MR. WARREN: Dr. Nelson, how do you regard the Civil War and the moral issue?

DR. NELSON: Well, that's so broad.

MR. WARREN: It's broad, isn't it?

DR. NELSON: It's very broad.

MR. WARREN: Let me, then, I'll read you a quotation as a key, as a starter out some way. And this is from Frederick Douglass. "The war began in the interests of slavery on both sides. The South was fighting to take slavery out of the Union, the North was fighting to keep it in the Union. The South, fighting to get beyond the limits of the Constitution and the North fighting for the old guarantees; both sides in fighting (spiting) the Negro, both insulting him.

DR. NELSON: Douglass, in one sense, goes to the heart of the matter. There was evil on both sides - an evil with which the entire Nation had lived far too long, with the Negro as the perpetual sufferer. Here was the opportunity to resolve the issue on moral grounds: that of the rightness or wrongness of slavery. Unfortunately, the Nation did not possess the capacity to do this. The issue was shifted, therefore, to a political level -- the preservation of the Union. The tragic commentary on the times ~~was~~ is that men saw no solution to this problem but war, which is to be explained in the fact that economic, political, and racial issues obscured the moral issue. Historically, in such situations the recourse has been to war. This war, however, should never have been fought. Even a hundred years ago the moral issue involved in slavery was so clear that a nation professing democratic and Christian principles was placed in a morally indefensible position in permitting it. Moreover, the negotiations which preceded the war were characterized by a brinkmanship which at that time had the most unpredictable and tragic consequences. Finally after a century, we are seeing how ghastly the costs are for the failure of men to solve their differences short of violence. We have yet to learn that the ends we reap are dictated by the means we use.

MR. WARREN: Let me ask then, Dr. Nelson, why was the Lincoln monument chosen as the spot for the March on Washington, to reach its climax?

DR. NELSON: Of all the figures in American history Lincoln, for the Negro, represents that single individual who did most to free him, not simply from slavery, but in a larger way. The fact of the Emancipation Proclamation alone would draw Negroes to the Lincoln Memorial. It is said that Lincoln performed this act solely to save the Union. It is true that as President he was bound to find political justification for such an act. On the other hand his unequivocal hatred of slavery, as expressed frequently, certainly suggests that his heart approved profoundly of what his hand did in signing the Emancipation Proclamation. This Negroes have always sensed. Lincoln, moreover, as a human being, appeals not only to Negroes, but to any group that is struggling against vast odds. In India I found that Lincoln is held in esteem alongside that nation's greatest heroes. In a public hall I have seen two pictures hanging side by side -- one of Gandhi, the other of Lincoln. Lincoln finds a high place there both in books and in the daily press.

MR. WARREN: Now would those Indians know that Lincoln was a racist, a thorough-going racist? For instance, this quote is a well-known quotation from Lincoln after the Emancipation Proclamation. This is Frederick Douglass. It's the same sort of thing he said after the Emancipation Proclamation: "I will say that I am not nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social or political equality of the white and black races." And he goes on and develops that it's a very common place thing he's quoting from Lincoln. But this has some bearing on the question. Now some part of history and the developments of history must enter at this point.

DR. NELSON: Indian scholars in American history would know this quotation from Lincoln. Others, probably not, except as they may have seen it quoted in the American press. You doubtless saw in newspapers recently an advertisement paid for

by the Citizens' Council of America in which this passage was quoted.

MR. WARREN: I just got long, long after I had just raised this question for our purposes, a little different. I may say Lincoln's a hero of mine, by the way, so I'm not . . . . .

DR. NELSON: I quite understand. I think this is a proper question and I am not surprised that you asked it.

MR. WARREN: Well, naturally, you would - - -

DR. NELSON: I think The Washington Post gave the proper answer. It said editorially that the advertisement both dishonored the memory of Lincoln and did injustice to the Negro. The Post reminded us also that Lincoln challenged Judge Douglass and his friends to adhere to the Declaration of Independence or amend it to read that all men are created equal except Negroes.

