

more properly be called a prophecy—be printed in the RECORD.

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

RIPPLING CREEK CLUB, INC., ET AL., PETITIONERS v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

[A satire from National Review magazine, October 1958]

(Supreme Court of the United States, No. 367, October term, 1973, on writ of certiorari to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, May 20, 1974)

Mr. Justice Smith delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case involves the construction and constitutionality of certain provisions of the Federal Discrimination Commission Act, 42 U.S.C., 9001 et seq., empowering the Federal Discrimination Commission to issue cease-and-desist orders against "any individual, firm, corporation, unincorporated association, or other entity whatsoever," whenever in the Commission's opinion such entity "is engaging, or is about to engage, in any discriminatory action, practice, or course of conduct" (42 U.S.C. 9004(b)).

The corporate petitioner is a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Alabama. Its organization and functions are those usual in country clubs. It maintains a clubhouse in which bar and dining facilities are provided, and it operates a golf course, tennis courts, swimming pool, and other customary amenities. It has, and at all times relevant to this litigation had, a membership of less than the full complement of 500 authorized by its constitution. New members are admitted upon the nomination of five regular members and the approval of the individual petitioners, an election committee of seven members appointed by the board of governors. An initiation fee and annual dues are charged. No so-called Negro is or has ever been a member.

On this state of facts the Commission instituted an investigation into petitioners' discriminatory practices, and, finding such to exist, issued on March 27, 1970, an order requiring petitioner to cease discriminating in its selection of membership (13 F.D.C. 398). This order was duly affirmed, and an injunction issued, by the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit (58 F. 3d 119). We denied certiorari (391 U.S. 917). More than a year having passed, and there still being no Negroes among petitioner's membership, the Commission initiated contempt proceedings. Petitioners were adjudged in contempt, and the statutory punishment of fine and imprisonment was imposed. We granted certiorari to reaffirm basic principles in the administration of the act (402 U.S. 933).

Petitioners' primary contention is that the act can have no application to, and the Commission no jurisdiction over, purely social organizations. Stripped of irrelevancies, in one aspect this argument is in essence that the 14th amendment, under which the act was passed, applies only to State action, and that the actions neither of the corporate petitioner nor of the individuals composing its election committee come within the scope of that amendment's prohibitions. It is true that only State action is inhibited by the amendment; but to contend that action of the kind here involved is not State action is to revive the exploded fallacy of the *Civil Rights Cases*, 109 U.S. 3. As we said in *Saffold v. Holder*, 364 U.S. 221, 224, where the ghost of those cases was laid to rest forever:

"To say that action of a corporation is not 'State action' in the instant context is to fly in the face of juristic reality. No corporation has or can have existence of any legally significant kind without the active consent of the State. While its activities may in no sense be governmental, the life which enables it to carry on those activities was

breathed into its nostrils by the State. What the State's creatures do, the State does."

The similar argument of the individual petitioners can fare no better. In the first case under the act to reach this Court, *Harrison v. United States*, 380 U.S. 11, 19, we said:

"Petitioner contends that even if the repeated pronunciation in public of this word as 'Nigra' amounts to discrimination within the meaning of the statute, the statute cannot be applied to him, since this conduct is not 'State action.' The true bounds of the concept of 'State action' have only recently emerged. It is plain that, under the unitary conditions of modern life, to limit the notion of 'State action' to those activities carried on by the legislature's express command or implied permission is to empty it of all significant content. The true teaching of *Marsh v. Alabama*, 336 U.S. 501, *Terry v. Adams*, 345 U.S. 461, and *Edgerton v. Shockley*, 361 U.S. 366, should by now be plain. It is that 'the State' cannot be dissociated from the community; that action which meets the approval of the community and expresses its mood is as surely 'State action' as is the most explicit statute."

We have frequently reaffirmed, and indeed broadened, this holding. *Firemen's Benevolent Society v. United States*, 397 U.S. 225; *McCracken v. United States*, 388 U.S. 409. Compare *United States v. One Book Called "Tales of Uncle Remus"*, 31 F. 3d 922.

