A: My partner has stated that he believes that the solution to the problem is to just give Negroes the right to compete on an equal basis, in every area of life. I reject this position.

DOUGLAS: Now I don't mind you stating what my position is, I don't want you to mis-state it. I said that artificial means of bringing Negroes up to par, are not satisfactory to me, because in its artificiality, the persons who acquire anything soon lose to persons who have more experience than them.

: Myrdal said -- well, let's say, we distributed a lot of land to the Negro, and gave him some kind of land right, that this would be a kind of a false equalization, is this what you think?

DOUGLAS: I'm not opposed to giving people preferred rights, but I'm saying that if you give them preferred rights alone, without the equal opportunity bit and without the even application under the law, then you're fooling yourself.

: I'm in such a position that I'll . What I'm trying, that you have at this point, you have to give Negroes something more than an equal opportunity to compete, but whatever you give him, it must include equal opportunity to compete. If you say that, I'll agree with you, because the other way, it's like,

DOUGLAS: I'm saying even more than that, I'm saying, that given a choice out of three, I would rather have the even application of the law.

: There's no question about it. I'm not denying that, but
you take this, now believe me, when I disagreed with what you said, I agree with what _______. I agree with ______.

[Speaker]: Well, of course, it seemed to me that when you went into it before, you seemed to be giving individualized interpretation of the Negro problem, and really he's thinking in terms of his situation, it would be easy for him to adjust, so why not.

[Listener]: What you seem to be telling me, would be that it would be easy for you to adjust than if let's say all the doors were thrown open, and you know, you can go in any store that you wanted to, and have any job, that this is what you would want. I think that the Negro needs more than that now. You see? To give you an example, in New York, as you know, they have the problem with the school problem, what does the Superintendent of Schools in New York proposed to do, as I understand it, was to try to give to bring the Negro schools up to par. But you got a very great amount of opposition to this idea of trying to have some kind of artificial mixing of the groups, bussing the students in and out of the districts, so that you have more or less racial equality, or approximately equal in all the schools. Some Negroes, the Negro leadership think this is the answer, for then you would have a kind of cultural intermixing. The administrative problems of such a thing are tremendous. It seems to me that this kind of thing, is a real problem. Merely to bring, to open the doors to Negroes, now, will not solve their problems. You've got to have some kind of plan, where by the Negro is given opportunities to bring himself up to the standard, I mean, when I say, the Negro, on the nationwide basis.

[Speaker]: But on this question, this cultural intermingling, this is a great thing. Well I was discussing with Marvin last week, and I said to him that I'm not at all certain that I would
want to send my kid to school in Harlem, and I think it's unrealistic to believe that you're gonna get any segment of the people to -- Harlem has said that they have the worst schools, the worst every damn thing -- and these people are gonna send their kids to Harlem? Marvin Ko said, well, he isn't concerned, because he doesn't know a single middle class Negro would be willing to send, he says, he'd get more resistance from Negroes. Because of the middle class Negroes, are on the up, and they send them to private schools.

Q: They do.

: See, so this is, I don't know exactly what we're gonna make of it. But I do not believe, I think we're gonna have to get a genius from some place, to get a solution, but bussing them in, isn't the solution, believe me. Because you, I think we can all agree, I wouldn't want to send my kid to.

Q: On the bussing-in technique, I've heard it said this way. I know white people in New York and around New York, who say "I will welcome the presence of any Negro child in the school where my child is, I would fight to the death to have my child stay in the school where he is."

: I don't follow, don't understand.

: They would not want the send their children out of the school, they'll say -- well, look, you can bring some in here, in other words, what they're saying in essence, is -- we don't have any objections to your bring in some children whose standards perhaps are lower than ours, underprivileged children and bringing them in here, but we don't want to go to their school, or to send our kids to their school where their standards are lower.

Q: That's right. We'll hold these standards here and introduce any number of Negro students here, and onething is,
a mother is heard say, taking a child of 8 or 9, and putting that child 2 hours on the bus, too late, of course, but the child, this is the wrong way to handle it. Two hours out of a child's life is impossible, or even one hour extra.