MR. WARREN: Did they have something like this?

DR. NELSON: Yes. I would add that a single quotation read only for one set of implications cannot prevail over the major persistent trends of a man's life. Your question also suggests an extension of this line of thought which I have followed during a good number of years of my life. It is very difficult to recall any of our heroes who did not have weaknesses born of the times in which they lived or of their own personal histories in those times. They must be judged by their highest insights, by their supreme achievements, and not by the errors resulting from their times and environment. Remember the Kentucky in which Lincoln was born or even the Illinois in which he spent adult years. The constitution of Illinois at that time forbade a Negro to migrate into or vote or hold office in that State. Incidentally, it should be remembered that Lincoln called for the right to vote of some Negroes. The myopic view expressed by Lincoln concerning Negroes can be forgiven, moreover, in the light of the moral majesty he revealed in his other views toward Negroes and toward men in general. It is the Citizens' Councils that we should condemn which, a hundred years after the Negroes' emancipation, would

sully the name of the Emancipator in order to justify their own archaic obsessions. It may be recalled also, since it was a quotation from Douglass which started this line of thought, that during his debates with Stephen Douglas, all too frequently forgotten, Lincoln stoutly asserted that Frederick Douglass was his (Lincoln's) equal and that of anyone else in the right to earn from the sweat of his brow. Douglass, moreover, following Lincoln's assassination, remarked that in honoring Lincoln Negroes were fastening to themselves an imperishable and immortal name and fame.

MR. WARREN: Is there a question of a difference in a hundred years, what was -- as one historian, an eminent -- one, said to me about Lincoln: "Why in '61, it would be impossible to find a man, a white man, on the American continent and probably in Europe, who was <u>not</u> a racist.

DR. NELSON: That is certainly relevant.

MR. WARREN: But this was an assumption that was so readily made then, that with the world has changed with a hundred years of scientific investigation and a hundred years of other things.

DR. NELSON: So we have two time spans to consider in making a judgment of Lincoln -- his own time span and his growth within it and, in addition, the century in which he spoke and acted and the one in which we live today.

MR. WARREN: With the benefit of science and other researches in between.

DR. NELSON: Quite so. Let us take the view toward war then and now. It could well be that if we had lived then, we would have given no thought to avoiding the Civil War on the basis of our view on war itself. Today, you would find many people whose concept of war is such that they would exhaust every possible resource, on grounds of conscience, to discover means of solving justly any internal conflict short of war.

MR. WARREN: The world -- I'm getting to this point now: Do you feel that the world actually changed its moral climate, at least America has, on this question, say, in a hundred years the moral climate has changed?

DR. NELSON: Yes, I do.

MR. WARREN: It is discernible progress.

DR. NELSON: Unquestionably.

MR. WARREN: In the whole temper of society.

DR. NELSON: Yes. Wherever slavery is reported to exist in any form today, Americans generally are profoundly unhappy about it. A hundred years ago, or a little more, it was in our bosom and was defended at the cost of more than a half million lives. But now and for some time there has been a rapidly growing conviction in America that violence is futile as a solution to society's problems. In respect to war, even General Eisenhower and General MacArthur have expressed themselves to this effect, not to speak of increasing numbers of American writers of international standing. Most Americans would welcome as they would few other gifts a substitute for the carnage of war or any form of violence as a solution to social conflict. Tension between the North and South is great today and the South cries out bitterly against a so-called invasion. My judgment, however, is that a war between the States is just about unthinkable. There may be violence, yes, but a conflagration such as the Civil War is most improbable.

MR. WARREN: This point is an important point in a way because there are people, both Negro and white, who refuse to see or don't see any change in the moral climate. Now not long ago I was talking with a very, very able lawyer in New Orleans (I won't tell you just where he is), and he burst out -- he said, "It's against my desires, but I must say that I have a feeling that the white man is beyond redemption, that not to become a black Muslim,'" he said, "I'm even reading their literature now -- a feeling that there's no hope for . . . . . to my --

question. I'm asking, moral climate, he burst out with this. This man's a thoughtful man, an educated man, a very able lawyer --

DR. NELSON: A Negro?