But the corporate petitioner's constitutional argument goes further than this; it raises the question left open in the *Firemen's Benevolent* case, supra, whether the right of assembly guaranteed by the first amendment ousts the application of the act to purely social organizations, whose sole raison d'être is the gathering together of congenial persons. We did not reach this question in *Firemen's Benevolent*. There we held that the Commission had undoubted power to prevent the production of the "minstrel show" complained of, since the society functioned as an insurer as well as a social organization; but we intimated that this question would be ruled by our decision in *States Rights Democratic Party v. United States*, 393 U.S. 1. In the latter case we held that political associations could not hide from the act behind the shield of the first amendment, since such associations are by their nature concerned with government, and discriminatory action "is not reasonably related to any proper governmental objective." *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497, 500. Petitioners seek to avoid the impact of the States rights decision by arguing that its rationale is limited to political associations; that it holds only that the protection accorded political associations is restricted to their governmental, or would-be governmental, activities. But States rights cannot be so restricted. Whether or not the first amendment right is limited to the right of political assembly, see *Yamaguchi v. Weinberg*, 370 U.S. 93, 99, we hold that the amendment does not shield a mere social organization from the Discrimination Act. It would indeed be strange if it were otherwise. No discriminations leave deeper or more lasting scars than do social ones, and it was Congress' particular intention in creating the Commission "to forge a weapon capable of dealing with this threat to our democratic society" (S. Rept. No. 316, 89 Cong., 1st sess. 26).

Petitioner's other contentions are equally devoid of merit. It is settled that "the content of the term 'discriminatory' is sufficiently rooted in the common conscience of the American people to constitute a valid standard with ascertainable criteria" (*Harrison v. United States*, supra, at 16). Thus, the Commission's condemnation of offensive pronouncements of group names, *Harrison v. United States*, supra; of printing the word "Negro" without a capital initial, *United States v. 377 Copies of the London*

Times, 236 F. Supp. 346 of advertising a musical instrument as a "Jew's harp," *Apez Piano Co. v. United States* (44 F. 3d 619, certiorari denied, 399 U.S. 924); and of employing the phrase "dirty Irish trick" (*Ng Yang Toy v. United States*, 399 U.S. 772), have all been upheld. We have approved, in *Northfield Aircraft Co. v. United States*, decided this day, Commission regulations forbidding prospective employers to inquire as to the names of job applicants, since this might reveal the applicants' ancestry or national origin. At any rate, we are not here concerned with the borderlines of the discrimination concept. The flagrantly exclusionary conduct of the petitioners is sufficiently extreme to satisfy any definition.

Petitioners contend, finally, that the fact that no so-called Negroes applied for admission to membership absolves them of any responsibility for discrimination. This contention is likewise without merit. Ever since *Barrett v. United States*, 380 U.S. 585—in one sense, indeed, ever since the New York schools case, *Hunt v. Board of Education*, 355 U.S. 116—it has been clear that it is no defense to a charge of exclusionary discrimination that no members of the group discriminated against have sought admission. As we pointed out in *Barrett*, "the lack of applications tends to show not apathy but repression; to demonstrate good faith it is necessary that the party charged actively seek out members of other groups." It is urged that this confers irrebuttability on the statutory presumption of discrimination when no member of the minority group is found in the group or organization involved; but that this is not so should be obvious from *Northern Vermont Driving School, Inc. v. United States*, 400 U.S. 33.

We hold, therefore, that the act is constitutional as applied to petitioner; that social organizations cannot discriminate against members of minority groups. There are limits, of course, to the extent to which social alignments can be regulated (see *Gotlieb v. New York*, decided this day, holding invalid the New York compulsory intermarriage law). But those limits were not reached in this case. They were not even approached.

Affirmed.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that our well liked and highly regarded colleague, the Senator from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, led the ticket in West Virginia in the selection of delegates at large to the Democratic National Convention. Senator RANDOLPH led the ticket of 50 candidates, with an unofficial total of 128,777 votes. I am sure this will please all Members of the Senate; and it is of especial significance in view of the fact that Senator RANDOLPH has been a consistent supporter of civil rights and civil rights legislation.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN SOVIET EDUCATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there is increasing concern throughout the free world over mounting anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Not only does the new wave of action reflect anti-Jewish sentiments among the Soviet peoples, sentiments which contributed to the brutal pogroms of the last century, but also, Mr. President, it reflects deliberate discrimination by the Soviet Government against members of the Jewish religion.

We are familiar with the conspicuous Communist actions against religious observances—the closing of synagogues, banning of religious writings and publications, and the denial of rights to prepare matzoth. We are also familiar with the economic persecution of members of the Jewish faith who frequently become scapegoats for the economic failures of communism. When harsh penalties, including the death sentence, are imposed on Soviet Jews for so-called private enterprise activities, then it is evident to all the world that this is not justice but persecution, tyranny, and brutality.

Fewer Americans, however, are aware that even in more insidious ways, government discrimination against Jews is a part of modern Soviet life. In the field of education, for instance, a study recently completed by Prof. Nicholas DeWitt, of Indiana University, indicates the unfortunate situation in Soviet universities. Under Soviet rule today only 3.22 percent of the student population is Jewish. This compares with about 10 percent in 1918 within the Pale of Settlement, 5 percent outside the Pale, and 3 percent in St. Petersburg and Moscow. Dr. DeWitt sees strong evidence of the operation of a quota system that has increased the extent of discrimination against Jewish students. He points out, for instance, that between 1935 and 1960 the total number of Soviet students increased by 248 percent whereas the number of Jewish students declined 39 percent.

