

This is Tape 1, of a conversation with Judge Hastie, in Philadelphia, April 20.

Q: Judge Hastie, in what sense do you think we could call the Movement, the Negro Movement, the Negro Civil Rights Movement, the Civil Rights Movement, however we choose to call it -- a revolution. In what sense is it a revolution? Or is it one?

HASTIE: It's a revolution in the sense that it is a movement for more rapid social change, than will take place in the normal course of events. ~~xxxx~~ Actually, the drive, if I may so describe it, for the modifications or correction of our basic law, and for equality of status and rights under law, the drive in organized form, goes back to the early 1930s, to about 1930 roughly. And it is continued with some organization ever since. The first 15 years the pace of change was slow. And it is the acceleration in the last 10 years, the, probably the fact that more Negroes and whites as well, than ever before, have openly and aggressively identified themselves, with the request -- yes, demand, for change, that has caused the continuity of the effort in the last ten years, to be described as revolution. But I suppose my real ~~point~~ point now is, that, call it what one will, it's a continuation and an acceleration of a drive, with a greater accession of strength through aggressiveness of the participants and through a wider participation, but nonetheless, a continuation and acceleration, rather than a new departure.

Barn
Q: Dr. Avon Henry, of Clarksdale, Mississippi, who is president of the N.A.A.C.P., there, referred this long process in this way. He said to me, the N.A.A.C.P. and all the other individuals and agencies who have worked to define the legal basis that has been in education and other departments of life, have made possible, to have a revolution within the terms of law.

But now the attack is on laws that are ~~not~~ not laws, and ~~not~~ practices that are not legal, because now a citizen knows what the law actually means to him. Am I making myself clear.

~~HASTIE~~ HASTIE: Yes, you are. Part of ~~the~~ the problem is the obvious continuing problem of definition of the meaning of words. Now one can define revolution as an effort to bring about change ~~inconsistent~~ inconsistent with the basic legal order, and of course, there are persons in this day and time, who urge that. But I think that the gentleman who you are quoting, is using revolution as perhaps most people do in this connection, to mean a rapid change, brought about through a great deal of popular or community pressure, within the national constitutional framework, and within the laws of the United States, and the laws of the states that are permissible under our constitution. In that sense many would say it's not a revolution, but I don't think the word by which we call it, makes a great deal of difference.

Q: He said, to continue just for a moment, that this is a movement toward ~~legality~~--legality, rather than from legality.

HASTIE: I think that's true, because I think what he means is that the political concept which is a fundamental in

our nation, and its basic laws, is a concept of an equalitarian society. And if all valid law has to respect that concept, then the movement is to bring both our practices and certain of our local statutory enactments, within the ideological ~~framework~~ framework, indeed, within the constitutional framework, of the nation. So in tht respect I would agree with him entirely.

Q: There's another aspect of not merely a revolution, but I suppose any strongly felt popular movement -- a revolution, say, lives on hope and hate, two great motivating elements -- emotional charge. Hope is clear in this. But hate has a part in it. And the hope and hate direct themselves at liquidation of some regime or some class, historically speaking. The problem then, is ~~that~~ can you keep this kind of motivation, that hate part of it, which we have to recognize as a component, constructive, when you're actually moving to maintain a society, and not to liquidate it.

HASTEIE: Well -- I think, to say, to keep the hate part constructive, is almost contradiction.

Q: Yes.

HASTIE: It assumes that hate is a constructive force, when the emotion of hate drives people to tear and rend ~~it~~ whatever is the object of the hate. But the movement remains constructive so long as hate is depersonalized. I suppose this is really a translation of the Christian ethic, you hate the evil in man without hating man himself, retain a certain amount of ~~comparison-~~ compassion for the individual. Now, I suppose that's not the

type of hate that many people ~~xxxx~~ are talking about in this connection. But I think, to a considerable degree, it has been possible to maintain drive with that kind of hate, as distinguished from so much of the personalized hate of individuals, and to a considerable extent, because most Negroes, I think, do not have the feeling that they are deserted by the entire white community.

~~Chax~~ The , perhaps on a very narrow local scene, that sometimes is the case. But I think most Negroes have maintained throughout this, a sense that there is a very large element, a very powerful element, in the national community, and in most local communities, that gives some significant^t support to the so-called revolution.

