CIVIL RIGHTS AWARD

Excerpts from

Remarks by

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

In Accepting the 1957 America's Democratic Legacy Award

March 3, 1958

On behalf of the Senate of the 85th Congress, I am happy to join Senator Knowland in accepting the 1957 America's Democratic Legacy Award sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith. Certainly the 85th Congress ~~has already~~ distinguished itself by enacting the first Civil Rights legislation in 82 years. I believe that it really deserves this medal which has been awarded annually since 1948 to an American citizen or institution for the practical advancement of our American ideals.

As you know, I have been a staunch supporter of Civil Rights legislation for many years. As an American, as well as a Senator, I feel encouraged by the action of the Congress last year in this critical testing area for democracy. When I say that I am encouraged by this action, of course, I am not saying that I am satisfied. The 1957 Civil Rights Act was a step in the

right direction. But, It is not the end of the fight for improved Civil Rights. — it is the beginning

By civil rights we mean the personal, political, and economic rights and privileges guaranteed under the Constitution and the law, and implicit in our democratic way of life -- rights and privileges which are morally the heritage of every human being, regardless of his membership in any ethnic group. To be specific, I believe these rights include the right to education; the right to housing; the right to the use of public accomodations, of health and welfare services and facilities; and the right to live in peace and dignity without discrimination, segregation, or distinction based on race, religion, color ancestry, national origin, or place of birth. These are the rights and privileges without which no individual can participate freely or completely in our democratic society. These are the rights which the government has the duty to defend and expand.

You know as well as I that this great issue of human rights goes far beyond partisanship, touching as it does, the very life of our democracy, whether our homes happen to be in the North, the South, the East, or the West. I know full well that civil rights is a charged issue, infused with emotionalism. We know that some people would prefer not to face these problems. But the fact of the matter is that the problems are facing us.

[illegible] human rights is NOT basically a social issue, an economic issue, a political issue, or even a legislative issue. It is primarily a moral issue. It is for that reason that I feel as I do about it. I know, of course, that it is an issue, and a very real one, in all of these other contexts. Most particularly, in the past few years it has become an issue which has begun to affect with a sudden and dramatic impact the conduct of our foreign policy. Just as Lincoln decided upon the emancipation of the slaves, not only as

an "act of justice" but also as a "military necessity," so the achievement in America of racial equality is now urgently needed on these grounds.

You can be sure that the discouraging events at Little Rock did not escape a watchful world. Brotherhood and equality of opportunity must now become central aspects of the image that we cast abroad.

Nevertheless, world reaction is an insufficient motivation to impel us to take the great strides which are required of us. We shall not convince others if our motiviations are essentially tactical or political in nature. Our proper response, both to the Kremlin, which is waiting for us to falter, and to the millions of people in Asia, and Africa, who want to believe in us, but are undecided, is to do what we should have done anyway to make this Nation, in Lincoln's words, the "last best hope of earth".

It is undeniable, of course, that we have made great progress during the past 100 years -- from the Dred Scott decision, which totally denied the Negro the protection of our laws, to the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court in the school segregation case, to the 1957 Civil Rights bill, which affirmed the right of the Negro to full protection of the law. It has been a long fight, in which the power of American principles has slowly overcome the imperfections of American practice. It has been a long process of remolding old attitudes and re-establishing old truths. And it is not yet finished.

Primarily, the 1957 Civil Rights Act was designed to protect the right to vote. However, the Act also established a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government and provided for a new Assistant Attorney General to head the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice. I mention these other aspects because I regret the excessive delays

which have occurred during the past months in selecting and nominating appointees to fill these posts. Precious time has been lost. Now that nominations have been sent to the Senate for confirmation, however, I hope that the Senate will not add to the delays but will proceed speedily to complete the confirmation process.

In this connection I also wish to call attention to the bills which are still pending in the Senate Committees. These bills include many which I have introduced in various sessions of the Congress for the last 10 years -- bills covering such subjects as anti-lynching, anti-poll tax, FEPC, and prevention of discrimination in interstate transportation. There is also the admirable new bill introduced by Senator Douglas and several other Senators of whom I am one. This new bill would give effect to the constitutional guarantees under the 14th Amendment, of equal protection of the laws. It would do so by cushioning the

(X) Work yet to be done

effect of law with extensive provisions for persuasion, inducement, and community compliance. I would like to believe that the 2nd as well as the first session of the 85th Congress will make history by passing this improved civil rights legislation.

The challenge of civil rights has never been stated more eloquently than in the complaint of a Negro student a generation ago: "If you discriminate against me because I am uncouth, I can become mannerly. If you ostracize me because I am unclean, I can cleanse myself. If you segregate me because I am ignorant, I can become educated. But if you discriminate against me because of my color, I can do nothing. God gave me my color. I have no possible protection against race prejudice but to take refuge in cynicism, bitterness, hatred and despair. I am a Negro-American. All my life I have wanted to be an American."