: Therre's have to be just an elimination of school districts and boundaries, you see, this is what is going to be ultimately in a community like New York. But I'd be damned if I can see, if I lived in New York presently, and then want to bus my kid to Harlem, or Brooklyn, for instance, Bedford Stuyvesant, I couldn't see that.

: Well, I think that the leadership may be somewhat, the Negro leadership may be somewhat impractical, in the solution that they propose. But I think the main idea behind it, my interpretation, is to get the school board to do something. At least, the school board is thinking seriously about this thing, they're thinking about it now, trying to get the best teachers, and to put more money into the schools. You see, that's been the situation. The best teachers in New York just don't want to teach in Harlem. And they do teach in Harlem, but their schools, the physical plant isn't equal to the other schools, the standards are lower, the principals let the teachers get away with more, or the violence, it's a bad system, and the people, the administrators of the public school system in New York, just aren't willing to do anything about it. Now it's the same thing as this, you can take anyplace. Either north or south. You've got the same situation as far as the Negro schools and the white schools, the same problem, just on a grand scale in New York.

: The problem is going to be even more acute, where you have something like 80% of all the children in the public schools, are Negro. Who's gonna be bussed in? Where are you going to get them? Bring them from West Virginia every morning, you see, that's what I'm arguing, and New York is going in that direction.
I was reading in the paper today, something like 60%, more than half, of the school children in Harlem today, are Negro, in New York City. Maybe it's Manhattan, may not be -- I don't think it's the whole of New York City, just in the borough of Manhattan.

Q: Yes, it's some terrific percentage. About 70%, I think.

W: Well, of course, the problem, let me say this, that nothing is really been done, to solve the problem so far as residence is concerned, so rather than, they started attacking say, that if we can lift the education of these people, who come out of the ghetto, perhaps then we can do something about the standards of society in general. But you know, what can you do, you can't shuffle people like a deck of cards, so far as housing is concerned.

Myrdal: I'd like to get back to something that he said earlier, there's sometime I do agree with you, you know. When he wrote this article, he pointed out that in New Orleans, the reasons why we not been able to elect anyone, was because of this geographical dispersal of people. This is true, I mean, Negroes in Harlem, can elect state representatives, they can send Adam Clayton Powell to Congress. We can't do that here, because there are pockets of Negroes all over the city, but the fact that there are pockets of Negroes in the south, may mean that it's gonna be a hell of a loteasierto integrate the schools in the south, than in the north, and this is why, when people make the comment, that integration is gonna come to the south, true integration and equality, before it hits the north, I think what he might have in mind.

Q: Did I tell you the other day about the young lady who's second in her class of Howard University Law School, and her remarks to me, having lunch together, in November? Her first words, were, in conversation, says -- I'm from the south, I was born in
and raised in a farm in Virginia, and I have much more hope, for peace
soon and an acceptable peace in the south, than I have in the north. She said — one reason, we share a common history. We have
lived on the same land, she said, there's some basis for a human
recognition. There's some human contact here, to fall back on.
Even with the policemen in Birmingham, using the law. Some bank to
use, to draw on. I can't see it in New York, I can't see in
Detroit or Chicago.

: I agree with her.

; But you know, the problem, is what is New York
gonna do with Harlem. What is Chicago gonna do with the South Side,
what is Los Angeles gonna do with the town of . Here
are your problems. Believe me, the problem of the Negro in the
north isn't altogether different from the problem that the
southerners had with slaves. They didn't know
what the hell to do with them. And this is a fact. And the solution,
I don't know. In the south, these kids, I know the boys that I went
to school with, are elected to public office. And they're being
elected now. There have been really radical changes, not enough
of them, but in the north it's a different kind of thing,
altogether. Given, the kind of political equality that exists, when
I say political equality, I mean nothing more than the right to vote,
I don't mean to imply that Negroes have political equality, in the
north, or political power, but what I'm suggesting, is given the
right to vote, given the kind of thing that he tells about. It's something that doesn't really exist any place.

Q: Let me shift the ground, the conversation, a little bit, please. I know a Negro psychiatrist, with whom I've had one conversation,
will have others, he says the New Negro movement that he sees,
is an expression of the male principal, I think of the male, not the male principal, as opposed the basis of matriarchal society, of the American Negro, until well this generation. He reads it that way in the light of his profession. What kind of sense does that make?

