

A SYMPOSIUM

INTEGRATION, PRUDENCE, AND PRINCIPLE

THREE PEOPLE WELL ACQUAINTED with the Southern States discuss in the following pages the larger issues reflected in the present controversy over "integration" of schools for white and colored students in the South.

For two of the participants, this is their first appearance in a critical quarterly of ideas. Captain Court, a Virginian, is a naval officer, much read in history. Mrs. Benagh, a Nashville housewife, writes poetry occasionally. The editors of MODERN AGE hope to attract other intelligent contributions, from time to time, from people outside the Academy or the learned disciplines; we feel that intellectual endeavor and serious writing in America are tending to be too much confined to academic circles, narrowly defined.

Professor Stone, now chairman of the department of English at Ohio University, until recently was a member of the faculty of the University of North Carolina, and has much first-hand acquaintance with the Southern temper.

Integration in Historical Perspective

JOHN COURT

NATIONALLY, HERE IN THESE United States, we have retrogressed to the passions of the Tragic Era. In the controversy over "integration" in Southern schools, there have been sorry symptoms of contempt for the basic principles of free government, of

federal tolerance, and of a society founded upon Christian respect for the human person. Now the integration controversy is only one aspect of a general national affliction; but it is a sufficiently notorious example to warrant some analysis of its mean-

ing, in the light of historical knowledge. Therefore I digress here to touch upon certain parallel, though distant, historical events.

One of the great tragedies of ancient times was the subversion of the first important federal republic into autocratic empire. In the fifth century before Christ, the Confederacy of Delos, under Pericles, became integrated into an Athenian Empire, fatally arousing the jealous hostility of all Greece. The story of this tragedy was commonly taught in our secondary schools fifty years ago, but today our progressive educators disdain such classical studies.

To remind those who care to be reminded, the Confederacy of Delos was formed about 477 B.C. by the Ionian city states to defend themselves against the continental power of Persia. Together these states brought democratic government to its greatest prestige and inspired development of a highly cultured civilization throughout the Mediterranean. Athens, the greatest naval power of the time and chief commercial colonizer, became leader of the defense force and later seat of the central government. Pericles, leader of the popular party of Athens, dominated the government for almost thirty years. Towards the close of his administration, after it had led to the disastrous Peloponnesian War, he delivered on a solemn state occasion a famous oration, comparable to Lincoln's address at Gettysburg, exhorting his countrymen to ever greater sacrifices for their fatherland. In it he painted in classic outline the civilized community as we yet conceive it should be. Though Athenian democracy was comprised of slaveholders, and Athens ruled as vindictively as did Spain two thousand years later, her principles were admirable. Thucydides reports Pericles' words, in part, thus:

What was the training by which we reached our position; with what political institutions and by what manner of life did our empire become great?

Our form of government does not

emulate the institutions of our neighbors. We are a pattern which others follow rather than imitators ourselves. Our government is in the hands of the many, not of the few. This is why we call it a democracy. While as regards the law all men have equality for the settlement of their private disputes; as regards the value set on them, it is as each man is in any way distinguished that he is preferred to public honors, class considerations not being allowed to interfere with personal merits; nor, again, does poverty bar the way; if a man is able to serve the state, he is not hindered by the obscurity of his condition.

The freedom which we enjoy in our public life also extends to our every day life. There, far from exercising a jealous surveillance over each other in our daily lives, we do not feel resentment with our neighbor for doing what he likes.

But while we thus avoid giving offense in our private intercourse, we are restrained from lawlessness in our public life chiefly through reverent fear, for we render obedience to the magistrates and to the laws, particularly such laws as regard the protection of the oppressed, whether they are actually on the statute books or belong to that code which although unwritten cannot be broken without acknowledged disgrace.

These ideas set forth by Pericles, the great democrat, presented to posterity the aspirations of Athens in its day of glory. Yet not a century was to pass before the Athenian democracy had perished and the Attic Empire lay vanquished. Disaster ensued when Athens betrayed the trust of her confederated allies. Her insistence upon centralized autocracy destroyed the cement of faith and mutual respect amongst the confederacy's component communities.

We, citizens of these United States, twenty-four centuries after the glow of Athens, should note the circumstances which led to the rapid decline of the first federal republic from that summit of civilization.

It was through the continuous extravagant expansion of the enterprises of their central government that Pericles fatally sapped the vitality and distorted the perspective of his people. His noble words and ambitious strategy enveloped his compatriots in a suffocating delusion of grandeur as to the eminence and power of their state. To carry on the imperial illusion, Athenians diverted the common treasury of the League, from its original purpose of common defense, to a series of public festivals, public buildings and popular benefactions which betrayed the whole concept of their federalism.

