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Many Americans have a vague idea of the fact that the Republican and Democratic Parties have shifted when it comes to race, specifically concerning the issue of African Americans’ rights. Anybody who has heard the Republican Party referred to as the, “Party of Lincoln,” then seen a Republican voter in the South displaying a Confederate flag might question the odd juxtaposition. Anyone who has seen Barack Obama, a Democrat and the first black President of the United States, give a speech at the Jefferson-Jackson Dinner, a dinner named for two slave masters considered to be patron saints of his party, is probably also aware that something has changed. But many Americans are unsure of when or how the shift took place. The truth is that the Republican Party was more supportive of the rights of African Americans until the 1960s, at which point the Democratic Party became the more supportive entity.

For much of the nineteenth century leading up to the Civil War, there was a consensus between the Whig and Democratic parties that slavery should not be interfered with. In 1828, the Democratic Party was founded, and Andrew Jackson was the first party member to be elected president. Jackson was a reactionary on the issue of slavery, to say nothing of his extremely conservative stance on the rights of Native Americans. Abraham Lincoln once observed that even slaveholders found the traders who sold slaves to be morally reprehensible. Jackson had risen from poverty and become a rich man not only from owning slaves but also from trading them. Once, when a slave ran away, Jackson offered, “ten dollars extra, for every hundred lashes any person will give him, to the amount of three hundred,” if the slave was located outside of Tennessee. As president, he supported censorship of abolitionist petitions and other literature. Every other Democratic president before the Civil War—Van Buren, Polk, Pierce, and Buchanan—took a proslavery stance, and Polk flaunted his slaveholding and treated his slaves with much the same brutality as Jackson. Conservative “Cotton Whigs,” such as Henry Clay and Millard Fillmore, prevented the rival Whig Party from taking a strong antislavery stand as well. However, in the 1850s, the Whig Party crumbled, and the antislavery

---

Northern minority defected from the Democratic Party. In 1854, a coalition was formed composed of antislavery Whigs, antislavery Democrats, and former members of the antislavery fringe Liberty and Free Soil parties. This coalition was the antislavery Republican Party. Black and white abolitionists, however, comprised a minority in the Republican Party. The first Republican president, Abraham Lincoln, defeated the Southern Democrats who had formed the Confederacy to promote slavery, and worked with Yankee Republican Congressmen and Senators to pass the Thirteenth Amendment, ending slavery. After the war, Yankee Republican politicians went against the wishes of Southern Democrats and their Northern party allies by passing the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. It is important here to note a couple of things. First of all, the Republican Party, save for a few radicals like Charles Sumner and Frederick Douglass, was never firmly committed to full racial equality. Indeed, the abolitionist Wendell Phillips would label Lincoln, “The Slave-Hound of Illinois” and lambast him for racism and moral cowardice. Second, the Republican Party as a whole ceased to make increased rights for African Americans a major priority after Benjamin Harrison left office in 1893. Meanwhile, factors such as the defection of a number of Northeastern Republicans, called “Mugwumps,” to the Democratic Party in the 1880s and generational shifts with regard to racial attitudes meant that in the aftermath of Reconstruction, the Democratic Party acquired some Northern liberals who differed philosophically from the party leadership on civil rights.

Yet the fact is that the Democratic Party remained more hostile to blacks than the GOP. The Republican Party retained major supporters of racial equality, such as NAACP cofounders John Milholland and Albert Pillsbury. Meanwhile, the vast majority of segregationists, such as Ben Tillman, Coleman Blease, and James Vardaman, were Democrats.

Grover Cleveland, the Democratic president supported by Mugwump NAACP cofounder Moorfield Storey, ran partly on
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opposing a voting rights bill proposed by Republicans.\textsuperscript{11} He agreed with the Supreme Court’s segregationist ruling in\textit{ Plessy v. Ferguson}, in which a lawyer who challenged segregation had been a Republican “carpetbagger” during Reconstruction.\textsuperscript{12} Cleveland favored segregated schools and proclaimed that, “in my official position,” he had never eaten with, “any colored man, woman, or child.”\textsuperscript{13} Although he believed in white supremacy, it is hard to imagine Teddy Roosevelt, who favored the desegregation of New York public schools and ate dinner at the White House with Booker T. Washington, making such a boast.\textsuperscript{14}

To the consternation of the few supporters of racial equality who backed them, Democratic presidents and presidential candidates such as William Jennings Bryan, Woodrow Wilson, John W. Davis, and Franklin Roosevelt all either supported segregation outright or worked to avoid supporting more rights for African Americans. Roosevelt allowed New Deal agencies to be segregated, even in Wisconsin where the Republican governor protested.\textsuperscript{15, 16} He was often very slow to support civil rights reforms, and when he did, he sometimes backpedaled later.\textsuperscript{17} The Republican Party presidential candidates in 1940 and 1944, Wendell Wilkie and Thomas Dewey, called for integrating the military, but Roosevelt did not do so.\textsuperscript{18} From the late 1800s, post Reconstruction, to the 1960s, there was a constant dichotomy. Both the Democratic and Republican Party had white Northerners and African Americans who staunchly supported civil rights. But segregationists were nearly all Democrats, and until at least the mid 1940s, they had a controlling interest in the party. The greater prevalence of racism in the Democratic Party under FDR is exhibited by the 1936 presidential election. FDR won all forty-eight states except for Maine and Vermont, which voted
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Republican. It would be absurd to argue that white Republican voters in Maine and Vermont were more racist than white voters in the South, who overwhelmingly supported FDR.