MR. WARREN: A Negro. He burst out with this. This is not always the answer one gets.

DR. NELSON: No.

MR. WARREN: That there is a change in the moral climate.

DR. NELSON: There is a change, but even so you are going to get persons who hold the views of a hundred years ago.

MR. WARREN: Sure.

DR. NELSON: Oh yes.

MR. WARREN: Let me ask a question about the Reconstruction. This again is looking back and playing with history, or -- or -- have you ever played this game of trying to set up what would have been the reasonable reconstruction policy in the South? Because we're into a reconstruction right now, of a sort.

DR. NELSON: I cannot say that I have played very much at that game. My approach, of course, would be to apply to the Reconstruction period an overall philosophy.

MR. WARREN: Well, I would ask the overall philosophy, too, if we could turn into that, if you choose.

DR. NELSON: It begins with the simple assumption that all men are brothers and thus the sons of a common Father; that the law of brotherhood requires that each of us consider the welfare of his brother as important to him as his own welfare and that man's wellbeing in this world is inevitably bound up in this moral law.

MR. WARREN: . . . . . laid down a program that he thought would have worked. It ran something like this: "Federal remuneration for freeing of slaves, after the war of Reconstruction, paid slaveholders; two, expropriation of plantation lands, but with their full federal payment, both for slaves and for land, southern land;

distribution of land to any who would work it, Negro or white, on a long-range mortgage basis, not a gift, but minimum payments. Supervision of the freed men and the property for a period for educational purposes. Universal taxation of the country to pay these costs; encouragement of Negroes in westward expansion, who remain as far as possible in the South on government lands and in the North." Does that seem to make practical sense? Even if it wasn't possible?

DR. NELSON: There is much that is good in this proposal. It reflects, I believe, the spirit which would have characterized Lincoln's approach had he lived. As you recall, he declared himself against bloody work -- killing and hanging -- once the war was over. He wanted resentments extinguished and harmony re-established. I believe he would not have permitted the excesses of Radical Republicanism and even more the lawlessness of the Ku Klux Klan. He would rightly have required allegiance to laws and proclamations respecting slavery, and in the event of recalcitrance would have acted with the determination he showed in meeting the challenge of the rebellion. To all this I might add the duty which existed of guaranteeing ex-slaves during Reconstruction immediate access to opportunities to contribute their full share as American citizens to the life of the Nation. This would have meant full access to education at all levels for such persons as qualified and every right of citizenship, such as voting. It would have meant the preservation, rather than the early demise, of the Freedmen's Bureau with its high promise in the area of education. The great national sin has been the failure of the Nation to employ the means justified by the Constitution to guarantee Negroes their full rights as citizens. This is a failure for which the American people have paid dearly. Even today, a hundred years after Emancipation, we agonize and limp toward the belated realization of justice for all.

The great difficulty in following the above course during Reconstruction is that the American people, North and South, had permitted and profited by slavery for two hundred and fifty years. Slavery had been abolished in the midst of a terrible war with scarcely an American family escaping some dreadful loss. The land reeked with hate, and until this day we suffer the effects of it all. As I try to answer your question, I begin to wonder, therefore, whether it might not be more profitable today to bend our energies to applying to our times the lessons of the slave and post-Emancipation periods. What kind of nation are we going to bequeath to the generations beginning a hundred years from now? Will those who live in 2064 condemn or pity us for our prejudices and hatreds, for fastening on them the problems which those of 1864 fastened on us?

MR. WARREN: At least . . . . . . is attacking the notion of Reconstruction as punitive; he's trying to make a reconstruction of society for peace rather than reconstruction as a punitive measure, that he wants to pay and make it work.

