

1964

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Aug. 6, 1964]

HEART OF DARKNESS

Only two weeks ago we were blandly assured by Sen. James O. Eastland of Mississippi that the disappearance of three civil rights workers in his state might well turn out to be a hoax. Now three bodies have been found, and the FBI has identified two of them as Mickey Schwerner and Andy Goodman. The third corpse is probably all that is mortal of James Chaney, the Negro companion of the two white youths. Some hoax.

It is true that the North has no right to affect superior airs in lecturing Mississippi on civil rights; bigotry is no respecter of the Mason-Dixon line. But the attitude to murder sets Mississippi apart. A year ago, Medgar Evers was shot in the back. Since then, at least 11 Negroes have been killed in mysterious circumstances in Mississippi, including two whose bodies were believed to have been found in the Mississippi River during the search for three civil rights workers.

Through this bloody business horrifies the rest of the country, the tendency in Mississippi is to shrug it off. In Philadelphia, Miss., a resident who declined to give his name to Associated Press was quoted as laconically remarking of the three boys, "if they had stayed home where they belonged nothing would have happened to them." Implicit in this attitude is the feeling that Mississippi is not "home" to an American but an alien place to be visited at one's own peril.

None of those who have died in Mississippi have died in vain. The corpses in the river, the three bodies in the levee, are all damning witnesses to a way of life that is indifferent to life. The killings in Mississippi have also made clear the extent to which local police tend to shield the lawless rather than enforce the law. It surpasses belief that Mississippi police are incapable of solving a single civil rights crime.

Although the FBI may uncover the identity of the murderers, the underlying horror cannot be removed by the Federal police. The redemption of Mississippi will have to come from within. The discovery of the three bodies ends a long ordeal for the boys' parents. The ordeal for Mississippi has just begun.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C.,
Aug. 6, 1964]

MURDER IN MISSISSIPPI

The finding of the bodies confirms what almost everyone believed—that the three civil rights workers who disappeared in Mississippi last June were murdered. This puts a grim period to the pretense, inspired perhaps by wishful thinking, that their disappearance was some kind of civil rights hoax.

There are indications that a tip led the FBI to the earth dam in which the bodies had been buried. But tip or no tip, the fact remains that it was the relentless work of the FBI which resulted in the discovery. Certainly, and this is disgraceful, there is no reason to think the bodies would ever have been found had the search been left in the hands of Mississippi authorities.

What has happened confirms that the atrocious crime was committed. What remains is to identify and apprehend those responsible for the murders. There have been hints that the FBI already knows who they are. We hope that this is so, and we also hope that the agents will be able to arrest the killers on the basis of evidence sufficiently strong to convict them—in the eyes of the civilized world if not in the courts of Mississippi.

Mayor Richard J. Daley and People of Chicago Awarded Citation for Captive Nations Week Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 7, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week it was my great privilege to represent Mayor Richard J. Daley and the people of Chicago at a dinner sponsored by the Assembly of Captive European Nations which was held here in the Nation's Capital to honor those who have performed outstanding service in observing Captive Nations Week.

Chicago was selected as a recipient of this highly coveted award because, under the direction of Mayor Richard J. Daley, Chicago has held an annual Captive Nations Week observance in Grant Park which draws several thousand people of more than 32 various ethnic groups.

This year's observance by the city of Chicago drew an unusually large gathering indicating the strong feeling that large masses of Americans continue to have for the captive nations.

I was indeed pleased to receive this year's award in behalf of Mayor Daley and the people of Chicago. The mayor requested me to represent him because of the press of duties in Chicago.

Following is the citation which was read by Mr. Stefan Korbonski, vice president of the Assembly of Captive European Nations and one of the most daring Polish underground leaders during World War II.

Following Mr. Korbonski's introduction, are my own remarks which I delivered at this banquet:

The recipient of our award are the people and city of Chicago, represented here, at the request of Mayor Richard J. Daley by the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Member of the House of Representatives. In bestowing the award to the people of Chicago, to their government, congressional delegation, their press and civic organizations, we mean to give recognition to the fact that for many years they have been second to no other American community in the scope and intensity of their backing for the cause we are trying to serve.