In 1945, things began to change. President Franklin Roosevelt, who for twelve years had presided over a coalition in which working class whites received the lion’s share of the benefit while blacks were given paltry concessions, died shortly into his fourth term. His replacement was Harry Truman. A native of Missouri, which was situated on the Northern rim of the Jim Crow belt, Truman was descended from slave owners and referred to blacks as “niggers” and “coons” all his life. In his old age, he condemned interracial marriage as a sin and criticized the civil disobedience of civil rights activists, saying that they had not been spanked enough as children and that Southern police officers should be given paddles to hit them with. Equally disturbing, he criticized both the white Northern abolitionists of the past and the white Northerners participating in the Civil Rights Movement as outside agitators who caused trouble.

Yet as president, Truman established a committee on civil rights and pushed for a package of reforms. These included federal legislation against poll taxes, lynching, and segregation in interstate travel, a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission, and integration of the military. At least part of Truman’s motivation was political. There was a legitimate risk that Republican candidate Thomas Dewey could gain many votes from blacks in states where they were not prevented from voting. When running in the 1939 New York gubernatorial election, Dewey stated that he would rather lose the election than pander to racist voters. As governor, he signed the first state law in the history of the United States to ban workplace discrimination based on race. In the 1944 presidential election, when he was much more willing to publicly give his views on controversial subjects, Dewey called for extending New York’s anti-discrimination law to the whole country and ending segregation in the military. He also supported addressing the exclusion of African Americans from Social Security rolls by extending benefits to cover domestic servants and farmers, who made up half the country’s black work force in 1944. Furthermore, Henry Wallace and Glen Taylor, two prairie liberal Democrats, were running on the
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Progressive Party ticket and had made ending segregation an important part of their platform.\(^\text{25}\)

At the 1948 Democratic National Convention, where Harry Truman was nominated, Mayor Hubert Humphrey of Minneapolis gave a speech that would jump-start a long process of political realignment. In his speech, Humphrey urged the Democratic Party to finally embrace civil rights. “My friends,” he proclaimed, “to those who say that we are rushing this issue of civil rights, I say to them we are 172 years late. To those who say that this civil-rights program is an infringement on states’ rights, I say this: The time has arrived in America for the Democratic Party to get out of the shadow of states' rights and to walk forthrightly into the bright sunshine of human rights. People -- human beings -- this is the issue of the 20th century. People of all kinds -- all sorts of people -- and these people are looking to America for leadership, and they’re looking to America for precept and example.”\(^\text{26}\)

Infuriated, a group of segregationist Democrats led by Strom Thurmond of South Carolina stormed out of the convention. In the 1948 election, these segregationists nominated Strom Thurmond for president on the “States’ Rights Democratic Party” ticket. Their platform called for Southern states to be allowed to continue racial segregation.\(^\text{27}\) Thurmond ended up winning South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana, while Truman took the rest of the South\(^\text{28}\) Many Southern white supremacists still felt strong loyalty to the Democratic Party, and they had little incentive to vote for Dewey. Meanwhile, Dewey failed to gain much black support apart from that of some black newspapers.\(^\text{29}\) This was probably largely due to advice he received from supporters that he was guaranteed to win the election if he avoided making any major mistakes. Thus, while he encouraged the GOP to include a pro-civil rights plank in its platform, he generally avoided taking stands on controversial issues, including segregation.\(^\text{30}\)


Still, one should not think that the Democratic Party was no longer the more racist of the two parties during the late 1940s. In spite of Humphrey’s brave stand, Thurmond and his ilk returned to the Democratic Party after the election and were welcomed back.\footnote{Hamilton, Mary Allienne, \textit{Rising from the Wilderness: J.W. Gitt and His Legendary Newspaper: the Gazette and Daily of York, Pa} (York: York County Heritage Trust, 2007), 126.} From the 1940s to the 1960s, there continued to be at least five political camps within the two parties. Among the Republicans, there were politicians like Robert Taft and Barry Goldwater who tended to oppose grand civil rights reforms at the federal level but often supported modest federal legislation and generally avoided praising segregation. There were also politicians like Harold Stassen, Clifford Case, Jacob Javits, and Nelson Rockefeller who strongly favored racial equality and comprehensive legal change. Meanwhile, the Democratic Party was led by civil rights moderates who tried to keep both the segregationist wing and the black-white Northern liberal wing satisfied.\footnote{Woods, Randall Bennett, \textit{LBJ: Architect of American Ambition} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 326.} Yet the fact remains, as referenced earlier, that segregationists remained mostly Democrat.

