

1964

tions. For example, under the social security system the Government is now committed to pay \$625 billion in future retirement, survivors' and disability benefits to presently covered individuals. With the dollar depreciating around 1½ percent per year, the Government is reducing the purchasing power of these future payments to you and me by \$9.2 billion a year.

Thus, even the Government's own books, confirm the truth of the Wall Street Journal's statement that the deficit is being "taken out of the hide of the economy—the American people, that is."

**SELF-PROTECTION**

Can we protect ourselves against such irresponsible fiscal management? The answer is an emphatic "yes." Any time we, the people, insist that the Government balance its budget, inflation will grind to a halt. A good way to begin is to invest in a 5-cent stamp to write your Congressman saying that a real tax cut is devoutly to be desired; but a phony tax cut, financed by more borrowing and more debt, is no favor to anybody. It would do no harm to say that a vote for such a tax cut will be remembered in the privacy of the voting booth this coming November.

After that you might spend another nickel on a letter to the Council of Economic Advisers, The White House, Washington, D.C., saying that you are watching carefully what is happening to your cost of living and that you are holding the economic planners jointly responsible with Congress.

If Washington officials want to claim credit, as they always do, for the good things that happen in this great American economy of ours, then it is high time they be made to accept responsibility for the daily defeats millions of Americans suffer in their struggle with the rising cost of living.

**Constitution Day—Part II****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. BRUCE ALGER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 25, 1964*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a second editorial by John Coyle, president of radio station KVIL in Dallas and broadcast over that station on February 16, dealing with the 175th birthday of the Constitution of the United States:

**CONSTITUTION DAY—PART II**

FEBRUARY 16, 1964.

On Wednesday, March 4, the Constitution of this country will be exactly 175 years old. That will be Constitution Day, an anniversary to which too often the average citizen gives only perfunctory attention. One result has been that over the years and especially in the last 40, courts have kicked around the meaning of the Constitution without remedial action by Congress. Yet our continued security rests on the unimpaired strength of this fundamental document. Only so can continue the most successful form of government ever devised for free men.

This 175th Constitution Day must be made a special occasion. All right-thinking Americans must rededicate the preservation of this basis on which our Government rests. That can only be done by continued study and support of its provisions. Insist that the Constitution can be changed only by amendment, not by the quibbling of new judicial definitions.

KVIL urges Governor John Connally to proclaim Constitution Day in Texas. The proclamation should be read in every school, court, and meeting on March 4, stressed by all news media.

Make this Constitution Day real.

JOHN COYLE,  
President, KVIL.**Bobby Baker Whitewash****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 24, 1964*

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the country knows that those in the highest positions in the executive department are viewing with trepidation the investigation of Bobby Baker's sordid affairs in the other body. Yesterday's New York Times editorially demands the truth about this whole rotten episode:

**TRUTH IN THE BAKER AFFAIR**

The refusal of Robert G. Baker to produce his business records in response to a subpoena from the Senate Rules Committee, which has been seeking to determine whether he misused his influence while he was secretary to the Democratic majority, raises some interesting questions of constitutional law and public policy. It had previously been brought out before the committee that Mr. Baker's own estimate of his net worth had grown from \$11,000 to \$2 million during his relatively brief tenure.

Mr. Baker pleaded the first, fourth, fifth, and sixth amendments to support his refusal. The first amendment, guaranteeing the right of free speech, appears to have been invoked because of alleged wiretapping against him by the Government. The relevance of the fourth, dealing with unreasonable search and seizure, has not been made clear. The fifth amendment, of course, guarantees that no person may be compelled to be a witness against himself in any criminal case. We have defended the right to invoke it many times. It is a bulwark of our liberties. Mr. Baker is just as much entitled to its protection as any extremist of the left or right.

But it is the invocation of the sixth amendment, which guarantees the right to a jury trial in all criminal cases, that is of especial interest. Edward Bennett Williams, Mr. Baker's counsel, has told the committee he recognizes its right to gather information for legislative purposes, but has challenged its right to conduct what he calls "a legislative trial," which, he says, would be conducted in a highly partisan atmosphere, and in which his client would have no right to cross-examine witnesses.