This is why prejudice and discrimination cost too much for democracy to afford. This is also why history was successful in making a claim on the first session of the 85th Congress, and why

it will continue to exert its claim on future Congresses.

Certainly it is as true today as it was in 1948 at the Democratic National Convention when I said: "Let us forget the evil passions, the blindness of the past. In these times of world economic, political, and spiritual -- above all, spiritual crisis, we cannot -- we must not, turn from the path so plainly before us." Let us walk out of the shadows of State Rights into the bright sunlight of Human Rights"

3/3/58

Sp. file: March 3
Wash DC
B'nai B'rith

Statement by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

Mr. President, last night it was my great privilege to attend the Annual Award Dinner sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. The occasion was the Award of the American Democratic Legacy Silver Medallion to the 85th Congress for its distinguished contribution to the enrichment of our heritage of freedom in passing the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

Mr. President, this medal has been awarded annually since 1948 to an American citizen or institution for the practical advancement of American ideals. Previous recipients of the award have included many of our nation's most distinguished personalities and foundations. The list is an impressive one:

1948 Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
Darryl Zanuck
Dore Schary
Barney Balaban
Charles E. Wilson

1949 Harry S. Truman

1950 J. Howard McGrath

1951 Henry Ford II

1952 Herbert H. Lehman

1953 Dwight D. Eisenhower

1954-55 Carnegie Corporation
Ford Foundation
Rockefeller Foundation

1956 Herbert H. Lehman
James P. Mitchell
Charles P. Taft

This year, Mr. President, the Award was accepted on behalf of the 85th Congress by the Distinguished Minority Leader of the Senate, Mr. Knowland, and myself, on behalf of the colleagues in the Senate, and Representatives Emanuel Cellar and Kenneth Keating for their colleagues in the House.

An impressive group of Senators and Congressmen was present to witness the presentation.

Mr. President, I want to pay special tribute to the officers of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith for their hard and consecrated work not only in connection with this annual award, but day in and day out in the constructive activities of B'nai B'rith. I mean particularly the Chairman, the Honorable Henry E. Schultz; the National Director, Benjamin R. Epstein, the

the President of the National Commission, Philip M. Klutznick, the Executive Vice President of B'nai B'rith, Maurice Bisgyer, and the Washington representative, Henry Edelsberg.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of the officers of the League of B'nai B'rith be printed at this point in the Record and that the name of the sponsors of the Award Dinner also be printed at this point.

(Exhibit A)

Excellent addresses were delivered, Mr. President, by the President of B'nai B'rith, Mr. Philip M. Klutznick, and by the Honorable Henry E. Schultz, chairman of the Anti-Defamation League. A poem by Reginald Rose entitled "An Act of Congress" was narrated by Franchot Tone. Brief acceptance speeches were made by the four Representatives of the 85th Congress to whom I have already referred.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that excerpts from my own remarks in accepting this award be printed at this point in the Record.

3/4/58

Leaders equipped with ideas are needed today to arouse us to our dangers, to propose the means to overcome those dangers, to mobilize the people for sacrifice and action—and then to act.

We need this kind of leadership not only to meet the problems of war and peace abroad, but the problems of an economic and social nature at home.

Today, I am going to talk about just one of our Nation's problems—one in which I think you at Howard University are particularly interested, but one with which the entire country and the entire world are also deeply concerned. I refer to civil rights. This is a problem with which I have been concerned ever since I was a youth, and to which I have been privileged to devote a major share of my energies throughout my adult years.

Here let me say that although I am in the twilight of my own life, I shall always continue to be a soldier in the struggle for equal civil rights—which is part of the noblest struggle there is—the eternal struggle for human justice.

The struggle for human justice is ancient as well as eternal. It began long before the dawn of recorded time. It went on in the land of the Bible, in the time of Abraham and Moses, and Herod and Jesus. It raged in Greece around the figures of Socrates and Plato; in Rome, around Cicero and Brutus; in France, around Voltaire; in Switzerland, around William Tell. It has gone on in every period, among almost every people. I believe it will continue as long as men remain on this earth—even until Judgment Day.

The hope of human progress lies in the expectation that this struggle will move steadily forward to higher ground, always centering around new issues and new objectives in the constant effort to eliminate injustice and inequality among men.

What we call the civil-rights struggle today is just the current phase of the eternal quest for social justice.

I know it is completely unneccessary for me to tell you, assembled here today, that the fight for civil rights is not a fight for special privileges for some, but rather a struggle for equality for all.

All of us here know that the civil-rights struggle did not begin with the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, nor even with the issuance of the historic report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights in 1947—President Truman's Committee, that is. This struggle in America began centuries ago, soon after the first slaves were brought to these shores. It has continued in varying forms, in the political arena and on the battlefields of the Civil War, until the present day.

The institution of slavery was the predecessor of the institution of segregation; the two are of the same nature. Segregation is not much more than a substitute for slavery.

Of course segregation is not the only denial of civil rights being practiced in our land. It is, however, one of the most blatant. It is the strong point against which the Supreme Court started to move in 1954.

