Federal union . . . These decisions mark a long step backward into the unhappy era where a majority of the members of this court were thought by many to have convinced themselves and each other that the demands of the constitution were to be measured not by what it says but by their own notions of wise political theory."

Two other Justices of the Court said, "such a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel Judicial power demands analysis of the role of this Court and our Constitutional scheme. . . It may well impair the Court's position as the ultimate organ of the Supreme Law of the Land. . ."

The only reason it is the Supreme Law of the Land today is because we have a President who cares so little for freedom that he would send the armed forces into the states to enforce the dictatorial decree.

Our colonist forefather had something to say about that too.

The Declaration of Independence cited as an act of tyranny the fact that, ". . . Kept among us in times of peace standing armies without the consent of the legislature."

Today, 188 years later, we have actually witnessed the invasion of the State of Arkansas, Mississippi, and Alabama by the armed forces of the United States and maintained in the state against the will of the people and without consent of state legislatures.

It is a form of tyranny worse than that of King George III who had sent mercenaries against the colonies because today the Federal Judicial tyrants have sanctioned the use of brother against brother and father against son by federalizing the National Guard.

In 1776 the colonists also complained that the monarch ". . . Has incited domestic insurrections among us. . . ." Today, we have absolute proof that the Federal Department of Justice has planned, supervised, financed and protected acts of insurrection in the southern states, resulting in vandalism, property damage, personal injury, and staggering expense to the states.

In 1776 it was charged that the monarchy had asserted power to ". . . Dissolve representative houses and to punish . . . For opposing with manly firmness his invasions of the rights of the people. . . ."

Today, the Federal judiciary asserts the power not only to dissolve state legislatures but to create them and to dissolve all state laws and state judicial decrees, and to punish a state governor by trial without jury ". . . For opposing with manly firmness his invasions of the rights of the people. . . ."

The colonists also listed as acts of tyranny: ". . . The erection of a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and to eat out their substance. . . ."

". . . Suspending our own legislatures and declaring themselves invested with the power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever;"

". . . Abolishing the free system of the English laws. . . ." □--it had "abdicated government here;" □--refusing to assent to the laws enacted by the people, ". . .

Laws considered most wholesome and necessary for the public good;"□--and ". . . For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury . . . ; For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally form of our government; for suspending our own legislatures and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever."

The United States Supreme Court is guilty of each and every one of these acts of tyranny.

Therefore, I echo the sentiments of our forefathers who declared: "a prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people"

Ladies and gentlemen, I have listed only a few of the many acts of tyranny which have been committed or specifically sanctioned by the United States Supreme Court.

I feel it important that you should know and understand what it is that these people are trying to do. The written opinions of the court are filled with double talk, semantics, jargon, and meaningless phrases. The words they use are not important. The ideas that they represent are the things which count.

It is perfectly obvious from the left-wing liberal press and from the left-wing law journals that what the court is

saying behind all the jargon is that they don't like our form of government.

They think they can establish a better one. In order to do so it is necessary that they overthrow our existing form, destroy the democratic institutions created by the people, change the outlook, religion, and philosophy, and bring the whole area of human thought, aspiration, action and organization, under the absolute control of the court. Their decisions reveal this to be the goal of the liberal element on the court which is in a majority at present.

It has reached the point where one may no longer look to judicial decisions to determine what the court may do. However, it is possible to predict with accuracy the nature of the opinions to be rendered. One may find the answer in the Communist Manifesto.

The Communists are dedicated to the overthrow of our form of government. They are dedicated to the destruction of the concept of private property. They are dedicated to the object of destroying religion as the basis of moral and ethical values.

The Communists are determined that all natural resources shall be controlled by the central government, that all productive capacity of the nation shall be under the control of the central government, that the political sovereignty of the people shall be destroyed as an incident to control of local schools. It is their objective to capture the minds of our youth in order to indoctrinate them in what to think and not how to think.

I do not call the members of the United States Supreme Court Communists. But I do say, and I submit for your judgment the fact that every single decision of the court in the past ten years which related in any way to each of these objectives has been decided against freedom and in favor of tyranny.

A politician must stand on his record. Let the Court stand on its record.

The record reveals, for the past number of years, that the chief, if not the only beneficiaries of the present Court's rulings, have been duly and lawfully convicted criminals, Communists, atheists, and clients of vociferous left-wing minority groups.

You can't convict a Communist in our Federal court system. Neither can you convict one of being a Communist in Russia, China, or Cuba. The point is that the United States Supreme Court refuses to recognize the Communist conspiracy and their intent to "bury us."

Let us look at the record further with respect to the court's contribution to the destruction of the concept of God and the abolition of religion.

The Federal court rules that your children shall not be permitted to read the bible in our public school systems. Let me tell you this, though. We still read the bible in Alabama schools and as long as I am governor we will continue to read the bible no matter what the Supreme Court says.

Federal courts will not convict a "demonstrator" invading and destroying private property. But the Federal courts rule you cannot say a simple "God is great, God is good, we thank Thee for our food," in kindergartens supported by public funds.

Now, let us examine the manner in which the Court has continuously chipped away at the concept of private property.

It is contended by the left-wing liberals that private property is merely a legal fiction. That one has no inherent right to own and possess property. The courts have restricted and limited the right of acquisition of property in life and have decreed its disposition in death and have ruthlessly set aside the wills of the dead in order to attain social ends decreed by the court. The court has substituted its judgment for that of the testator based on social theory.