DOUGLAS: Well, my immediate impulse is to agree with him, purely from a masculine viewpoint. But certainly there have been Negro women, who have made substantial contributions to the civil rights movement, and I can think of one immediately, Auriitha Castle, and her sister and her mother, who have played a large part in the civil rights struggle here in New Orleans. I don't know if, if he's talking about matriarchal in the sense, in the historical sense as against patriarchal now, I would have to agree that the men I would agree that now the male is assuming what I would consider his proper position in the roles of things here in the south. This is not to say that women don't play a substantial part, because

Q: He wouldn't deny that of course.

DOUGLAS: Generally, I'd have to agree with him. I don't know whether I agree or disagree with him, you know what I mean, it never occurred to me.

: Well, I happen to know, of course, I read a great deal on this, that the so-called Negro society or Negro vote generally has been characterized among psychiatrists and sociologists and even anthropologists as a matriarchal society, in spite of the fact, all the way back from slavery time, the mother as the family, rather than the father, has been the mainstay of the race. Of course, this has persisted even down to the present time. Of course, the existence of a great number of, for instance, common law marriages, and, or no marriages at all, where a woman might have, you know, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten children, this kind of thing, I think is the reason behind the same material—saying historically
you've had this matriarchal society, which is now becoming patriarchal in nature. I would say agree that the male is, the Negro male is coming to the forefront during this movement. However, that I don't feel we have moved far enough away from the matriarchal society yet. In any true patriarchal society, among Negroes, a revolt a patriarchal group, I would say we/probably have revolted in the United States among Negroes. It's been unfortunate, perhaps, that the Negro male has been willing to take as much as he has taken, and to have his women and children subjected to this, for years. Of course, this is one reason perhaps why the group has been characterized more or less as a matriarchal group, because of perhaps the lack of aggressiveness in terms of resistance to the system of segregation and discrimination that has existed in the south.

Q: Are any of you acquainted with a book by Stanley Elkins, it's not widely known, I think it is an important book, book called Slavery? -- published by University of Chicago Press. The thesis is presumably primarily of this-- that only in the United States was the slave system directed at destroying the sense of identity and the sense of masculinity of the slave. Now this is not true in Brazil, or West Indies, or anywhere in existence. Because there marriage, in the a sacrament Catholic countries, marriage was recognized, by the slave, church, and by the slaveholder, whether he liked it or not. was a true marriage. And also the state in Brazil or in Cuba, despite all the abuses, had its supervisor outside the home, and made visits, and reports, so at least theoretically there was a place of appeal, and outside power placed against the owner's power. So often it didn't revolt work, the theory was there. So you had a long history of revolt in Brazil and other places, with a very spotty history and very limited history of revolt in America. And you have a deliberate or at least instinctive system of destroying personality.
This is the male personality.

Q: Do I understand you to say that his theory is that there was no deliberate attempt.

Q: His theory is only in America, you see, it's where the system was, in a way, paternalistic, as opposed to the more formal thinking in the Catholic country, it worked out either instinctively or deliberately, as a way of actually robbing the Negro man of his role, his self-respect. While it is not true in the South American countries, or Cuba, or Haiti and those places. And yet the slavery revolts, he says, indicated this.

Q: Well, I'd like to challenge the use of the word "paternalistic" in reference to the system of segregation, which

Q: I don't mean segregation, I mean slavery.

Q: Well, with the system of slavery.

Q: Well, the word is in quotes, and we can, you know.

Q: Well, in essence, isn't the system of segregation, which has existed, merely an extension of slavery, in just a different form? Certainly is the child of slavery. In essence, it's just another kind of slavery. Just a more relaxed form of slavery. So if

DOUGLASS: I would think that segregation is more invidious than slavery. Because it robs a man of the only thing that he can use, and that's the feeling that he can stand four-square and meet whatever it is to challenge

Q: In essence, you agree with this man's thesis. And I've heard it on many occasions, and I've read it in different places, I can't quote the one from whom I read it, I tell you this -- Are you familiar with Daniel Thompson-Thompson's book called Negro Leadership Class,

Q: The one in New Orleans?
Right. In this book, I didn't read the whole book, but in this book Thompson discusses this question, he discusses the question of the concept of the matriarchal Negro society.