To digress a minute on that, some ~~xxx~~ people have expressed shock in the last few weeks, that 25 % of the vote in the Wisconsin primary election, went for the Governor of Alabama. I think that involves a ~~xxxx~~ presupposition that there is an overwhelming popular support in Wisconsin at any rate, for the accomplishment of the revolution. ~~Personle~~ -Personally, I don't think the support is as overwhelming as we would sometimes hope it was and I would suspect that 25% of the citizens ~~xxxx~~ in Wisconsin, look at least askance at the revolution. In that sense it may not be an inaccurate representation of public opinion. But I cite that not to point to the 25% , but really to the 75% and emphasize that there is an awareness and a sense of a great support of rapid change in this area in the white community.

Q: On the matter of the role of the white sympathizer, or white liberal, or whatever he is, we find a very strongly articulate impulse among some Negro groups anyway, to say -- liberal, go home. White man, go home. For instance, James Baldwin the liberal an ~~afflictien~~ --affliction. Or we find others saying -- you've served

your time. Now we are throughb with you. Now we take over. Take the white walled tires off the front wheels of the car. You know, all this impulse. How do you read this impulse, the thing behind its impulse, and it, as , not a psychological fact, but a political fact? How do you set its value

MHASTIE: First of all, I'm a poor person to judge, because of the fact that I have not been in position to be out in the hustings, and to personally sample grass roots reaction, and get a sense of the feel of great numbers of people. I , and there's also the ~~impend~~---~~impendra~~--imponderable, as to the relative importance of leadership view, and ~~xxx~~ whether there is a mass reaction ~~xxx~~ and view distinct from what Baldwin or any other individual or group of leadrs may say. So with that preamble, I just hazard one or two really guesses.

I think that the ~~amount~~---amount of hatred of everything white, and rejection of white liberal assistance, is probably exaggerated. ~~MYX~~ Maybe the wish is father to the thought. It is sensational and therefore it makes newspaper ~~xxxx~~ headlines, when a Negro takes this position. Perhaps because of our ~~generations~~---generations-old stereotype of the Negro as a very docile sort of person. But my guess is that at least as of now, there is not as much rejection of the support of whites, as some of the headlined utterances might cause one to believe. Take the March on Washington. It was a prime indication of what happens when the chips are down, and it's ~~a~~ necessary and desirable to ~~xxx~~ get as wide-based support as possible. So recognizing that this is the reaction-~~which~~---with which your question started, is a fact, is experienced by numbers of people ~~xxx~~ in leadership position, and of course, numbers

of followers. My own guess and it's hardly more than a guess is that as of now, ~~its--new--~~ it's not as great as we sometimes think. Certainly it has a potential of getting greater, and that I think, is the importance of the drive for civil rights legislation now for many other changes quickly, if only to prevent the further development and spread of this very dangerous potentially catastrophic point of view.

Q: Within the revolution itself, there is no clearly defined leadership now. Historically, looking back on great social movements, even those that don't emerge as full fledged revolutions, there is usually a concentration of leadership before it's over. Do you see any tendency toward such a concentration? ~~For the~~ for the centralizing of authority and prestige, in this, the Negro Revolt, or the Negro Revolution, or whatever we choose to call it.

HASTIE: Again, I doubt whether I can give a very meaningful answer. Certainly, as you know, the leadership of five or six of the most important national civil libertarian and Negro advancement organizations, has been meeting informally, attempting to reach common ground for several years. And again, turning to the March on ~~Washington~~ Washington, that indicated the potentiality and also the willingness of leadership of those organizations, at any rate, to work as a group. Now, it's true, it's a group without any titular head, or any one person who's recognized as the dominant force. But though revolutions of some types have certainly moved when there was this sort of single dominating personality in a group, I'm not sure whether this is _____ generous

enough to ~~z~~ go forward without that, but I agree with you that certainly there has not emerged that type of unitary leaderships.

q; There are some ~~axix~~ aspirants right now apparently, who are emerging. I t's, a character such as Malcolm X, presumably he can only thrive in that role, and there are other characters of that cut, who are beginning to appear on the scene. How much of a problem do you think there is to contain this impulse toward personalized, centralized over-reaching authority? That offers more emotional excitement than the old line organizations, is that a real hazard, do you think?