The courts assert authority even in decree the use of private cemeteries.

They assert the right to convert a private place of business into a public place of business without the consent of the owner and without compensation to him.

One justice asserts that the mere licensing of a business by the state is sufficient to convert it into control by the Federal judiciary as to its use and disposition.

Another asserts that the guarantees of equal protection and due process of law cannot be extended to a corporation.

In one instance, following the edicts of the United States Supreme Court, a state Supreme Court has ordered and directed a private citizen to sell his home to an individual contrary to the wishes of the owner.

In California we witnessed a state Supreme Court taking under advisement the question as to whether or not it will compel a bank to make a loan to an applicant on the basis of his race.

We have witnessed the sanction by the courts of confiscatory taxation.

Let us take a look at the attitude of the court with respect to the control of the private resources of the nation and the allocation of the productive capacity of the nation.

The Supreme Court decisions have sanctioned enactment of the civil rights bill.

What this bill actually does is to empower the United States government to reallocate the entire productive capacity of the agricultural economy covered by quotas and acreage allotments of various types on the basis of race, creed, color and national origin.

It, in effect, places in the hands of the Federal government the right of a farmer to earn a living, making that right dependent upon the consent of the Federal government precisely as is the case in Russia.

The power is there. I am not in the least impressed by the protestations that the government will use this power with benevolent discretion.

We know that this bill authorizes the President of the United States to allocate all defense productive capacity of this country on the basis of race, creed, or color.

It does not matter in the least that he will make such allocations with restraint. The fact is that it is possible with a politically dominated agency to punish and to bankrupt and destroy any business that deals with the Federal government if it does not bow to the wishes and demands of the president of the United States.

All of us know what the court has done to capture the minds of our children.

The Federal judiciary has asserted the authority to prescribe regulations with respect to the management, operation, and control of our local schools. The second brown decision in the infamous school segregation case authorized Federal district courts to supervise such matters as teacher hiring, firing, promotion, the expenditure of local funds, both administratively and for capital improvements, additions, and renovations, the location of new schools, the drawing of school boundaries, busing and transportation of school children, and, believe it or not, it has asserted the right in the Federal judiciary to pass judgment upon the curricula adopted in local public schools.

A comparatively recent Federal court decision in a Florida case actually entered an order embracing each and every one of these assertions of Federal supervision.

In ruling after ruling, the Supreme Court has overstepped its constitutional authority. While appearing to protect the people's interest, it has in reality become a judicial tyrant.

It's the old pattern. The people always have some champion whom they set over them . . . And nurse into greatness. This, and no other, is the foot from which a tyrant springs, after first appearing as a protector.

This is another way of saying that the people never give up their liberties . . . And their freedom . . . But under some delusion. But yet there is hope.

There is yet a spirit of resistance in this country which will not be oppressed. And it is awakening. And I am sure there is an abundance of good sense in this country which cannot be deceived.

I have personal knowledge of this. Thirty-four percent of the Wisconsin Democrats supported the beliefs you and I uphold and expound.

Thirty percent of the Democrats in Indiana join us in fighting this grab for executive power by those now in control in Washington.

And, listen to this, forty-three percent of the Democrats in Maryland, practically in view of the nation's capital, believe as you and I believe.

So, let me say to you today. Take heart. Millions of Americans believe just as we in this great region of the United States believe.

I shall never forget last spring as I stood in the midst of a great throng of South Milwaukee supporters at one of the greatest political rallies I have ever witnessed.

A fine-looking man grabbed my hand and said:

"Governor, I've never been south of South Milwaukee, but I am a Southerner!" Of course, he was saying he believed in the principles and philosophy of the southern people . . . Of you here today and the people of my state of Alabama.

He was right.

Being a southerner is no longer geographic. It's a philosophy and an attitude.

One destined to be a national philosophy--embraced by millions of Americans--which shall assume the mantle of leadership and steady a governmental structure in these days of crises.

Certainly I am a candidate for President of the United States.

If the left-wingers do not think I am serious--let them consider this.

I am going to take our fight to the people--the court of public opinion--where truth and common sense will eventually prevail.

At this time, I have definite, concrete plans to get presidential electors pledged to me on the ballots in the following states: Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, New York, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, Kentucky, Arkansas, Tennessee, and of course Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana. Other states are under serious consideration.

A candidate for President must receive 270 electoral votes to win.

The states I am definitely going to enter represent 218 electoral votes.

Conservatives of this nation constitute the balance of power in presidential elections.

I am a conservative.

I intend to give the American people a clear choice. I welcome a fight between our philosophy and the liberal left-wing dogma which now threatens to engulf every man, woman, and child in the United States.

I am in this race because I believe the American people have been pushed around long enough and that they, like you and I, are fed up with the continuing trend toward a socialist state which now subjects the individual to the dictates of an all-powerful central government.

I am running for President because I was born free. I want to remain free. I want your children and mine and our prosperity to be unencumbered by the manipulations of a soulless state.

I intend to fight for a positive, affirmative program to restore constitutional government and to stop the senseless bloodletting now being performed on the body of liberty by those who lead us willingly and dangerously close to a totalitarian central government.

In our nation, man has always been sovereign and the state has been his servant. This philosophy has made the United States the greatest free nation in history.

This freedom was not a gift. It was won by work, by sweat, by tears, by war, by whatever it took to be--and to remain free.

Are we today less resolute, less determined and courageous than our fathers and our grandfathers?