Since the Supreme Court decision, there has been a quickening of the struggle—even some outbreaks of violence. In some areas, resistance to school desegregation has stiffened. In those areas, there is almost today defiance of the supreme law of the land. It might even be called anarchy—or subversion.

Today, in the light of sputnik and of Soviet advances in the fields of science, there is an aspect to this situation which is almost incredible. We have suddenly realized that our school system is inadequate to the challenge of the cold war. Some of the most vital engagements in this war are being lost in the schoolrooms of America. We know we have a critical shortage of all types of school facilities, and particularly of elementary schoolrooms. Nowhere is this shortage more critical than in the South. Yet some Southern States continue to maintain two separate sets of schools for the purpose of segregation. In some of those States, laws have recently been passed authorizing the abolition of the entire public-school system if threatened by desegregation.

In my judgment, to shut down the public schools, on whose optimum functioning our national survival depends, in order to uphold the unconstitutional and immoral practice of segregation, is not only incredible but borders on the treasonable—in a fundamental, if not in a legal, sense.

The spirit which gives rise to such moves is small and narrow.

Yet in this aspect of our national life, there are some northerners, as well as southerners, who continue to cry for gradualism—another word for maintaining the status quo. I say that these regressivists who want to stand still or go backward are puny men trying to halt relentless tides. These tides will not stop for any man.

These so-called gradualists wring their hands and ask you to have patience. But the memory of every Amercan Negro encompasses more than 100 years of slavery before the Declaration of Independence, 77 more years of slavery in this land of liberty after 1776, and 90 years of segregation, after the Emancipation Proclamation.

And now it is almost 4 years since the Supreme Court decision. How much patience must one have?

What does patience mean against this background of 300 years of waiting?

I believe that among the truly heroic folk of America must be numbered those patient men and women of the Negro race who have so long endured the degradation of segregation, and still work with restraint and reason to achieve their goal of simple equality of treatment as American citizens.

What an epic of indomitable courage and patience was written by the humble people of Montgomery, Ala., in the historic bus strike 2 years ago.

But, in my judgment, the greatest heroes of all must be written down as those little schoolchildren, in Little Rock and in many, many other places less renowned, who have walked the gantlet of hate and prejudice to break the trail for the onward march of brotherhood.

What courage they have showed. What faith has moved them—those little boys and girls, as they have walked, in many a town and village, up to those all-white school steps into the eye of the whirlpool? In almost every case I have heard about, these children have acted with grace and dignity, with the simple conduct of people who quietly move mountains. These are true heroes and heroines.

When reference is made to the monumental problems of the South involved in desegregating, I like to think of these young people, and of the millions like them. They are the personification of the right to equality we are fighting to secure. They are the symbols of the struggle for freedom and equality in America today. But they are more than symbols. They are fighters.

They are fighting not only for their own rights, but also for the rights of all other Negro children, for the rights of the children of every minority group, and, finally, for the freedom of each and every one of us.

Those children are front-line fighters. All Americans should pay them homage. They should inspire each one of us and all of us to greater and more vigorous efforts on this crucial front. The example of these young heroes and heroines—and of their patience—should put to shame those timid men who say that we are moving too fast and have too little patience.

The timid souls, including, I regret to say, some in the top leadership of our Government, have a regrettable tendency to identify themselves as a kind of third force in the arena of struggle. They seem to consider themselves as neutralists in the cold war over civil rights.

Speaking surely only for myself, but hopefully also for the majority of the American people, I cannot either be or pretend to be neutral in this struggle.

This is not a battle between two equal and opposite forces in our country. This is a struggle against oppression. It is a struggle to uphold not only the letter of the Constitution, but its spirit, and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence as well. And what is even more, the spirit of America.

How can I be a neutral in this situation?

The NAACP and the Urban League, for instance, have been unfairly branded in some quarters—and I am thinking of responsible quarters which should know better—as the spokesmen of an extremist viewpoint. In my judgment, this is a false indictment and I am glad to call it so. In my judgment, these organizations are the spokesmen for a truly moderate viewpoint. The NAACP and the Urban League are responsible champions of the law, amici curiae, in the truest sense of that classic Latin phrase.

These organizations of citizens do not speak only for Negroes. They speak also for that vast number of white people in our country, both north and south of the so-called Mason and Dixon line, who advocate no more and no less than equal justice under law for all Americans.

It is important to understand that the fight for civil rights is being carried on by white people as well as by Negroes. It is important that the victims of oppression know that they are not isolated and alone. It is important, vitally important, that the struggle for justice be carried on, not only by the victims of injustice, but also on their behalf.

In carrying on this struggle, I believe that we must bear constantly in mind the problems of the oppressors as well as the oppressed.

Many, if not all of them, are, in my judgment, unwilling oppressors. Consciously or unconsciously, most of them will, I believe, rejoice when freed from their end of the chains.