Then Athens became too proud to bend in the compromises necessary to maintain the federal nature of the league of Ionian States. She pressed instead for the integration of her citizens and those of her allies in the steadily more hazardous schemes of the central government. After the reins had been firmly gathered in Athens by Pericles, the plague struck and the great statesman died. As lesser men took charge, their errors passed beyond recovery. Attic wisdom and perspective failed. When into the ruins of Athens four centuries later came the spiritual grace of Christianity, in the person of St. Paul, Athenians turned away in boredom. They had lost interest in freedom which entailed renunciation of their intellectual conceit. Elsewhere, founded on a sterner discipline, sturdier republics would be born, but civilizations would rise and fall before democracy and self-government could prevail in Athens again.

The fall of Athens was precipitated by her self-righteous pagan pride, summed up in Pericles' — "Our city as a whole is the school of Hellas." She had not heard the injunction of Christ, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things which are God's." Among Athenians, Caesar was all, Caesar in the person of their own collective sovereignty.

II

In 1775, Edmund Burke pleaded eloquently to Parliament to desist from com-

pulsion upon the American colonies. England did not heed him, but his words were memorable. One passage is peculiarly prophetic for modern America:

Who are you that you should fret and rage and bite the chains of nature? Nothing worse happens to you than happens to all nations who have extensive empire, and it happens in all the forms into which empire can be thrown. In larger bodies the circulation of power must be less vigorous at the extremities, Nature has said it. Despotism itself is obliged to truck and huckster. The Sultan gets such obedience as he can, he governs with a loose rein that he may govern at all and the whole force of his authority in his center is derived from a prudent relaxation in all his borders. This is the immutable condition, the eternal law of extensive and detached empire.

In May, 1946, a remarkable conference was held in London. The prime ministers of all the great dominions of the Empire met as peers to determine the political structure in which to carry on. Imperial England had colonized a world, had planted English common law and English tolerance wherever her sons had gained a foothold; now she bent with a new tide and accepted her partners on equal footing.

Jan Christian Smuts, old hero of the Boer War, held out strongly for the concept of a purely voluntary association. The great South African elder statesman launched a unique step forward in world history when he expressed the unity in his cohorts' minds thusly:

We are members of one family. Family relationships are strongest when they are not set down on paper. If it becomes necessary for the members of the family to call in lawyers to define their relationships and duties to each other, then one may be sure that the true relationship has already departed. We are stronger without formal agree-

ment. We must not try to define what is indefinable.

The Commonwealth today includes many more dark-skinned people than light-skinned ones. The British Empire has matured into a league of voluntary associates bound together by a common esteem for law and order, a respect for diversity and a common distrust of tyranny.

Britain learned the art of federalism from the loss of her American colonies. We ourselves must relearn it before our present hypocritical intolerance of any diversity within our member states arouses the hostile suspicion of all kindred nations. The last voluntary sovereign associate to join *our* Union, indeed the first and last to enter sovereign since the original thirteen, was Texas in 1845. The voluntary nature of that admission was nullified when the South was retaken by invasion and beaten to submission by the longest military occupation of a conquered nation in modern history—twelve long years the bayonet ruled the former Confederacy. Neither the Japanese in China nor the Russians in Austria equalled the record of the Black Republicans. Any modern who was horrified by the events in Hungary last year should read the unedifying story of the unconstitutional subjugation of the people of Maryland when they sought to secede in 1861. Ruthlessness is not a Bolshevik monopoly.

We have much to learn about voluntary associations. True, we have established an unusual experiment in Puerto Rico. Perhaps it can stand repeating, for there we accepted the self-proposed collaboration of a commonwealth of different language and different antecedents, as a separate but equal partner, free to go or to stay, to be different or to imitate. Possibly, had we the desire to try, we could interest others in a commonwealth relationship. But certainly we would first be obliged to demonstrate that we were sufficiently tolerant among ourselves to recognize the value, strength and dignity of separate societies, such as that of the French in Canada, the

Indian in Mexico, or the white people in our own South.