Are we to abandon this priceless heritage that has carried us to our present position of achievement and leadership?

I say if we are to abandon our heritage, let it be done in the open and full knowledge of what we do.

We are not unmindful and careless of our future. We will not stand aside while our conscientious convictions tell us that a dictatorial Supreme Court has taken away our rights and our liberties.

We will not stand idly by while the Supreme Court continues to invade the prerogatives left rightfully to the states by the constitution.

We must not be misled by left-wing incompetent news media that day after day feed us a diet of fantasy telling us we are bigots, racists and hate-mongers to oppose the destruction of the constitution and our nation.

A left-wing monster has risen up in this nation. It has invaded the government. It has invaded the news media. It has invaded the leadership of many of our churches. It has invaded every phase and aspect of the life of freedom-loving people.

It consists of many and various and powerful interests, but it has combined into one massive drive and is held together by the cohesive power of the emotion, setting forth civil rights as supreme to all.

But, in reality, it is a drive to destroy the rights of private property, to destroy the freedom and liberty of you and me.

And, my friends, where there are no property rights, there are no human rights. Red China and Soviet Russia are prime examples.

Politically evil men have combined and arranged themselves against us. The good people of this nation must now associate themselves together, else we will fall one by one, an unpitied sacrifice in a struggle which threatens to engulf the entire nation.

We can win. We can control the election of the president in November.

Our object must be our country, our whole country and nothing but our country.

If we will stand together--the people of this state--the people of my state--the people throughout this great region--yes, throughout the United States--then we can be the balance of power. We can determine who will be the next president.

Georgia is a great state. Atlanta is a great city. I know you will demonstrate that greatness in november by joining alabama and other states throughout the south in electing the next president of the United States.

We are not going to change anything by sitting on our hands hoping that things will change for the better. Those who cherish individual freedom have a job to do.

First, let us let it be known that we intend to take the offensive and carry our fight for freedom across this nation. We will wield the power that is ours--the power of the people.

Let it be known that we will no longer tolerate the boot of tyranny. We will no longer hide our heads in the sand. We will reschool our thoughts in the lessons our forefathers knew so well.

We must destroy the power to dictate, to forbid, to require, to demand, to distribute, to edict, and to judge what is best and enforce that will of judgment upon free citizens.

We must revitalize a government founded in this nation on faith in God.

I ask that you join with me and that together, we give an active and courageous leadership to the millions of people throughout this nation who look with hope and faith to our fight to preserve our constitutional system of government with its guarantees of liberty and justice for all within the framework of our priceless freedoms.

http://www.wadsworth.com/politicalscience_d/special_features/ext/amgov/gov_foundations/sr_ideo2.html

Handout 4.2 (next page) Letter from Jerry Tanton (Minister) to Governor Wallace
Source: <http://www.archives.state.al.us/teacher/rights/lesson2/doc1.html>

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Handout 4.3 (next page) Letter from Tuskegee Institute Young Democrats Club to Governor Wallace
Source: <http://www.archives.state.al.us/teacher/rights/lesson2/doc4.html>

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

We Did It All

On a Sunday morning in September 1963, a bomb exploded in the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama. Four black girls, preparing for church, were killed: Denise McNair, Cynthia Wesley, Carole Robertson, and Addie Mae Collins. A few days after the bombing, Charles Morgan, Jr., a white lawyer, addressed the Young Men's Business Club, calling on his peers to think deeply about their responsibility for the bombing:

Four little girls were killed in Birmingham Sunday. A mad, remorseful, worried community asks, "Who did it? Who threw that bomb? Was it a Negro or a white?" The answer should be "We all did it." Every last one of us is condemned for that crime and the bombing before it and the ones last month, last year, a decade ago. We all did it. A short time later, white policemen kill a Negro and wound another. A few hours later two young men on a motor bike shoot and kill a Negro child. Fires break out and, in Montgomery, white youths assault Negroes. And all across Alabama, an angry guilty people cry out their mocking shouts of indignity and say they wonder, "Why?" "Who?" Everyone then "deplores" the "dastardly" act.

But, you know the "who" of "who did it?" is really rather simple. The "who" is every little individual who talks about the "niggers" and spreads the seeds of his hate to his neighbor and his son. The jokester, the crude oaf whose racial jokes rock the party with laughter. The "who" is every governor who ever shouted for lawlessness and became a law violator. It is every senator and every representative who in the halls of Congress stands and with mock humility tells the world that things back home aren't really like they are. It is courts that move ever so slowly and newspapers that timorously defend the law. It is all the Christians and all the ministers who spoke too late in anguished cries against violence. It is the coward in each of us who clucks admonitions. We are ten years of lawless preachments, ten years of criticism of law, of courts, of our fellow man, a decade of telling school children the opposite of what the civics books say. We are a mass of intolerance and bigotry and stand indicted before our young. We are cursed by the failure of each of us to accept responsibility, by our defense of an already dead institution.

Sunday, while Birmingham, which prides itself on the number of its churches, was attending worship service, a bomb went off and an all-white police force moved into action, a police force which has been praised by city officials and others at least once a day for a month or so. A police force which has solved no bombings. A police force which many Negroes feel is perpetrating the very evils we decry. And why would Negroes think this? There are no Negro policemen; there are no Negro sheriff's deputies. Few Negroes have served on juries. Few have been allowed to vote, few have been allowed to accept responsibility, or granted even a simple part to play in the administration of justice. Do not misunderstand me. It is not that I think that white policemen had anything whatsoever to do with the killing of these children or previous bombings. It's just that Negroes who see an all-white police force must think in terms of its failure to prevent or solve the bombings and think perhaps Negroes would have worked a little bit harder. They throw rocks and bottles and bullets. And we whites don't seem to know why the Negroes are so lawless. So, we lecture them[...]