The answer, it seems to us, lies in the resolution authorizing the inquiry, unanimously adopted by the Senate on October 10 on motion of Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It authorizes the Senate Rules Committee to investigate the financial and business interests and activities of any present or former officer or employee of the Senate to determine whether these have involved any conflicts of interest or other improprieties—clearly a legitimate and justified legislative purpose.

Complicated procedural questions lie ahead. But with or without Mr. Baker's testimony, and with or without his records, the committee must proceed relentlessly to carry out its mandate. Too many other persons, and too much principle, are involved for it to halt.

**Beef Import Agreement****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. O. C. FISHER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 25, 1964*

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, while the agreement with Australia and New Zealand on beef and mutton imports was a step in the right direction, I must register my disappointment that it did not include lamb and also that it was not based upon a 5-year average of such imports.

Australia and New Zealand account for approximately 80 percent of our imports of beef and veal. Right now approximately 11 percent of our domestic meat market is filled by foreign imports. The 1962-63 average, which formed the basis for the voluntary agreement, witnessed by far the highest imports of beef and mutton into this country in history. For that reason, it would seem that a 5-year average, rather than the 2-year peak period, would have been more fair and realistic.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that I was disappointed because the agreement did not include lamb. I call attention to the fact that lamb imports have increased over 1,000 percent since 1957. Our sheep population is now the lowest since 1867. This decrease is due to lack of profit in the industry. From this it is clear that excessive imports of this product can be very harmful.

New York City is one of the three areas of this country that the domestic lamb industry must depend on for over 70 percent of its lamb sales. New York City is also the port through which the bulk of our lamb imports arrive. A few too many lambs there breaks the wholesale market and since New York is the sensitive price-setting point, the live lamb market frequently follows the lower New York market and breaks all over the Nation. It follows that a drop of even ½-cent per pound in our live lamb market as a result of the influx of imports is equivalent to a 5-cent per pound drop in wool prices.

The average farm price of U.S. lambs in 1963 was only \$18.20 per hundred-weight compared to the beef cattle price of \$19.80.

Mr. Speaker, if lamb and mutton imports cannot be held at the average of the last 5 years, then I feel the industry would approve holding imports of lamb even at present increased levels in order to remove the present uncertainty as to volume coming in, resulting in further liquidation in an already depressed industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to effectuate the objective which I have described. A copy of the bill follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the total quantities of beef, veal, lamb and mutton (in all forms except canned, cured, and cooked meat) originating in any country which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during any*

period of twelve months shall not exceed the average annual quantities of such products imported from such country during the five-year period ending on December 31, 1963: *Provided*, That beginning January 1, 1965, there may be an annual increase in the total quantities of such products which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for such purpose, corresponding to the annual rate of increase in the total United States market for such products, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

## Our Inaction on Cuba *Cuba*

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this week, the OAS report on Castro's doings in Venezuela will be presented to the United States. The report shows without a doubt the subversive nature of Castro's beachhead, Venezuela.

Based upon past inactions, I will predict that we will do nothing. Yesterday's Wall Street Journal has an excellent article on the whole subject of Cuba:

**HEATING UP CUBA: OAS REPORT ON CASTRO PLOT AGAINST VENEZUELA MAY FUEL A NEW CRISIS—BATTLE PLAN AND ARMS CACHES REVEALED—CALL FOR STERNER JOHNSON STAND IS EXPECTED—CUBAN ECONOMY MAKES GAINS**

(By Phillip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—A new crisis is quietly building up over Cuba. Some top officials think it could blow up into the biggest foreign policy test and perhaps the nastiest domestic political dilemma that President Johnson will encounter between now and election day.

The trouble only begins with the current ruckus over burgeoning West European trade with Fidel Castro. This is causing the Johnson administration trouble enough with friendly nations abroad and with political critics at home. But the real catalyst to fresh crisis is expected this week in the form of a report by a special investigating team of the 21-nation Organization of American States (OAS).

The subject is familiar enough: Castroite subversion in Venezuela. But the contents, say officials in a position to know, are explosive. They add up, at least in U.S. eyes, to an eye-popping expose of an elaborate Castro-inspired plot to foment widespread revolt, timed to last fall's Venezuelan elections. Included is evidence, already aired, of large caches of arms of Cuban origin.