Mr. President, this study leads, as Will Maslow, executive director of the American Jewish Congress, points out, to a most depressing conclusion—greater education prejudice in the Soviet Union today than in the czarist days of pogroms and open violence.

Mr. President, in order that this outrageous state of affairs be fully revealed, I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks in the RECORD, the text of this remarkable and scholarly work that documents for all the world the latest evidence of the Soviet double standard and of the campaign against the Jewish religion being waged from the Kremlin.

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

THE STATUS OF JEWS IN SOVIET EDUCATION

(By Nicholas DeWitt¹)

FOREWORD

(By Will Maslow, executive director, American Jewish Congress)

A higher percentage of Jewish students was permitted to attend universities in czarist Russia than is enrolled in the U.S.S.R. today.

¹ Formerly research associate of the National Academy of Sciences and of the Russian Research Center, Harvard University; currently associate professor, Russian and East European Institute, Indiana University; chairman, Department of International and Comparative Education, School of Education; director, Foreign Area Studies for the State of Indiana; director, International Survey of Educational Development and Planning; and consultant to the National Science Foundation.

This is perhaps the most depressing conclusion to be drawn from the study of Jews in Soviet education by this country's outstanding authority on the subject, Prof. Nicholas DeWitt, of Indiana University.

Professor DeWitt notes that approximately 3.22 percent of the student population in Soviet universities is Jewish. Comparing this figure with the official quotas imposed on Jews in 1887 by the czarist Minister of Education, we find that according to the "History of the Jews in Russia and Poland," by the Jewish Historian Simon Dubnow, published in 1918, the Jewish university quota was 10 percent of the Christian university population within the Pale of Settlement, 5 percent outside the Pale and 3 percent in St. Petersburg and Moscow.

The Soviet Government's own statistics on the enrollment of Jewish and other nationality groups in universities give the lie to Soviet claims that no discrimination exists against Jews in Soviet education. The study by Professor DeWitt, combined with other extensive evidence of religious and cultural discrimination against the Jews of the U.S.S.R., deepens our concern for the future of Soviet Jewry.

MAY 1964.

INTRODUCTION

Over the last 10 years one of the persistent features of Soviet propaganda efforts has been an attempt to convince the world that the U.S.S.R.'s policies toward all national groups and especially toward Jews have been equitable and just. The Soviet claim has been that no discrimination, no Russification, and no restrictions whatsoever existed in the past or presently exist which would impede the equal cultural development of all national groups and all social strata in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government claims that equality of educational opportunity is fully guaranteed by the laws and the constitution of the U.S.S.R. Any and all statements to the contrary are denounced simply as malicious lies and sinister fabrications.

In order to support the pretention that the problem of discrimination against Jews in education does not even exist, Soviet propaganda agencies in recent years—through broadcasts, periodicals, embassy releases, etc.—have issued a flood of statements containing official facts and figures. These statements, released piecemeal, are intended more to confuse than to clarify the basic issue: Is there or is there not discrimination against Jews so far as the equal right of access to education is concerned?

QUOTA SYSTEMS

When put together and examined in orderly fashion, the official statistics do permit clarification of this basic issue. Since 1955, there have been persistent reports on a "numerus clausus"—more simply, a quota system—for determining the admission to Soviet universities and other institutions of higher learning of all nationalities, and of Jews in particular.

In my earlier studies of Soviet education, particularly in "Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R." (especially pp. 353-360 and 420-421), I dwelt at some length on the operational features of the so-called equivalent balances. These are admission quotas by nationality, which stipulate that the composition of students by nationality should optimally be such as to give a proportionate representation among students approximately equivalent to the proportion which a given nationality has in the total population. This is a major policy directive, but how this numerus clausus is used as a direct discriminatory device against the admission of Jews to institutions of higher learning in the U.S.S.R. can be easily seen: If the share of Jewish applicants is high, the admissions are cut back and preferences are

given to other nationals, though on strictly competitive and nondiscriminatory grounds most of the qualified Jewish applicants should have been admitted.

I feel deeply honored that, by calling attention to this policy directive, and especially for interpreting its operational features, I have recently been denounced by the Soviet Government for the "lunatic hallucinations of an American professor." I was pleased indeed to see that the researchers of the Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., a member of the state planning committee, and a member of the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education all joined forces in their recent review of my book (in "Vestnik Vysshei Shkoly," December 1963, pp. 75-79). Their greatest vehemence was directed against my statements that such a quota system exists. For though it is guarded as a state secret in the Soviet Union, it is common knowledge in the West. In my judgment, and I think the factual evidence presented later will corroborate it, this device is deliberately used in the U.S.S.R. as a means of discrimination against Jews in education by the tacit exclusion or limitation of Jewish applicants from admission to institutions of higher learning in the light of intensified competition for places.