Those four little Negro girls were human beings. They have lived their fourteen years in a leaderless city; a city where no one accepts responsibility; where everybody wants to blame somebody else. A city with a reward fund [for information on capturing the bombers] which grew like Topsy as a sort of sacrificial offering, a balm for the conscience of the "good people." The "good people" whose ready answer is for those "right-wing extremists" to shut up. People who absolve themselves of guilt. The liberal lawyer who told me this morning, "Me? I'm not guilty," then proceeded to discuss the guilt of the other lawyers, the ones who told the people that the Supreme Court did not properly interpret the law. And that's the way it is with the southern liberals. They condemn those with whom they disagree for speaking while they sigh in fearful silence.

Birmingham is a city in which the major industry, operated from Pittsburgh, never tried to solve the problem. It is a city where four little Negro girls can be born into a second-class school system, live a segregated life, ghettoed into their own little neighborhoods, restricted to Negro churches, destined to ride in Negro ambulances, to Negro wards of hospitals or to a Negro cemetery. Local papers, on their front and editorial pages, call for order and then exclude their names from obituary columns.

And who is really guilty? Each of us. Each citizen who has not consciously attempted to bring about

peaceful compliance with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, each citizen who has ever said, "They ought to kill that nigger," every citizen who votes for the candidate with the bloody flag; every citizen and every school-board member and school teacher and principal and businessman and judge and lawyer who has corrupted the minds of our youth; every person in this community who has in any way contributed during the past several years to the popularity of hatred, is at least as guilty, or more so, than the demented fool who threw that bomb.

What's it like living in Birmingham? No one ever really has and no one will until this city becomes part of the United States. Birmingham is not a dying city; it is dead.

<http://www.facinghistory.org/sites/facinghistory.org>

Handout 4.5 (next page) Alabama Senate Resolution No.28
Source: <http://www.archives.state.al.us/teacher/rights/lesson4/doc3.html>

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Handout 4.6 (next page) Northrop Space Lab letter to Gov. Wallace
Source: <http://www.archives.state.al.us/teacher/rights/lesson2/doc5.html>

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Letter from Carleton Lentz to Gov. Wallace

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

<http://www.archives.state.al.us/teacher/rights/lesson2/doc3.html>

Handout 4.8 (next page) Letter from Central Methodist Church to Gov. Wallace
Source: <http://www.archives.state.al.us/teacher/rights/lesson2/doc2.html>

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Lesson Plan: Day 5

Unit Name: Civil Rights Movement

School District: Andover

Date:

Class and Grade: 10th grade, 20th Century: United States and the World

State framework standard: USII.25 Analyze the origins, goals, and key events of the Civil Rights movement, and, USII.26 Describe the accomplishments of the civil rights movement.

Historical thinking standard: 1, Chronological Thinking, and 3, Historical Analysis and Interpretation, and 4, Historical Research Capabilities.

Leadership: (see #1 below)

Enduring Understanding: The United States has long struggled with racism, and despite legal and social improvements, racism persists.

Essential questions: How lasting were the gains of the Civil Rights Movement? What is the status of race relations today in the United States? What more needs to be done, if anything, to ensure civil rights and equality for all Americans? Does one group's privilege necessarily demand another group's disadvantage?

Development and selection of activities and resources:

1. Students in groups construct a Leadership Timeline of the Civil Rights Movement that also labels causes and effects of events associated with the leaders. All noted and selected leaders must be included.
2. Note that with all the struggles and achievements included on the students' timelines, many Americans would argue that we still have a ways to go to create an equal and just society.
3. Conduct an Agree/Disagree debates with some of the following resolutions: Privileged groups have earned their privileges; Privileges for some are always disadvantages for others; the U.S.A. has put all of its worst racism and bigotry behind it, i.e., we are an equal and just society; in the United States, prejudice, inequality, and injustice can never be fully eliminated.
4. Have students read excerpts from "White Privilege and Male Privilege" by Peggy McIntosh.
5. Discuss how McIntosh's argument affects their opinions expressed in the previous debates.

Content: Student summary of Civil Rights Movement. How group privilege affect civil rights.

Performance Task: Students should identify an instance or on-going practice of injustice or inequality in the United States. They should research the topic and construct a well-reasoned argument (essay) as to why and how this exemplifies injustice or inequality. They should then compare and contrast their topic with the Civil Rights Movement.

WHITE PRIVILEGE AND MALE PRIVILEGE: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences Through Work in Women's Studies (1988)

By Peggy McIntosh

Through work to bring materials and perspectives from Women's Studies into the rest of the curriculum, I have often noticed men's unwillingness to grant that they are over privileged in the curriculum, even though they may grant that women are disadvantaged. Denials that amount to taboos surround the subject of advantages that men gain from women's disadvantages. These denials protect male privilege from being fully recognized, acknowledged, lessened, or ended.

Thinking through unacknowledged male privilege as a phenomenon with a life of its own, I realized that since hierarchies in our society are interlocking, there was most likely a phenomenon of white privilege that was similarly denied and protected, but alive and real in its effects. As a white person, I realized I had been taught about racism as something that puts others at a disadvantage, but had been taught not to see one of its corollary aspects, white privilege, which puts me at an advantage.