Hubert Humphrey was arguably the leader of the pro-civil rights Democrats following World War II. During his time as mayor, he had vehemently opposed racism and anti-Semitism in Minneapolis. According to political scientist Nelson Polsby, Humphrey “more than any other Senator” fought for civil rights from 1949 to 1965.\footnote{Taylor, Jeff, \textit{Where did the party go?: William Jennings Bryan, Hubert Humphrey, and the Jeffersonian Legacy}, (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2006), 204-205.} Comparing him with John F. Kennedy is instructive. In 1957, Kennedy and Humphrey both voted for final passage of the first successful piece of civil rights legislation since Reconstruction. Yet beforehand, Kennedy had voted twice to weaken or impede the bill. In one of these cases, Kennedy had voted in favor of Georgia segregationist Democrat Richard Russell’s attempt to prevent Vice President Richard Nixon from sending the bill straight to the Senate floor without being considered by the Judiciary Committee. The motivation here was obvious. Russell hoped that the bill would die in committee or at least be seriously weakened. Kennedy also voted in favor of an amendment to the bill that allowed whites who interfered with black voting rights to be tried by local juries rather than federal judges. This, of course, significantly decreased their chances of being convicted. Humphrey voted against both compromises.\footnote{O’Brien, Michael, \textit{John F. Kennedy: A Biography} (London: MacMillan, 2006), 458.} While Humphrey had criticized the United States for not immediately practicing racial justice upon
its founding, Kennedy devoted a chapter of Profiles in Courage to praising Daniel Webster for favoring the Compromise of 1850.35 (The Compromise of 1850 had included, among other things, a stronger fugitive slave law.)

The contrast between Humphrey and Lyndon Johnson is even more revealing. In his early days as a Texas Senator, Johnson favored requiring segregation in Washington, D.C. and opposed virtually all of Truman’s civil rights proposals.36 And like Truman, he used the “n word” to refer to blacks.37 For comparison, the most offensive comment Hubert Humphrey is reported to have made was when he called black civil rights activist Fannie Lou Hamer “that illiterate woman.”38 But offensive though this statement was, it is true that Hamer had been forced to leave school following sixth grade, in contrast to civil rights leaders like James Farmer and Martin Luther King, Jr. who had graduated college.39 Given this fact and Humphrey’s record, this remark ought to be viewed as a tasteless reference to Hamer’s lack of high school or college education and her tendency to speak too “emotionally to help the party” as reason why she should not be permitted to speak at the 1964 Democratic National Convention rather than as a case of Humphrey showing latent racism. It should also be noted that, at the time he made the remark, Humphrey was basically being compelled to do Lyndon Johnson’s unpleasant tasks in exchange for the vice presidency, indicating that frustration may have caused him to say something that was not in keeping with his values.40

Humphrey represented a shift in white voter demographics that paralleled the shift in black voter demographics. The Northeastern and Great Lakes states, where Jim Crow laws were least pervasive, were inching ever so slowly from being either Republican or battleground states into the Democratic column. From 1949 to 1959, Paul Douglas, William Proxmire, and Edmund Muskie were elected to the Senate. All three, like Humphrey, were Northern Democrats from the party’s pro-civil rights wing. And all three, like Humphrey, replaced Republican Senators. These new arrivals were often a thorn in the side of Southern Democrats, who were used to making the decisions about civil rights for their party. For instance, when Lyndon Johnson was the Senate Majority Leader, he penalized Edmund Muskie for his strong support of civil rights by giving him
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In the 1952 and 1956 presidential elections, both the Democratic and Republican parties retreated from the pro-civil rights stands that they had taken in 1948. Dwight Eisenhower defeated pro civil rights stalwart Harold Stassen for the GOP nomination in 1952, and after winning the election, he ran again in 1956. Eisenhower had defended segregation in the military and tried hard to straddle both sides of the fence, favoring some civil rights reforms like a federal ban on poll taxes and opposing others, such as a federal Fair Employment Practices Commission. Meanwhile, the Democratic Party nominated Adlai Stevenson in 1952 and 1956. Adlai Stevenson took a similarly moderate path. While being interviewed by Truman adviser James Loeb, Stevenson said that he wanted civil rights issues to be decided by states. He also said that he took a dim view of the NAACP’s work against segregation.

Stevenson’s choice of a running mate in 1952 was segregationist John Sparkman, a clear concession to segregationists rather than blacks or white liberals. Later in the decade, Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., a black Democrat from New York, introduced an amendment to a federal school construction bill that would have denied federal funds to any states where schools were not complying with the Brown v. Board of Education ruling. While prominent Democrat Eleanor Roosevelt favored the amendment, Stevenson opposed it.

In both of his bids for the presidency, Stevenson was crushed by Eisenhower. The moderate Democrat’s tepidness in supporting civil rights was indicated by the fact that he failed to win a single state outside the Jim Crow belt in either election. The elections gave black voters little in the way of choice.
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Black ex boxer and lifelong Republican Joe Louis was so disgusted by Eisenhower’s previous support for military segregation that he endorsed Stevenson. Powell was so disgusted by Stevenson’s weakness on civil rights that he crossed party lines to endorse Eisenhower.