HASTIE: Again, I don't know, unquestionably, in local communities and local situations, for the time being, such leadership ~~ixix~~ will gain dominance, and at times and places, in the last two or three years, has become dominant. But it is leadership that appeals to the hopeless, to those who are convinced that there is no, there is no satisfaction, no solution, to be found within the present order, under leadership of the sort that we have experienced in the past. And I'm far ~~z~~ from sure that that sort of ~~ixix~~ hopelessness is characteristic of the overwhelming number of Negroes in America. So I could only hazard the view that the success of that kind of leadership will be in direct proportion to the hopelessness or desperation of the potential followers.

q; It is said by some observers, that the split now between the rising upper half of the Negro population, ~~ixix~~ ^{who are} responsible citizens, the professions opening to them, jobs opening, business opening to them, and the submerged third to one half,

creates a problem, that is the split within the situation of the Negro citizenry, that makes the problem. That half, say, or more than half, whatever percentage we take, does have a sudden opening of opportunity. The other half feels more ~~xxxxxxx~~ desperate than ever because they are cut off from this, which their own even blood relatives have frequently, much less, members of the same ethnic group. This is hidden dynamite in the situation, does that make sense.

HASTIE: I think it does, and this is what, part of what we've been ~~xxxxxx~~ saying. The appeal of Malcolm X is, basically is to the most disadvantaged group who have this feeling of ~~xxx~~ hopelessness and desperation. That's why, of course, that the various ~~xxxx~~ economic and social measures undertaken both locally and nationally to benefit persons regardless of race, or in that economic and social ~~situation~~ situation, those measures of the greatest importance and value arresting the destructive type of racist revolution that the Malcolm Xs would seek to foment.

Q: In other words, ~~xxx~~ we have here the intersection of an economic class problem and a race problem at the same time.

HASTIE: There's no question about it. Many people have said that from a point of view of social strategy, if the people who wanted to keep the mass of Negroes, as the expression goes, in their place, had realized it, the best way to have done it, would have been a generation or two ago, to encourage and advance a Negro elite, and identify them with the white community. Certainly the fact that all Negroes, at least up to a generation or two ago, felt themselves in essentially the same boat, gave a

measure of solidarity, provided a leadership among the better prepared and trained Negroes that conceivably might have been, not have been present, had those people not had the same sense of suffering, sense of suffering, that some of them, don't have today.

On the other hand, let me say this. We must remember that among young people, colored as well as white, our college trained people are ~~expensive~~ people who have had advantages and opportunities, are, many of those are in the very forefront of the struggle now, and concede it as a humanitarian cause to which they dedicate themselves, so I think that's about all I can say now on that subject.

Q: The tendency to isolate the race question from the surrounding questions, if I call you right, create a certain ~~an~~ unreality in the possibility of solution, does that follow? To isolate the race question ~~from~~ from the context in economic,

HASTIE; Oh, oh, surely, I don't believe any serious thinker about this matter, ~~it~~ believes that the racial question can be dealt with apart from the whole socioeconomic complex of American life. And certainly all of the constructive efforts to deal with it, involve a combination of approaches recognizing the problem as being more than racial.

Q: Let us take a case such as the Harlem schools and integration of Harlem schools. Given the population ratios, and the area to be covered in New York City, we have a test tube

case of integration by bussing, as a solution aimed at the racial aspects. Other aspects we know about. Can you see a solution in ~~xxxx~~ terms of bussing as significant.