I think whites are carefully taught not to recognize white privilege, as males are taught not to recognize male privilege. So I have begun in an untutored way to ask what it is like to have white privilege. This paper is a partial record of my personal observations and not a scholarly analysis. It is based on my daily experiences within my particular circumstances.

I have come to see white privilege as an invisible package of unearned assets that I can count on cashing in each day, but about which I was "meant" to remain oblivious. White privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, assurances, tools, maps, guides, codebooks, passports, visas, clothes, compass, emergency gear, and blank checks.

Since I have had trouble facing white privilege, and describing its results in my life, I saw parallels here with men's reluctance to acknowledge male privilege. Only rarely will a man go beyond acknowledging that women are disadvantaged to acknowledging that men have unearned advantage, or that unearned privilege has not been good for men's development as human beings, or for society's development, or that privilege systems might ever be challenged and changed.

I will review here several types or layers of denial that I see at work protecting, and preventing awareness about, entrenched male privilege. Then I will draw parallels, from my own experience, with the denials that veil the facts of white privilege. Finally, I will list forty-six ordinary and daily ways in which I experience having white privilege, by contrast with my African American colleagues in the same building. This list is not intended to be generalizable. Others can make their own lists from within their own life circumstances.

Writing this paper has been difficult, despite warm receptions for the talks on which it is based. For describing white privilege makes one newly accountable. As we in Women's Studies work reveal male privilege and ask men to give up some of their power, so one who writes about having white privilege must ask, "Having described it, what will I do to lessen or end it?"

The denial of men's over privileged state takes many forms in discussions of curriculum change work. Some claim that men must be central in the curriculum because they have done most of what is important or distinctive in life or in civilization. Some recognize sexism in the curriculum but deny that it makes male students seem unduly important in life. Others agree that certain individual thinkers are male oriented but deny that there is any systemic tendency in disciplinary frameworks or epistemology to over empower men as a group. Those men who do grant that male privilege takes institutionalized and embedded forms are still likely to deny that male hegemony has opened doors for them personally. Virtually all men deny that male over reward alone can explain men's centrality in all the inner sanctums of our most powerful institutions. Moreover, those few who will acknowledge that male privilege systems have over empowered them usually end up doubting that we could dismantle these privilege systems. They may say they will work to improve Women's status, in the society or in the university, but they can't or won't support the idea of lessening men's. In curricular terms, this is the point at which they say that they regret they cannot use any of the interesting new scholarship on women because the syllabus is full. When the talk turns to giving men less cultural room, even the most thoughtful and fair-minded of the men I know will tend to reflect, or fall back on, conservative assumptions about the inevitability of present gender relations and distributions of power, calling on precedent or sociobiology and psychobiology to demonstrate that male domination is natural and follows inevitably from evolutionary pressures. Others resort to arguments from "experience" or religion or social responsibility or wishing and dreaming.

After I realized, through faculty development work in Women's Studies, the extent to which men work from a base of unacknowledged privilege, I understood that much of their oppressiveness was unconscious. Then I remembered the frequent charges from women of color that white women whom they encounter are oppressive. I began to understand why we are justly seen as oppressive, even when we don't see ourselves that way. At the very least, obliviousness of one's privileged state can make a person or group irritating to be with. I began to count the ways in which I enjoy unearned skin privilege and have been conditioned into oblivion about its existence, unable to see that it put me "ahead" in any way, or put my people ahead, over-rewarding us and yet also paradoxically damaging us, or that it could or should be changed.

My schooling gave me no training in seeing myself as an oppressor, as an unfairly advantaged person, or as a participant in a damaged culture. I was taught to see myself as an individual whose moral state depended on her individual moral will. At school, we were not taught about slavery in any depth; we were not taught to see slaveholders as damaged people. Slaves were seen as the only group at risk of being dehumanized. My schooling followed the pattern which Elizabeth Minnich has pointed out: whites are taught to think of their lives as morally neutral, normative, and average, and also ideal, so that when we work to benefit others, this is seen as work that will allow "them" to be more like "us." I think many of us know how obnoxious this attitude can be in men.

After frustration with men who would not recognize male privilege, I decided to try to work on myself at least by identifying some of the daily effects of white privilege in my life. It is crude work, at this stage, but I will give here a list of special circumstances and conditions I experience that I did not earn but that I have been made to feel are mine by birth, by citizenship, and by virtue of being a conscientious law-abiding "normal" person

of goodwill. I have chosen those conditions that I think in my case attach somewhat more to skin-color privilege than to class, religion, ethnic status, or geographical location, though these other privileging factors are intricately intertwined. As far as I can see, my Afro-American co-workers, friends, and acquaintances with whom I come into daily or frequent contact in this particular time, place, and line of work cannot count on most of these conditions.