Our special recognition goes to the congressional delegation from Chicago. Democrats like BARRATT O'HARA, JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, ROLAND LIBONATI, WILLIAM T. MURPHY, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, and DAN ROSTENKOWSKI; Republicans like EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, HAROLD L. COLLIER, and DONALD RUMSFELD—not to speak of the distinguished Senators of Illinois, Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS and EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN—have consistently raised their voice in support of the captive nations and their freedom aspirations. It goes equally to the press of the Windy City—the Chicago Sun-Times, the Chicago Tribune, Chicago's American, the Chicago Daily News, as well as to such outstanding national language papers as the Polish Dziennik Zwiazkowy; Dziennik Chicagoski; the Czechoslovak

Hlasatel and the Lithuanian Draugas. We also want to honor the invaluable contribution of the Polish American Congress, the Czechoslovak National Council of America, and the American Lithuanian Council—all headquartered in Chicago—have brought to our common struggle.

In presenting the award to the people and city of Chicago we ask Congressman PUCINSKI to convey to Mayor Daley our respects and to the people of this great community our heartfelt appreciation.

The citation reads:

"To the city and people of Chicago always in forefront of Captive Nations Week observances in recognition of the great contribution they, their congressional delegation and press, have made to keeping the captive nations' cause a burning issue.

"WASHINGTON, D.C., July 1964.

"ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS."

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ROMAN C. PUCINSKI BEFORE CAPTIVE NATIONS AWARDS DINNER, JULY 29, 1964

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen: Mayor Richard J. Daley has asked me to extend to you his most sincere apology for not being able to be with you this evening to personally receive this very great honor which you are bestowing upon the people of Chicago.

We in Chicago are deeply grateful to the Assembly of Captive European Nations for this distinction. And, while we are truly thankful for this recognition, I should like to stress that Chicago has been in the forefront in observing Captive Nations Week as a continuation of the dynamic ethnic spirit which has built our great city.

Mayor Daley himself grew up in a neighborhood to which, at the turn of the century, came immigrants from many of those nations which today, tragically, are held captive by the Communists.

Chicago is a polyglot metropolis where you will find people of more than 32 separate and distinct ethnic backgrounds all living in harmony and good will toward one another. The people of Chicago for decades have served as a thriving example that people of different national origins and religious beliefs can find a common ground of respect and understanding for one another's cultural values.

I deeply regret Mayor Daley is not able to be with you this evening for, in his presence, you would find the embodiment of understanding for the hopes and aspirations of the various ethnic groups which comprise the city of Chicago.

It should come as no surprise that Chicago should be so prominent in arranging annually the largest Captive Nations Week observances in this country since the Congress established this commemorative practice in 1958.

Mayor Daley has been the moving spirit in implementing the request of Congress by providing the leadership for these impressive observances. And while the ceremonies we hold in Grant Park every third week in July are imposing in themselves, I feel compelled to remind you, ladies, and gentlemen, that in Chicago we rekindle the spirit of hope for the unfortunate victims behind the Iron Curtain by our conduct every day of the year.

And this is as it should be.

The people of Chicago join all freedom-loving Americans in daily rededicating ourselves to the proposition that the conscience of the world cannot rest until the millions of people now held captive behind the Iron Curtain, the Bamboo Curtain, and, yes, the Castro Curtain in Cuba, can once again rejoin the world family of free nations.

Mayor Daley has asked me to thank you for the honor you have bestowed on the people of Chicago this evening. Recognition by such a distinguished organization as the Assembly of Captive European Nations gives us renewed strength and determination to carry on in Chicago a concerted effort to keep alive the spirit of hope for the oppressed victims of communism.

The task ahead of us is monumental.

There can be no doubt the world today is in a state of continuing revolution. Social orders are changing. Even the Communists are beginning to feel the backlash to their own tyrannical colonialism.

History will judge America by the degree to which it is able to understand this running world revolution and the leadership and dedication with which it pursues the goal of universal human freedom.

President Johnson has been explicit in laying down guidelines the United States intends to follow in providing the dynamic leadership to insure this universal personal freedom. Let there be no mistake—President Johnson is firm and resolute in his determination to do all possible to keep the spirit of liberty throughout the world. His determination proudly follows the guidelines enumerated by our beloved late President, John F. Kennedy.

America today is actively and courageously engaged in trying to pull the individual captive nations from their Moscow orbit—and this will be done.