If we are going to spend tens of billions of dollars annually to defend the Free World, to maintain order, perhaps it would be wise to offer a continuing relationship to any interested allies. But it would have to be a much less compulsive arrangement than we presently offer our own states. Does it really matter if a minimum wage is different in Portugal from that in New York? Must the church be banned from the schools in Belgium as it is banned in New Jersey? Is it essential that boys and girls be educated together in Quebec as in Boston? Suppose somebody elsewhere does do things differently? Can we tolerate a lack of uniformity if they stand with us to revive the vigor of our Christian civilization? Do we really grow by the directives established in the catacombs of Washington? Have we sufficient intelligence to differentiate between the significant things held in common among the people of Christendom and the local prerogatives of our diverse communities?

III

Neither the term "integration" nor the concept it conjures up in the public mind today can be found in the text or the background of the Federal Constitution. Whatever the implication of integration may be in the works of social scientists, it is patently a radical departure from the explicit provisions of the contract between the states which established this federal union. The indisputable ninth and tenth amendments rule out Federal interference in social matters so clearly and emphatically that it is difficult indeed to comprehend how the whole judiciary can with clear conscience ignore them or pretend to misunderstand them. Read them again:

ARTICLE IX. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

ARTICLE X. The powers not dele-

gated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

This concept of federalism was born of necessary compromise between theoretical freedom and real security. Our founders precisely defined the limits of authority because their greatest fear, as in any nascent federation, was the evil of unlimited authority. What authority was surrendered by the States in 1789 was surrendered because of the present threat of foreign invasion and economic subservience. That which has been surrendered since has been spelled out in the formalized amendments of the basic compact.

The objectives of personal freedom and social equality, when examined dispassionately, are in the ultimate sense mutually incompatible. Since the beginning of time men have been unequal in talent, in strength, in wealth, in wit, in experience, in energy, in wisdom and so on, *ad infinitum*. Men are inherently equal one to another, only in the Christian or theological sense, as individual souls in the sight of Almighty God. On the other hand, men are inherently free to use their wills, minds, and bodies except as others restrain them. The more precisely a government attempts to enforce equality of mind or spirit the more energetically it must restrain freedom. It must balance out nature's inequalities by penalizing competent individuals and specially assisting the less competent. For the practical purposes of public safety men must accept compromises both of their freedom and of their equality.

The bounds of our freedom in society are spelled out primarily by our traditions. Equality before the bar of justice is not to be achieved by distorting the established traditions of a society. An encroachment on our traditions is an encroachment on the freedom of our society. Time and custom alone can properly erase solid tradition in a community founded on Christian premises.

The concept of achieving equality

through compulsory integration is of much broader significance than the race question or the school question. It is a flagrant denial of self-determination. It is part and parcel of the totalitarian line of thinking. It is fundamentally contrary to the voluntary principle of Christianity. It espouses the imperial instead of the republican form.

The Supreme Court in *Brown vs. Board of Education* placed a dangerously compulsive interpretation on an issue which ultimately can be resolved only on a voluntary basis. The Court's action is symbolic of the impatient and compulsive interpretation we tend to place on delicate issues in international affairs which ultimately can be resolved satisfactorily only on a voluntary basis. If we are to convince the West of our tolerance of diversity abroad a tolerance of diversity at home is essential.

IV

The Negro people in the United States possess a society of their own. It has already given convincing evidence of great vitality and adaptability. It is certainly premature to conclude it has no future other than forced absorption. It is understandable that one of their leading spokesmen, Richard Wright, rebellious though he is against the constraint of the colored community in this country, has encouraged in Ghana the complete rejection of English guidance or participation. Natural also is the attitude of the African in such matters. The primary grievance of Jomo Kenyatta, the Mau Mau leader in Kenya, is that the white man has broken up in Africa, as in America, the tribal life and destroyed the communal traditions of the native population. But most significant are the cogent words of the talented Zora Hurston, who wrote a Florida newspaper, in part, the following observations on integration here:

The whole matter revolves around the self-respect of my people. How much satisfaction can I get from a court order for somebody to associate with me who does not wish me near them? The Amer-

ican Indian has never been spoken of as a minority and chiefly because there is no whine in the Indian. Certainly he fought and valiantly for his lands, and rightfully so, but it is inconceivable of an Indian to seek forcible association with anyone. His well-known pride and self-respect would save him from that. I take the Indian position.

In the ruling on segregation, the unsuspecting nation might have witnessed a trial balloon. A relatively safe one, since it is sectional and on a matter not likely to arouse other sections of the nation to the support of the South. If it goes off fairly well, a precedent has been established. Government by fiat can replace the Constitution. You don't have to credit me with too much intelligence and penetration, just so you watch carefully and think.

