

Despite the improved record of the legislative branch of our National Government as indicated by the Civil Rights Laws and the "War on Poverty" measures, it is still possible for a member of Congress to stand up there and smear minority groups and their leaders with impunity. Incidentally, these tirades are seldom answered with equal thrust and spirit by fellow Congressmen, who classify themselves as liberals. However, in retrospect, the frequency and violence of these verbal assaults upon Negroes and other minorities in the House and Senate have markedly declined over the years.

Apparently, the move toward the "great society" will further develop the tendency for the Government to assume a bit more responsibility for improving the human relations of its people. This orientation, historically, was first noticeable in Teddy Roosevelt's "Square Deal," became more definite in Franklin Roosevelt's "New Deal," and was continued in Harry Truman's "Fair Deal" and John Kennedy's "New Frontier." This is a most important trend, for the cold fact is that the American Government has never thrown its full weight behind a program of integrating its diverse elements and eliminating inequality.

At the state level, there are more than a dozen anti-discrimination committees that deal with fair employment, housing and public service. Advertisements for workers or for the rental or purchase of dwellings fall under review by such bodies. This is thus a restraint on public references to race, religion or national origin. Even so, most states even when they are motivated to take affirmative action in the realm of inter-group relations, tend to deal with *nonverbal* behavior,

that is with public facilities, personnel and opportunities. This is, of course, following the lead of the National Government.

A dramatic example of municipal action in the realm of symbolic behavior is supplied by Philadelphia. Customarily, the Mummers New Year's day parade in that city included participants who blacked their faces. Negroes and their friends protested and won out over those who insisted that it was a personal right and privilege for anyone who wanted to do so to apply burnt cork to his face and walk down a public street.

Even in the deep South "colored" and "white" signs are less conspicuous than in the 1940s. Such symbols of racial separation have disappeared completely from trains, busses and street cars. Fresh paint has been applied in some places where the words "white only" or "white ladies" and "colored women" had been chiseled into the stone structures of public buildings. Like time-worn scars that cannot be completely erased, these are reminders of the old system that is no longer legal.

Moreover, in many places in the South today where the Negro vote is considerable, racial epithets are seldom heard. But in Alabama and Mississippi and perhaps Louisiana the campaigns for statewide as well as local officials still revolve around who is best qualified to keep the Negro in his place. Torrents of anti-Negro slander are poured forth at the political rallies, over radio and TV and in leaflets. All of the old bugaboos are resurrected and each politico glorifies himself as the most capable defender of "white virtue, civilization and rule." It must be noted, however, that the area