1. I can, if I wish, arrange to be in the company of people of my race most of the time.
2. I can avoid spending time with people whom I was trained to mistrust and who have learned to mistrust my kind or me.
3. If I should need to move, I can be pretty sure of renting or purchasing housing in an area which I can afford and in which I would want to live.
4. I can be reasonably sure that my neighbors in such a location will be neutral or pleasant to me.
5. I can go shopping alone most of the time, fairly well assured that I will not be followed or harassed by store detectives.
6. I can turn on the television or open to the front page of the paper and see people of my race widely and positively represented.
7. When I am told about our national heritage or about "civilization," I am shown that people of my color made it what it is.
8. I can be sure that my children will be given curricular materials that testify to the existence of their race.
9. If I want to, I can be pretty sure of finding a publisher for this piece on white privilege.
10. I can be fairly sure of having my voice heard in a group in which I am the only member of my race.
11. I can be casual about whether or not to listen to another woman's voice in a group in which she is the only member of her race.
12. I can go into a book shop and count on finding the writing of my race represented, into a supermarket and find the staple foods that fit with my cultural traditions, into a hairdresser's shop and find someone who can deal with my hair.
13. Whether I use checks, credit cards, or cash, I can count on my skin color not to work against the appearance that I am financially reliable.
14. I could arrange to protect our young children most of the time from people who might not like them.
15. I did not have to educate our children to be aware of systemic racism for their own daily physical protection.
16. I can be pretty sure that my children's teachers and employers will tolerate them if they fit school and workplace norms; my chief worries about them do not concern others' attitudes toward their race.
17. I can talk with my mouth full and not have people put this down to my color.
18. I can swear, or dress in secondhand clothes, or not answer letters, without having people attribute these choices to the bad morals, the poverty, or the illiteracy of my race.
19. I can speak in public to a powerful male group without putting my race on trial.
20. I can do well in a challenging situation without being called a credit to my race.
21. I am never asked to speak for all the people of my racial group.
22. I can remain oblivious to the language and customs of persons of color who constitute the world's majority without feeling in my culture any penalty for such oblivion.

- 23.** I can criticize our government and talk about how much I fear its policies and behavior without being seen as a cultural outsider.
- 24.** I can be reasonably sure that if I ask to talk to "the person in charge," I will be facing a person of my race.
- 25.** If a traffic cop pulls me over or if the IRS audits my tax return, I can be sure I haven't been singled out because of my race.
- 26.** I can easily buy posters, postcards, picture books, greeting cards, dolls, toys, and children's magazines featuring people of my race.
- 27.** I can go home from most meetings of organizations I belong to feeling somewhat tied in, rather than isolated, out of place, outnumbered, unheard, held at a distance, or feared.
- 28.** I can be pretty sure that an argument with a colleague of another race is more likely to jeopardize her chances for advancement than to jeopardize mine.
- 29.** I can be fairly sure that if I argue for the promotion of a person of another race, or a program centering on race, this is not likely to cost me heavily within my present setting, even if my colleagues disagree with me.
- 30.** If I declare there is a racial issue at hand, or there isn't a racial issue at hand, my race will lend me more credibility for either position than a person of color will have.
- 31.** I can choose to ignore developments in minority writing and minority activist programs, or disparage them, or learn from them, but in any case, I can find ways to be more or less protected from negative consequences of any of these choices.
- 32.** My culture gives me little fear about ignoring the perspectives and powers of people of other races.
- 33.** I am not made acutely aware that my shape, bearing, or body odor will be taken as a reflection on my race.
- 34.** I can worry about racism without being seen as self-interested or selfseeking.
- 35.** I can take a job with an affirmative action employer without having my co-workers on the job suspect that I got it because of my race.
- 36.** If my day, week, or year is going badly, I need not ask of each negative episode or situation whether it has racial overtones.
- 37.** I can be pretty sure of finding people who would be willing to talk with me and advise me about my next steps, professionally.
- 38.** I can think over many options, social, political, imaginative, or professional, without asking whether a person of my race would be accepted or allowed to do what I want to do.
- 39.** I can be late to a meeting without having the lateness reflect on my race.
- 40.** I can choose public accommodation without fearing that people of my race cannot get in or will be mistreated in the places I have chosen.
- 41.** I can be sure that if I need legal or medical help, my race will not work against me.
- 42.** I can arrange my activities so that I will never have to experience feelings of rejection owing to my race.
- 43.** If I have low credibility as a leader, I can be sure that my race is not the problem.
- 44.** I can easily find academic courses and institutions that give attention only to people of my race.
- 45.** I can expect figurative language and imagery in all of the arts to testify to experiences of my race.
- 46.** I can choose blemish cover or bandages in "flesh" color and have them more or less match my skin.

I repeatedly forgot each of the realizations on this list until I wrote it down. For me, white privilege has turned out to be an elusive and fugitive subject. The pressure to avoid it is great, for in facing it I must give up the myth of meritocracy. If these things are true, this is not such a free country; one's life is not what one makes it; many doors open for certain people through no virtues of their own. These perceptions mean also that my moral condition is not what I had been led to believe. The appearance of being a good citizen rather than a troublemaker comes in large part from having all sorts of doors open automatically because of my color.

A further paralysis of nerve comes from literary silence protecting privilege. My clearest memories of finding such analysis are in Lillian Smith's unparalleled *Killers of the Dream* and Margaret Andersen's review of Karen and Mamie Fields' *Lemon Swamp*. Smith, for example, wrote about walking toward black children on the street and knowing they would step into the gutter; Andersen contrasted the pleasure that she, as a white child, took on summer driving trips to the south with Karen Fields' memories of driving in a closed car stocked with all necessities lest, in stopping, her black family should suffer "insult, or worse." Adrienne Rich also recognizes and writes about daily experiences of privilege, but in my observation, white women's writing in this area is far more often on systemic racism than on our daily lives as light-skinned women.

