

his eyes were full of tears as he recalled and recounted the fight they fought and lost in some areas because they simply could not hold back the waters.

There are so many stories and so much misery as a result of a natural disaster, but I think there is also a second side to it, and that is a very inspirational side of what people can do for each other and with each other to try to deal with these difficult times. The one thing about life is, success is pretty easy to handle. The question is, How do you handle things when times get a little tough?

I wanted to say I am so proud of the people of my State, the State I am privileged to represent. We have a lot now to do with the Corps of Engineers, with future water projects, and the kinds of protections that are needed to be improved for future flood protection. That will come at a different moment in the weeks and months ahead, but for now I simply wanted to describe to my colleagues some of the circumstances we faced in our State and especially the stories about what people did together to try to make a big difference, fighting back the waters of these many rivers that exceeded their banks and caused such havoc in many of our communities.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN HOPE FRANKLIN

Mr. WEBB. Madam President, I would like to take some time today and talk a little bit about an individual for whom I have great admiration who passed away without much comment from this body last month, John Hope Franklin. I think perhaps the most eminent Black historian in America. Even that does not do justice to John Hope Franklin, one of the most eminent historians in our country, who happened to be of African-American descent.

I make these comments as someone who spent a good deal of my life as a writer and dedicated to examining American history, and also I make them in the spirit that our Attorney General offered when he said: Maybe we should have a little more courage when we are talking about issues like race in America.

It is interesting to take a look at the paper this morning and see the Pulitzer Prizes that were awarded this year, the Pulitzer Prize for history being awarded to Annette Gordon-Reed for a book entitled "The Hemingses of Monticello: An American Family," which ties into the continuing saga of Thomas Jefferson; and for general nonfiction, a book entitled "Slavery by Another Name: The Re-Enslavement of Black Americans From the Civil War To World War II," by Douglas A. Blackmon, which is another examination of the situation of Black America in the American South.

Those are both important contributions to our understanding of American

history. When I look at John Hope Franklin, who died at the age of 94 last month, and the contributions he made and the environment in which he grew up and basically conquered through his success, I look at an individual who had a lot of impact on me when I was a young man trying to put the history of the American South into some context because John Hope Franklin had the courage to not only address Black history but to place it into the context of American history, not to deal with it as a separate issue.

There is a very fine obituary that was written in the Economist April 4 edition which outlined a lot of the high points and the challenges of John Hope Franklin's life. I ask unanimous consent this obituary be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WEBB. I am going to hit a couple of points in this obituary, then I want to talk about the American South as John Hope Franklin understood it and where we are today, White and Black.

John Hope Franklin grew up in Oklahoma. His father moved to Oklahoma when he was 6 years old to practice law. He had his own challenges in that environment during the Jim Crow laws. He then went to Fisk University, was an outstanding scholar, got a doctorate at Harvard. He became the first African American to lead an all-White history department at Brooklyn College.

He later taught at the University of Chicago, and as the Economist pointed out:

Unlike many after him, he did not see "black history" as an independent discipline and never taught a formal course on it. What he was doing was revising American history as a whole. His books, especially "From Slavery to Freedom" which was first published in 1947, offered Americans their first complete view of themselves.

When I was at Georgetown Law Center, after I left the Marine Corps, and was studying on my own stead, sort of an avocation, of ethnic settlement patterns in America, I was being confronted with a lot of rhetoric that had come out of people who did not understand the American South, who did not really understand that, in truth, the American South has never been White against Black, even during its worst times. It was more a three-tiered than a two-tiered society. It was a small veneer of White aristocrats in many ways manipulating White against Black.

White and Black in the majority of the American South economically differed very little at all. I started reading John Hope Franklin's classic book, "From Slavery to Freedom." I saw that he was an intellectually honest observer, a passionate observer of true history, and he commented in this book on that in 1860, at the height of slavery right before the Civil War began.

Region-wide, less than 5 percent of the Whites in the South owned slaves.

If you think about what the American perception is on the issue of South versus slavery, you will realize what an astounding statistic that happens to be. He also went on to say:

Fully three-fourths of the white people of the South had neither had slaves nor an immediate economic interest in the maintenance of slavery or the plantation system.

So contrary to a lot of rhetoric today and a lot of misunderstanding, John Hope Franklin was giving an actual context that in the South, fully 75 percent of the Whites living alongside Blacks during the Civil War and afterwards had never benefitted from slavery or had never participated in it as an economic institution.