DR. NELSON: I would agree with the assumption that Reconstruction should not have been punitive. That is one of the reasons the loss of Lincoln was so fearful. He would doubtless have approached the future on the basis of reconciliation. What would have happened, one doesn't know, of course.

MR. WARREN: He might have been shot by somebody else down here on the other side.

DR. NELSON: He could have been.

MR. WARREN: A radical Republican could have shot him then, some fanatic.

DR. NELSON: Even so. But had he lived, there are those of us who believe he would have played the role of reconciler. Nor, I believe, would his role as reconciler have led him to sacrifice the demands of justice dictated by the post-Emancipation events. But I speak as a layman, unlike the expert historian, and without a mastery of all the facts with which that period was crowded.

MR. WARREN: But it's the laymen who lead into action in these matters though; it's not historians.

DR. NELSON: And most profitably laymen who are guided, first, by a general moral philosophy and, second, by a grasp of the soundest expert analysis of the relevant facts that are available.

MR. WARREN: One more question on this general line before we break for our lunch. James Baldwin says (this is a very close paraphrase): The southern mob does not represent the will of the southern majority, but takes action in a moral vacuum. It fills a moral vacuum. Do you have any feeling about that notion?

DR. NELSON: I agree. Great numbers of Southern people cannot be described as a mob in spirit. Their sin is one of moral inertia, the failure to create a climate inhospitable to the mob. They cannot escape, therefore, reproach for their lack of action, their silence. The Southern religious community is especially vulnerable to criticism.

MR. WARREN: Some Negroes and some whites say that we're actually conniving, by silence, so that we're morally culpable in the same way as the mob.

DR. NELSON: To the extent that we connive by our silence, we are culpable.

MR. WARREN: You can't yell <u>all</u> the time.

DR. NELSON: At the same time, in the clash of moral issues one cannot escape condemnation for his silence. One of the great values of the non-violent movement is that it provokes, provides a climate for speech and action on the part of many who otherwise would be silent and inert.

MR. WARREN: I think that's true to a degree; I've seen some of it happen, people who have said that, this hurts me.

DR. NELSON: The virtue of non-violence is that it reaches the otherwise silent but conscience-stricken onlooker. Violence tends to drive him into the camp of the conscienceless perpetrator of injustice.

(BREAK FOR LUNCH)

MR. WARREN: Dr. Nelson, could you say something about the growth of your awareness of the relation of the Negro to American life from your boyhood?

DR. NELSON: Yes.

MR. WARREN: How does the question present itself to you?

DR. NELSON: Born in Paris, Kentucky, I was taken very early by my parents to Paducah, Kentucky, where I finished high school. One of my lingering memories of Paducah is a report then current that a Negro had been lynched on the courthouse grounds across from which I worked in a barber shop, shining shoes. I can remember a kinsman of mine, my mother's father-in-law, who at that time was a great blackface minstrel actor. Annually he came to town with his troupe and, as a small boy, I walked with him at the head of the parade on the day before the night of his performance. I saw the performance, of course, but always from the "peanut" gallery. That was the way of life in Paducah and I can recall no conversations of that period of my life on the problem of segregation in theatres or elsewhere.

Consciousness of the race problem had developed by my high school years. At the sight of color prejudice on one occasion I threatened to have the Emancipation Proclamation published and to sell it. I recall my anger at being made to wait at the public library and my pondering just how I should protest. I recall having to see the class play of the white high school by peeping from an alley, since Negroes were not admitted to the performance. The urgency of seeing this play lay in the fact that my own class was giving East Lynne in the same theatre the following week.

I was deeply concerned at the absence of an organization of Negroes and the need for unity if a solution of the race problem was to be found. I read Kelly Miller's Race Adjustment at that time and began to make speeches on the race problem.

