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In discussing the subject of racial segregation in this country and particularly in the South, the only sensible and practical approach must be objective and not merely critical from a standpoint of one's personal opinion. We should consider what the ultimate ability of segregation, or integration of the races by court order actually means.

Satisfaction

Man's Reward

Propositions of the intermarriage of the races, the group or congregation action against religiously and racially alien groups with such nations as the United States, the recognition of the sovereignty of Colonized People and by logical progression that segregation is in the world against the God of Good.

Every citizen has responsibility for his active and courageous participation in the voting, and encouraging others to act.

Each Negro minister, or white minister, who really understands human nature, who really understands the soul of another man, understands the soul of a Negro. The soul of a Negro is the struggle. The soul of a Negro is the fight. It is a fight for freedom. It is a fight for justice. It is a fight for equality. It is a fight for democracy. It is a fight for brotherhood.

The United States Supreme Court had occasion to pass upon the subject of the Fourteenth Amendment with regard to the segregation of the races under State laws in several cases prior to the decision of May 15, 1954.

On May 15, 1954, the court, in considering the segregation statutes of the State of Louisiana, with only Justice Harlan dissenting, held:

"The object of the amendment was undoubtedly, in part, at least, to extinguish forever the practice of racial segregation in public education by compelling the States to embrace a policy of school integration. That an Act of Congress bearing a constitutional aspect is void because its purpose is to accomplish a result which, if accomplished by a State Act, would be constitutional does not mean that the end cannot be accomplished by the States through proper legislative means. The policy of public education is one which the States have always been free to adopt or abandon as they thought best. The same right of control was enjoyed by the States in relation to the provision of public parks and other public services under the pursuits clause of the Constitution. Our decision in the case at bar is in accordance with that policy and with the decision in the case of the State of Kansas v. United States, 208 U.S. 1, decided the 27th of May, 1907."
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