I would not have focused attention on this item were it not for the fact that in the very same review the Soviet officials explicitly admit that the "Soviet national republics, furthermore, have a special right to assign to the central major higher educational establishments a certain number of nationals for preferential admissions without competitive entrance requirements. . . . These preferential quotas . . . expand the educational opportunities. . . . These annually planned preferential admission quotas are not a hindrance and discrimination (as claimed by the author), but measures of direct benefit for the national development."

It is worth rereading statements of this sort in order to grasp their full meaning. The quotation above raises other questions. First, is there or is there not a nationality quota? There is, and it is annually planned for all key institutions. As a student of educational development, I would say that any quota system is bad, but racial or national quotas in education are utter folly.

The second question then becomes one of mere logic. If someone is admitted to an institution of higher learning on the basis of a preferential nationality quota, there must, by definition, be someone else who is excluded from admission either because he does not fall within such a quota or because there are only a limited number of admission places left after the preferential quota has been filled. Who, then, is excluded?

The final question which must be raised in regard to the equality of educational opportunity for Jews in Soviet education is this: Which of the Soviet national republics could nominate Jews for preferential admission quotas? I do not know of any.

THE STATISTICAL JIGSAW PUZZLE

I hope that this brief diversion to these questions may have served as a supplementary example of what I like to think of as Soviet tactics of deliberate confusion. Not infrequently the Soviet Government denies something merely in order to admit it. Such tactics of confusion are equally applicable to recent statistics which the Soviet information services have released as proof that something does not exist.

It is common knowledge that for almost 20 years, beginning with the late 1930's, the word "Jews" as a statistical category in the U.S.S.R. did not exist in any type of current reporting of national composition, be it of population, students, language of newspaper, native tongue, etc.

Not until the late 1950's did figures identifying Jews as Jews begin to appear in official sources. In the statistical breakdowns by nationality prior to that time, Jews were relegated either to the other nationalities category or to a residual category; that is, after all identified nationalities in a given tabulation were counted, there was invariably some officially unexplained remainder. Since 1956, however, piecemeal figures or tabulations specifically identifying Jews as Jews have appeared from time to time, although the reporting practice of using the word "other" or "remainder" is still quite common. From these piecemeal releases, facts on Jews are quoted in Soviet information sources. Usually these are used as illustrations, such as: 36,173 Jews were working in 1962 among research and academic workers; or 290,707 Jews had completed higher education as of December 1, 1960; or 143,146 Jews had completed secondary specialized education as of December 1, 1961; or 77,177 Jews were enrolled in Soviet institutions of higher learning as of October 15, 1960.

Many other isolated figures can be cited. However, the problems cannot be meaningfully understood without an analysis of the trends rather than statistical quotations in isolation. This paper, accordingly, will devote itself to an analysis of trends on the status of education of Jews as they can be ascertained from official Soviet statistics released since the mid-1950's and particularly in conjunction with the 1959 census of population.

POPULATION

It is well nigh impossible to discuss the question of educational opportunity without reference to some base, such as population, the degree of its linguistic identity, or the degree of urbanization.

First consideration for our purposes must be given to the overall size of the Jewish population in the Soviet Union.² Over the years, this Jewish population has been as follows: 1926 census, 2,646,000; 1937 census, no data published, declared not valid; 1939 census, data not released; 1939 estimates (in prewar U.S.S.R. boundaries), 3,021,000; 1940 (in postwar U.S.S.R. boundaries absorbing Jews from annexed territories), about 5 million; 1959 census, 2,268,000.

Largely because of the calamities of the Second World War, the Jewish population in the Soviet Union was some 17 percent smaller in 1959 than three decades earlier. Obviously, the change in the size of the population is relevant to the numerical trends in education.

LINGUISTIC IDENTITY AND URBANIZATION

Table 1 summarizes 1959 census data on the linguistic identity of the total Soviet population and of Jews within it. Two important observations become evident from these data in regard to the status of Jews in Soviet education:

1. No other national group shows a higher level of urban concentration than the Jewish population (95.3 percent were urban residents as compared with an average of only 47.9 percent for the total population).

2. Except for the Russians proper as a national group, no other national group in the Soviet Union declared Russian as its native language to the extent so declared by the Jewish population—76.4 percent. In other words, while for the total population 93.4 percent declared the language of their nationality as their native language, only 21.5 percent of the Jewish population declared the language of their nationality as their native language.

