

Rebels In The Republican Ranks

Walter D. Kennedy

Southern conservatives awoke the 15th of July 2005 to read the following headline in many local papers "G.O.P. Apologies to NAACP for Southern Strategy." For many Southerners this was somewhat of a rude awaking that hot Southern July morning. Once again, Southerners are instructed to assume their assigned position upon the "stool of everlasting repentance." As America's formal whipping boy, the South is once again brought into the public eye and given its 30 lashes-this time by our good friends in the National Republican Party. The irony of those words "G.O.P. Apologies to NAACP for Southern Strategy" has not been over looked by many neo-Confederates. The South, the region that has made the G.O.P. a majority party, must once again stand before the nation, hat in hand, and accept being held up before the world and proclaimed to be the bastion of all that is evil in America. Southerners routinely vote overwhelmingly for conservative candidates; yet, it is the South that is chastised by the G.O.P. in order to curry favor from a group that routinely votes 95% AGAINST conservative candidates. Today, more than anyone in the United States, we the people of the South have made the Republican Party the majority party in America. Yet how is the Republican Party repaying the South? Let us face the issue squarely; the South is a pariah, a black sheep, the redheaded stepchild, or more correctly, the bastard spurious issue of the Republican Party. Ironic, yes but the closely held attitude about the South by the National Republican Party does not come as a surprise to those who have been active in the defense of Southern Rights and true American Constitutional government.

Southerners instinctively understand that left of center, big government, and socialist elements in America naturally dislike the South. Why would they not hate the South? After all, the South is the section of America that has from the beginning of the republic stood in the way of the growth of big government. Big governments, whether in the form of Hitler's nazis, Stalin's communists or America's left of center politicians, all place their *ultimate* faith in government as the agent of change within a nation. Add to this list of big government advocates, America's neo-conservative (neo-con) establishment. Although dubbed "right of center," America's neo-conservatives, i.e., conservative Republican ideologues, have one thing in common with their socialist allies-their willingness to use the power of big government to advance their policies and/or power. To a neo-con big government is only evil if it is in the hands of their political enemies. As long as conservatives, i.e., neo-cons, are holding the reigns of power, big government is not so bad or so their logic goes. A prime example of this neo-con philosophy at work can be seen in the writings of Mr. Neo-Con himself, Newt Gingrich. In his book *To Renew America* (which should have been sub-titled *By Trashing the South*), Gingrich opens his tome with a blistering attack on Southern racism.

The first premise of most neo-cons such as Gingrich is that the South is responsible for all of America's race problems because it is the South who enslaved Blacks, segregated Blacks and of course lynched and otherwise mistreated Black Americans. The left of center elements in America routinely asserts that Southerners left no stone unturned to "keep the Blackman poverty ridden, ignorant, and otherwise abused." By not stating their opposition to these lies, neo-cons such as Mr. Gingrich have given their tacit approval of this liberal message. In his book Mr. Gingrich states that Southern Democrats established segregation.¹ This "blame the South" mentality is rather common in the left of

center socialist (liberal) brigades and their neo-conservative comrades. But as is so often the case when dealing with facts about issues of race in America, the truth is stranger than accepted myths. Let's enlighten our neo-con friends with a little history lesson. Segregation did not begin in the South but rather it began in New England! Also, it should be noted that it was not Southern Democrats who made segregation the law of the land but rather, it was the *Federal* Supreme Court. In its 1898 *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision the United States Supreme Court codified racial segregation laws (the so-called Jim Crow laws) as the law of the land. This decision was based upon an 1845 law in *Massachusetts* (not Mississippi) that mandated separate schools for White and Black children in the Northern State of Massachusetts. The Federal Supreme Court Judge who wrote the majority opinion for this case was a native of the Northern State of *Michigan* (not Mississippi). The only judge who voted against the majority of Federal Supreme Court Judges establishing Jim Crow laws in the United States was a Southerner, the only Southerner on the Supreme Court at that time. Oh look, another bit of irony! Massachusetts and the Federal Supreme Court is responsible for legalizing segregation in the United States; the only Federal Judge to vote against legalizing segregation in the United States was from the South, those voting for segregation were from the North; yet, according to the left of center crowd, neo-cons, and Mr. Gingrich, the South is at fault for establishing segregation in America.