But also available to the OAS group is well-documented evidence, insiders say, of a detailed battle plan to put these weapons to use, including such specifics as the precise positioning of bazooka teams and other insurgent groups to take over key Caracas strongpoints while the bulk of Venezuela's Army was scattered around the nation on election day, seeking to keep order at polling booths. While the plan failed with discovery of the arms caches and the Venezuelan election came off successfully, these revelations apparently constitute long-awaited evidence clearly and directly implicating Castro for the first time in terrorism and subversion outside Cuba.

#### CLAMOR FOR ACTION LIKELY

The OAS investigators are charged only with reporting the evidence to that body's

ruling council. But the effect of such damning evidence, officially set forth by a responsible inter-American team of probers, is certain to be loud clamor—from anti-Castroites in Latin America and from Cuban policy critics in the United States—for action. And the effect of this, in turn, can only be measured by a look at this country's Cuban dilemma as it currently stands. This is the picture that emerges from talks with experts in all of the Government's centers of Cuban expertise:

For all the U.S. efforts to undermine Castro by economic sanctions, diplomatic isolation, and unmentionable covert efforts to stir disaffection, his position still strikes most experts as strong. "There are none of the traditional signs of a revolution going sour," concedes one U.S. official, adding: "You might not be able to call it a really stable regime but it's far from falling apart."

The Cuban economy, which most analysts consider the key to any effort to bring about Castro's downfall, is proving remarkably resilient, even to glaring Communist mismanagement. One reason is heavy Soviet help. Another is some fast footwork by Mr. Castro to soften the impact of U.S. trade sanctions; instead of succumbing, like so many small-country revolutionaries, to the prestige lure of forced industrialization, he is engaged in a great leap backward to a sugar-and-cattle economy which is less susceptible to economic strangulation.

Worldwide sugar shortages and resulting soaring sugar prices have also played into Castro's hands by more than offsetting the impact of Cuba's nearly disastrous sugar crop last year. Result: From almost empty coffers a year or so ago, Cuba has piled up close to \$100 million in foreign exchange, making it a tempting market for British buses and French and Spanish trucks.

#### TRADE-SANCTION FRUSTRATION

The Western sales to Cuba are not only undercutting the U.S. embargo effort but making the whole scheme of trade sanctions look futile and the United States look embarrassingly impotent. Already this frustration is fanning public demand in the United States for stronger measures against Castro. Without specifics, every Republican candidate is crying for something more.

Yet U.S. strategists have been racking their brains ever since the Bay of Pigs fiasco 3 years ago without coming up with anything they consider might be more effective against Castro, short of blockade, invasion, or other use of force. And so far, with memories of 1962's nerve-racking missile confrontation still fresh, the decision has been firmly against force.

Such is the U.S. sense of frustration that there has even been increased talk among some officials of the ultimate need for a radical policy shift, to downgrade the Cuban menace and explore the possibility of coexistence with a Castro lured away from close Communist-bloc connections by increased trade with the West. While the Russians probably couldn't afford the loss of face should Castro slip his Communist leash completely, they themselves are thought to be solidly behind his recent efforts to drum up more Western trade. They might welcome some loosening of their hold on him in exchange for lightening a foreign aid burden that by some estimates has cost them upward of \$750 million in 3 years.

Castro himself has been hinting he might be interested in making restitution for seized Yankee property in Cuba in return for resumption of diplomatic ties.

But no U.S. official can seriously advocate this softer course in an election year. Castro's involvement in the Panamanian rioting against the United States, his arbitrary cutoff of water to the U.S. Guantanamo base, and his continued troubling elsewhere in the hemisphere would make any suggestion of coexistence unthinkable, even

before the OAS report pictures the Cuban leader caught redhanded in his most flagrant hemispheric mischiefmaking to date.

With publication of the OAS report, the administration will be in this awkward and dangerous spot: The outcry for some sort of action is sure to become irresistible; yet the use of force will become no more appealing and the alternatives to it no less promising. Right now U.S. policymakers are refusing to tip their hand. "All I can say is that we are going into this with our eyes wide open," declares one. But the United States will be ready to propose further measures against Castro when the time is considered right.

The question remains what?

The answer depends partly on how persuasive the Venezuela evidence may appear to nations such as Mexico, Brazil, Uruguay, Bolivia, and Chile—to name the five OAS members that have not severed diplomatic relations with Cuba. Venezuelan diplomats, who have been touring the hemisphere, flashing their dossier on Castro and seeking support for their indirect aggression charge, report a favorable response, even in such centers of apathy to Castro as Brazil.