Identifying myself with the victims of segregation does not preclude me, and should not preclude the rest of us, from sympathizing with and trying to understand the problems and point of view of those on the other side of the wall.

They carry a heavy burden, too. They must be helped to free themselves of it, and as Reverend King, that young and inspiring spiritual leader of Montgomery, has so movingly said on so many occasions, they must be loved.

Hate will not accomplish our ends. Love and the spirit of brotherhood—even for the erring brothers—will.

There are many in the South—I do not know how many, but I believe very, very many—who are truly men of good will. They do not know how to extricate themselves from their present dilemma. Let us help show them the way.

There is much to be done at all levels. But we are assembled today in Washington, the seat of the Federal Government. Therefore I suggest a program of Federal action as follows:

1. Congress must proceed promptly to enact legislation in affirmative support of the Supreme Court's finding that school segregation is unconstitutional. School districts, which are willing to desegregate, must be encouraged and assisted to do so. The

courts must be given further statutory tools to help attack the problem of those States which are totally recalcitrant. The Attorney General's office must be equipped with the authority to seek injunctions in such cases.

2. Congress must protect all basic rights. It must pass legislation insuring all citizens against discrimination in education, travel, employment, and use of public and publicly-supported facilities.

3. Congress must act to protect such organizations as the NAACP and the Urban League from harassment and persecution by State governments.

4. The Senate must amend its rules to outlaw the filibuster.

5. The President must broaden his actions. He brought physical force to bear on the Little Rock situation. He is long overdue in applying moral force. The President must act now to exercise moral leadership and rally all men of good will in the North and South for the great tasks ahead. In Little Rock, the situation is deteriorating. It is deteriorating elsewhere, too.

There is a crying need for positive leadership—for firm, strong voices from among our elected officials to speak and act with zeal, not out of political necessity but out of deep conviction. We need leaders who are deeply moved by compassion for the suffering of those who have been segregated as well as by consideration for those white citizens who are disturbed and distressed by the abolition of segregation.

Such national leaders will be heard and followed. Such leadership will be successful in meeting the problems I have described.

The word I hear from Capitol Hill is that the congressional leadership of both parties feel that enough was done in passing the Civil Rights Act of 1957. No further consideration is to be given to civil rights legislation at the present session. To be sure, last year's act was indeed a step forward—although only a short step. It was the first Civil Rights Act passed by Congress since 1875. But the present session of Congres must be importuned to move further and faster. A public demand that will be heard in the halls of Congress must be made. That is the only way. That is a job for all citizens, not just for organizations with lobbyists in Washington.

In fact, the entire civil rights struggle, in all its phases, is everybody's job.

All citizens must accept it as a part of their duty to their country to help meet this challenge. Every citizen cannot only demand Federal and State action, but can also, himself, help ease the tension between the races, and can help quiet fears and eradicate prejudices among whites and Negroes alike. Both Negroes and whites share this vital obligation.

We in the North have our special responsibilities—to rid our own house of unofficial but effective segregation and discrimination.

All segregation and discrimination—official and unofficial—must go. Liberty and equality for all our citizens must prevail.

In the world community today, there are great differences in race, color and creed. To advance or even tolerate the fiction of the superiority of one race over another can lead only to international discrimination, reprisal, repression and conflict.

I wonder how many of you read the letter from the little Vietnamese girl to the editor of the Washington Post, printed on the front page of the Post last week?

Do you remember question No. 8? It read:

"Why are there still a lot of white Americans do not get along with black Americans? Do they still have the impression that black Americans are their slaves? I think America is a democratic and free country, so such a colored separation must be ended. The trouble at Little Rock. Do you think that was a big shame hung over America?"

This was one of the questions asked by this teenage girl from Vietnam in her letter to Mr. Al Friendly, the managing editor of the Washington Post. The language of her question was not good English as we know it, but it was truly eloquent.

Similar questions, in different languages, have been and are being asked of Americans and America in many quarters of the globe.

We Americans must answer these questions. I hope that the day will come soon when we will be able to say to this girl and others that the evil conditions referred to no longer exist.

I hope that this day will be very soon. We can make it come sooner if we dedicate to it all our efforts and energies, and if all men of good will, under inspired leadership, will lend themselves to this great task.

It is unnecessary to magnify the problem, nor is it wise or possible to minimize it.

We move in what we hope and believe to be God's way to solve one of the fundamental problems of human existence—the problem of achieving brotherhood in the midst of conflict.

Abroad the forces of totalitarianism press with increased vigor their challenge to the free world. To meet this challenge, freedom, justice, equality and brotherhood are the brightest banners we have. Let us raise them, for the whole world to see. Let us march forward under them, with unflinching hearts, to attack the forces of darkness, hate, prejudice, and fears, wherever they may be—at home and abroad.