These two major observations call for further comment. One is that the meaning of the census question—"Which language do you consider your native language?"—is obviously liable to a great many subjective

interpretations. This is not a mere exercise in semantics; aside from the potentially biased phraseology of the census question, the major fact remains that the Jews, either by choice or by compulsion, appear linguistically the most Russified nationality in the U.S.S.R.

The implication of this trend is particularly significant in historical perspective. While in the 1928 census about 75 percent of Jews declared Yiddish as their native language, less than 20 percent (about 400,000) probably made such a declaration in 1959. This linguistic shift has a direct bearing upon the education of Jews, particularly when it is coupled with their high degree of urbanization.

Putting the two together—linguistic homogeneity and urban concentration—we can reasonably assume that the levels of educational attainment among Jews, and thus their potential suitability for higher education (postulating random intellectual ability), must be substantially higher than that of the population at large.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

This assumption is indeed reflected in the demographic data. The substantially higher levels of educational attainment for the Jewish population are clearly evidenced by partial data from the 1959 Soviet census of population. Table 2 presents data on the number of persons with 7 or more years of education per 1,000 population. In 1939 there were 3 to 4 times as many Jews per 1,000 population with 7 or more years of education as there were among the population at large. In 1959, although this difference narrowed, the Jewish population still had 1.5 to 2.5 times more persons per 1,000 population with 7 or more years of education. Unfortunately, the 1959 Soviet census failed to release these data for the U.S.S.R. at large and for most republics, which would permit comprehensive comparisons.

Paraphrasing, it might be noted that the educational attainment level (7 or more years of education) over the 20-year period 1939-59 improved for the Soviet population at large by a factor of 3 to 3.5, while for the Jewish population by a factor of only 1.5 to 2.5. The implications of this are obvious: The expansion of educational opportunities for the population at large proceeded at a more rapid rate than for the Jewish population. In fact, the rates of completion of secondary schooling (i.e., 7 or more years of education) probably went down for Jews during these two decades, while for the population at large they rose.

Nevertheless, the generally higher level of educational attainment of the Jewish population is important for judging their rates of access to higher education. The general rate of completion of secondary education in urban schools of the U.S.S.R. (which most Jews attend) is about twice as high as that for rural schools. Further, most instruction (about 80 percent) in higher education is conducted in the Russian language. Both these factors are obviously relevant to the problem of continuing studies in higher education if there was merely a random selection, based on ability, for such studies.

HIGHER EDUCATION ENROLLMENTS

In the postwar period the only comprehensive set of figures for the enrollment of Jews in higher education was released by the Soviet Government for the fall of 1960. A summary tabulation, by type of program and urban republic, is presented in table 3.

The data in table 3 indicate that there was substantial variation in the distribution of students by type of program for the different republics. On the average, the proportion of Jewish students enrolled in full-time day programs was slightly lower (44.5 percent) than the proportion of all students enrolled in such day programs (48.2 percent). On the

other hand, there was a slightly higher proportion of Jewish students enrolled in evening programs than the proportion of all students enrolled in such programs.

The data in table 3 are of particular interest, however, when subjected to further analysis. Table 4 presents data on the Jewish population in relation to the total population and on Jewish higher education enrollment in relation to total higher education enrollment for all nationalities. On the basis of these two sets of data, the index of Jewish representation in higher education has been calculated for the different republics (column G). This index shows the relationship between the number of Jewish students to the Jewish population as compared with the number of students of all nationalities in relation to the total population. This index is simply indicative of the differential rates of access to higher education for the Jewish population and for the population at large. The very peculiar behavior of this index by republic must be noted.

While the proportion of Jewish population (col. C) in the total population varies substantially, and while the share of Jewish students (col. F) among all students also shows a strong variation, the index of representation (col. G) shows less variation. Generally speaking, depending upon republic, there is a deviation of about one-third from the national average. A further peculiarity of this index is that in the republics with a high proportion of Jewish population, the index of representation of Jewish students in higher education is below the national average. Conversely, in some republics with a smaller proportion of Jews in the total population, the index of higher education attendance is above the national average.

Such behavior of the index of representation is conceivable only in the presence of normative regulations concerning admissions of Jews to higher education. If there were no restrictive regulations, a far greater geographic variation in the index would be observed. Furthermore, those republics with a greater proportion of Jews in the population would obviously have higher rates of Jewish representation among higher education students.

An examination of the data along similar lines can be carried further if the urban population is related to higher education attendance. These data are presented in table 5. Since the Jewish population is almost exclusively urban, it is obvious that the meaning of the index of representation (in this case, the ratio of Jewish students per Jewish urban population to students of all nationalities per total population) is that in a number of republics—Byelorussia, Uzbekistan, Georgia, Lithuania and Moldavia—the access of Jews to higher education is far below the proportionate representation of Jews in the urban population of these republics. Again, note that there is a converse relationship between the proportion of Jews in the urban population and the index of representation of Jews in higher education.