These are mere straws in the wind, but they cannot be ignored. Society is not clay in the hand of a fleeting government. Burke called it "a contract between God and Man linking the lower with the higher natures, connecting the visible and invisible worlds according to a fixed compact sanctioned by the inviolable oath which holds all physical and all moral natures, each in their appointed place." Society is a natural order which governments were designed to serve and not to mold.

Africa and Asia will be areas of phenomenal economic and political progress in the next century. Judging from the Bandung conference, the American Negro can be accepted there as a leader, a counsellor, and a guide long after the white man is *persona non grata*. Has the talented Negro no interest in an education slanted toward the development of his own culture in the Christian Commonwealth? Is it any more improper to permit him to develop his own culture than to permit Catholics to educate their own children according to their own formula? Is it more undemocratic to operate a school which teaches only colored children than to operate one which teaches

only boys? Is it essential for "equal protection of the law" that everyone be taught together, indiscriminately ignoring custom, background, or objective?

It is quite possible that the movement to subsidize private education, begun in the southern tier of States in response to the threat of compulsory integration, will have a salutary effect on education throughout the United States. It is in line with the most cogent criticisms of our educational system today. For our complex civilization and our diverse objectives, communities and societies, a standardized education is a disaster.

In 1580, Montaigne commented thus in his essay "Of the Institution and Education of Children":

We have been so subjected to harp upon one string that we have no way left to us to descant upon voluntarily; our vigor and liberty is clean extinct. It was my hap to be familiarly acquainted with an honest man at Pisa, but such an Aristotelian that he held this infallible position, that conformity to Aristotle's doctrine was the true touchstone and squire of all solid imagination and perfect verity; for whatsoever had no coherency with it was but idle humor inasmuch as he (Aristotle) had known all, seen all and said all. I would have him make his scholar narrowly to sift all things with discretion and harbour nothing in his head by mere authority or upon trust. Aristotle's principles shall be no more axioms unto him than the Stoic's or the Epicurean's. Let this diversity of judgment be proposed unto him; if he can, he shall be able to distinguish the truth from the falsehood, if not he will remain doubtful.

Can we not offer a variety of education, a variety of schools, a variety of societies to our posterity? Would not freedom as well as scientific progress then be better served? Let us then give heed to Montaigne and offer diversity to our scholars and a choice in their avenue to understanding the

purposes of our civilization. Those who hesitate to choose may remain honestly doubtful. An honest doubt is a healthy thing for a God-fearing society.

V

Had the Court, in reopening the previously decided segregation issue, based its decree on the first amendment which guarantees the right of people (of different races) peaceably to assemble as they might choose, for educational or other purposes, and had it thus left the matter voluntary among those involved, a great step forward would have been taken. One form of arbitrary social planning would not merely have been substituted for another. A well-stabilized and substantially accepted code of social ethics would not have been discarded in favor of a highly dubious psychological theory. But in the famous opinion on *Brown vs. Board of Education*, the Supreme Court pointedly denied the people of Topeka, Kansas, the commendable option of setting up a variety of schools and permitting voluntary selection to satisfy the maximum number. Obviously the Court was motivated by concerns other than logic, or precedent, or law, or common sense. The merits of their concern history will judge.

Chief Justice Warren rejected the long-recognized prerogative of local and state governments to establish "separate and equal" arrangements for different racial groups, using the singular reasoning that since separate facilities *implied* inequality, psychological equality was disturbed in fact, and thereby the guarantee of "equal protection of the law" was transgressed. His ruling has been interpreted by many as final evidence that compulsory integration is an accepted and enforceable precept of our political philosophy. Not since the *Dred Scott* decision of 1857 has such a broad scale challenge to democratic prerogatives been flung down by the judiciary. Never before has more tenuous reasoning been presented to support or veil a controversial judicial purpose.

If it is morally wrong to exercise a pref-

erence for association with one's own race, it also must be morally wrong to exercise patriotism for one's national community. If it is psychologically wrong to have separate institutions for separate races, then it also must be psychologically wrong to have separate churches for separate creeds. If it is legally wrong for a community to give parents a choice in their children's school associates, it also must be legally wrong to permit private or parochial education. If the "equal protection of the law" guarantee of the disputed Fourteenth Amendment can be construed to deny the people of the States the right to operate different facilities to educate different children, it can be argued, consistently, that colleges must be closed unless everyone is sent to college, because certainly a college graduate has a psychological advantage over a mere high school graduate. If "equal protection of the law" requires compulsory integration in schools and parks and swimming pools, such protection must be guaranteed in the end by government control of all the elements of living. This demand for autocratic uniformity will logically proceed from the field of education to industry, to the press, to domicile, to property, and finally to thought. More than the head of the camel is already in the tent. To those who treasure freedom it must slowly become evident that compulsory integration as spelled out at Little Rock presents a Trojan Horse for totalitarian government.