There will be no ticker-tape parade down Wall Street to mark a sudden victory of freedom over communism. Instead, it will be a slow but decisive process of evolution rather than revolution.

The struggle is gargantuan only because never before in the history of civilization has freedom been challenged by so formidable and extensive an adversary. Those who would raise false hopes of easy victory are guilty of the most brutal demagoguery.

Ultimate liberation of the captive nations will come when they are individually and then collectively pulled away from the complete domination of the Kremlin. This will be a long and painstaking process.

Today, though, we are encouraged to see not only the possibility, but the probability, that this will be done. Once these nations are free from Moscow rule and Soviet occupation, we know that their internal forces for freedom will work their will.

Our hopes may be based, in some instances, only on minute sparks indicating a more deep-seated resentment of the oppressive Communist philosophy. In other instances, these hopes are based on meaningful and significant developments behind the Iron Curtain.

We see in Poland today a persistent, steady, and determined effort being made by the Polish people to dilute their subservience to Moscow's Communist rule.

While it is true that the present regime in Poland continues virtual complete obedience to the Kremlin, the signs are clear that unrelenting pressures from the Polish people themselves foretell significant changes in the Moscow-Warsaw Axis.

We cannot ignore the fact that, despite all sorts of obstructions, more than 1 million people participate in religious observances in Czestochowa arranged by His Eminence Cardinal Wyszynski. Nor can we sweep under the rug the bold and heroic demands by 39 of Poland's outstanding literary figures for greater freedom in their writings and their travel.

It should be of profound significance to the free world that the Polish Communist Government had to capitulate to these demands.

This may be one of those sparks I referred to earlier, but a most significant one in that it demonstrates the rulers of Warsaw are today no longer complete masters of their own destiny.

It would be cruel to suggest that Poland by some magic will be liberated in the immediate future. The fact remains, however, that the unconquerable spirit of her people gives the Communists little comfort to look to the future with any security.

Nor can we ignore what has been happening in Czechoslovakia where, against tremendous odds, 3,000 bold students recently challenged their oppressors.

Nor can we look with impunity upon what is happening in Rumania. On the contrary, the U.S. Government has followed a very bold course in suggesting closer economic and cultural ties with the people of Rumania. The chaos which our discussions with the Rumanian Government have created in the Kremlin is a matter of public record.

There are strong indications that throughout the entire Communist cordon sanitaire behind the Iron Curtain, each of the captive nations is beginning to reflect in increasing degrees the unrest of the people against Communist subjugation.

Our greatest problem today is to be wary of those who would play Russian roulette with the future of millions of people behind the Iron Curtain.

Men of little faith in the ultimate triumph of freedom, and less understanding of the complex nature of the problem, would counsel us to overt, impetuous, military—yes, even nuclear—action to free the victims of communism behind the Iron Curtain.

History demonstrates the danger of this formula.

We need only look at the ill-fated Hungarian uprising to see the tragedy inherent in ill-timed and insufficiently armed rebellions.

To urge millions of unfortunate victims of communism behind the Iron Curtain toward overt acts at this time would be an act of cruelty unparalleled in history.

This is not the time for brinkmanship.

Indeed, we can see the day when these tragic victims of communism will again be free without laying waste their cities and leaving huge corridors of human devastation. We can see the day of their peaceful liberation by properly exploiting the present Sino-Soviet crises.

There are those who question the gravity of the philosophical and economic split between the Kremlin and Peking. I respect their judgment, but all available evidence would indicate there is ample basis to treat the split as serious and meaningful.

The free world today must stand courageously on the side of freedom for those unhappy victims of Communist treachery. It would be my hope that the entire free world will join the United States in doing everything possible to pull the captive nations away from Moscow.

We have reason to believe that, with its hands full with Peking, Moscow has little alternative but to concede to such demands by the West.

Our own State Department should place renewed pressures on the Soviet Union during this period of Sino-Soviet crises for the removal of Soviet troops from the captive nations.

No time was ever more opportune for Western allies to forcefully press both Moscow and the Communist regimes within the captive nations for free and unfettered elections, guaranteed each of these nations in the wartime agreements negotiated between East and West.

It is my hope that the Western allies will also base their economic dealings with the captive nations, and the Soviet Union itself, on the basis of firm commitments for human dignity and freedom for their people.