To sum up, the examination of regional data relating higher education enrollments to the population for all nationalities and for Jews indicates:

1. There is a pattern strongly suggesting the presence of normative regulations (i.e., a quota system);
2. The Jewish representation among all students in relationship to the Jewish population as a whole is about three times higher than the rate of higher education attendance in relation to the total population; and
3. If, however, the ratio of Jews in the U.S.S.R.'s urban population is compared with the Jewish representation among all students, it is evident that in those republics where Jews constitute an above-average pro-

² Source 3.

13104

portion of the urban population, their representation among university students is well below the rate of the general population's access to higher education. In only three of the Soviet Union's 15 republics is the Jewish university representation significantly above average.

HISTORICAL DATA ON HIGHER EDUCATION ENROLLMENTS

During the last three decades Soviet higher education enrollments have multiplied about five times. What happened to the enrollment of Jewish students during this period?

Table 6 presents data on enrollments in Soviet higher education in full-time day and evening programs (i.e., excluding extension-correspondence students). For recent years the only available data specifically identifying Jewish students were released for 1960 only. For all other years Jewish students have been included in the "unaccounted" residual.

The full implications of these data are obvious. In the late 1950's and the early 1960's there were actually fewer Jewish students in Soviet higher education than there had been in the early 1930's. The historical trend in a nutshell is as follows:

	1935	1960	Trend (percent up (+) or down (-))
Day and evening students:			
Total.....	563,500	1,400,000	+248
Jews.....	71,900	45,800	-59

Figures for residual enrollments in the late 1950's indicate that there has been hardly any change and thus the number of Jewish students has not changed either. In the early 1960's the maximum increment possible (allowing enrollment increases for other nationalities) would be 10,000 to 15,000 Jewish students. This is an exaggeratedly optimistic figure. But even if it were true, the enrollment of Jewish students in day and evening programs in 1960 would still be substantially below that of 1935.

Soviet censorship has prevented the release of data for the late 1930's, when the number of Jewish students was probably even higher than in 1935. But if we take 1935 as a base and compare that year's figures

with the total enrollment of 77,177 Jews in 1960 in Soviet higher education (including extension-correspondence students), it is evident that the current total figure is just about the same as the 1935 figure for Jewish student day and evening enrollment only.

PROFESSIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION GRADUATES

Table 7 presents figures on the total number of higher education graduates and the number of Jews among them. It is to be noted particularly that these data refer to the current stock of employed graduates and thus reflect past trends in training. These data are highly revealing if we compare them with the present situation in higher education—i.e., the current percentages of Jewish students to total enrollment. This is done in table 8.

It is obvious that the proportion of Jewish students currently enrolled in higher education is substantially smaller than the proportion of Jews who enjoyed higher education in the past.

Table 9 presents data on the number of higher education graduates employed in the national economy, the total for all nationalities, for "accounted" nationalities and for the "residual." Again, the only year for which Jews are identified properly is 1960. On the basis of these data, however, estimates (approximate through reasonably reliable) as to the total number of Jews among professional higher education graduates for other years are possible, as follows:

Number of Jews among professional higher education graduates (approximate)

Year:	
1941.....	170,000.
1954.....	250,000 to 270,000.
1960.....	290,000.
1962.....	310,000.

The implication to be drawn from these figures is that, on the average, Soviet institutions of higher education in the late 1950's were graduating annually about 10,000 Jews, which is about the same as annual output of Jewish graduates in the late 1930's. It must be recalled, however, that in the meantime the number of graduates for all nationalities combined had increased from about 100,000 annually in 1940 to about 330,000 in the early 1960's.²

As a result of this trend, the proportion of Jews who had completed higher educa-

² See source 6 for a discussion of general trends in education.

tion among all Soviet professionals declined from about 18 or 19 percent in 1941 to 8.2 percent in 1960.

RESEARCH AND ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Among the figures cited most frequently by the Soviet Government in its denials of discrimination against Jews in education are those for so-called scientists. In reality, these figures do not refer to scientists as we understand the term, but rather to personnel employed as teachers in higher education and as researchers in various institutions conducting research (academies, as well as industrial, agricultural, medical and other institutes). Usually, the Soviet sources state the latest available figure, but if one takes care to consider the trend, the current situation regarding Jewish representation among Soviet academic and research professionals is markedly different from that two decades ago. Table 10 summarizes this trend.

While it is true that their absolute number increased (in fact, about doubled in 20 years), the proportion of Jewish professionals in the research community declined drastically. It was, in truth, cut in half. It does not seem unreasonable to conclude, therefore, that even at this high level of professional certification there were outside forces in operation responsible for this drastic change.

