

Dear,

Post D. Day, 1944.  
letters being delivered again  
(both on Balkan & in W. Europe.)  
June 16, 1944

I have so many things on my mind right now. Sort of bubbling and steaming over in my mind. I'm writing you a little essay which I shall not mail - it needs reworking, among other reasons. I've been piling up a list of things in your letters I want to talk about, but I haven't finished that yet. Just to keep you up to date, I have now received letters up to June 7. I know I have not received all of them - there are gaps. I also know that you haven't received letters after about April 18<sup>th</sup> or so. I trust the other means of communication was satisfactory during that period. From what I hear, they are now allowing the mail to flow again. One further question - what was this special messenger letter? the one you had to have censored? I don't quite understand.

This present letter has mainly to do with racial problems in the U.S. and the world. It has grown out of some recent discussions on the subject, reading Beard's book, and your letter concerning the Texan political move toward white supremacy as a campaign platform. Herewith are enclosed my thoughts at the moment. They are full of undefined general terms, broad sweeping generalizations, and are only opinions without much research or experience in the particular problems or in some of the broad fields concerned. But here goes.

There are two parts to my analysis, diagnosis in cases of racial troubles and treatment of them. I know little about sociology, but one of the most fundamental facts of that science is, I am told, that the family group is the basis of human society and that peoples are groups of similar families, i.e. similar in respect to factors of geography, economics, hereditary makeup, customs & social structures. It is also obvious that governments are derived from these groups. I believe that the more homogenous the people are, the more integrated in total background they are, the more possible is efficient government; especially of the constitutional democratic type. I don't believe there is much argument with the ideas so far, even tho the words maybe poorly chosen, but here comes the crux of the argument. Political equality in a constitutional democracy is prefaced by social equality or social similarity & acceptability. (Talk about B.S.G.) I refer to the acceptance of family groups into social life on even terms, the adoption of customs which do not conflict very much, the ability of the family groups in question to mingle socially and intermarry. Certain groups in a society may be isolated for various reasons, economic or otherwise and this leads directly to a heterogenous society without a good base for

Democratic government.

In America there are many groups which are not yet well assimilated. There are large islands of families of foreign descent who are isolated in many large cities. There is the large group of negro Americans. There is a small group of Japanese of great importance in the Far West - (did you see the "Fortune" job on them?). There are forces at work which tend toward assimilation, especially concerning the islands of Caucasian descent, regardless of their religion. National history has demonstrated that these groups can be easily absorbed into the American mass, and this is happening at present, even in the large city islands. National history also shows that with the same or sometimes even better opportunities for assimilation, negro Americans have not lost their separate character. I do not know all the reasons for this demonstrable fact, but I certainly know ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> important one: there are wide, striking, hereditary biological differences between Caucasians and Negroids. Cross breeding can & does take place, as between Donkeys & horses, but mixed family groups living together in society with both types rarely occurs. There are other broad differences of racial character. <sup>It is a phenomenon which</sup> And we have said that

similar <sup>intermarrying</sup> family groups are the basis of an integrated society and government.

Enough of diagnosis, treatment is certainly indicated. The first principle I hold necessary to correct the situation, or rather to prevent its accentuation is the rigid control of immigration. I think you can floor the best liberal argument about the brotherhood of man by asking how many hundred thousands of Japanese he would allow to immigrate to the United States. We are not historically on record as an asylum for immigrating peoples or as a melting pot. Our postulated constitutional freedoms were intended for the already well melted American population of revolutionary times — a caucasian population to have these rights; Slavery was countenanced by the founding fathers as the method of handling the incompatible negro population. Washington & Jefferson did not foresee or desire the huge waves of immigrants to follow them. For various reasons, they came anyway & the country assimilated them, especially the caucasian element with remarkable ease. But I feel that any future immigration of Asiatics or Africans should be prevented. We can be a good neighbor nation without opening the doors to incompatible elements. I can have great respect for a

a great man or an interesting fellow from Siam or Ethiopia or anyplace but I don't want him living next door in any numbers. Why don't we just admit that various peoples are built differently and will live differently and won't mix without a tremendous amount of friction & time expended?

And now the more difficult problem. Here we are in 1944, 135 millions or so Americans of us including lots of negroes and japanese & urban racial islands of various kinds. Where do we go from here?

I believe the caucasian racial islands are disappearing, and I don't believe they will be important in a few more generations. However, I do not have great confidence in the faith of some liberals that the american negroes and asiatics can be absorbed in a similar fashion in the same time. Biological & sociological evidence is against it. This, of course, means we will have to ~~live~~ live with our hair shirt. These minorities have been granted political liberties and rights for which there is no social underwriting. We may therefore assume that there will always be friction. To paraphrase Jefferson, speaking of undesirable immigrants, these minorities, in proportion to their numbers, will share legislation with us. They will infuse into it their spirit, warp or bias its direction, and render it a heterogeneous, incoherent distracted mass.

Practically speaking, white men are sitting on top, dealing the cards, and any attempt to knock him off is just going to bring conflict and retaliation like the Texas affair. You can be sure that negro americans are not going to dominate a state politically without another civil war. John Austin thinks that their congressional representation should be cut according to the population not represented at the polls, he admits that the state can more or less define its own voting requirements to control the elections. People who decry the "justice" of the situation have got to redefine justice leaving out the abstracts. As I look at it, re-criminalization & conflict are not the answer. Task:

- ① That negro americans resign from attempts to dominate state governments.
  - ② That they control their local governments by democratic methods.
  - ③ That matters of conflict be settled thru compromise and cooperation of local & state or local governments.
- This is really the only constructive outlook, I believe.

I cannot lead myself to believe in or hope for eventual assimilation of <sup>the</sup> minorities by social mixing and intermarriage, but perhaps even that may happen in a few thousand years.

I suppose this letter reflects my southern background, but I haven't heard any better ideas on the subject than I have given. Tear it up if you want to. Love, Don