In unpacking this invisible knapsack of white privilege, I have listed conditions of daily experience that I once took for granted, as neutral, normal, and universally available to everybody, just as I once thought of a male-focused curriculum as the neutral or accurate account that can speak for all. Nor did I think of any of these perquisites as bad for the holder. I now think that we need a more finely differentiated taxonomy of privilege, for some of these varieties are only what one would want for everyone in a just society, and others give license to be ignorant, oblivious, arrogant, and destructive. Before proposing some more finely tuned categorization, I will make some observations about the general effects of these conditions on my life and expectations.

In this potpourri of examples, some privileges make me feel at home in the world. Others allow me to escape penalties or dangers that others suffer. Through some, I escape fear, anxiety, insult, injury, or a sense of not being welcome, not being real. Some keep me from having to hide, to be in disguise, to feel sick or crazy, to negotiate each transaction from the position of being an outsider or, within my group, a person who is suspected of having too close links with a dominant culture. Most keep me from having to be angry.

I see a pattern running through the matrix of white privilege, a pattern of assumptions that were passed on to me as a white person. There was one main piece of cultural turf; it was my own turf, and I was among those who could control the turf. I could measure up to the cultural standards and take advantage of the many options I saw around me to make what the culture would call a success of my life. My skin color was an asset for any move I was educated to want to make. I could think of myself as "belonging" in major ways and of making social systems work for me. I could freely disparage, fear, neglect, or be oblivious to anything outside of the dominant cultural forms. Being of the main culture, I could also criticize it fairly freely. My life was reflected back to me frequently enough so that I felt, with regard to my race, if not to my sex, like one of the real people.

Whether through the curriculum or in the newspaper, the television, the economic system, or the general look of people in the streets, I received daily signals and indications that my people counted and that others either didn't exist or must be trying, not very successfully, to be like people of my race. I was given cultural permission not to hear voices of people of other races or a tepid cultural tolerance for hearing or acting on such voices. I was also raised not to suffer seriously from anything that darker-skinned people might say about my group, "protected," though perhaps I should more accurately say prohibited, through the habits of my economic class and social group, from living in racially mixed groups or being reflective about interactions between people of differing races.

In proportion as my racial group was being made confident, comfortable, and oblivious, other groups were likely being made unconfident, uncomfortable, and alienated. Whiteness protected me from many kinds of hostility, distress, and violence, which I was being subtly trained to visit in turn upon people of color.

For this reason, the word "privilege" now seems to me misleading. Its connotations are too positive to fit the conditions and behaviors which "privilege systems" produce. We usually think of privilege as being a favored state, whether earned, or conferred by birth or luck. School graduates are reminded they are privileged and urged to use their (enviable) assets well. The word "privilege" carries the connotation of being something everyone must want. Yet some of the conditions I have described here work to systemically over-empower certain groups. Such privilege simply confers dominance, gives permission to control, because of one's race or sex. The kind of privilege that gives license to some people to be, at best, thoughtless and, at worst, murderous should not continue to be referred to as a desirable attribute. Such "privilege" may be widely desired without being in any way beneficial to the whole society.

Moreover, though "privilege" may confer power, it does not confer moral strength. Those who do not depend on conferred dominance have traits and qualities that may never develop in those who do. Just as Women's Studies courses indicate that women survive their political circumstances to lead lives that hold the human race together, so "underprivileged" people of color who are the world's majority have survived their oppression and lived survivors' lives from which the white global minority can and must learn. In some groups, those dominated have actually become strong through not having all of these unearned advantages, and this gives them a great deal to teach the others. Members of so-called privileged groups can seem foolish, ridiculous, infantile, or dangerous by contrast.

I want, then, to distinguish between earned strength and unearned power conferred systemically. Power from unearned privilege can look like strength when it is, in fact, permission to escape or to dominate. But not all of the privileges on my list are inevitably damaging. Some, like the expectation that neighbors will be decent to you, or that your race will not count against you in court, should be the norm in a just society and should be considered as the entitlement of everyone. Others, like the privilege not to listen to less powerful people, distort the humanity of the holders as well as the ignored groups. Still others, like finding one's staple foods everywhere, may be a function of being a member of a numerical majority in the population. Others have to do with not having to labor under pervasive negative stereotyping and mythology.

We might at least start by distinguishing between positive advantages that we can work to spread, to the point where they are not advantages at all but simply part of the normal civic and social fabric, and negative types of advantage that unless rejected will always reinforce our present hierarchies. For example, the positive "privilege" of belonging, the feeling that one belongs within the human circle, as Native Americans say, fosters development and should not be seen as privilege for a few. It is, let us say, an entitlement that none of us should have to earn; ideally it is an unearned entitlement. At present, since only a few have it, it is an unearned advantage for them. The negative "privilege" that gave me cultural permission not to take darker-skinned Others seriously can be seen as arbitrarily conferred dominance and should not be desirable for anyone. This paper results from a process of coming to see that some of the power that I originally saw as attendant on being a human being in the United States consisted in unearned advantage and conferred dominance, as well as other kinds of special circumstance not universally taken for granted.

In writing this paper I have also realized that white identity and status (as well as class identity and status) give me considerable power to choose whether to broach this subject and its trouble. I can pretty well decide whether to disappear and avoid and not listen and escape the dislike I may engender in other people through this essay, or interrupt, answer, interpret, preach, correct, criticize, and control to some extent what goes on in reaction to it. Being white, I am given considerable power to escape many kinds of danger or penalty as well as to choose which risks I want to take.