The Western allies must also recognize the possibility of crushing the Communist cancer in Cuba from within by joining the United States in its economic embargo against this Caribbean republic. No one can deny that no captive nation has been more susceptible to liberating itself from the yoke

of communism than Cuba is today, if only the free world will help tighten the final notch in this staggering example of Communist failures.

Finally, the United States should lead the way in encouraging among the people of the captive nations of Europe the creation of a third force which would ultimately serve as the balance wheel for lasting peace between East and West when freedom again returns to the entire world.

History dictates that indeed the people of those nations, which we today describe as the captive nations of Europe, have a common bond of friendship and cultural ties. During the past 20 years, they have suffered a common dignity at the hands of the Communists. It is my fervent belief that the people of these captive nations, once they regain their full freedom and are again free to choose their own governments, can be welded into one political-economic bloc which with its common interest, can serve as the third force of Europe separating East from West. It would be my hope that in this Captive Nations Assembly will be found men of wisdom and ability to work out the necessary details for such a concept.

The people of Western Europe need a catalyst; they need to know what the future holds for them once they have freed themselves from Communist oppression. It would appear to me that these captives of communism must be assured by the free world today against any further territorial changes; and they must be assured of full support from the Western allies in their economic development once they are free of their Communist yoke.

Your dinner here tonight serves again to emphasize the vital role that the captive nations of Europe play in the development of freedom throughout the world. The United States and the Western allies—particularly the nations of NATO—must understand that the resistance against communism by the people in these captive nations today indeed constitutes the free world's first line of defense.

There can be no doubt that Khrushchev's entire foreign policy would take on a more bold and arrogant nature if he and his Kremlin advisors believed for one second that they could count on these captive nations in the event of a confrontation with the West.

The spirit of these people remains high but the clock is running out.

A whole new generation has been brought up behind the Iron Curtain under severe Communist domination. We can find pride in the fact that the Communists have failed to corrupt the masses of youth behind the Iron Curtain with their despotic ideologies.

But this is no time for smugness.

In the captive nations of Europe today we see the seeds of new hope for the ultimate collapse of the Communist empire. God grant that the people of America, our Government, and the free people of the world, have the wisdom and the understanding to help these tragic victims of communism by helping establish an atmosphere of understanding and cooperation in their struggle for dignity and freedom.

The Truth Even Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the country is united behind the President in his action to defend the honor of the

1964

United States. He could do nothing else. Nevertheless, we have not been given the honest facts about Vietnam. I hope the American people will now be told the truth.

Richard Starnes, in the July 30 edition of the New York World Telegram properly takes the Johnson administration to task for deceiving the American people in this regard:

HOUR OF REALITY
(By Richard Starnes)

All signs and portents from South Vietnam now point to one large, intractable, and politically supercharged fact:

The war for southeast Asia has grown to the point where it cannot grow any more and still masquerade under the comforting fiction that it isn't an American war at all, but actually is sort of a conflict by proxy.

At no time have the American people been told the whole dismal truth about the war, and prospects for candor are sure to diminish as November and the election draw near. But the reality is that the Communist North Vietnamese and the Chinese Reds have called all our raises in Vietnam (and Laos), and raised the ante in turn.

Mr. McNamara's slicked-down and parted-in-the-middle estimates of the pace and direction of the conflict are heard no longer in Washington. Americans were eager to believe them, but Ho Chi Minh's hardpan bitter-enders were not so easily taken in. Thus the promise of gradual American withdrawal has perished silently (as all such irredeemable pledges do in the Nation's Capital) and we now witness a buildup of our forces consigned to that sweltering hell.

American "advisers" are to be increased by 5,000, and our elite Special Forces are soon to be told their tour on the Mekong is to be doubled, from 6 months to 1 year. No man alive knows the present money cost of our adventure in white-man's-burdenship, but apparently the \$1.5-million-a-day figure is still the one that is passed glibly from hand to hand on the Georgetown cocktail and clamdip circuit.

That, to be sure, is bound to add up to a sum that must be reckoned impressive even by the Babylonian standards of midcentury Washington. But money is not the central tragedy that has engulfed us in southeast Asia, and even the young lives that have been cast into the balance are not the real measure of the disaster.