Yankees find it very convenient having the South around to blame for all race related problems that face our nation. Yankees have been given a pass on their history of race discrimination while they waste no time in pointing out the problems down South. Those accustomed to denigrating the South seldom mention the positive contributions made by Black and White Southerners. During the days of segregation when few African-Americans exercised the right of voting, more schools and colleges were created and funded by white voters of the South than any nation on earth. In the past 120 years nowhere in the world outside of the United States have Black people had a higher income, more personal wealth, higher literacy rate, longer life expectancy or lower infant mortality rate than in the South. While denigrating the South, Mr. Gingrich could find no place in his book to praise the South for its positive contributions to African-Americans. Contrast the difference between the words of the G.O.P. apologizing to the NAACP for their so-called Southern strategy to the words of Booker T. Washington praising the South for its efforts in assisting African-Americans. In his book *Up From Slavery* Washington describes how while visiting President McKinley in Atlanta, Georgia, a white man and former slave-holder was asked by the President if he thought it would be wise for the President to visit the Negro school at Tuskegee. Booker T. Washington states the ex-slaveholder answered the President and said it was the proper thing to do. This and many other such acts of kindness between Black and White Southerners are detailed in Washington's book, more proof of positive acts of kindness and good will existing between the races in the South. Unfortunately, these acts are seldom reported.

In October of 1957, the Shreveport Times printed an editorial written by the Bureau of Public Relations at Grambling College, a Black College in Grambling, Louisiana. In this editorial the Black author explains how at a recent football game a very large crowd of Black people were present. The crowd was well dressed, drove fine cars, and departed themselves with grace. All of this while many outside the South were reporting only negatively on life in the South for Black people. The editorial states: "No one who looked at the thousands of Negroes...would say that the Southern Negro was held in bondage, a mishandled, unkempt, poverty-stricken, and ignorant lot....It is unfortunate that this side of Negro life in...the South generally goes unnoticed by the northern press, agitators, political rabble-rousers, and other who would put the good people, white and Negro, in a bad light." Both liberal

Democrats and neo-conservative Republicans delight in putting the "white and Negro [in the South] in a bad light."

Liberals and neo-cons delight in demeaning the South for its social standards during the days when segregation was the law of the land. According to them, the African-American led a precarious life before the victory of the civil rights movement in the late 60's. Yet, when we look at the life of African-Americans in 1950 as compared to 2005, we find some remarkable differences. In 1950 70% of African-American children were born in two parent homes, today less than 30% are born in two parent homes; in 1950 sexually transmitted disease (S.T.D.'s) were infrequently seen in teenage African-Americans, today S.T.D.'s are epidemic within this group; today Black on Black murder is so common that if it is reported at all it will be on the back pages of the newspaper. In the past ten years in the United States (some forty years after the civil rights victory) more Black people died at the hands of fellow Blacks than were lynched in the South in the past 125 years! This is not intended to be a defense of segregation but rather it is an attempt to show the hypocrisy of the far left and neo-cons as they deal with the issue of race and the South.

Yes, anti-liberty laws (Jim Crow laws) were common in America for far to long. But Southerners did not force these laws upon the United States. In 1950 New York City was just as segregated as Montgomery, Alabama. So-called Jim Crow laws were part of the legal codes of 26 States in the Union at the time when only 48 States were in the Union-yet, it is the South that is blamed for these laws. One hundred and twenty years before the birth of Martin Luther King and 176 years before the modern civil rights movement, a founding father of this nation and a Southerner, St. George Tucker of Virginia, wrote an article declaring the need to end both slavery and laws that discriminated against people of color. Oh, yet another irony! While Massachusetts holds the dubious honor of being the first American colony that was engaged in the African slave-trade and the first American colony that passed a law recognizing a master's right in the property of his slaves; it was the South that first demanded an end to the African slave-trade and a Southerner who first demanded equal rights for African-Americans³. But what about the neo-con's (AKA, Republicans) assertion that only the Federal government can protect the rights of a minority.