SUMMARY

In accordance with their heritage and history, Jews living in the lands now comprising the Soviet Union have traditionally sought opportunities for education, including university training, in numbers far exceeding their proportionate representation in the total population. This holds equally true today. Official government statistics, however, demonstrate clearly that Soviet authorities are now employing a quota system to reduce the proportion of Jews enjoying opportunities for higher education—this despite the high degree of urbanization of the Jews of the U.S.S.R. and the high percentage of Jews who speak Russian, the language used in most Soviet universities.

While Soviet Jews still attend universities in the U.S.S.R. in a proportion exceeding their statistical representation in the country at large, the evidence shows that this proportion is steadily and rapidly decreasing. According to all available figures, the Soviet Government is succeeding in its effort to limit the number of Jews in higher education.

TABLE 1.—Total population and Jewish population in the U.S.S.R. as of 1959, by language, sex, and rural-urban composition

	Total Soviet population (millions)			Jewish population (thousands)		
	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females
Declared their native language as that of their nationality:						
Total.....	196.9	88.2	108.7	1,487.8	214.9	273.8
Urban.....	91.7	41.2	50.5	454.7	198.3	256.5
Rural.....	105.2	47.0	58.2	33.0	15.7	17.3
Declared Russian as their native language:						
Total.....	10.2	5.0	5.2	1,733.2	763.1	940.1
Urban.....	7.8	3.8	4.0	1,671.4	780.9	910.5
Rural.....	2.4	1.2	1.2	61.8	32.2	29.6
Declared other language as their native language:						
Total.....	1.7	.8	.9	46.8	23.5	23.3
Urban.....	.6	.2	.3	35.6	17.9	17.7
Rural.....	1.2	.6	.6	11.2	5.6	5.6
Total population:						
Total.....	208.8	94.0	114.8	2,267.8	1,030.6	1,237.2
Urban.....	100.0	45.2	54.8	2,161.7	977.0	1,184.7
Rural.....	108.8	48.8	60.0	106.1	53.6	52.5

¹ Including Jews who speak as a native language Georgian (35,700), Tadzhik (20,800), and Tatar (25,400). (Apparently, "other languages," including Yiddish, accounted for the "residual"—some 400,000.)

² Including Jews who use as a native language Ukrainian (24,800) and Tadzhik (5,200).

Source: Source 1, pp. 184-202.

TABLE 2.—Number of persons with 7 or more years of education per 1,000 in the total population of the Soviet Union, and among Jews, 1939 and 1959

[Persons with such education per 1,000 population]

	Total				Urban				Rural			
	Population		Jews		Population		Jews		Population		Jews	
	1939	1959	1939	1959	1939	1959	1939	1959	1939	1959	1939	1959
Russian S.F.S.R. (p. 416ff.)	83	282	462	600	174	369	460	694	38	108	389	615
Ukrainian S.S.R. (p. 194)	103	319	280	591	183	308	299	594	58	299	172	484
Belorussian S.S.R. (p. 134)	83	271	206	510	204	416	211	508	43	187	166	564
Azerbaijani S.S.R. (p. 148)	80	282	299	478	164	355	306	484	32	216	185	285
Lithuanian S.S.R. (p. 166)	188	282	464	464	333	333	404	404	99	99	99	487
Moldavian S.S.R. (p. 96)	196	282	438	438	362	362	436	436	148	148	148	462
Latvian S.S.R. (p. 98)	365	282	597	597	459	459	597	597	247	247	247	623

Source: Source 2 (page number indicated in parentheses).

TABLE 3.—Enrollment in Soviet institutions of higher education, total enrollment and Jewish enrollment, by type of program, distributed by Union Republic, fall 1960

Union Republic	Total students of all nationalities (thousands)				Jewish students (units)			
	Total	By type of program			Total	By type of program		
		Full-time day	Evening	Extension-correspondence		Full-time day	Evening	Extension-correspondence
Russian S.F.S.R.	1,496.1	699.2	167.1	629.8	46,555	21,483	6,268	18,804
Ukrainian S.S.R.	417.8	199.0	44.1	174.7	13,673	7,007	3,545	8,121
Belorussian S.S.R.	59.3	32.3	5.5	21.5	3,020	1,416	609	935
Uzbek S.S.R.	101.3	51.3	7.1	42.9	2,902	1,238	317	1,347
Kazakh S.S.R.	77.1	42.7	3.4	31.0	837	495	84	258
Georgian S.S.R.	56.3	26.2	4.0	26.2	910	372	105	433
Azerbaijani S.S.R.	36.0	18.5	3.4	14.1	906	417	148	341
Lithuanian S.S.R.	26.7	15.6	1.9	9.2	413	270	77	66
Moldavian S.S.R.	19.2	10.4	.5	8.3	1,225	570	113	542
Latvian S.S.R.	21.6	12.6	1.9	7.1	800	513	61	226
Kirgiz S.S.R.	17.4	10.8	.9	5.6	263	180	33	50
Tadzhik S.S.R.	19.9	11.4	1.1	7.4	391	219	69	103
Armenian S.S.R.	20.2	10.9	1.8	7.5	52	28	12	12
Turkmen S.S.R.	13.2	8.0	.7	4.5	104	53	6	45
Estonian S.S.R.	13.5	7.6	.5	5.4	126	71	13	42
U.S.S.R. total	2,395.5	1,155.5	244.9	995.1	77,177	34,332	11,520	31,325
Distribution by program (in percent)	100.0	48.2	10.3	41.5	100.0	44.5	14.9	40.6