Sensitiveness to race prejudice and growing resentment followed me through my college years at Howard University and my later professional and graduate study years. While a student at the University of Paris and the Protestant Theological Seminary in Paris, I wrote a small book in French entitled La Race Noire dans la Démocratie Américaine. A very favorable review in the daily Petit Parisien pleased me almost more than the book itself. Two years of study in Germany followed my year in Paris.

These early years of my life and study abroad gave a definite turn to my thinking on race and, indeed, on human relations. Titles of articles I wrote in the 1920's and a book in later years suggest the trend of my thinking. The emphasis is on "World Community," "World Understanding," "Interracial and International Understanding," etc.

Finishing Yale, I served Howard University for seven years as teacher and administrator. Following this I served as President of Shaw University in Raleigh, North Carolina, for five years and of Dillard University in New Orleans for four years. I then returned to Howard, where I have remained. These nine years in the South had a very sobering effect upon me. Only history will tell who has suffered most, the whites or Negroes, from the undemocratic, irrational, immoral separatism which the white South has inflicted upon Negroes there and upon itself. To live in the midst of the tragedy is to ask whether pity is really not more appropriate than hate. Of course, neither of these in itself offers much of a remedy.

Since 1940, and especially since 1948 when I returned from a year in India (during which I had the priceless opportunity to converse on more than one occasion with Gandhi), I have studied and experimented quite intensely with the non-violent approach to human problems, including those of race relations. This deep involvement began in the early 1940's with the March on Washington Movement and has continued until now.

MR. WARREN: You've been associated with Dr. King in formulating -- in discussing and formulating these principles, have you not?

DR. NELSON: We have talked on a number of occasions and been associated in meetings of Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference and elsewhere. We are well acquainted with each other's views on non-violent principles, and I feel a keen sense of oneness with him concerning them. We have not discussed details of current strategy of the non-violent movement. My interest in strategy, of course, is deep, stemming from my participation in the original March on Washington Movement and from my study of strategies followed since that time in other parts of the world.

MR. WARREN: Do you see any difference between the principles of the original March on Washington Movement, as I have read, in the formulation of . . . . . Randolph and the formulations that exist now around the movement, those of yourself and those of Dr. King and Dr. Farmer -- Mr. Farmer?

DR. NELSON: The principles of the movement led by Dr. King and that proposed by Mr. Farmer have much in common. In the early 1940's Mr. Farmer drew inspiration from Mahatma Gandhi, whose movement was approaching a climax at the time. Farmer had only recently finished his theological studies and was certainly under the influence also of the central teachings of the Christian ethic. His proposals, on the practical side, called for no half-way measures. He urged that residential segregation be destroyed rather than being made more tolerable, that discrimination be wiped out rather than made more bearable. He urged that racial brotherhood be translated from an ideal to a fact.

The principles of the first March on Washington Movement, as a few of us worked them out, were also influenced by Gandhi. One of our number, a missionary to India, had been expelled from India by the British government on account of his support of the Gandhi movement there. The original March on Washington Movement, however, never attained appreciable development under the influence of

these principles. The Farmer proposals had no influence, as I recall, upon the March on Washington Movement. The Farmer statement is very significant in that it was, I believe, the first major document of our times proposing a radical movement to secure the full rights of American Negroes, based on the non-violent principles of the Sermon on the Mount and the teachings and practices of Mahatma Gandhi. The present non-violent movement has put into action these Christian and Gandhian principles far beyond anything we have known in our country's history.

MR. WARREN: Do I understand that defining this -- Dr. Fishman, who has studied the effects of non-violence in the Negro movement now on the psychology of participants gives a naturalistic argument for what you approach through ethical and religious ground? Ethical and religious grounds?

DR. NELSON: Dr. Fishman describes his approach as psychological, and simply descriptive, not naturalistic.

MR. WARREN: Would you say he gives support in terms of your investigation?