So, at the least, U.S. officials count on the OAS council to recommend a meeting at the foreign ministers' level to deal with the Venezuelan case. Even then, however, Latins' disinclination to mix in each other's affairs, plus widespread reluctance to stir home-front leftists by assailing Castro, will tend to limit any OAS action, U.S. officials fear. A logical first step might be a finding of aggression, then agreement on severing of remaining diplomatic ties, followed by some token tightening of trade sanctions, which in Latin America are almost total already. The last remaining air and sea links between Cuba and the rest of Latin America might likewise be sliced.

#### LITTLE IMPACT SEEN

But with Cuban trade ties expanding to other Western lands, and the OAS already on record in opposition to Castro, such measures are hardly likely to have much impact. And the likelihood that the OAS might endorse more forceful measures, such as a quarantine to shut off arms traffic from Cuba to other Latin countries strikes most experts as somewhat remote.

The result, then, may be largely to expose OAS impotency. But this would not take the United States off the hook, either at home or in the hemisphere. So already officials are citing passages from a resolution passed 2 years ago at an anti-Castro OAS rally in Punta del Este which might seem to condone action by individual OAS members, in any numbers down to, say, the United States and Venezuela alone, to "strengthen their capacity to counteract threats or acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security."

As some experts read this, it would clear the way for any combination of OAS members to band together to blockade Cuba, tighten up patrols of the Caribbean coast, establish international counterguerrilla units, or even muster an expeditionary force to invade Castro's island stronghold. Probably there will be demands from some quarters, whether militantly anti-Castro Caribbean nations or some U.S. politicians, for any or all of these approaches.

At this point it's impossible to foretell how the administration ultimately will react. All that's clear is that, as one top administration adviser puts it, "This thing is going to be too big to sweep under the rug."

Some officials hope the OAS report may make it easier for the United States to talk its allies out of trading with Castro, or to take stiffer action against the Western traders. The State Department is hastily seeking to discourage the private consumer boycotts that Secretary Rusk once seemed to be condoning; but U.S. diplomats are trying to persuade private U.S. business to use its

influence on affiliates, subsidiaries or licensees abroad to halt the Cuban trade. More forceful action, such as U.S. Government refusal to buy goods from offending foreign firms, or denial of licenses for U.S. exports to the offenders, is not ruled out.

#### BUT TRADE MAY GROW

Even so, allied trade with Cuba may well grow, rather than shrink, in the weeks just ahead; Japan, West Germany, Italy, and others are said to be poised for trade deals with Castro, especially if Britain's Leyland Motors follows up its 400-bus, \$11 million order with 1,000 additional buses now under consideration. "Everybody's watching Leyland's lead," says one official.

Experts differ on just how much material help this allied trading furnishes Castro; presumably he could acquire some of these items from the Red bloc. But psychologically, U.S. officials complain, the trading adds to the impression of Castro's permanence—which in turn improves his oversea credit rating and encourages more trade.

Perhaps most important, the spurt of Western trade with Cuba strengthens the impression that whatever the United States is doing to get rid of Castro, it isn't working very well. Thus it will be all the harder for President Johnson to maintain in the face of the Venezuelan exposé that the United States is really wearing Castro down.

"After this OAS report, we're going to have to do something more, and something that really convinces people that we're doing something more," says one adviser, who is no clearer than anybody else what more can or will be done.

### Jellyfish Diplomacy

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**  
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Tuesday, February 25, 1964*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Johnson administration continues its foreign policy retreat in all parts of the globe, the timidity which it has displayed in the circumstances surrounding abuses of our representatives and citizens in Zanzibar is especially disturbing.

This morning's Chicago Tribune has a brief, timely, and practical editorial on this subject which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

#### JELLYFISH DIPLOMACY

This country's sagging prestige abroad isn't going to be helped by the cringing haste with which we recognized the leftwing revolutionary regime in Zanzibar 4 days after it had thrown out our only remaining diplomat, or by the flimsy excuses offered in an effort to justify that recognition.