The fact that Eisenhower was not a particularly strong proponent of civil rights should not make one think that he was as reactionary as Southern Democrats. When the Supreme Court handed down its 1954 decision, Brown v. Board of Education, Eisenhower refused to endorse it, but he quickly integrated the Washington, D.C. public school system. Meanwhile, segregationists in the House and Senate put forth the “Southern Manifesto” condemning Brown and urging white Southerners to resist the ruling. Ninety-nine of the manifesto’s signatories were Democrats. Two were Republicans. When Eisenhower sent federal troops to Little Rock to enforce the decision, it was because the state’s Democratic governor refused to comply with desegregation. Other governors who favored massive resistance to Brown, such James F. Byrnes and Thomas Stanley, were also Democrats.

Looking at the way in which political affiliation influenced judges in the Brown case is also indicative of the GOP’s comparative liberalism on race. When Brown was first argued before the Supreme Court, there were seven Democratic justices, one Republican, and one Independent. Evidence suggests that only four justices were originally planning to rule against public school segregation. Three of them—Douglas, Sherman Minton, and Hugo Black (ironically a former member of the Ku Klux Klan)—were Democrats. One, Harold Burton, was the lone Republican on the court. This left four Democrats—Tom Clark, Stanley Reed, Fred Vinson, and Robert Jackson—and one Independent—Felix
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Frankfurter leaning toward declaring that public school segregation was constitutional or feeling ambivalent. But in the midst of deliberating, Fred Vinson died and was replaced by Republican Earl Warren. While Warren’s civil rights record as governor had not been without blemish, he helped push the court toward ruling against segregation. Thus, while only about 43% of Democrats on the court in the 1952-1954 period consistently supported striking down public school segregation, 100% of Republicans did.

In addition, as referenced earlier, Eisenhower signed two pieces of voting rights legislation over the objections of Southern Democrats. Furthermore, some Republicans in the 1950s took a stronger position in support of civil rights than Eisenhower. Examples of such Republicans include Kenneth Keating, Jacob Javits, Hugh Scott, Clifford Case, Prescott Bush, Irving Ives, and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

Meanwhile, however, the balance of power in the Republican Party was shifting. Conservative intellectuals and writers were beginning to try and make their voices heard. In 1955, William F. Buckley founded a right-wing publication called National Review. One of Buckley’s early articles was a condemnation of Brown v. Board of Education. At times, his rhetoric was framed in terms of support for states’ rights. But in 1957, Buckley wrote that, “the central question that emerges... is whether the White community in the South is entitled to take such measures as are necessary to prevail, politically and culturally, in areas where it does not predominate numerically? The sobering answer is Yes – the White community is so entitled because, for the time being, it is the advanced race.”

James Kilpatrick, a writer Buckley hired for National Review, defended the alleged right of states to disobey Brown. In 1963, Kiplatrick would state categorically that blacks constituted an inferior race. The positions staked out by National Review showed that Southern segregationists were far from without allies in the North. While Kilpatrick was from Virginia by way of Oklahoma, Buckley was a native Northeasterner. Frank Meyer, another National Review writer vehemently opposed to Brown, was also from the Northeast.

---
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As National Review condemned Brown and most of the other instances of federal intervention in the Civil Rights Movement, a new star was rising in the Republican Party. In 1960, Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona released his book, The Conscience of a Conservative. Most of the book focused on non-racial issues such as economics and foreign policy. However, Goldwater devoted a short chapter to civil rights. While he stated that he personally opposed segregation in public, he also said that the Brown decision had been unconstitutional and wrong.\textsuperscript{58}

Goldwater was a different man than Strom Thurmond, James Eastland, or any number of other Southern Democrats. He favored the modest Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 and integration of the Arizona National Guard and Phoenix public school system.\textsuperscript{59} Yet there has been a claim by some Goldwater admirers that he was simply a consistent libertarian who only opposed the civil rights laws applying to private businesses, due to reasons that had nothing to do with racism. Goldwater’s 1960 opposition to Brown, a libertarian decision that applied only to discrimination by government, gives lie to this claim. Goldwater tried to win the GOP presidential nomination that same year but came up short. The party, it seemed, was still too liberal for the Arizona conservative. But Goldwater’s book, as well as his bid for the nomination, had helped him establish a reputation.

In 1960, both presidential candidates seemed to be straddling the fence on racism again, though they came down more on the side of civil rights than their parties had in 1952 and 1956. The Democratic primary was mainly divided between three moderate candidates who would be acceptable to old guard segregationist Democrats and two stalwart civil rights supporters. In the moderate camp were Kennedy, Johnson, and, as civil rights activist John Lewis would label him, “the luckless Adlai Stevenson.”\textsuperscript{60} In the stalwart camp were Hubert Humphrey and Stuart Symington. Symington, then serving as a Senator, had once been Truman’s Secretary of the Air Force. In this capacity he had been on record as firmly supporting integration of the military.\textsuperscript{61} Unlike, for instance, Kennedy, he refused to speak before segregated audiences.\textsuperscript{62}

The power of Southern Democrats was clear in the West Virginia primary. West Virginia’s schools had been legally segregated until Brown, and interracial

marriage remained a violation of state law. The issue of civil rights played a role when Humphrey faced Kennedy in the state’s 1960 Democratic presidential primary. Given that Kennedy was a wealthy Roman Catholic, some believed that he was at a disadvantage with the working class, Protestant Democrats of West Virginia. Yet in the end, Kennedy defeated Humphrey.