AWARD OF AMERICA'S DEMOCRATIC LEGACY SILVER MEDALLION TO 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last night it was my great privilege to attend the annual award dinner sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. The occasion was the Award of the America's Democratic Legacy Silver Medallion to the 85th Congress for its distinguished contribution to the enrichment of our heritage of freedom in passing the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

Mr. President, this medal has been awarded annually since 1948 to an American citizen or institution for the practical advancement of American ideals. Previous recipients of the award have included many of our Nation's most distinguished personalities and foundations. The list is an impressive one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Nineteen forty-eight: Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Darryl Zanuck, Dore Schary, Barney Balaban, Charles E. Wilson.

Nineteen forty-nine: Harry S. Truman.

Nineteen fifty: J. Howard McGrath.

Nineteen fifty-one: Henry Ford II.

Nineteen fifty-two: Herbert H. Lehman.

Nineteen fifty-three: Dwight D. Eisenhower

Nineteen fifty-four and nineteen fifty-five: Carnegie Corp., Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation.

Nineteen fifty-six: Herbert H. Lehman, James P. Mitchell, Charles P. Taft.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This year, Mr. President, the award was accepted on behalf of the 85th Congress by the distinguished minority leader of the Senate [Mr. KNOWLAND], and myself, on behalf of our colleagues in the Senate, and Representatives EMANUEL CELLER and KENNETH KEATING for their colleagues in the House.

An impressive group of Senators and Representatives was present to witness the presentation.

Mr. President, I want to pay special tribute to the officers of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith for their hard and consecrated work, not only in connection with this annual award, but for the day-in-and-day-out constructive activities of B'nai B'rith. The Anti-Defamation League is and has been the guardian of civil liberties and civil rights. It continue to be a powerful force for freedom, equality, and justice. I mention particularly the chairman, the Honorable Henry E. Schultz; the national director, Benjamin R. Epstein; the president of the national commission, Philip M. Klutznick; the executive vice president of B'nai B'rith, Maurice Bisgyer; and the Washington representative, Herman Edelsberg.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of the officers of the League of B'nai B'rith be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the names of the sponsors of the award dinner also be printed at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICERS OF THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

Hon. Henry Edward Schultz, chairman.

Joseph Cohen, Jefferson E. Peyser, Max J. Schneider, vice chairmen.

Herbert Levy, secretary.

Benjamin Greenberg, treasurer.

Benjamin R. Epstein, national director.

Bernard Nath, chairman, executive committee.

Paul H. Sampliner, vice chairman, executive committee.

Hon. Meier Steinbrink, honorary chairman.

Barney Balaban, A. G. Ballenger, Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, Leon Lowenstein, William Sachs, Benjamin Samuels, Melvin H. Schlesinger, Jesse Steinhart, honorary vice chairmen.

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION

Philip M. Klutznick, president, B'nai B'rith.

Maurice Bisgyer, executive vice president, B'nai B'rith.

Hon. Robert L. Aronson, Melvin A. Block, William P. Bloom, Hon. David Coleman, Maurice N. Dannenbaum, Samuel Daroff, Hon. Henry Epstein, Samuel L. Fendel, Herman Fineberg, Joseph M. Finkle, Jerome J. Friedman, Edward Goldberger, Frank Goldman, Abe Goldstein, Lester Gutterman, Samuel J. Halpren, John Horwitz, Hon. Irving R. Kaufman, Mrs. Hy Kornbleet, Harold Lachman, Mrs. Arthur G. Laufman, Richard Lederer, Jr., David H. Litter, Louis Matusoff, Edward Miller, Philip Mitchel, Alan R. Morse, Hon. Stanley Mosk, Norman Newhouse, Hon. David A. Rose, Edward Rosenblum, Mrs. Arthur G. Rosenbluth, Nelson Stamler, Morris L. Strauch, Mrs. Harry Strauss, Hon. Sidney Sugarman, George J. Tallanoff, Samuel Tarshis, Allan Tarshish, Hon. Lenore D. Underwood, Mrs. Hyman C.

Weisman, Mrs. Albert Woldman, Harry Yudkoff, Louis Zara.

STAFF DIRECTORS

Nathan C. Belth, press relations.
Oscar Cohen, program.
Arnold Forster, civil rights.
Alexander F. Miller, community service.
J. Harold Saks, administration.
Lester J. Waldman, executive assistant.
Herman Edelsberg, Washington representative.