We are told that our charge d'affaires, Donald Petterson, wasn't actually expelled; that he was merely asked to leave in order to demonstrate the Karume regime's irritation at our delay in giving it the recognition which had been given so promptly last month by Russia, Red China, and Cuba.

We are told that recognition might "discourage" a trend toward communism—although two members of the comic opera trio which run Zanzibar learned their political lessons in Peking and Havana, respectively, and have already tried to export their revolution to the mainland of Africa. Besides, it is to "discourage" communism that we have refused to recognize the Peking gov-

ernment and that we broke relations with Castro.

Finally, we are told that recognition had already been discussed with Britain before Mr. Petterson's expulsion—or, pardon us, his requested departure. What may have gone on behind closed doors, we're afraid, won't make much difference to most people.

All they know is that the United States and Britain have yielded reluctantly to the newest and one of the tiniest totalitarian states in the world. Leftwing troublemakers everywhere have learned that if the United States doesn't seem to like them at first, they need only give us a few kicks and we'll come crawling in search of friendship.

### Freedom and Freedom Songs

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 25, 1964*

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, a fascinating article by Theodore Bikel appeared in the March 1964, issue of the national folk music magazine Hootenanny. The noted singer and actor eloquently describes the importance of folk songs and folk singing to the civil rights movement. Theodore Bikel has dedicated his time and talent to the struggle for equality, and his article provides much insight into the dynamic of the civil rights movement. I recommend it to my colleagues:

FREEDOM SONGS—FROM EGYPT TO MISSISSIPPI  
(By Theodore Bikel)

A logical and obvious statement: "There would have been no contemporary 'freedom' songs but for the integration movement in the South."

A seemingly illogical statement: "There would have been no movement but for the songs."

Yet, for all its irrationality, the latter statement was made in complete seriousness by one of the leaders of the movement, the closer examination more than bears out his contention. It asserts, in fact, that the music emanating from the Southern streets, churches and jails is not merely a product but, rather, one of the prime causes of the demonstrations, the prayer vigils and the mass meetings.

It emphasizes that many of the so-called direct action undertakings could not have been conceived or carried out, that the beatings and the jailhouses might have stopped the movement in its tracks, that faith and courage would not have prevailed had it not been for the songs.

This, of course, may be fairly true of any liberation movement in history, but it is doubly true of the Negro movement, and for sound psychological reasons, I do not refer to mass psychology, which no doubt can easily explain crowd behavior and reaction to musical stimuli during times of stress and in a group's pursuit of a common ideal. I refer to psychology based upon the ethnic and social structure peculiar to Negro society, especially in the South, a society that is applying its own temperament and time-worn mode of behavior to this 20th century political movement.

One need be no ethnomusicologist or anthropologist (indeed, this writer lays no claim to any such scholarly distinction) to know that Negroes, by tradition and natural inclination, are incapable of conducting a

gathering of any kind without punctuating and underlining what is being said with music and song. Speeches and even prayer in a Negro meeting must evoke the crowning experience of song, without which no feeling of mass communication is possible. Such was the trademark of the Negro church, and such is the trademark of the mass movement aimed at integration. Although this is a black-and-white-together movement, it takes its emotional shape from the Negro characteristics of mass dedication.

It should be noted that this obviously secular movement not only has insoluble ties with the various Negro churches, but also relies on religious traditions and practices in its everyday workings. The mass meeting—planning a sit-in, a freedom march, or a voter registration drive—is held in the church; the demonstrators, bleeding and weak from the beatings and the fasting in jail, make their way to the church; the local leader of the movement is more often than not the minister of the church; and many of the songs that are sung are the old spirituals and gospel tunes with new words.

Where yesterday the minister from the pulpit promised the congregation a slice of the Kingdom of God, and everyone answered, "Amen, hallelujah," he admonishes them today from the same pulpit to "go down and register to vote," and the answer is still, "Amen, hallelujah." For he is asking for an act of religious dedication, and they receive it as such.

Indeed, what else does it represent when those who heed the call find physical violence and humiliation of personal dignity in their path. How inevitable must the identification seem that draws a parallel between the early martyrs and the fate of Medgar Evers, William Moore, James Travis, and the hundreds of Freedom Fighters who were beaten, shot at, trampled on or killed, carrying the word "freedom" on their lips. Little wonder then that the hymn and the freedom song become as one, that there is no telling where man leaves off and God begins.