If we cannot in our modern Athens of the West tolerate separation, diversity, or local options in education, can we long tolerate it in our economy, our religion, or politics? If we mold each child to a uniform national psychology in the governmental monopoly of education, we are proceeding down the road to ruin. Before we bludgeon the last vestige of self-direction and tradition out of the various entities in our society, we must regain sufficient faith in Christian civilization to practice among ourselves the doctrine of self determination which we preach in international councils.

Like the Athenians who subverted the

Delian League with Macedon and Rome just over the historical horizon, we are subverting the basic strength of Christian civilization while the Russians and the Chinese stand patiently by to engulf a decaying civilization. The daily news from abroad cries out the need to join together new forces, not quibbling over their lack of social uniformity or their peculiar political traditions. Acknowledging their right to self-government, we must blend their productive talents with ours in the tremendous task which is our common undertaking, that of rejuvenating the spirit and body of our Christian civilization so it can proceed in growth and diversity rather than decay like all civilizations before it in standardization at the meanest level.

VI

Arnold Toynbee, in *A Study of History*, after analyzing the rise and fall of twenty civilizations, concludes significantly, "We must ask whether, as we look back over the ground we have traversed, we can discern any master tendency at work, and we do descry a tendency toward standardization and uniformity, a tendency which is the correlative and opposite of the tendency towards differentiation and diversity which we have found to be the mark of the growth stage of civilizations."

The civilization whose future concerns us now is the one which succeeded that of Greece and Rome in the West. I have called it Christian Civilization because I believe its dynamics have been furnished by the Christian revelation. The extraordinary dual nature of Christ bestowed a singular zeal, tenacity, and strength of character upon his faithful adherents. It was this enhanced potential of the individual which constituted the invincible vigor of the early Church. The barbarian invaders who demolished every other institution of Roman life were ultimately overcome by it.

Five hundred years ago the West lay in a gloomy condition, comparable to the one faced today. Mohammed II had just taken Constantinople, the capital of the Byzan-

tines and long the center of Christian civilization. The last of the Crusaders had been driven from the Holy Land. No existing national state could cope with the Saracen host. Moors dominated the entire Mediterranean and Mongols ruled in Muscovy. The Turks, having overwhelmed the Byzantine empire, were moving on to take Hungary and to lay siege to Vienna. The routes to the East were closed and the lucrative trade with India sealed off. The last remaining citadels of Christian Europe appeared doomed. Spiritually, politically, and economically, the strength of the West was at its lowest ebb.

The resurgence of Christian civilization after this crisis sprung from a fortuitous combination of circumstances. The time was ripe for the Reformation which sent a revitalizing wave of spiritual enthusiasm through Europe, a return to basic Christian principles. The medieval church was cleansed of superstitions. Tremendous vitality was imparted to the new national states. Concurrently, the vulgar assumption that the earth was flat was dramatically disproven. The resultant capacity of seapower to outflank Islam gave a commanding military advantage to the maritime states. Finally, the discovery of a New World of unbelievable extent and resources provided an unprecedented uplift to the flagging economy of the West and a beckoning haven to Europe's diverse dispossessed. Thus it was that the awesome challenge of the Turks, viewed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries with such foreboding, proved the greatest stimulus yet given to Christian civilization.

Christian influence in the West has experienced cycles of growth, stagnation, and regression. In our generation we are witnessing a serious regression substantially abetted by the propaganda of the humanitarians who teach that man and his society can be perfected without divine aid to individual souls. The concept of a brotherhood of the faithful, seeking an eternal reward, has been distorted by the secularists of various stripes to mean a welfare state,

a socialist economy, or a totalitarian Leviathan. During the twentieth century Christian influence has defaulted to the State, while Christian civilization throughout the West has stumbled on, using forms which become meaningless if long deprived of the spirit which established them. All about us are plainly visible the trends toward dissolution that Toynbee has remarked. Yet the supposedly enlightened liberals press more strongly for that conformity and standardization throughout the West which simplifies the tasks of scientific planners and ambitious administrators. Misguided churchmen, like the Gnostic heretics of the early Church, confound the mold of intellectual humanitarianism with the stamp of Christian inspiration. Thus, with our spiritual well-springs diverted, the dynamic force of Western civilization wanes. St. Paul rescued Christianity from the rigors of Jewish conformity by scrapping the law of the synagogues and insisting on the superiority of the spirit to the law. The time has come when we must again assert the superiority of the spirit to the requirements of the code of conformity.