DR. NELSON: Our approaches are different. Dr. Fishman is attempting to relate social and psychological influences in the attempt to understand both the development and the effect of non-violence. My special interest is in the philosophical and religious foundations of the non-violent ideal buttressed, where possible, of course, by the findings of the social sciences. Dr. Fishman is interested in knowing why people, especially youths, commit themselves to non-violence and the effect of this commitment upon them and upon the opposition. Where the effect is positive he wishes to know why. He is as much interested in the people who commit themselves to or oppose the ideal as in the ideal itself. Dr. Fishman is also interested in the effect of a pragmatic or politically expedient use of non-violence without an emotional or spiritual commitment to it. Does it have, under these circumstances, psychological and social advantages? We agree that there are some positive effects of such a use of non-violence. Although Dr. Fishman and I approach the subject from the standpoint of different disciplines,

we are both keenly interested in the conclusions reached by each other and we co-operate in investigations of non-violence from every serious standpoint.

MR. WARREN: Then Dr. Fishman, as one psychologist, would not agree with Dr. Kenneth Clark, as another psychologist, on this matter of non-violence.

DR. NELSON: Dr. Clark has reached conclusions on which, I believe, Dr. Fishman has not expressed himself, at least publicly. Dr. Clark feels that it is too much to ask Negro masses to grasp so highly sophisticated a doctrine as non-violence. He points out that in 2000 years Europe has not understood Christianity. It is also psychologically unrealistic to ask Negroes who have suffered so much to have imposed upon them the additional burden of philosophical and ethical love. He is not thinking, of course, of persons such as Dr. King. Thus Dr. Clark does not oppose non-violence but believes it requires a sophistication beyond that to be expected generally in a suppressed people. Dr. Clark takes the position, moreover, that in spite of attempts at non-violence, the only method of getting rid of violence is for whites either to destroy the Negro or to abandon violence themselves.

MR. WARREN: This is not getting so far afield as it may seem, at first glance. I have in my hand here a clipping from the morning Times, March 2nd, <u>New York Times</u>. The heading is Minister to Defy Fanny Hill Ban. Have you seen this?

DR. NELSON: No, I have not.

MR. WARREN: That Robert William Lenisk will give out books, <u>Fanny Hill</u>, at a time of Bible reading at the Spencer Memorial Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn. Perhaps you'd like to glance at the whole thing before I ask you my question about religion and life. I didn't bring this for the purpose -- I happened to clip it for someone else . . . . . . but I offer it to you, since you mention religion and life.

DR. NELSON: Yes. My definition of religion is that, in its simplest terms, it

is the commitment of an individual to what he regards as supreme in the universe -- a supreme person, a supreme power, a supreme principle -- a commitment not simply of the mind and of the spirit, but of the life. All else, for me, that men call religion, is peripheral or, at most, supportive of this commitment.

MR. WARREN: This would lead to action to the social order, of course.

DR. NELSON: Most certainly.

MR. WARREN: I say of course because I gather that from many things you've said --

DR. NELSON: Yes. A man's life ought to be judged as religious not on the basis of the Scriptures he reads, the creed he professes, the prayers he prays, but rather, in the light of its consistency or loyalty to what he regards as the highest, the best, the noblest in the universe.

MR. WARREN: Does the giving out of Fanny Hill at the time of Bible reading in Brooklyn seem to be an appropriate act, in line with the definition of religion?

DR. NELSON: Your question certainly brings the discussion down to a practical level. From a religious perspective an act of this kind must be judged from two standpoints: first, on the basis of its motive; second, in the light of its method. If the purpose of the minister is to educate and thus to provide a sound basis for judging this piece of literature or similar pieces, the motive might be applauded. If the motive is to stage an act, to attract public attention and gain publicity, then the act deserves condemnation. If the motive is judged to be good, the soundness of the method might still be questioned. Although the performance described in the article is not in accord with my personal taste, I am not prepared to say that in relation to this minister and the people he serves, it was not warranted. The question of motive, of course, has religious relevance. The matter of method touches religion if it has grown out of such moral elements as insensitiveness to the tastes, feelings, and traditions of others.

