University of Mississippi

Correspondence

eGrove

James W. Silver Collection

3-27-1963

Calvin S. Brown to Mr. Silver, 27 March 1963

Calvin S. Brown

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jws_corr

Recommended Citation

Brown, Calvin S., "Calvin S. Brown to Mr. Silver, 27 March 1963" (1963). Correspondence. 965. $https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jws_corr/965$

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the James W. Silver Collection at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Correspondence by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

ATHENS. GEORGIA

, erpoy vieressia March 27, 1963

Dear Mr. Silver:

Thanks for your note about my Faulkner article. I have a number of copies on hand, and am happy to send you this one.

Calvin B. Brown

With regard to the propaganda, it seems impossible to find a balanced view anywhere. Certainly the propaganda of such groups as the White Citizens' Councils is much of it false and irresponsible. (Incidentally, why whould it be splendid for the negro to organize for racial purposes, but iniquitous for the white to do so?) But the same one-sidedness on the other side may strike some balance, but is certainly not much better. To take only two examples:

The "Price of Defiance" Pamphlet, p. 5. paragraphs b and co, emphasises the fact that the Constitution of the state vests control of the University in the Board of Trustees, not in the Governor, and that this control "includes the question of the admission of students to the university." All this is true, of course. But by the same fact, the Governor's oath to defend the Constitution of the state obliges him to oppose the usurpation of this right by the federal courss, which have dictated the MNXXXXXX admission policies of the university. The first and major political interference in the affairs of the University came from outside, and the governer's interference was an attempt to cancel this interference. Certainly his methods were imsame, but that doesn't change these facts.

Also, the last full paragraph on p. 7 of the same pamphlet says, if stripped of its devious language, says that citizens of the United States have the protection of the Bill of Rights only at the President's pleasure.

Certainly, the self-pity of a good deal of Mississippi is, as pointed out, offensive. But

equally offensive is the self-righteousness of the over-simplifiers on the other side.

Edel . TS down Sincerely yours, Calvin S. Brown

Calvin S. Brown

Thanks for your note about my Faulkner article. I have a number of copies on hand, and am happy to send you this one.

With regard to the propaganda. It seems impossible to find a balanced view anywhere. Certainly the propaganda of such groups as the White Citizens' Councils is much of it false and irresponsible. (Incidentally, why whould it be eplendid for the negro to organize for bibnelge purposes, but iniquitous for the white to do sor) But the same one-sidedness on the other side may strike some balance, but is certainly not much better. To take only two examples: The "Price of Defiance" Pamphlet, p. 5. paragraphs b and or, emphasises the fact that the Constitution of the state vests control of the University in the Board of Trustees, not in the dovernow, and that this control 'includes the question of the admission of students to the university." All this is true, of course. But by the same fact, the Jovernor's oath to defend the Constitution of the state obliges him to oppose the usurpation of this right by the federal courts, which have dictated the MMERREE admission policies of the university. The first and major political interference in the affairs of the University came from outside, and the governer's interference was an attempt to cancel this interference. Certainly his methods were insane, but that doesn't change these facts. Also, the last full paragraph on p. 7 of. the same pamphlet says, if stripped of its devious language, carea that citizens of the United States have the protection of the Bill of Rights only at the President's pleasure. Certainly, the self-pity of a good deal of

Mississippi is, as pointed out, offensive. But