Christianity now faces another ominous challenge. The West retains little semblance of spiritual unity. Faintheartedness appears the dominant characteristic of the professed adherents. Clearly the time has come when those of us who recognize our Christian kinship must face up to our peril, reexamine our basic motivations, take inventory of our opportunities.

Today, as when Constantinople fell, the challenge is answerable. The conquest of space has a greater potential than the discovery of a round earth and a new world. We need first, however, to remember that the strength of the West never has lain in the imperial tradition, but in the dynamic Christian inspiration, in the spontaneous zeal of individuals for something beyond material and terrestrial gain. Individual souls have little significance, and men attribute little value to their freedom, unless the potential spark of Divine guidance is recognized in each citizen. This was the

necessary premise to Jefferson's Declaration of independence, to his insistence on the Bill of Rights, and to his primary precept that that government is best which governs least.

Unless their citizens recognize the individual as the vesture in which the Christian spirit acts, democratic and republican forms of government have little rational basis and less permanence of tenure. The preservation of self-government in communities and of self-determination among states or federal groups depends directly upon the same religious respect for individual motivation. The basic premise of English law, whereby the accused remains innocent until he can be proven guilty to the satisfaction of his peers, is derived from this belief. Unless this respect is maintained both by the State toward the citizen and by each citizen towards his brethren, the pattern of collapse in Greece and Rome will follow. If our assumption be wrong that a Christian spirit potentially guides each of the vast majority of our citizens, freedom cannot long survive. We have the forms, we can go through the motions of our predecessors; but if we lack the apprehension of Christian theology which molded the traditions, or lose faith in the Christian revelation, these forms can be promptly subverted into the means of our enslavement.

VII

To overcome the heresy of the humanitarians, we shall have to educate our children in the elements of our heritage. We must again teach them a decent respect for what God has wrought, and together with this Christian tolerance, and a healthy suspicion of all arbitrary governments. We must be sure the rising generation comprehends the fundamental precept that the function of government is to maintain order and give compass to society's initiative.

Acquiescence in a government employing compulsion unrelated to the will of the governed presumes a superior and continuing wisdom on the part of those who exer-

cise the compulsion. If the ultimate civil power is called upon to exercise compulsion in the practice of those prerogatives which belong to the family, to the local parish, or community, to the universities, or to the clergy, then there has been rendered unto Caesar what is not Caesar's. And regardless of the benevolence of our Caesar today, some Nero may begin his tyranny tomorrow. Certain institutions have been established in Christian civilization for certain functions. Our predecessors discrimi-

nated in the assignment of responsibilities for the diverse objectives of that civilization.

Seen in the perspective of history, the aim of the humanitarians, to improve man's status through compulsory conformity in a centralized state, is the mark of a declining civilization. The fallen republics of the past ages and the recurring crises of Christian civilization witness to the necessity for freedom, for limited government, and for a tolerant unity in Christendom.

A Backward and Forward Look at Integration

EDWARD STONE

IN THE SUMMER OF 1957, I fell to brooding about integration. Until recently, I had spent twenty of my forty-five years in the South, which was the birthplace of my wife and our children. The following remarks were the result, and MODERN AGE accepted them for publication. To these observations, written more than a year ago, I append certain recent second thoughts.

* * *

A hundred years ago, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a famous decision, which those interested in the recent Supreme Court decision on integration might profitably recollect. However much we may wish to neglect this centennial of the Dred Scott Decision, we must heed lessons painfully taught. Disrespect for the Dred Scott Decision drove John Brown to Harper's Ferry and the South to secession. How far will disrespect for the decision of 1954 take us?

When Chief Justice Taney handed down the decision of 1857, he was not—in his own eyes, at least—*making* history: he merely was citing it and reaffirming certain articles of the American national faith. Just what articles, to be sure, may puzzle or provoke the student who considers them today. One, the superogatory dictum that Congress has the power to legislate regarding property in slaves, is only of historical interest. Another, that the Constitution draws no distinction between human flesh (if black) and that of beasts of burden, controversial though it was, truly is salt in the wounds of the American conscience. But though time reversed Taney, we cannot ignore the fact that his court was the highest in the land; that in a civilized society, the only permissible way to correct abuses in a law of the land, as interpreted by the courts, is to amend or repeal the law.

Now it happens, perhaps to the dismay