The aftermath of the Civil War was a very difficult time for the American South, White and Black. As I wrote in my book "Born Fighting," between the end of the Civil War and the beginning of World War II, the South was basically an owned place. It was a colonized place and, in fact, it was colonized doubly. It was colonized from the outside, an entire region owned from the outside in its basic infrastructure, its banking systems, its schools not properly funded, and it was also colonized from the inside.

This is the area that we see so many historians commenting on even today; that is, the planters society, early, before the Civil War, became, in many ways, this aristocracy that kept White and Black down at the same time, and it has taken us a very long time to get past that.

In 1933, President Roosevelt published probably the most comprehensive document on the economic conditions of the American South that has ever been written. He pointed out in this document in 1933, the educational base of the South has been decimated, White and Black. Illiteracy in the South was five times as high in the North Central States and more than double the rate in New England than the Middle Atlantic States.

The total endowments of all of the colleges and universities in the South were less than the combined endowments of Harvard and Yale alone. The South was being required to educate one-third of the Nation's children with one-sixth of the Nation's school revenues. The richest State in the South in 1933 ranked lower in per-capita income than the poorest State outside the region.

In 1933, the average annual income in the South was only \$314, while the rest of the country averaged more than \$600. This report pointed out, importantly, using the terms of the time:

Whites and Negroes have suffered alike. Of the 1.8 million tenant families in the region, about 66 percent are white [the South's population at this time was 71 percent white] . . . half of the sharecroppers are white, living under conditions almost identical with those of Negro sharecroppers.

The region had 28 percent of the country's population. In 1937 it had 11 percent of the Nation's bank deposits.

So this was a region, all the way into World War II, where you had legal separation, which we were able to overcome through the Civil Rights Movement and through a lot of very courageous people, John Hope Franklin among them.

But once you get past the legal restrictions, the economic conditions among a preponderance of the population were basically the same. But this has provided downstream implications for both African Americans and people of European descent in the American South.

When I was in law school in 1974, the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago did a study on White ethnic groups, broke them down by 17 different criteria. White Baptists, which basically are a population that has descended out of the American South through the Scotch-Irish migration—of which I wrote in “Born Fighting”—averaged 10.7 years of education. Blacks nationwide averaged 10.6 years of education. So the point to be made is that for both of these groups with a very common heritage, once we set aside, as we have, the legal disparities that tormented the South for so long, have very similar challenges in terms of breaking down generational cycles.

In the obituary from the *Economist* that was written about John Hope Franklin, this point was made:

Militancy was not in his nature. He was too scrupulous a historian for that, and too courteous a man. Asked whether he hated the South, he would say, on the contrary, he loved it. His deepest professional debt was to a white man, Ted Currier, who had inspired him to study history and had given him \$500 to see him through Harvard.

I would say, as we remember this truly brilliant American, that he not only loved the South, he understood it.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the *Economist*, Apr. 4, 2009]

JOHN HOPE FRANKLIN

His chief pleasures were contemplative and patient. With watering can and clippers, he would potter in his greenhouse among hundreds of varieties of orchids. Or, standing in a river, he would wait for hours until a fish tickled his line. These were, one could say, typical historian's amusements; very close, in rhythm and character, to the painstaking, careful accumulation of tiny pieces of fact.

And yet what John Hope Franklin collected, over a lifetime of scholarship, were scraps of horror. Five dollars for the cost of a branding iron. A deed of sale, in Virginia in 1829, for a male slave “of a yellow colour” who “is not in the habit of running away”. Or the testimony from 1860 of Edward Johnson, a black child apprentice:

“I was taced and plased with a rope a round my rists my back intiarly naked and swung up then and there Each of [the men] tuck a cow hide one on Either side and beet me in such a manner when they let me down I fanted and lay on the ground 2 hours.”

To these Mr Franklin could add from his own experience. The train journey to Checotah, Oklahoma, when he was six, that ended when his mother refused to move from the whites-only carriage. His father's small law office in Tulsa, reduced to rubble after a race riot in 1921. The day he was told by a

white woman whom he was helping, at 12, across the road, that he should take his “filthy hands” off her. And the warm evening when he went to buy ice cream in Macon, Mississippi—a tall 19-year-old student from Fisk University, scholarly in his glasses—only to find as he left the store that a semi-circle of white farmers had formed to block his exit, silently implying that he should not try to break through their line.