What a slap in the face neo-cons give African-Americans when they assert that only the Federal government can guarantee the rights of African-Americans. Every minority group in American has had to overcome discrimination and each has done so without the guiding hand of big government. Long before signs stating, "No Negroes need apply," signs would read, "No Irish need apply." A complete list of such people "discriminated" against in America would include almost the entire American population. Red, Yellow, Black and White, all in their turn have had to face down discrimination. Other than African-Americans, no group of Americans has had to have the Federal government "guarantee" their rights. The question then is, "How do people over come discrimination?" Here is how Booker T. Washington suggest this be done, "The great human law that in the end recognizes and rewards merit is everlasting and universal....No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized."⁴ Hard work and merit, not un-Constitutional Federal rules, edicts and regulations were Booker T. Washington's suggestion for ending discrimination. It was merit and not Federal bayonets that broke down the color barrier in baseball; Motown was the capital of Black music in the early 1960's, yet Southern White children were just as likely to listen, sing, and buy Motown music as any Northern child, it was merit not Federal bayonets that broke down that color barrier; when Black musician Charlie Pride burst upon the Country Music charts, it was merit and not Federal

bayonets that broke the color barrier. The growing economic power of America's African-American community, coupled with hard work and merit, would have done a much better job of ending Jim Crow laws in American than empowering the Federal government with fraudulent powers-powers that would eventually be used to speed the growth of big government.

As long as the civil rights movement followed Booker T. Washington's model of self improvement and merit real progress was possible. This was done without creating an oppressive big government overlord interfering with the daily activity of Americans. Since the rise of the modern civil rights movement, Booker T. Washington's plan of self improvement has been abandon and replaced by W.E.B. DuBois' Marxist theory of class struggle. DuBois, an admirer of communism, redefined the civil rights struggle to embrace the concept of struggle between the oppressed and the oppressors. Now, White people are no longer seen as Booker T. Washington describes them, i.e., partners in the improvement of Black Americans but now they are redefined as the oppressor. Listen to the language of Al Sharpton or Jesse Jackson and you will hear this communist mantra with each speech. How different it would have been for all Americans if this nation had followed the advice of St. George Tucker and Booker T. Washington. State's Rights would have been saved and big government would have died on the vine. But the left of center politicians desired the death of State's Rights.

In his book Mr. Gingrich even explains why he sometimes favors big government. According to Gingrich only the Federal government could protect the rights of minorities, therefore, it is only logical that the Federal government exercise the power necessary to protect minorities². Of course my first question for big government neo-cons is, "If the Federal government is our guardian then *who shall guard the guards?*" According to Thomas Jefferson and James Madison in their famous Kentucky and Virginia Resolves of '98, it is the people at the local governmental level, i.e., the States, who retain the final say on how they are to be governed. Furthermore, according to these gentlemen the Federal government can only legally exercise the power it has been granted. Any exercise of power that has not been granted to the Federal government via the Constitution is a usurpation of the reserved rights of the people of the States and therefore not Constitutional. Even high federalists such as Alexander Hamilton noted that in cases where the Federal government went beyond its delegated rights its action would be non-binding upon the States of the Union⁵. Mr. Gingrich and his neo-con cohorts all pay lip service to the concept of State's Rights. But how can State's Rights exist if the Federal government is allowed to usurp any of the reserved rights of the people of the States? What Mr. Gingrich and his neo-con fellow travelers call State's Rights is at best an effeminate shadow of *real* State's Rights and at worst, nothing more than State privileges. A State privilege is a right that the Federal government has determined that the people at the local level could at present exercise. In other words big government is the one who determines every issue, not the people at the local level. What socialist would find anything wrong with this formula? Hitler did not like the concept of local control (State's Rights), he believed in big government; Stalin did not like people at the local level governing themselves (State's Rights), he wanted to rule from Moscow; likewise, Lincoln, American socialists, and neo-cons don't like State's Rights; they want to be in control of the government.

It is clear that left of center groups as well as neo-cons do not like *real* State's Rights. Southerners and other traditional conservatives view State's Rights as the indispensable safe guard for American liberty. What is it about State's Rights that is so important to the maintenance of true American liberty?