"Over my head I see freedom in the air;  
There must be a God somewhere."

To anyone who still thinks it exaggerated to say that there could be no movement without the songs, one must answer from personal observation. The sights and sounds of a little Negro church in Albany, Ga., or in Clarksdale, Miss., or of a larger church in Birmingham, Ala., are a powerful memory to have. You are a participant, true, and less than objective because of a personal involvement with the cause. But you are also a guest from the North, with the observing eye of a visitor. And you know the tell-tale signs of weariness, of boredom with the repetitiveness of the speeches that lurk in the eyes of the congregation. A crisis is on. That means there has been a mass meeting every single night for the last week or more.

Although the speakers may be most revered as leaders and bear illustrious names such as King, Shuttlesworth, Abernathy, or Walker, the heart is heavy from the bombings, the bloodshed, the look of children fresh out of jail. Also, nonviolence does not come easy. How do you teach yourself not to lash out in fury when the white man raises a fist, a club, or a gun? How do you master your impulses when your own child is carried into your house, beaten senseless and bloody for having committed the crime of sitting at a soda fountain or going to a movie? The words, inspiring as they are, do not quite penetrate the curtain of dull pain and anxiety. But then someone begins to sing:

"We have walked through the shadow of death

We've had to walk all by ourselves  
But we'll never turn back,  
No, we'll never turn back."

Until we've all been freed and we have equality. All of a sudden it begins to make sense, not in a rational way, but in an emotional acknowledgement; although the mind had failed to understand, the soul had nodded assent. And the singing continues:

"We shall not, we shall not be moved,  
We shall not, we shall not be moved,  
Just like a tree that's standing by the water,  
We shall not be moved."

"That's right, brother," come the exclamations. "You tell 'em." And a new verse, with acid humor this time:

"Tell Governor Wallace he shall be removed,  
Tell Governor Wallace he shall be removed,  
Just like a pail of garbage in the alley,  
He shall be removed."

The eyes are brighter now; there is a dawning of fresh energy and renewed courage. And the songs do not let up. They attack apathy and resigned complacency in various ways: with earthy sarcasm, and a new verb:

"Down here in Mississippi  
No neutrals have we met  
Tell me, will you fight for freedom  
Or 'Tom' for Ross Barnett?  
Which side are you on?  
Which side are you on?"

And with words of inspiration that in any other context might have sounded forced or even corny:

"I don't mind the jailhouse  
'Cause I want my freedom  
I want my freedom now."

Many words of this are often substituted—such as: I don't mind "walking" or "marching" or "dogs" or "Bull Connor." As you watch a boy, no older than 9, sing in all seriousness and fervor, "I don't mind dying 'cause I want my freedom," and you realize that he is not just mouthing words, but knows what he is saying, you look about and see all the weariness and listlessness gone from the eyes of the assembled. They are ready to meet the haters again. Tonight, if need be; because freedom is already 100 years too late in coming.

A large number of these songs have existed for a long time; they were sung by Negro congregants at every service. Why then assume that the texts of such songs should have suddenly triggered or even inspired action in the 1960's when they failed to do so 15, 25, or 40 years ago? I suppose the answer lies in a shift of interpretation. The term "freedom" was, until recently, used as a word of solace. It referred to a freedom that was promised in the afterlife; in the Kingdom of Heaven, in the arms of Jesus:

And before I'd be a slave,  
I'd be buried in my grave,  
And go home to my Lord and be free.

Or:

I have trials here below  
But I keep singing 'cause I know  
Yes I know—(Oh my Lord)—  
My change will come.

It was not until the boycott of Montgomery, Ala., in 1955, the freedom rides and sit-ins in North Carolina and Tennessee, the Albany movement in 1960, the voter registration drive in Greenwood, Miss.; not until Birmingham, Cambridge, Md., and Danville, Va., that the words "change" and "freedom" were read with an appended "now." Even the unofficial anthem of the movement, every verse of which used to include the words "some day," has undergone changes:

Black and white together now it says, and  
We are not afraid today.

The movement of the 1960's is, in fact, pledging its efforts, its energy, its dedication to the brotherhood of white and black, its determination to remain nonviolent in

the struggle, its willingness to risk jail—and even death—for the cause. Anything but its patience. For that has run out.