Academia offered no shelter. He excelled from high school onwards, eventually earning a doctorate at Harvard and becoming, in 1956, the first black head of an all-white history department at a mostly white university, Brooklyn College. Later, the University of Chicago recruited him. But in Montgomery, Louisiana, the archivist called him a “Harvard nigger” to his face. In the state archives in Raleigh, North Carolina, he was confined to a tiny separate room and allowed free run of the stacks because the white assistants would not serve him. At Duke in 1943, a university to which he returned 40 years later as a teaching professor, he could not use the library cafeteria or the washrooms.

Whites, he noted, had no qualms about “undervaluing an entire race”. Blacks were excluded both from their histories, and from their understanding of how America had been made. Mr Franklin's intention was to weave the black experience back into the national story. Unlike many after him, he did not see “black history” as an independent discipline, and never taught a formal course in it. What he was doing was revising American history as a whole. His books, especially “From Slavery to Freedom” (1947), offered Americans their first complete view of themselves.

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S WINE

Militancy was not in his nature. He was too scrupulous a historian for that, and too courteous a man. Asked whether he hated the South, he would say, on the contrary, that he loved it. His deepest professional debt was to a white man, Ted Currier, who had inspired him to study history and had given him \$500 to see him through Harvard. Yet, alongside the dignity and the ready smiles, a sense of outrage burned. He longed to tell white tourists thronging Washington that the Capitol had been built by slaves, and that Pennsylvania Avenue had held a slave market, “right by where the Smithsonian is”. Profits made possible by enslaving blacks had not only allowed Thomas Jefferson to enjoy fine French wines: they had also underpinned America's banks, its economic dynamism and its dominance in the world. The exploitation of blacks was something he admitted he had “never got over”.

Nor had America got over it, despite the march from Selma, in which Mr Franklin led a posse of historians, and Brown v Board of Education, where he lent his scholarship to help prove that the Framers had not meant to impose segregation on the public schools. The “colour line”, as he called it, remained “the most tragic and persistent social problem” the country faced. His own many black firsts—president of the American Historical Association and the Southern Historical Association, membership of Washington's Cosmos Club—had not necessarily opened the door to others. The night before he received the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1995, a woman at the Cosmos Club asked him to fetch her coat. He was overjoyed by Barack Obama's election, but could not forget the poor, immobile blacks revealed by Hurricane Katrina.

He yearned to improve things, but wondered how Financial reparations he was doubtful about; apologies seemed trifling. Only time, in historical quantities, seemed

likely to make a difference. For some months he was chairman of Bill Clinton's Initiative on Race, a disorganized effort that ended by recommending “community co-operation”. Hostile letters poured in, mostly from people who did not think the subject worth talking about. Mr Franklin took them in his stride. He would go and work on his next book, or retire to the greenhouse, implements in hand; and practise patience.

HONORING YOM HASHOAH,
HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. REID. Madam President, today, Holocaust Remembrance Day, or Yom Hashoah in Hebrew, is a day to give us pause. Today, we remember the horrific events of over half a century ago, when more than 6 million Jewish men, women, and children were targeted and systematically murdered, along with countless other victims of Nazi persecution. Today, we honor their memories and renew our commitment to stand up against prejudice and hatred in all its forms.

In 1980, Congress passed legislation that would dedicate this week every year to Holocaust Remembrance, so that Americans all over our country could come together and pay tribute to those who perished, and to ensure their stories will never be forgotten. This same legislation created the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, a building that now stands in our Nation's Capital as a center of Holocaust education and learning and a memorial to its victims. Today, the names of some of those who perished will be read aloud in the Museum's Hall of Remembrance, and on Thursday, Holocaust survivor and Nobel Laureate Elie Wiesel will join President Barack Obama and congressional leaders in a ceremony in the Capitol Rotunda.

Even now, so many decades later, we continue to uncover more stories of untold brutality and terror during the Holocaust, as work by the International Institute for Holocaust Research at the Yad Vshem Holocaust Museum exposes new evidence of Nazi genocide. These little-known cases are even more poignant today, as we consider the renewed struggle against anti-Semitism and continued denial by some of the State of Israel's very right to exist.

Next week, on April 29, we will celebrate 61 years since the establishment of Israeli independence, and 61 years of unwavering U.S.-Israeli friendship. Last year, I was proud to lead the Senate in adopting a bipartisan resolution to honor Israel in its achievement of 60 years of statehood, and its resilience as a stronghold of democratic principles and freedoms in a volatile region. Although Israel remains under constant siege from neighboring states and terrorist groups, its unwavering dedication to these ideals and its proud history of survival demonstrate that Israel will endure and it will do so with the United States standing firmly by its side.

Today, as we both remember those who perished in the Holocaust and look