There were a number of probable reasons why Humphrey lost. For instance, while Kennedy may have struck some West Virginia coal miners and farmers as elitist, his vast amount of money and legion of photogenic siblings who could go on the campaign trail for him were major assets. Yet it seems hard to deny that race played a role as well. Kennedy had staked out positions on civil rights that could appeal to segregationists, African Americans, and white liberals.

In the Republican primary, meanwhile, Richard Nixon won easily. Nixon’s level of support for civil rights was about equal to Kennedy’s. He had played a decisive role in the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and had been more aggressive in supporting the bill than Kennedy, but he had long opposed a federal Fair Employment Practices Commission. In 1960, he appeared in a campaign ad urging the nation to enact civil rights reforms, both for moral reasons and because it was necessary to win the Cold War. When it came time for the Republican Party to put forth their 1960 platform, however, Nixon clashed with Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York, whom he had easily defeated during the primaries.

Nelson Rockefeller has been on the receiving end of some accusations of racism, primarily due to his handling of the Attica prison riot. To be sure, Rockefeller quelled the riot very aggressively, with great loss of life, and he received great criticism for it. In and of itself, however, this does not prove racism. A strong case could be made that Rockefeller’s handling of the riot was the result of his conservative views on crime. There have also been accusations that, when the prison was retaken, Muslim inmates were singled out for particularly brutal treatment despite having actually risked their lives to protect

the guards held hostage by rioters. However, given Rockefeller’s views on discrimination, it is difficult to conclude that this treatment by police was done in accordance with Rockefeller’s orders.

In 2011, a recording of a conversation between Nelson Rockefeller and Richard Nixon was discovered, in which they discussed the events at Attica. Rockefeller never once said that he personally handled the situation in the manner that he did because of race or that he was personally less distraught about the deaths of inmates because they were black. In fact, when it came to light that some of the white hostages had been accidentally shot by state police officers, Rockefeller was quite callous. “Well you know, this is one of those things,” he remarked. “You can’t have sharpshooters picking off the prisoners when the hostages are there with them, at a distance with tear gas, without maybe having a few accidents.”

One can glean from Rockefeller’s private statements a sort of color-blind ruthlessness. They do not appear to be the statements of a warm, kind-hearted individual, but neither do they seem to be the statements of a racist.

A look at Rockefeller’s lifelong record demonstrates his sincere belief in racial equality. Prior to being elected governor of New York, Rockefeller had secretly paid Martin Luther King, Jr.’s hospital bill after King was stabbed in Harlem and nearly died. As governor, he was able to enact legislation against racial discrimination in housing, lending, and public accommodations. He also made, “some unprecedented appointments of blacks to high positions,” in the state government.

It was probably to appeal both to the liberal, pro-civil rights Republican faction led by Rockefeller (dubbed “Rockefeller Republicans”) and to African Americans that Richard Nixon chose Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. as his running mate in 1960. Lodge had been the previous occupant of Kennedy’s Massachusetts Senate seat and was now serving as an ambassador to the United Nations. Lodge was a very strong supporter of civil rights, prompting Nixon supporter E. Frederick Murrow to state that, “not even the NAACP can be against his superb liberal record.”

---
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For a time, it seemed that Kennedy would avoid running to the left of Nixon on civil rights. A confidential Kennedy campaign strategy book recommended appealing to white Southerners by attacking Nixon’s honorary NAACP membership. A turning point came when Martin Luther King, Jr. was jailed in Georgia and received a four-month sentence. While Rockefeller quickly wired President Eisenhower to ask that King be protected, Nixon deliberated and eventually decided not to get involved. Kennedy called Coretta Scott King to express his condolences, and Robert Kennedy secured King’s release. In addition, when Lodge promised that Nixon would appoint an African American to his Cabinet if elected, Nixon repudiated such a pledge, leaving some African Americans upset.

Kennedy preserved much of his support among segregationists due to the fact that his aid to King did not become national news, but his intervention increased his support among African Americans. Martin Luther King, Sr., a lifelong Republican, endorsed Kennedy.

When Kennedy entered office, however, it initially seemed that his civil rights policy would be similar to the moderate course pursued by Eisenhower. During his campaign, he had promised to end racial discrimination in public housing by the “stroke of a pen.” However, he waited eight months into his presidency to sign such an order, causing civil rights supporters to mockingly send him hundreds of pens. In his first year in office, he declined to support a civil rights bill. According to Timothy Thurber, “During the spring of 1963, Rockefeller blasted Kennedy for ignoring recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission regarding housing, employment, voting rights, and education, failing to live up to promises made in the Democrats’ civil rights plank of 1960, and appointing anti-civil rights judges to the Federal bench in the South.” By 1963, however, Kennedy had begun pushing for comprehensive federal legislation on civil rights. Civil rights demonstrations were a major factor in pressuring Kennedy to be more supportive of reform. However, another factor may well have been Rockefeller. In addition to his other acts and statements in support of
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civil rights, Rockefeller had voiced support for sit-ins and was a financial support of King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference. As Rockefeller eyed another run for the presidency, Kennedy likely realized that his African American support could be in serious jeopardy if Rockefeller managed to get the nomination.