The cruelest aspect of the Nation's dilemma is simply that by pursuing a bankrupt policy in Asia the United States is made to look like a nation that is itself morally and intellectually bankrupt. Americans do not believe this to be so but sophisticated Asians do, and so do a disheartening number of Europeans.

There is no surprise in the news that more North Vietnamese regulars are being identified among Communist Vietcong units, nor in word that the guerrillas are better equipped than ever. Since the United States first gingerly stepped into that murderous flypaper, the Communists have never shown any sign that their ultimate objective was anything less than total conquest.

All these unpalatable truths are known to the Government, and to the busy tacticians who are mapping Senator GOLDWATER's campaign strategy. Vietnam is the biggest political time bomb in Washington, because the next step is the commitment of combat troops and every realist from the Mekong to the Potomac knows it.

What is not known is the nature of the reaction that would be forthcoming from the American people. Presumably it would hurt the administration, however, and for that reason we can expect to see Mr. Johnson perform prodigies of juggling in an attempt to forestall the reckoning until November is safely past.

The Republicans have already tipped their hand to a degree. In his keynote speech to the GOP Convention, Oregon's Gov. Mark Hatfield simultaneously scolded the Democrats for losing Laos and for fighting to prevent the loss of South Vietnam. This dichotomous din is bound to grow to deafening proportions as the war for southeast Asia is enlarged.

Prayer and Bible Reading in School

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 7, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed by an article entitled "Prayer and Bible Reading in School." The article was written by the Reverend Claud L. Asbury, pastor of the First Baptist Church of McColl, S.C., and it was published in the McColl Messenger on July 30, 1964.

I am glad to be able to call the article to the attention of the Members of the Senate, not only because the Reverend Asbury makes a very convincing argument against the recent Supreme Court decisions which would bar prayers and Bible reading in our schools, but also to call attention to the fact that many, many Baptists do not concur in testimony in opposition to the Becker amendment, which recently was presented by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs before the House Judiciary Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN SCHOOLS

(By Rev. Claud L. Asbury)

In making the ruling regarding prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, I feel the Supreme Court has the intention of doing that which even Congress is not to do, and I cite the first amendment to the Constitution:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Now, let us note a definition—one of eight definitions—as found on page 1024 of "The American College Dictionary" (edited by Clarence L. Barnhart; Harper & Bros. Publishers): "6. a point or matter of conscience: to make a religion of doing something."

On page 481 of "The Universal Standard Encyclopedia," volume 2 (Joseph Laffan Morse, editor in chief; Standard Reference Works Publishing Co., Inc., New York), we find these words: "Atheism is not necessarily irreligious."

In his book, "The Religions of Mankind" (p. 18; publishers: Abingdon-Cokesbury, New York), Edmund Davison Soper says: "In our day a class of definitions is being presented with no necessary reference to higher powers or to God."

On page 169 of his book, "Psychology of Religion" (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press), Paul E. Johnson says " * * * atheism is, by every test, as much a belief as theism, and it is evidently quite as incapable of escaping the waves of emotion that beat upon beliefs."

On page 819 of "The Winston Dictionary" this is to be found: "Religion 2, the outward acts or practices of life by which men indicate their recognition of such relations; 5. conscientious devotion to some principle."

On page 6866, volume 14 (QR), of "The World Book Encyclopedia," copyright 1959, these words are to be found: "Religion. Many scholars have been inclined to define religion as belief in gods or supernatural beings. But this by no means includes all the religions, because religion has often meant a way of living rather than a way of believing. And there have been many who have denied or been indifferent to any kind of God."

In ruling as it did regarding the Madalyn Murray case of 1963 the Supreme Court violated that point, part of the first amendment of our U.S. Constitution, which reads as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion * * *"

This one, Mrs. Madalyn Murray, who is responsible for this particular controversy and action on the part of the Supreme Court has stated that she is an atheist, and this is, in my opinion, definitely a religion.

Let us bear in mind that the question (regarding prayer and Bible reading) was raised, in the first place, by the minority (the atheist—Mrs. Madalyn Murray) and has to do with this, that (prayer and Bible reading), which is followed, advocated by the majority. Let us note that the acknowledgment of God as the Supreme Being, as God of this, our Nation, and who was so acknowledged by the writers of the Constitution of the United States of America was and is advocated by the majority.