The grant of power from the States to the Federal government in the Constitution is well defined and specific. Any power, authority, or right which is not delegated to the Federal government or denied to

the States is retained by the people of the sovereign States. According to Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison, one of those rights is the right and duty of the States to judge for themselves if the Federal government is overstepping its authority. In relation to the idea that the Federal government will be the guardian of our rights, the question was asked earlier "who shall guard the guards?" The author of the Declaration of Independence (Jefferson) and the father of the Constitution (Madison) give us a clear and unequivocal answer-the States. State's Rights is the great check upon the Federal government to ensure that it does not over step its delegated authority, thus becoming a tyrannical government. The right to judge the Constitutionality of an act of the Federal government has not been denied to the States nor has it been delegated to the Federal government; therefore it belongs to the people of the States. Likewise, the right of nullification and/or secession has not been denied to the States nor have they been delegated to the Federal government; therefore these rights belong to the people of the States. *Real State's Rights* is the only way to check the uncontrolled growth of the Federal government. If *real State's Rights* as just described were active today, does anyone believe that the Federal government would have a 17 trillion dollar debt or control every act or action of citizens in every State? Everything from how much water goes down your toilet to how much money the IRS will allow you to keep comes under the control of the gargantuan Federal government⁶. Neo conservatives who dutifully pay lip service to the concept of State's Rights while denying the right of nullification and/or secession have successfully castrated *real State's Rights*. Without *real State's Rights* the Federal government continues to grow-when will it end? It will not end until the chains that are now being forged are placed securely upon us!

Yes, the growth of big government has been slowed from time to time. Nevertheless, even under the leadership of Ronald Regan the size and power of big government continued to grow-why? Why, even when the Congress and the office of the President are in Republican hands, and a majority of Supreme Court justices are Republican appointees, does this malignant growth of big government continue? The reason for this malignant growth is because the natural check upon the growth of the Federal government was surrendered at Appomattox-don't hold your breath waiting for Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, Newt Gingrich or any neo-con to tell America the truth about Appomattox.

Is the present Republican Party serving the needs of those who love true American liberty? If we define true American liberty as Jefferson and Madison did in the Kentucky and Virginia Resolves then it is obvious that the present National Republican Party is not the party of liberty but the party of big government-surely, a lesser version of a big government party than the Democrats but at bottom, it still believes that Washington rules-no different than Lincoln (no irony there). If Washington rules then the republic of republics as established by our forefathers is dead. Our dearest interests and rights are held in the hands of those we cannot control, rather, they control us. What would Patrick Henry think of such a government?

When Republican National Committee Chairman Ken Mehlman apologized to the NAACP, he stated he was proud to be part of the party of "Lincoln, Harriet Tubman, Sojourner Truth and Fredrick Douglas." He went on to state that he looked forward to "rebuilding the historic relationship between the NAACP and the Republican Party." If this is the kind of party National Republicans are planning, where does that leave the South? Lincoln and Fredrick Douglas are advocates of big government activism not limited government. Where is this activism headed? Will this activism lead down the road of civil rights for gays, pedophiles, and practitioners of bestiality? Once the brakes have been removed from government there is no telling how far and how fast it will go. The G.O.P. and its neo-cons have no more use for the brakes of *real State's Rights* than their liberal cousins. It is time for traditional Southern

conservatives to reconsider our options-perhaps both within the G.O.P. and within the Union-its time to consider some radical alternatives.

1 Newt Gingrich, To Renew America (Harper Collins Publishers, New York, NY: 1995) p. 21.

2 The Shreveport Times, October 22, 1957, p6-A

3 Walter D. Kennedy, Myths of American Slavery (Pelican Publishing Co., Gretna, La: 2003) pp.23-30;41-46.

4 Booker T. Washington, Up From Slavery (1901, The Classics of Liberty Library, New York, NY: 1993) pp. 223, 318.

5 Alexander Hamilton, The Federalist, No. 33

6 James R. Kennedy, Reclaiming Liberty (Pelican Publishing Co., Gretna, La., 2005) p 167.