---: I haven't read anything yet that tended to relate ideas of matriarchal family life, among Negroes, and how this is related to the Negro revolt.

---: If the Negro revolt is a revolt against the matriarchal family, in other words, where the Negro male is now beginning to realize that he has been robbed in essence of the role that he plays, and that of course, this is an attempt in a sense, to summarize what's happening among a group of some 20 million people, in the United States.

---: The only problem I have with that is,

---: This is the generalization.

---: The problem that I have with that is never touched on, it is that you have a very significant part of this movement, is being led and directed by women. And I don't think that this accounts for it, you see. This is my problem.

---: Of course, the women play a greater part than meets the eye, for example, I imagine if my wife tends to oppose some of the activities that I follow as a result of my work in civil rights, that it would restrain my activities substantially, and this is a substantial contribution, as I see it.

---: Here again, you are attempting to interpret what we see in the movement, in terms of this particular one example involving yourself.

---: Well, Bob, whether we admit it or not, all interpretation is based largely upon your own personal experiences and your ability to project and imagine what goes on.

---: I wouldn't be based upon just your own personal
experience. Your one example of the effect, you would have — at least you would try to

---

Well, it's not difficult

---

To try to bring out of your experience, what you have learned from a number of different experiences, and then summarize it, not just based on what you yourself does or what someone told you. Actually, you may feel a little different about it. I would, you know, if you were trying to say what you think is happening here, you might disagree with what's happening, but you would interpret it as this is what is going on, because I see so many examples of it. And to me, of course, I don't think there's a basic disagreeing, although Lolis doesn't seem to get the same interpretation out of the situation as you or I get, that is, this in essence, is becoming a revolt against the old, say, women-led kind of family or society among Negroes.

Q: What about the Negro antisemitism? Does that appear in this community?

DOUGLASS: We've been so busy, trying to get ourselves included into the mainstream of things that this is a luxury, really, not, well, maybe it's a poor choice of words, but it's the kind of thing that occurs when you have, well, the short answer, is there is no antisemitism, as far as I've been.

I'd like to attempt to answer that, and really I want to attempt to answer it. I've been meeting with a group of Jewish women and one Jewish man at least, in the past period, as a matter of fact, I'm going to speak to a city-wide group on the 19th, and they asked this very question. And I say, my answer was exactly as Mil's answer, saying I was reminded at a Baptist minister at a public meeting once, he was making a speech, we had just been denied
the use of a municipal auditorium for the Rev. Martin Luther King. Two of the judges that overruled the district court were of the Jewish faith, or had been. It's highly questionable, again, if the person is Jewish, he stops going to synagogue, and this Baptist minister made the statement, saying -- they denied us the use of this public facility, and two of them were Jews. So the guy works for the Anti-Defamation League, he said this man said that he was, because this man is a noted Negro hater, this signified that there was a large amount of anti-semitism in New Orleans, and this is what he said, after I said, I thought there was not. And I thought he must misinterpreted what the man was saying altogether. I think, we feel very close to Jews, certainly I do, and the reason, because these people, those among them, that see anything at all, they see number one, that the Negro is nothing more than a buffer for Jewish people, this guy said, he had to have something between him and the ground, if he didn't have the Negroes, he'd have the Jews, no question about it.

Number two, these people, I mean particularly, the moneyed Jewish people, I'm not talking about the Jewish people who don't want to be Jews, but intermingle, you know, get invited to a country club, once a year, on Brotherhood Week or something, I, not those people, or those who change their names, I mean, the Orthodox and the Conservative Jewish people. They identify themselves very closely with the movement, you see, and I would say that, one other point, that the Negro does not make distinctions between white people, this was true of me after I was 21 years old, either a person was white or colored,

Q: All Chinese look alike, in other words.

: I mean, this is right. You know, just in terms of, the only way I know that some people today are Jewish, is because some guy who is Italian, told me, and says, we're discussing another
lawyer, in a case, and he said — well that Jewish bastard, you can't trust him. And of course, I knew what he tells this Jewish bastard when he talks about me. I don't think there's any anti-Semitism in New Orleans, to amount to anything.

Q: There is in some places, of course,

+ : Theredit probably be some in New York.

Q: Philadelphia had a bad case of it. I read in the papers.