It is not only a question of whether or not our children are permitted or allowed to read the Holy Bible and to pray in school on a voluntary basis, though this in itself is indeed a great and important question, and one, which I believe must be answered and will be answered in the affirmative by the American people, but there is also the important point of the Supreme Court ruling in favor of a group of people, a minority of people, who are known as atheists and thus by their own admittance, and which is a religious group.

Ruling as they did, the Supreme Court, in a very real sense, did cater to the religion of atheism: thus we can readily see the grave danger which a group of men could lead us to experience if such power as they now seem to possess is not removed from their clutches. To allow such to continue will, in my opinion, lead to the setting up of atheism as a, or perhaps the, religion of the land.

Although the Baptist Joint Committee and others have been and are opposing congressional passage of the Frank J. Becker amendment, and though the Southern Baptist Convention, the Nation's biggest Protestant denomination, went on record at their recent meeting (May 1964) in Atlantic City, N.J., as opposing such amendment to the Constitution, such action by no means represents all Southern Baptists, who now number 10.4 million, for let us take note of the fact that the number present at this meeting in Atlantic City was in the thousands; therefore, I contend that so few cannot possibly speak for so many, who perhaps have not been heard in this regard. It is true that those present met, spoke, perhaps debated, and voted as messengers from Southern Baptist churches and as the Southern Baptist Convention in one of its yearly sessions, but the voices, sentiments, convictions of all Southern Baptist churches, members were not included.

It is my prayerful concern that all necessary efforts be put forth in securing the congressional passage of "the Frank J. Becker amendment to the U.S. Constitution."

Please note that House Joint Resolution 693 (88th Cong.), which is the proposed prayer amendment to the Constitution "does

not seek to change the first amendment, but only to clarify its meaning, and thereby prevent and defeat future attacks on the spiritual heritage of our Nation, as evidenced in current suits to remove " . . . under God . . ." from the Pledge of Allegiance and deny tax exemptions to churches. Chaplains in the Armed Forces, and the motto, "In God We Trust" on our coins and currency are also being threatened as 'unconstitutional.'" (From "Fact Sheet on the Proposed Prayer Amendment to the Constitution; House Joint Resolution 693 (88th Cong.)")

Following is the amendment's text:

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering from, or listening to prayers or Biblical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

"Sec. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceedings, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"Sec. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion.

"Sec. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." Psalm 33: 12.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Proverbs 14: 34.

REV. CLAUD L. ASBURY.

MCCOLL, S.C.

FACT SHEET ON THE PROPOSED PRAYER AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION (H.J. RES. 693, 88TH CONG.)

The amendment's authors

House Joint Resolution 693 was authored by a committee of six Congressmen (three Democrats and three Republicans) with the aid of constitutional lawyers and legislative counsel. This committee was appointed by more than 60 Members of the House who had introduced similar resolutions, and wished to arrive at one text acceptable to all. Congressman FRANK J. BECKER, the committee's chairman, introduced House Joint Resolution 693 on September 10, 1963.

The amendment's purpose

To restore the inherent American right to the " . . . free exercise . . ." of religion, as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution. Decisions of the Supreme Court in 1962 and 1963 declared unconstitutional the practice of prayer and Bible reading in our public schools, and the amendment seeks to restore this right. The amendment would also prevent future attacks on the spiritual heritage of our Nation, as evidenced in current suits to remove " . . . under God . . ." from the Pledge of Allegiance and deny tax exemption to churches. Chaplains in the Armed Forces, and the motto, "In God We Trust" on our coins and currency are also being threatened as "unconstitutional." House Joint Resolution 693 does not seek to change the first amendment, but only to clarify its meaning, and thereby defeat attacks such as those outlined above.

The amendment's text

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or Biblical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

"Sec. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"Sec. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion.

"Sec. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

What you can do

Write to your Congressman, telling him of your support for the prayer amendment: Feel free to use any of the arguments cited in the enclosure and urge him to sign discharge petition No. 3, reminding him that this petition is the only means to insure for the Congress a chance to vote on the amendment before adjournment. He may reply that he has introduced an amendment himself. Write again, and remind him that discharge petition No. 3 only affects House Joint Resolution 693, and that he may offer his own amendments to that bill if it comes to the floor of the House. At the present time 166 Congressmen have signed the petition—of the 218 required to free the resolution from committee. Mine is the first signature on the petition.