Kennedy did not live to see the civil rights bill get passed due to his assassination at the hands of Lee Harvey Oswald. However, his successor, Lyndon Johnson, realized that the momentum had shifted far in the direction of civil rights, and thus he took up the mantle. With Humphrey playing a prominent role, liberal Democrats in the House and Senate joined with liberal Republicans like Jacob Javits to work for passage of the bill. In this capacity, they worked to persuade conservative Republicans such as Senator Everett Dirksen of Illinois and Karl Mundt of South Dakota to support them. One wonders if, as they read headlines such as, “LBJ Champions the Civil Rights Act of 1964,” Democrats like Humphrey and Paul Douglas felt any shred of resentment that Kennedy and Johnson, latecomers to civil rights, were getting credit for something they had aggressively advocated for many years.

As the 1964 presidential primaries got underway, most Republicans were likely unaware that the year would end with a very different GOP than it had begun with. Among the primary candidates were Goldwater and Rockefeller. Goldwater had the support of conservatives like Buckley and Kilpatrick. Rockefeller’s effectiveness was seriously hampered not only by widespread racism among white Americans, but also by events in his personal life. Following a divorce in 1961, Rockefeller had married a much younger woman in 1963, and she gave birth to a son shortly before the California Republican primary.

Generally more conservative on race than the neighboring Washington or the Northeastern and Great Lakes states, California was experiencing major white backlash against a recent state law restricting racial discrimination in housing. However, Rockefeller’s divorce, remarriage, and his second wife’s giving birth to a son also played a major role in causing him to narrowly lose to Goldwater in the California primary. With another month to go before the convention in San
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Francisco’s Cow Palace, Rockefeller had effectively been bounced out of the race. Desperate, pro-civil rights Republicans turned to Governor William Scranton of Pennsylvania. Scranton was a strong proponent of civil rights who had lambasted Kennedy for not doing enough to promote racial equality early in his administration and had appointed the first African American Secretary of Labor and Industry in his state.\footnote{Booker, Simeon, “How Republican Leaders View the Negro—most are hesitant about giving all-out support to controversial civil rights drive,” March, 1964, \textit{Ebony}, 32, 37-38.}

Little more than a week before the Republican National Convention, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 finally came up for a vote. In the House, sixty-nine percent of Democrats and eighty-two percent of Republicans voted for it. In the Senate, sixty-three percent of Democrats and eighty percent of Republicans voted for it.\footnote{Marcy, Bill, \textit{Don’t Let Me Confuse You With the Truth} (I was unable to find the location of publishing: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2009), 54.} However, Goldwater was one of just six Republican Senators who voted against the bill.\footnote{Nash, Jere and Andy Taggart, \textit{Mississippi Politics: The Struggle for Power, 1976-2008} (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2009), 24.} Goldwater stated that while he personally condemned racial discrimination, he believed that the act was unconstitutional.\footnote{Bean, \textit{Race and Liberty}, 226-227.} He had arrived at this conclusion with the help of two Northern conservatives, a lawyer named William Rehnquist and a constitutional law professor named Robert Bork.\footnote{Lash, Scott, \textit{The Militant Worker: Class and Radicalism in France and America} (Cranbury: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1984), 198; Perlstein, Rick, \textit{Before the Storm: Barry Goldwater and the Unmaking of the American Consensus} (New York: Perseus Books Group, 2009), 363.}

Goldwater’s attempt to frame his opposition to the bill partly in libertarian terms lacked validity. Just four years earlier, he had argued that the federal courts had no right to interfere with \textit{government} discrimination in education. Five years after his vote on the Civil Rights Act of 1964, he would favor federal legislation to restrict the pornography industry.\footnote{Strub, Whitney, \textit{Perversion for Profit: The Politics of Pornography and the Rise of the New Right} (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011); page not numbered, page can be found here: (http://books.google.com/books?id=JbmrfK9-\_AoC&pg=PT138&dq=barry+goldwater+%22attacks+of+knee-jerk+civil+libertarians%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=6OvPUUqJGi8gSqmYDABg&ved=0CDYQ6AEwAA )} While Goldwater was hardly a segregationist, it is impossible to look at his opposition to the private sector provisions of the Civil Rights Act and not see a mild degree of racism.

At the Republican Convention at the Cow Palace, tensions between white moderates, white liberals, and African Americans on one side and white conservatives on the other were palpable. Goldwater was nominated, while Nelson Rockefeller was booed during his convention speech.\footnote{Booker, Simeon, “What Republican Victory Means To the Negro,” February, 1967, \textit{Ebony}, 89.} Jackie Robinson,
who had become one of the six deputy national directors for the Rockefeller campaign, wrote that, “The hatred I saw was unique to me because it was hatred directed against a white man. It embodied a revulsion for all he stood for, including his enlightened attitude toward black people. A new breed of Republicans had taken over the GOP. As I watched this steamroller operation in San Francisco, I had a better understanding of how it must have felt to be a Jew in Hitler’s Germany.”  