SPONSORS

Richard Abel, Columbus, Ohio.
A. David Abrams, Beckley, W. Va.
Sol Bernstein, Waterbury, Conn.
Melvin A. Block, New York City.
Paul Broida, Parkersburg, W. Va.
Morris Cafritz, Washington, D. C.
N. M. Cohen, Washington, D. C.
Samuel Daroff, Philadelphia, Pa.
Bernard Ehrenreich, New York City.
Lee Filer, New York City.
Herman Fineberg, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Henry J. Fox, Chevy Chase, Md.
Leopold Freudberg, Washington, D. C.
Morel J. Fuchs, New Rochelle, N. Y.
Edward Goldberger, New York City.
Aaron Goldman, Washington, D. C.
John Goldwater, New York City.
Benjamin Greenberg, New York City.
Harry Jacobs, Wilmington, Del.
Sam Jonas, Washington, D. C.
Joseph Kaplan, Boston, Mass.
Garfield I. Kass, Washington, D. C.
Joel S. Kaufman, Washington, D. C.
A. S. Kay, Silver Spring, Md.
Milton W. King, Washington, D. C.
Samuel Kramer, New York City.
Milton Kronheim, Sr., Washington, D. C.
Harold Lachman, Chicago, Ill.
Richard Lederer, Jr., New York City.
Herbert Lee, Boston, Mass.
Phillip Leff, New York City.
Carl Levin, Washington, D. C.
Bernhart Levy, Washington, D. C.
Herbert Levy, Chicago, Ill.
Sidney Lipkins, New York City.
Samuel Lopinsky, Charleston, W. Va.
Irving Louis, New York City.
Alfred May, Detroit, Mich.
Lawrence Nathan, Chevy Chase, Md.
Joseph Ottenstein, Washington, D. C.
Benjamin Reeves, New York City.
Victor Riesel, New York City.
Maurice A. Rosenthal, Chicago, Ill.
Max Roth, Charleston, W. Va.
Harold Rubinstein, New York City.
William Sachs, New York City.
Melvin H. Schlesinger, Denver, Colo.
Armund Schoen, Chicago, Ill.
Henry E. Schultz, New York City.
David Schwartz, New York City.
Hershel Seder, Chicago, Ill.
Frederick W. Straus, Chicago, Ill.
Ben Strouse, Baltimore, Md.
Louis Taxin, New York City.
A. Raymond Tye, West Newton, Mass.
Morton H. Wilner, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Excellent addresses were delivered, Mr. President, by the president of B'nai B'rith, Mr. Philip M. Klutznick—who, by the way, has a record of great service to his country, most recently as a delegate to the 12th General Assembly of the United Nations—and by the Honorable Henry E. Schultz, chairman of the Anti-Defamation League. A poem by Reginald Rose entitled "An Act of Congress," was recited by the noted stage and screen actor Franchot Tone. Brief acceptance speeches were made by the four Representatives of the 85th Congress to whom I have already referred.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that excerpts from my own remarks in accepting this award be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL-RIGHTS AWARD

(Excerpts from remarks by Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in accepting the 1957 America's democratic legacy award, March 3, 1958)

On behalf of the Senate of the 85th Congress, I am happy to join Senator KNOWLAND in accepting the 1957 America's democratic legacy award sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith. Certainly the 85th Congress distinguished itself by enacting the first civil-rights legislation in 82 years. I believe that it justly deserves this medal which has been awarded annually since 1948 to an American citizen or institution for the practical advancement of our American ideals.

As you know, I have been a staunch supporter of civil-rights legislation for many years. As an American, as well as a Senator, I feel encouraged by the action of the Congress last year in this critical testing area for democracy. When I say that I am encouraged by this action, of course, I am not saying that I am satisfied. The 1957 Civil Rights Act was a step in the right direction.

But it is not the end of the fight for improved civil rights—it is the beginning.

By civil rights we mean the personal, political, and economic rights and privileges guaranteed under the Constitution and the law, and implicit in our democratic way of life—rights and privileges which are morally the heritage of every human being, regardless of his membership in any ethnic group. To be specific, I believe these rights include the right to education; the right to housing; the right to the use of public accommodations, of health and welfare services and facilities; and the right to live in peace and dignity without discrimination, segregation, or distinction based on race, religion, color ancestry, national origin, or place of birth. These are the rights and privileges without which no individual can participate freely or completely in our democratic society. These are the rights which the Government has the duty to defend and expand.

This great issue of human rights goes far beyond partisanship, touching as it does, the very life of our democracy in the North, the South, the East, or the West. I know full well that civil rights is a charged issue, infused with emotionalism. We know that some people would prefer not to face these problems. But the fact of the matter is that the problems are facing us.

Human rights is not basically a social issue, an economic issue, a political issue, or even a legislative issue. It is primarily a moral issue. It is for that reason that I feel as I do about it. I know, of course, that it is an issue, and a very real one, in all of these other contexts. Most particularly, in the past few years it has become an issue which has begun to affect with a sudden and dramatic impact the conduct of our foreign policy. Just as Lincoln decided upon the emancipation of the slaves, not only as an act of justice but also as a military necessity, so the achievement in America of racial equality is now urgently needed on these grounds. Bigotry, discrimination, and intolerance are subversive today in a literal way. They are un-American. They lend themselves to political, social, and moral weakness. Brotherhood and equality of opportunity must now become central aspects of the image that we cast abroad.

Nevertheless, world reaction is an insufficient motivation to impel us to take the great strides which are required of us. We shall not convince others if our motivations are essentially tactical or political in nature. Our proper response, both to the Kremlin, which is waiting for us to falter, and to the millions of people in Asia, and Africa, who want to believe in us, but are undecided, is to do what we should have done anyway to make this Nation, in Lincoln's words, the "last best hope of earth."