Keep this in mind

Congressman Becker has said, "I cannot sit idly by and permit the advocates of a Godless society to accomplish in the United States what the Communists have accomplished in Soviet Russia. I have provided the legislative instrument . . . but the real job must be done by the people themselves. They must let their Congressmen know how they feel if we are to succeed."

Fight Like a Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it took a lady to tell some to "fight like a man" in the coming campaign.

Liberal journalistic establishments generally pronounce pious platitudes about guilt by association, innuendos, and smear, but sometimes they use these very low type tactics against someone they do not like; to wit, Senator GOLDWATER.

Clare Boothe Luce, in a hard-hitting article in last Sunday's New York Herald Tribune, wipes away the phoniness and tells these same liberals to stop hiding behind words.

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

If anyone will take the trouble to look up the word extremism in the dictionary, he will find the only political definition given to it is "radicalism," and that the dictionary uses extremist as a synonym for a political radical. It defines a radical as "one who advocates radical and sweeping changes in the laws and methods of government with the least delay." Now Senator GOLDWATER is a conservative, and the dictionary definition of a conservative is one who is "disposed to maintain existing institutions or views; op-

posed to change; designating, pertaining to, or characteristic of a political party which favors conservation of existing institutions and forms of government."

If there is any meaning whatever in words (or any sense to the dictionary), Senator GOLDWATER and his supporters are the very opposite of political extremists.

In his acceptance speech, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER made a brave but unsuccessful attempt to stop the widespread, incorrect use of the word "extremism" by both Republicans and Democrats. Defining the task of Republicanism as "preserving and enlarging freedom at home and of safeguarding it from the forces of tyranny abroad," he said, "Let our Republicanism be . . . so dedicated (to this task as) not to be made fuzzy and futile by unthinking labels. I would remind you that extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice."

By this he clearly meant that it is no vice to defend liberty (to use the phrases more commonly heard) "at all costs," "by every means," "to the utmost, i.e., to the extreme limits of our capacities."

THE ENEMIES

Nowhere is the desperate desire of the Senator's political enemies to conceal what the man really meant—and really stands for—seen more clearly than in the uproar they have made about this effort to get rid of catchall phrases and imprecise labels, and to get on with the honest business of calling political spades spades. His failure must be measured by the even greater failure of his political enemies to give any definition of the words extremism or extremists on which all reasonable Americans—Democrats or Republicans—can agree.

The fact is, as currently used, the words are as empty of intellectual content as howls, snarls, boos, or hisses. They are visceral, not cerebral, sounds, full of fury signifying nothing but a bellyful of unpleasant and hateful emotions, or possibly a headful of words which the people who use them are either too cautious, or too cowardly, to utter.

I say, you politicians, editors, commentators, have you all turned into mice? Now if you think a man is a Nazi, a Fascist, a Communist, a Ku Kluxer, racist, anti-Catholic, or anti-Semite, then stop cringing behind the word extremist and stand up squarely and call him that. The worst that can happen to you is that he will retort either by calling you one of these names back—or if not that, a liar, a smearer, a character assassin. No: the worst is he'll sue you for slander. (In my view, Ike should have sued a slanderer like Robert Welch for his last F.D.R. dime, or anyway have got the satisfaction of seeing him certified as wacky. I'm hoping that BARRY is keeping a careful little list of those who have called him a Nazi. People like Gov. Pat Brown, of California, ought to be good for a couple of years' salary.)

THE BIRCHERS

Or take the John Birchers. Do you think they are traitors, or Nazis, or Brown Shirts? If you do, why horse around with a lily-livered coverup word like extremists? But if you don't think they are disloyal Americans, then find the right word for what you do think they are. The English language is full of juicy terms of opprobrium. You have a choice of kooks, nuts, dopes, bigots, cranks, fuzz brains, goons, frenetic flag wavers, patriotic hopheads, star-spangled bananas—or whatever you have in your typewriter today, gentlemen, that will put a little more strain on your brain than extremists. And why—in the name of justice—do you want to let off the Ku Kluxers with this fuzzy word, when lawbreakers, terrorists, torturers, arsonists, racists, murderers are so much more graphic?

It seems to me that smart politicians who hope to win elections would do well to take BARRY's hint and get off this "extremism"