--; I think it's stupid.

DOUGLASS: Of course, I don't identify with certain segments of the Jewish community, that Lolis has, I don't have the same identification that Loliss is speaking of, at least I don't think I have the same identification. And the distinction with me now is, white and black, either you are white or you are black. And this is unfortunate in my opinion, because this shows that the controlling factor of course, is first color, in any individual, when it should be individuals first.

Q: Did you the article in the on the telephone recordings attacking Jews because they promoted integration. Reply to it, there's a long article in it. This morning's paper, yes. In , I guess, the big paper, big column inside. This is not the Negro antisemitism, this is antisemitism, because of the relationships between the Jews and and the Negroes.

--; Well, the Jews are certainly the chief financial backers of the civil rights movement, some for very selfish reasons, most of the lawyers that have been willing to help us, have been Jewish lawyers. Most of the white people participating in the demonstrations have been Jewish and this is one of the big reasons why the National Council of Churches and Catholic
groups have decided to get after it. So you can start going down the line -- chief counsel for CORE, chief counsel for legal defense of the N.A.A.C.P., Jack Greenberg. So you can go down the rest, and if you look at CORE, there are many people, who, when you say they are Jewish, again, these are not the people who go to the synagogue. Some of them may even be Baptist, so, are they Jewish, in other words, if -- maybe Hebrew is the term we should use. I don't, I would hate to believe that Negroes would be antisemists, but on the other hand, they would have to, some of them would have to be, this is a part of being America, you have to hate something, you know, if you don't, then you can't be an American.

Q: May I cut back to one of your essays,

DOUGLASS: I don't know if you properly call it an essay.

Q: Why not?

Q: Here's a quotation, this was written several years ago, a few years ago, Dr. A. Wilkerson, "the Negro has succeeded only in where progressive economic or political trends, and not independent of such trends in surrounding society." I'm going back to your passage on betrayals, you see, of Negro operation, in the actual writing of it, in the Constitution, at the time of the civil war. Here's the quote: "This is the fundamental lesson in our history, we saw the 1940's as another sharpening conflict in which the Negro's goal is bound in the general national goals, that the actual movements which have led to Negro advancement, have been made in terms of relations to progressive white movements, not as a result of that, but allied forms with it. Each phase has been a special kind of ally.

DOUGLASS: It might very well be that civil rights movement
is the complete example of this.

q; That's what I'm getting at it, how do you feel about that.

DOUGLASS: My position is that while certain impetus was given by the '54 Supreme Court decision, which of course, was in the making for a number of years, that the entire causation was not solely within the factors which existed within the United States alone, but is the result, more or less direct, of the lack of decisive balance/perhaps the United States and Russia, for leadership of the world; and as a result of this imbalance, it became necessary for the United States, to corral as much influence from as many sources as it possibly could. Hence, the eventual '54 decision which gave some more legal color to our claims for justice where none actually existed in fact previously, which would permit us to give some sort of credence to the story that we're trying to give the entire noncommunist world. I don't know if I've articulated it.

q; I'm following you. There are two questions then

DOUGLASS: In other words, maybe from another standpoint, this is good for us, because the closer the competition gets to the United States, and I said this 4 or 5 years ago, the closer the competition is between Russia and the United States, then eventually we'd have government officials and corporation officials coming to the college door, and sifting out the better brains of the Negro students, and apparently this is what is happening on a small.

Q: Is there also a change, you think, of moral climate? I say this because your passage in your writings, is is not of course, it's summarized, I don't mean to attribute to that's why I'm quoting a little bit more now, not taking/into account the changes you're talking about, of moral climate,

DOUGLASS: No, I don't think there's been a moral change, I
Q: Practically meaningful for it. Merely a question of the need, practical need for

DOUGLAS: I would think so, yes.

Q: That is, there is no moral improvement in the atmosphere of now, as opposed to 1861.

DOUGLAS: I don't think so.

Well, I would have to disagree with you, I know that. I think that we have a whole lot more people, today, percentage-wise in the United States today, who believe that segregation is immoral, than believed it in 1861. If we don't, heaven help us. Because I think that not only do we have to gain legal victories, and if they get a civil rights bill passed, we also want to change people's feelings with reference to the entire question of segregation and discrimination. We're working to see victories not only things that they must do because the law, but it's the thing to do because it is right.