HASTIE: Again, I don't know. I'm unable as of now to satisfactorily answer for myself, several fundamental questions, again, which are not essentially racial, which underly the solution to the racial problem. First, is the neighborhood very localized public school, a sound concept, without regard to race, for an urban area, characterized by a concentrated slums, concentrated middle income groups, concentrated areas of privileged living. Do we, should we reexamine, and if we reexamine, with what results, should we reexamine our whole premise of the soundness of the neighborhood school. In asking that, does the neighborhood school ~~xxxx~~ even have an advantage in the, in having the ~~xxxx~~ opportunity to concentrate upon the undoubted special requirements of underprivileged children. Is the, is our basic shortcoming that we have failed to do that, as distinguished from failing to mingle students in all socioeconomic classes, in the same, the classroom. My difficulty, and I suppose certainly it's a difficulty of most people who try to think through this, is what is the really most advantageous thing for the development of the youngsters. And of course, weighed with that, has got to be the disadvantage of the youngster feeling that racially or culturally he is isolated from the rest of society, and with all of the things that that sense of isolation to him. So I really, after using many words, have to confess, I can't come ~~xxxx~~ up with an ~~xxxx~~ answer to your question.

q; I was thinking of something like this. Suppose we admit integration is a great good, offers variety of experience, it offers some curative or ~~preven~~--preventive force such as isolation of any, either the white man or the black man. It does those things. But take Washington. Take some city like that, becoming an all Negrocity. How can you integrate, where ~~xxx~~ are the white children coming from?

HASTIE: You're saying, if the ghetto begins ~~xxx~~ big enough, there's nothing but ghetto to integrate, that's entirely true, and forces us in situations of ~~a~~ that sort, of necessity to seek a different type of solution.

Q: A person who is normally very responsible, and maybe responsible in this, said to me, in that case -- bring them from Virginia. The pupils to integrate. That does create some legal difficulties, I suppose.

But I wouldn't try to _____ you about those. But it's the state of mind I'm talking about there. ~~Thaxxxx~~ Think that this is the primary item, rather than evaluating in a context of other goods.

HASTIE: Well, it certainly does have to be evaluated in the context of other goods. Of course, now we are , we get to the again, to the nature of revolution. People do not get stirred up over a complicated ~~grop-of---~~group of ideas, some cutting one way, some ~~xxx~~cutting another. As we're sitting here, discussing pro and con. People get stirred up when ~~h~~ they adopt and struggle for a simple , very simple concept; in areas of Africa of course, you

use one word -- the Swahili word for freedom -- Huhuru. And you rally people around the enthusiasm generated by that concept. Revolution always oversimplifies ideas. And of course, one of the great problems of leadership is that though ideas be oversimplified in the minds of many people, that leadership with more sophisticated thinking attempts to adjust itself and its programs to the total need, viewed in a sophisticated way.

Q: I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, now, but I'm trying to paraphrase. By this line of thinking, then, it's conceivable that a thing like bussing, or integration serves as a symbol for many other things, and it is not treated only in the direction of this special good in a complex of goods; becomes an overriding symbol which appeals generally, can be used as a cry.

HASTIE: I think that's a fair statement. Though I suppose in a place like New York, it is an expression of dissatisfaction with many aspects of the local public schools, which may not be racial in themselves.

Q: Just damn bad schools.

HASTIE: And of course, it may be much more, it may reflect the dissatisfaction with slum living, in that it means getting the children outside of the slum at least for two or three hours of the school. I'm not sure what the psychology of it is.

Q: And you have too, ~~xgh~~ though, a counterpoise of middle class, upper class, Negro families, ~~saxx~~ sending their children to private schools, further depressing the "ghetto schools."

HASTIE: That's true, of course, again, you have considerations and impulses that are not racial, ~~motiati---~~ motivating people who are identified with the racial struggle.

END OF TAPE 1.

TAPE TWO.

Q: Let me ~~xxx~~ read you a quotation, Judge Hastie, from Dr. Kenneth Clark about Martin Luther King's philosophy. "On the surface King's philosophy appears to reflect health and stability, while the black nationalists betray pathology and instability. A deeper analysis however, might reveal that there is also an unrealistic if not pathological basis in King's doctrine. The natural reaction to injustice, oppression and humiliation, is bitterness and resentment, The form that such bitterness takes need not be overtly violent, but the corrosion of spirit, seem inevitable. It would seem, therefore, that any demands that the victims of oppression be required to love those who ~~oppress-them--~~ oppress them, places an additional and probably intolerable psychological burden upon the victims."

HASTIE: Well, the answer to that, of course, is an ~~xxx~~ answer that the psychologist has to give, and I'm not a psychologist. As you were reading I was thinking that the model for Dr. King of course, was Ghandi. And we are essentially a pragmatic people