



7-20-1956

Draft of Speech Regarding Civil Rights Bill, US House Resolution 627, July 20, 1956

Usher L. Burdick

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/burdick-papers>

Recommended Citation

Burdick, Usher L., "Draft of Speech Regarding Civil Rights Bill, US House Resolution 627, July 20, 1956" (1956). *Usher Burdick Papers*. 548.

<https://commons.und.edu/burdick-papers/548>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Elwyn B. Robinson Department of Special Collections at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Usher Burdick Papers by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

Cong. Record
7/20/56

The Civil Rights bill H. R. ~~XXXXX~~ ⁶²⁷ is being debated. It was before the Judiciary Committee for over a year and was finally passed out by the committee, but the bill passed out bears little resemblance to the original bill. The original bill as a basis for the bill relied upon the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, and the Charter of the United Nations. I was then and am now perfectly away ^{at} that the Constitution of the United States is foundation enough for any right enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, hence I objected to basing civil rights on the Charter of the United Nations, and that feature was stricken out.

We have the foundation for the bill in the Constitution of the United States and it has always been there since the adoption of the 14th amendment ^{to} of the Constitution. ^{the} Supreme Court has decided that minority groups and all groups ^{black}, as well as white, have the same equal protection. In other words we have all the law that is necessary ^{to} safeguard these rights. What remains to be done is to enforce the decision of the Supreme Court. That question is up to the executive department and the duty of enforcement rests with the attorney-General of the United States. The Supreme Court in ^{its} their opinion was very careful to say that there was no intention to rush in pell-mell and make the South accept the decision by force of arms. Evidently the court ^{realized} realized that could not be done for public opinion in the south that had prevailed since Colonial Days could not be wiped out over-night. Time will cure all things, and in time the South itself, will gradually support the negro in his desire and demand for complete equality before the law. ^{There} There is a vast difference between equality before the law and social equality. We have never had social equality in this country and never will. The people reserve the right to fraternize with people of their choice, and no law will force them to do otherwise. The Washington Social Register here in Washington selects its own company. I do not belong to it and don't want to but if I did want to and the membership said no, I never could become a member. In that event would I ever think of going to court to enforce social equality?

The North should be a little patient and not precipitate a movement that will set the colored race back in their marvellous development. If the North now thinks the colored race ~~isnt~~ is being discriminated against, the Merchants of the North should have thought of that when their ships were engaged in a ~~lucrative~~ lucrative slave trade transporting human beings to be sold in the South as slaves.

The bill before us does not settle the matter. It adds another law while the Decision of the Supreme Court is law enough. We can add a hundred laws

to further enforcement, but that will not accomplish the end desired. Nothing will change it except public opinion in the South itself. This decision of the court stands ~~as the~~ as the 18th amendment stood. That amendment was the law I was one of the United States Attorneys selected to enforce that law. The juries and the judges did not believe in the law, the community at large didn't believe in the law and enforcement became impossible. Gradually disrespect for all ~~the~~ ^{LAW} was being evidenced on every hand and finally the 18th amendment was repealed.

Here we have before us the Supreme Court Decision upholding equal rights to all citizens without distinction. No other law is needed or will enforce the Opinion of the Supreme Court. You can pass laws until Doomsday, but that will not prevent what the Supreme Court has banned. More acts of Congress will do ~~it~~ ^{NOT} it. There are, in my judgment only two ways to enforce ~~the~~ ^{FORCE} the opinion rendered in the Supreme Court and that is first, a change of public Opinion in the South brought about ^{WILL} by the South itself, or enforce it by ~~physical~~ ^{PHYSICAL} force, which means another contest such as we had almost a century ago.

I think this act is a futile effort if not a purely political one, but the Attorney General wants it and says that, through it, he can enforce the opinion of the Supreme Court. The administration leaders want it, and hence my attitude is to give ~~it~~ ^{THEM THE} law, not wishing to put my judgment up against the opinion of the Administration, but at the same time believing that this law will not accomplish what is claimed for it.