-- : Now -- let's take the Catholic church itself.

Where was the Catholic church in 1861.

DOUGLAS: Where is it now?

Where was the Methodist Church?

Where is it now?

All these other churches, that are supposed to give moral leadership, to the country. They were silent. But now, I think this is a sensitive situation, everytime I get on the soap box about religion, this One I think is an agnostic, and the other is an atheist.

Well morality is just too much for me.

---END-OF-INTERVIEW---
Q: It's possible, after the arrangements are made, suppose all the legal decisions are made, favorable to civil rights, all the bars are removed by legal action, then there is the question finally of a moral climate,

Douglas: That's correct, of course. Martin Luther King eloquently put it, it's not necessary for man to love me, inorder to stop him from lynching me. I think that once the barriers are removed, that people's attitudes will change. You hear this question about whether you should wait for people's attitudes to change first before you institute these reforms.

Q: That's a key question.

Douglas: Or you know, the question of whether law should come first, or whether the change of attitudes should come first. This has certainly been a perennial question. But of course, I'm firmly of the opinion that the majority of the people in the United States want a change and we've had a very powerful and very vocal minority in the south, who have constantly blocked legislation, in Congress, to start some of the changes that should have been going on a long time ago.

Douglas: A very interesting point is that in the enabling position of the 14th Amendment, Congress pared since the enactment of the 14th Amendment, the power to pass legislation which would have effected the kind of thing that we're working for now. And this is a terrible indictment of the immorality; whether it exists now or not seems to be something which doesn't need to be discussed, because here you have the authority to do it, and public opinion in the minds of those people who should know the policies, just wouldn't permit it. This is the only reason I can visualize why.
Q: Then or now?

DOUGLAS: Then. Public opinion may have changed now to the extent where we will get an enforceable civil rights bill.

Q: There was no public opinion then to enforce it.

In the post civil war period.

DOUGLAS: And it's questionable as to the kind of public opinion you have now.

Q: There is.

_: When he said there was no public opinion then, you meant no public opinion in the south.

Q: No, I mean in the north.

_: In the north.

Q: It wasn't enforced, died in a few years, in the big sellout of 1876, and

_: Henry Grady

Q: Before that, you get

DOUGLAS: I recently read Susan Woodward's comment, and I think I may have mentioned that in one of the

Q: My point there was no public opinion of any consequence then, in '65 to '76, to enforce the subject of emancipation. There were a few things, available facts. Is there more public opinion now to enforce any measures?

DOUGLAS: There's no possible question in my mind that there is. I don't know that people are any different now than they were then. But I think people's experiences with Negroes have been built. I think, frankly, the desegregation of the armed services, is possibly one of the most significant things that has happened in this country. We slept with guys, sat up and we ate together, and they were guys who admitted frankly and freely, that they had
certain misconceptions, that had since changed, you know, they'd find themselves preferring a conversation with me, than with the guy who was next to me, if for no other reason than we were both raised in a city. Or maybe they liked the way I played poker, so I think that this, if nothing else, has created a certain kind of climate. And there's been an awful lot of talk about it, there've been Negroes who have been able to talk, and the Negroes in the south. The white people now no longer looked to their maids to tell them what's going on, they buy Negro newspapers now. There were no books of any consequence, there were no James Baldwin, or Richard Wright, and Ralph Ellison, that they could have read, and I'm thinking about this boy who wrote Go South.

Q: Carl Rowan

: Oh, Carl Rowan, these people didn't exist. I mean, that they are saying something, and they are saying something who are willing to think have thought about. And then we are learning -- there were no atom bombs, there were no newly emerged African nations, even my own views changed about the African people. What I learned about Africa. I never knew Kenyatta existed. All of themseves, what is possible in this world. I think that the church is a little more vocal now than they were then. But they fall short of what they should be doing, certainly what they could do. Because the Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, and all of them, still tolerate segregation within the church. There is no question in my mind about it. You're not going to have a Negro priest saying a mass at the Holy Name, you don't have any Negroes on the faculty of Loyola -- so to my way of thinking, I know there are some that exclude Negroes.

END OF INTERVIEW