It is undeniable, of course, that we have made great progress during the past 100 years—from the Dred Scott decision, which totally denied the Negro the protection of our laws, to the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court in the school segregation case, to the 1957 civil rights bill, which affirmed the right of the Negro to full protection of the law. It has been a long fight, in which the power of American principles has slowly overcome the imperfections of American practice. It has been a long process of remolding old attitudes and reestablishing old truths. And it is not yet finished.

Primarily, the 1957 Civil Rights Act was designed to protect the right to vote. However, the act also established a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government and provided for a new Assistant Attorney General to head the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice. I mention these other aspects because I regret the excessive delays which have occurred during the past months in selecting and nominating appointees to fill these posts. Precious time has been lost. Now that nominations have been sent to the Senate for confirmation, however, I hope that the Senate will not add to the delays but will proceed speedily to complete the confirmation process.

In this connection I also wish to call attention to the bills which are still pending in the Senate committees. These bills include many which I have introduced in various sessions of the Congress for the last 10 years—bills covering such subjects as anti-lynching, anti-poll-tax, FEPC, and prevention of discrimination in interstate transportation. There is also the admirable new bill introduced by Senator DOUGLAS and several other Senators of whom I am one. This new bill would give effect to the constitutional guarantees under the 14th amendment, of equal protection of the laws. It would do so by cushioning the effect of law with extensive provisions for persuasion, inducement, and community compliance. I would like to believe that the second as well as the first session of the 85th Congress will make history by passing this improved civil rights legislation.

The challenge of civil rights has never been stated more eloquently than in the complaint of a Negro student a generation ago: "If you discriminate against me because I am uncouth, I can become mannerly. If you ostracize me because I am unclean, I can cleanse myself. If you segregate me because I am ignorant, I can become educated. But if you discriminate against me because of my color, I can do nothing. God gave me my color. I have no possible protection against race prejudice but to take refuge in cynicism, bitterness, hatred, and despair. I am a Negro-American. All my life I have wanted to be an American."

This is why prejudice and discrimination cost too much for democracy to afford. This is also why history was successful in making a claim on the first session of the 85th Congress, and why it will continue to exert its claim on future Congresses.

Certainly it is as true today as it was in 1948 at the Democratic National Convention when I said: "Let us forget the evil passions, the blindness of the past. In these times of world economic, political, and spiritual—above all,, spiritual crisis, we cannot—we must not, turn from the path so plainly before us. * * * Let us walk out of the shadow of States rights into the bright sunshine of human rights."

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM ANNOUNCES WORLD PRESS CONGRESS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, exchange of knowledge is basic to the development of mutual understanding, and the latter is essential to world peace.

To further such objectives, the University of Missouri has announced plans for a press congress of the world to be held next January on the campus at Columbia, Mo.

The timing of this 3-day convention coincides with the 50th anniversary of the world's first and finest school of journalism—that of the University of Missouri.

However, this event is more than the celebration of an anniversary. As Dr. Elmer Ellis, president of the university, stated in announcing this significant event:

A press congress of the world, bringing together the editors and publishers of newspapers from all the free nations of the world, great and small, can go a long way toward solving some of the misunderstandings which hold world peace in the balance today.

I ask unanimous consent that the University of Missouri press release announcing the congress be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COLUMBIA, MO., February 14.—President Eisenhower's plan for a worldwide cultural conference to seek new and better ways for human beings to exist peaceably together fits perfectly with a plan of the University of Missouri to sponsor a press congress of the world on the campus here early next year, University President Elmer Ellis said today.

"We feel that it is only fitting and proper that those engaged in the field of mass communications should be the first to implement President Eisenhower's suggestion with action," President Ellis said.

President Ellis pointed out that the University recently announced a proposed world press congress for January 12, 13, and 14, 1959, as a part of a year-long program celebrating the golden anniversary of journalism education here on the campus where the world's first school of journalism was established in 1908.

"Only last week," Doctor Ellis said, "James Wright Brown, of New York, the noted American journalist and chairman of the board of the national publication, Editor and Publisher, accepted the post of honorary chairman of the forthcoming press congress. Active chairman is Charles Nutter, managing director of International House in New Orleans, and Dr. Frank L. Mott, dean emeritus of the School of Journalism is cochairman.

"We believe," said President Ellis, "that a press congress of the world, bringing together the editors and publishers of newspapers from all the free nations of the world, great and small, can go a long way toward solving some of the misunderstandings which hold world peace in the balance today.

"Certainly these journalists, who help mold the opinions of their peoples and who have the responsibility of interpreting the rights and privileges of free peoples everywhere, can save the lives of millions if they can sit down together and talk over our mutual problems," Dr. Ellis said.

President Eisenhower's plan for a worldwide cultural conference to which Dr. Ellis referred was voiced publicly by his administrative assistant, Sherman Adams, in a speech at a Dartmouth College national alumni dinner in New York City on February 5. Adams said the President was considering some such conference, and that he had "asked some able people to consider how such a project might be initiated."