Robinson described seeing a white delegate from the Deep South throw acid on a black delegate’s suit jacket and light it on fire. At another point, Robinson nearly came to blows with a white Alabama delegate while cheering Rockefeller.

The die had been cast. Goldwater had gone against most Senators and Representatives from his party by voting against the Civil Rights Act, but he was now the GOP nominee. When the ink on the bill was barely even dry, Strom Thurmond became a Republican and went on the campaign trail for Goldwater. Thurmond had vehemently opposed the Civil Rights Act, just as he would later oppose the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Fair Housing Act of 1968, and he was not going to remain loyal to the new Democratic Party. “The Democratic Party,” lamented Thurmond, “has rammued through Congress unconstitutional, impractical, unworkable, and oppressive legislation which invades inalienable personal and property rights of the individual . . . ”

Segregationist Democratic Congressmen John Bell Williams and Albert W. Watson also endorsed Goldwater. Meanwhile, the Democratic Party made it clear that segregationists would no longer make many of the decisions about race. Humphrey was selected to be Johnson’s vice presidential candidate. In the end, Goldwater won a mere ten percent of the African American vote compared to the thirty percent that Nixon had won in 1960. The shift in state voting patterns was equally astounding. Other than his native Arizona, Goldwater won only five other states: Georgia, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina. All five of

---

97 Robinson, I Never Had It Made, 166.
103 Stern, Mark, Calculating Visions: Kennedy, Johnson, and Civil Rights (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 211.
these states had been Democratic strongholds, but all five of them were also extremely reactionary when it came to race.

Meanwhile, Johnson won in Maine and Vermont, which even Franklin Roosevelt had failed to do. In fact, Goldwater was the first Republican presidential candidate in history to lose Vermont. Yet all of Maine and Vermont’s Senators (three Republicans and a Democrat) had voted for the Civil Rights Act. While racial discrimination did not come up as much as an issue of debate in these states as it did in places like New York, due to Maine and Vermont’s very small black population, both Maine and Vermont had a history of liberal racial policies.\footnote{Paul Finkelman, “Prelude to the Fourteenth Amendment: Black Legal Rights in the Antebellum North,” \textit{Rutgers Law Journal} 17 (1985-1986): 425.} For instance, Vermont had been one of only a handful of states to have never banned interracial marriage.\footnote{Bonauto, Mary L., “The Freedom to Marry for Same-Sex Couples in the U.S.,” \textit{The Legal Recognition of Same-Sex Partnerships: A Study of National, European, and International Law.} Ed. Mads Tnneson Andenes, Robert Wintemute (Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2001), 184-185.} Maine had legalized interracial marriage in 1883, when it had still been illegal in roughly thirty states. This was sixty-five years before California legalized it and eighty-four years before the Supreme Court legalized it in the South.\footnote{Newbeck, Phyl, \textit{Virginia Hasn’t Always Been for Lovers: Interracial Marriage Bans and the Case of Richard and Mildred Loving} (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), xi, 46, 75-78.} It seemed that just as some white Southerners could not support a pro-civil rights Democratic Party, some white New Englanders could not support a Republican Party whose candidate opposed the Civil Rights Act.

From 1965 to 1988, racism became even more institutionalized in the Republican Party and less institutionalized in the Democratic Party than it had become in 1964. In an event that seemed to signal the victory of pro-racial equality liberals in the party, Humphrey received the Democratic Party’s presidential nomination in 1968. Many traditional Democrats supported Democratic Governor of Alabama George Wallace’s segregationist third party candidacy. Meanwhile, Nixon negotiated with Strom Thurmond for his support. While Nixon worked to position himself well to the right of Humphrey and Republican primary rivals Rockefeller and George Romney on civil rights, he also allegedly had to promise to support protection of the U.S. textile industry and anti-ballistic missile deployment to secure Thurmond’s support.\footnote{Clapp, Priscilla, Halperin, Morton H., Kanter, Arnold, \textit{Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy} (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1974), 71.} After all, Thurmond had the option of supporting Ronald Reagan, who had built a reactionary record on civil rights, for the Republican Party nomination.

After winning the nomination and defeating Humphrey in the general election, Nixon vacillated between support for civil rights and pandering to segregationists. He tried to appoint segregationists to the Supreme Court and
advocated a “go slow” approach for school desegregation in the South approximately fifteen years after the Brown decision.\(^{108}\) In 1970, North Carolina Democrat Jesse Helms, who had opposed both Brown and the Civil Rights Movement, became a Republican.\(^{109}\) In the 1972 presidential election, a group called “Democrats for Nixon” was formed. There were many various reasons why various Democrats did not support Democratic candidate George McGovern, such as McGovern’s liberal views on issues like crime, “family values,” welfare, and military policy. Yet the group was led by former critic of the Civil Rights Act Governor John Connally, and included former segregationists Farris Bryant of Florida and Mills E. Godwin of Virginia.\(^ {110}\) Just as there were a variety of reasons that some voters who had generally supported Democrats stood with Nixon instead of McGovern, there were a variety of reasons that the Democratic hold on the South was crumbling. Foreign policy, economics, a growing middle class of younger white Southerners, and an influx of Northern Republicans into Southern states all played a role.\(^ {111}\) Yet civil rights was also a major reason for the shift.