"Andim Hayinu Ve'ata B'ney Chorin"—goes an old Hebrew song. "Once we were slaves, but now we are freemen." It is quite obvious why the freedom movement of today draws upon the Biblical source so much, and finds itself particularly moved by the analogy of Egypt and Mississippi, Pharaoh and Barnett, Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and George Wallace, overseer of Alabama. There seems to be an heirloom of suffering that slaves and former slaves understand profoundly. So it appears that the song of the Israelites, building Pharaoh's pyramids in Egypt, was but a forefather of the tune sung by the Negroes picking Eastland's cotton in Leflore County. By a curious set of circumstances, the analogy goes even farther:

Go down Moses  
Way down in Egypt Land  
Tell old Pharaoh  
To let my people go.

Negro ministers and church choirs have been singing this for generations. But in today's crisis in the Mississippi Delta, one wonders if those who sing these words are not quite reverently referring to Robert Moses of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, who has come to lead his people to freedom as did his namesake in Egypt. History's pun, perhaps; but was not the original Moses an "outside agitator" too?

There is an old Talmudic saying: "In every generation, man must look upon himself as if he had personally come out of the bondage of Egypt." So it is with the idea—and the song—of freedom. If it is a fire of the same torch, and a torch of the same making, then the fire is being rekindled and the song being sung anew each time man's yoke becomes unbearable.

For freedom is not something that can be won and stashed away—it has to be fought for over and over again in each generation, wherever men seek to enslave others. Thus I see a chain throughout history that links the song of the slaves in Egypt with the battlecry of the Maccabees, the song of the French Revolution, the Greek revolt against the Turks, the Industrial Revolution in Europe, the Irish Rebellion against the English, and today's song of freedom in America.

A new day is coming upon us at last. It does not come unaided. If we are privileged to see its dawn at all, then surely we owe recognition to those who hastened the hour—to Martin Luther King, James Farmer, Medgar Evers, Bob Moses, Jim Forman, Charles Sherrod, Bob Zellner, Jim Peck, Sam Block and the host of leaders, students and militars who gave a new meaning to hackneyed words such as "justice" and "brotherhood."

History, however, will owe the greatest debt to those who sang in the jails and on the courthouse steps, for their song will stand as the one tangible reminder of this era, its shame and its nobility, long after the hater-mongers—and their victims—are forgotten.

Hon. Frank Horton

SPEECH  
OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this merited tribute to our colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York, Congressman HORTON.

I am equally pleased that the Department of the Army has corrected the previous oversight and awarded Colonel HORTON the Bronze Star Medal for World War II heroism.

It is interesting to note that the gentleman from New York, Congressman HORTON, with characteristic modesty, limited the reference to his World War II career to the simple line "service in North Africa and Italy from November 1942 to August 1945" in the Congressional Directory.

It will be 20 years next year since the end of World War II and it is good to have a reminder of this kind of the valiant and heroic service of many of our colleagues and of countless fellow Americans in that titanic struggle.

## Hearings Set on Congressional Districts

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have announced today hearings on March 18 on legislative proposals including my own bill, H.R. 2836, to solve the problem of the formation of congressional districts.

The hearings will also present the opportunity to all interested Members of the Congress to present their views on the problem with which they have been confronted since the recent decision of the Supreme Court involving congressional districts.

The decision in the case of Wesberry against Sanders has justified the position which I have taken on the problem of Federal standards for congressional districts and the enforcement of these standards since I first introduced legislation in the 82d Congress. During my long tenure in Congress, I have analyzed and studied that problem and have long believed that it was not an acute but a chronic one and now the recent decision has convinced not only the Members of the House of Representatives but the public at large that this is such a problem for all. We can no longer postpone a solution. Immediate action is necessary.

My bill, H.R. 2836, provides that every State with more than one Representative must divide its territory into districts. Each State legislature, under my proposal, would draw the lines for each congressional district along Federal standards which would be required to be composed of contiguous territory, reasonably compact as to form and contain a population not more than nor less than 15 percent of the population for the average congressional district in the State. Under my proposal, a Federal district court would be given the jurisdiction to review the action of each State legislature to review a State's redistricting act and also to expedite such litigation.

As introduced by me, the bill would not become effective until after the Nine-