"Who is there," Adams asked his audience, "who can say that a convocation in this country of scholars, historians, artisans, theologians, educators, sociolgists, philosophers, artists and musicians—representatives of the cultural pursuits of all the human race—meeting each other in their respective groups could not suggest new and better ways for human beings to exist peaceably together and to reap the greatest rewards from man's scientific discoveries?"

Commenting on the significance of a Press Congress of the World over long distance telephone today, Morris E. Jacobs of Omaha, Nebr., general chairman of the 50th anniversary celebration, said "It is a wonderful coincidence that we have planned a revival of the Press Congress of the World just at this time when the President of the United States calls for a worldwide conference of cultural leaders."

Jacobs pointed out that the first world press meeting was conceived and implemented by the late Walter Williams, the man who also conceived and established the world's first school of journalism at the University of Missouri, and who was its dean until he was elected president of the university in 1931.

This first world press parliament was held in connection with the Louisiana Purchase Exposition (the World's Fair) which was held in St. Louis in 1904. A St. Louis newspaper of May 19, 1904, carried a story of the press parliament in which it said, "Walter Williams of Columbia, country editor, is responsible for bringing together the greatest convention of newspapermen the world has ever known, and will ever know unless the press parliament is made permanent." More than 5,000 newspaper editors from all over the world, including 33 foreign nations, came to the meeting in St. Louis.

Walter Williams had been appointed press commissioner of the World's Fair by ex-Gov. David R. Francis, who was president of the World Fair Commission. He traveled around the world interesting leaders of various countries, the rulers as well as newspaper publishers, in the convocation of press men of the world.

Although the press parliament at St. Louis was, as intended, only a one-time affair, it served as a pattern for the first press congress of the world as an organization meeting at the Pan-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco in 1915. Walter Williams was elected president of this congress.

The second session of the organization was held in Honolulu, October 11 to 20, 1921, with Mr. Williams presiding. United States President Warren G. Harding served as honorary president of this congress. Mr. Williams was reelected president, and presided over a third meeting of the congress in Geneva and Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1926.

Because of the international political situation and a growing isolationist trend, a fourth meeting, scheduled for Melbourne, Australia, in 1931, was canceled.

MEN IN THE AIR AND MISSILES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last week there was published an article entitled "Men in the Air and Missiles." The article was written by a man who generally is considered to be the wisest and most experienced of all living airmen, Gen. Carl Spaatz.

Since the launching of the first sputnik, public interest has been generated in unmanned, guided, and ballistic missiles, to the point where some, including Mr. Khrushchev, predict that even now the manned air vehicle is, or soon will be, obsolete.

No doubt the wily rulers of the Soviet Union, because of their lead in missiles, would hope that we agree. But nothing could be further from the truth; and the Spaatz article presents conclusively the reasons why that is so.

Anyone interested in having this country adopt the proper policies and programs for national security should read this article with care.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that General Spaatz' article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MEN IN THE AIR AND MISSILES

(NOTE.—Against the background of today's preoccupation with earth satellites and guided missiles, Gen. Carl Spaatz, USAF, retired, has taken a hard and long overdue look at the role of the airplane in the age of the missile. A contributing editor of Newsweek, General Spaatz was Air Force Chief of Staff when he retired in 1948, and since then has served on top-level defense committees. In the following commentary, he evaluates the continuing importance of the airplane and the reasons for it.)

A manned airplane already has been flown 1,900 miles an hour and climbed to an altitude of more than 100,000 feet (the Bell X–2). And the scientists whose genius produced these results feel that they are merely on the threshold of their eventual achievement.

They foresee the time—and not very far distant—when a manned plane, operating in the twilight zone between the earth's atmosphere and outer space, will be capable of making 6 trips around the world in less than 24 hours.

Further experiments in speed and altitude flight are being conducted, as the earlier ones have been, by the Air Force in cooperation with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA), a highly effective agency whose members are appointed by the President and whose work is financed by the Government.

Details of the characteristics and performance of the latest planes of the X series, which hold the present records and will soon break them, are military secrets. But enough information has been released to suggest that the manned plane of the future will be an important weapon—perhaps the most important in our arsenal.

MAN HAS THE EDGE

Recently, public and official preoccupation with earth satellites, missiles, and the rockets that propel them has fostered the presumption that any total war of the future will be exclusively a duel between rocketeers firing missiles across oceans and continents at centers of power in the contending nations. The fact is that victory, insofar as there can be such a thing as victory in such a war, won't necessarily be won by the side with the biggest and best intercontinental ballistic missile.

When finally perfected, the ICBM will be an indispensable weapon, but not, as it has been called, the ultimate weapon. Because of its speed, development of an effective defense against it will not be easy. But I have no doubt that eventually it will be done. If the history of warfare proves anything, it proves that sooner or later defense always catches up with offense.

THE ICBM'S PROBLEMS

However, this generally is overlooked: The ICBM still is an experimental weapon. It

Minnesota
Historical Society