Ronald Reagan lacked much of the moderation on civil rights exhibited by Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford. At various points, Reagan opposed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and fair housing legislation.\(^ {112}\) A former Mississippi Democrat named Trent Lott who had opposed integrating his fraternity in college, was an admirer of Jefferson Davis, and had white supremacist ties, supported Reagan.\(^ {113}\)

As president, Reagan vetoed a bill that would have imposed economic sanctions on South Africa as a means of opposing apartheid.\(^ {114}\) In a remarkable victory for traditional Republicanism, the majority of Senate Republicans voted to override the veto. The ranks of Republicans who broke with Reagan included not


\(^ {111}\) Alexander, Gerard, “The Myth of Republican Racism,” Claremont Review of Books, March 20, 2004; this article analyzes the reason for shifting electoral patterns in the South. While Alexander is right to claim that other factors played a role in the South becoming more Republican, he seems eager to ignore the major role that racism played.


only moderates such as Lowell Weicker but also those with conservative reputations, such as Mitch McConnell. Yet despite the fact that former segregationists Ernest Hollings, Robert Byrd, Russell Long, and John Stennis were included in the ranks of Senate Democrats, all twenty-one votes against overriding the veto came from Republicans. Democrats who had once defended segregation understood that African Americans were a major constituency of the party now and that in states like Louisiana with large black populations, they could make the difference between losing and winning an election. In one of the most noticeable indicators of the shift that had taken place, Republican Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole had voted in favor of the Civil Rights Act but against overriding Reagan’s veto of the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act. Democratic Senate Minority Leader Robert Byrd had voted against the Civil Rights Act but in favor of overriding Reagan’s veto. Many of the individuals and institutions Reagan was allied with among the Religious Right—Jerry Falwell, W.A. Criswell, Bob Jones University—had records of defending segregation. Indeed, many Christian evangelicals such as Jerry Falwell and Jesse Helms backed Reagan’s leniency toward South Africa. Reagan also tried to appoint Robert Bork to the Supreme Court and appointed William Rehnquist to be Chief Justice. These two men, as mentioned earlier, had been the ones to discourage Goldwater from voting for the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

From the Reagan Administration to the present, the number of Republicans who take liberal positions on issues such as affirmative action and apartheid has decreased. Many of them, like Lowell Wicker, Jim Jeffords, Lincoln Chafee, and Olympia Snowe, were voted out of office or left the party. In 2002, Trent Lott became the Republican Senate Majority Leader and expressed a wish that Strom Thurmond could have been elected president so that the United States could have avoided, “all these problems over all these years.” On multiple occasions in the twenty-first century, Republican Governors Association Chairman Haley Barbour has expressed barely veiled white supremacist rhetoric, such as when he praised the segregationist Council of Conservative Citizens. These incidents were reminders that the Republican Party had retreated far from its roots.

Meanwhile, support for racial equality continued, albeit somewhat uneasily, to become more institutionalized in the Democratic Party. When candidate Jimmy Carter said during the 1976 Democratic presidential primaries that he had no objection to people, “trying to maintain the ethnic purity of their neighborhoods,” and still won the nomination, it seemed as if the traditional

Democrats might be regaining power. However, Carter made clear that he was dependent on African Americans and white liberals by his selection of a running mate. His pick, Walter Mondale, had been a protégée of Hubert Humphrey and had a strong civil rights record.

In the twenty-first century, a few reminders of the Democratic Party’s white supremacist past remain. Reminders of the Democratic Party’s pre-1960s racism include Jefferson-Jackson Dinners, annual wreaths on the Arlington Confederate War Memorial, and the selection of old guard white supremacist Robert Byrd as President Pro Tempore of the Senate and third in line to the presidency until his death in 2010. Yet it is clear that most of the Democratic Party leadership and the majority of its politicians favor racial equality. Most figures in the Democratic Party favor affirmative action programs as a means of increasing diversity in institutions such as universities. They generally also favor removing the Confederate Flag from public property and banning racial profiling by law enforcement.

The steady erosion of white supremacist power in the Democratic Party was also aided by the increasing prominence of Jewish Americans in the party. Between 1960 and 2008, the presence of Jews in Congress increased drastically. Jews played a prominent role in the NAACP during the days of Jim Crow and were disproportionately represented in the Civil Rights Movement overall. The fact that twenty-first century Jewish political figures as diverse as Paul Wolfowitz, Barney Frank, Joseph Lieberman, and Bernie Sanders all participated in the Civil Rights Movement is a reminder of this fact. Polls taken after the Civil Rights Movement show that, in spite of conflicts with African Americans over issues such as Israel, affirmative action, and “Black Power,” Jews as a group continue to hold more liberal views about blacks than white Americans in general do. Indeed, just as Frederick Douglass and Charles Sumner would likely marvel at what has become of the Republican Party they joined, Andrew Jackson, Jefferson Davis, Ben Tillman, and others would likely look with horror and outrage at the present Democratic Party.
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