There is an analogy here, once again, with Women's Studies. Our male colleagues do not have a great deal to lose in supporting Women's Studies, but they do not have a great deal to lose if they oppose it either. They simply have the power to decide whether to commit themselves to more equitable distributions of power. They will probably feel few penalties whatever choice they make; they do not seem, in any obvious short-term sense, the ones at risk, though they and we are all at risk because of the behaviors that have been rewarded in them.

Through Women's Studies work I have met very few men who are truly distressed about systemic, unearned male advantage and conferred dominance. And so one question for me and others like me is whether we will be like them, or whether we will get truly distressed, even outraged, about unearned race advantage and conferred dominance and if so, what we will do to lessen them. In any case, we need to do more work in identifying how they actually affect our daily lives. We need more down-to-earth writing by people about these taboo subjects. We need more understanding of the ways in which white "privilege" damages white people, for these are not the same ways in which it damages the victimized. Skewed white psyches are an inseparable part of the picture, though I do not want to confuse the kinds of damage done to the holders of special assets and to those who suffer the deficits. Many, perhaps most, of our white students in the United States think that racism doesn't affect them because they are not people of color; they do not see "whiteness" as a racial identity. Many men likewise think that Women's Studies does not bear on their own existences because they are not female; they do not see themselves as having gendered identities: Insisting on the universal "effects" of "privilege" systems, then, becomes one of our chief tasks, and being more explicit about the particular effects in particular contexts is another. Men need to join us in this work.

In addition, since race and sex are not the only advantaging systems at work, we need to similarly examine the daily experience of having age advantage, or ethnic advantage, or physical ability, or advantage related to nationality, religion, or sexual orientation. Professor Marnie Evans suggested to me that in many ways the list I made also applies directly to heterosexual privilege. This is a still more taboo subject than race privilege: the daily ways in which heterosexual privilege makes some persons comfortable or powerful, providing supports, assets, approvals, and rewards to those who live or expect to live in heterosexual pairs. Unpacking that content is still more difficult, owing to the deeper imbeddedness of heterosexual advantage and dominance and stricter taboos surrounding these.

But to start such an analysis I would put this observation from my own experience: the fact that I live under the same roof with a man triggers all kinds of societal assumptions about my worth, politics, life, and values and triggers a host of unearned advantages and powers. After recasting many elements from the original list I would add further observations like these:

1. My children do not have to answer questions about why I live with my partner (my husband).
2. I have no difficulty finding neighborhoods where people approve of our household.
3. Our children are given texts and classes that implicitly support our kind of family unit and do not turn them against my choice of domestic partnership.
4. I can travel alone or with my husband without expecting embarrassment or hostility in those who deal with us.
5. Most people I meet will see my marital arrangements as an asset to my life or as a favorable comment on my likeability, my competence, or my mental health.
6. I can talk about the social events of a weekend without fearing most listeners' reactions.
7. I will feel welcomed and "normal" in the usual walks of public life, institutional and social.
8. In many contexts, I am seen as "all right" in daily work on women because I do not live chiefly with women.

Difficulties and dangers surrounding the task of finding parallels are many. Since racism, sexism, and heterosexism are not the same, the advantages associated with them should not be seen as the same. In addition, it is hard to isolate aspects of unearned advantage that derive chiefly from social class, economic class, race, religion, region, sex, or ethnic identity. The oppressions are both distinct and interlocking, as the Combahee River Collective statement of 1977 continues to remind us eloquently.

One factor seems clear about all of the interlocking oppressions. They take both active forms that we can see and embedded forms that members of the dominant group are taught not to see. In my class and place, I did not see myself as racist-, because I was taught to recognize racism only in individual acts of meanness by members of my group, never in invisible systems conferring racial dominance on my group from birth. Likewise, we are taught to think that sexism or heterosexism is carried on only through intentional, individual acts of discrimination, meanness, or cruelty, rather than in invisible systems conferring unsought dominance on certain groups. Disapproving of the systems won't be enough to change them. I was taught to think that racism could end if white individuals changed their attitudes; many men think sexism can be ended by

individual changes in daily behavior toward women. But a man's sex provides advantage for him whether or not he approves of the way in which dominance has been conferred on his group. A "white" skin in the United States opens many doors for whites whether or not we approve of the way dominance has been conferred on us. Individual acts can palliate, but cannot end, these problems. To redesign social systems, we need first to acknowledge their colossal unseen dimensions. The silences and denials surrounding privilege are the key political tool here. They keep the thinking about equality or equity incomplete, protecting unearned advantage and conferred dominance by making these taboo subjects. Most talk by whites about equal opportunity seems to me now to be about equal opportunity to try to get into a position of dominance while denying that *systems* of dominance exist.

Obliviousness about white advantage, like obliviousness about male advantage, is kept strongly inculturated in the United States so as to maintain the myth of meritocracy, the myth that democratic choice is equally available to all. Keeping most people unaware that freedom of confident action is there for just a small number of people props up those in power and serves to keep power in the hands of the same groups that have most of it already. Though systemic change takes many decades, there are pressing questions for me and I imagine for some others like me if we raise our daily consciousness on the perquisites of being light-skinned. What will we do with such knowledge? As we know from watching men, it is an open question whether we will choose to use unearned advantage to weaken invisible privilege systems and whether we will use any of our arbitrarily awarded power to try to reconstruct power systems on a broader base.