MR. WARREN: Do you think that the selection of Fanny Hill for distribution at the Bible reading of a Sunday morning is an appropriate act or -- that's a trivial act, or worse?

DR. NELSON: I am willing to give this minister credit for sincerity in the absence of acquaintance with him or his reputation. As a minister, he is certainly aware of the history of banning books, a history with periods we should like to forget. His protest, therefore, could well be a matter of conscience and thus have a religious basis. On the other hand, the rarity of banning a book today prompts me, on second thought, to feel that a book banned by a New York court, which I would assume not to be squeamish in matters of this sort, might well go unread and that a minister might more profitably give his attention to social ills where the need of cure is less debatable.

MR. WARREN: To change the subject again, or -- do you see any danger in the -- or possible danger in the effect on the -- some of the young people who are now devoting themselves fully to the matter of civil rights? What happens to them, say, five years from now? Seven years from now? Is there a danger of certain psychological and intellectual casualties in this process?

DR. NELSON: There is always a psychological danger to participants in a whole-hearted commitment to a movement in which great moral principles are involved; the emotional drains are great. Studies are already beginning to reveal emotional disturbance in some of those who have been deeply involved in the Freedom Movement.

MR. WARREN: I was thinking of some sort of parallelism between the possible fate of some of these young people and the fate of certain young people in the '30s, who were deeply involved or deeply commited to matters of social justice of another approach, what's happened to many of them in my own experience, sometimes a . . . . . . a withdrawal from all social action. We know the pattern of these parties; these dangers exist. I was wondering if here there's less than there was in that period of something more sustaining.

DR. NELSON: One of the saving elements in the current non-violent movement is that it is built around a conscious moral and spiritual core with a strong intellectual content. This combination tends to give balance and to reduce the incidence of emotional collapse. It is understood, of course, that the depth of commitment to the moral and spiritual core varies greatly from individual to individual.

MR. WARREN: But there was no such core in the general . . . . . . there were various movements for social justice in the '30s to carry them -- to carry . . . . over into another period and save them from the disillusionment that followed for many, or most, as a matter of fact.

DR. NELSON: One must have the highest regard for movements for social justice of the '30s. Most of them had a religious content -- loyalty to an overriding ideal -- even though this religious content was not always explicit. This is the marked difference between these movements of the past and the present one. The present one not only professes spiritual content but aims at spiritual discipline. This, I believe, tends to reduce the incidence of psychological casualties.

MR. WARREN: Tell me something about this split or splits among leadership in the civil rights movement. How serious do you think these rifts are as of this moment?

DR. NELSON: As I read the situation, the differences appear to be less grave at the moment than in the past. The March on Washington of last August was a great visual testimony to this. A broad, common understanding as to purpose and method has been developing gradually, and I believe substantially.

MR. WARREN: Have you followed the New York situation in the last week or two about the school situation, the school boycott and the bus proposal?

DR. NELSON: I have followed this situation at a distance, from The New York Times' accounts, principally. That there are differences does not surprise me.

MR. WARREN: To an outsider like myself reading the paper, there seems to be a deep and fundamental rift on this boycott question. How deep, how merely fundamental, I don't know, between the parties that try for a total boycott, and a total bussing system as opposed to people like the CORE and . . . . . . which are different, more studious look at the situation presumably, though I don't propose to judge between them.

DR. NELSON: The problem is so long-standing and so difficult that any radical solution is bound to produce trauma and deep divergencies of opinion. Further, the approach to a solution naturally differs from group to group, since followers cluster around leaders with different motivations or dispositions and rally about movements which are inclined to sponsor what might be called more or less radical solutions. This can be expected, especially in a great metropolitan area like New York. In most instances, circumstances will dictate a meeting of minds, or at least the reluctant acceptance of a judgment with which one is not in complete agreement. In situations like that obtaining in New York I believe the achievement of substantial unity within the minority group will prove the overring consideration.

END OF TAPE #2