Source: Source 4, pp. 128-157.

TABLE 4.—Soviet population and higher education enrollments for all nationalities and for Jews, and index of representation

Union republic	Popular as of 1959			Higher education enrollments as of 1960			Index of representation (G)
	All nationalities (thousands)	Jews (thousands)	Percent (C)	All nationalities (thousands)	Jews (thousands)	Percent (F)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	
Russian S.F.S.R.	117,534.3	875.3	0.745	1,496,074	46,555	3.11	417
Ukrainian S.S.R.	41,869.0	840.3	2.007	417,748	18,673	4.47	223
Byelorussian S.S.R.	8,054.6	150.1	1.863	59,206	3,020	5.09	273
Uzbek S.S.R.	8,105.7	94.3	1.163	101,271	2,902	2.86	246
Kazakh S.S.R.	9,309.8	28.1	.301	77,135	837	1.08	359
Georgian S.S.R.	4,044.0	51.6	1.276	56,322	910	1.62	127
Azerbaijani S.S.R.	3,697.7	40.2	1.087	36,017	906	2.52	232
Lithuanian S.S.R.	2,711.4	24.7	.911	26,713	413	1.55	170
Moldavian S.S.R.	2,884.5	95.1	3.297	19,217	1,225	6.37	193
Latvian S.S.R.	2,093.5	36.6	1.748	21,563	800	3.71	212
Kirgiz S.S.R.	2,065.8	8.6	.416	17,379	263	1.51	363
Tadzhik S.S.R.	1,979.9	12.4	.626	19,959	391	1.96	313
Armenian S.S.R.	1,763.0	1.0	.066	20,165	52	.26	458
Turkmen S.S.R.	1,516.4	4.1	.270	13,151	104	.79	292
Estonian S.S.R.	1,196.8	5.4	.461	13,507	126	.93	206
U.S.S.R. total	208,826.4	2,267.8	1.086	2,395,545	77,177	3.22	297

Sources: Table 3 above and source 1, pp. 184-185.

TABLE 5.—Jewish population in the Soviet urban population and Jewish students in relation to total higher education enrollment, and index of representation

Union Republic	Urban population, 1959			Higher education enrollments as of 1960			Index representation (G)
	All nationalities (thousands)	Jews (thousands)	Percent	All nationalities (thousands)	Jews (thousands)	Percent	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	
Russian S.F.S.R.	61,611.1	878.8	1.42	1,496,074	46,555	3.11	219
Ukrainian S.S.R.	19,147.4	840.3	4.39	417,748	18,673	4.47	102
Belorussian S.S.R.	2,490.5	150.1	6.03	59,296	3,020	5.09	84
Uzbek S.S.R.	2,728.6	94.3	3.46	101,271	2,902	2.86	83
Kazakh S.S.R.	4,067.2	28.1	.69	77,135	837	1.08	156
Georgian S.S.R.	1,712.9	61.6	3.01	56,322	910	1.62	54
Azerbaijani S.S.R.	1,767.3	40.2	2.27	36,017	906	2.52	111
Lithuanian S.S.R.	1,046.0	24.7	2.36	26,713	413	1.55	66
Moldavian S.S.R.	642.2	96.1	14.81	19,217	1,225	6.37	43
Latvian S.S.R.	1,178.9	36.0	3.12	21,668	800	3.71	119
Kirgiz S.S.R.	606.2	8.0	1.24	17,379	263	1.51	121
Tadzhik S.S.R.	646.2	12.4	1.92	19,959	391	1.96	102
Armenian S.S.R.	881.8	1.0	.11	20,165	52	.26	236
Turkmen S.S.R.	700.8	4.1	.58	13,151	104	.79	136
Estonian S.S.R.	675.5	5.4	.80	13,807	126	.93	116
U.S.S.R. total	99,977.7	2,267.8	2.27	2,395,645	77,177	3.22	142

Sources: Table 3 above and source 1, pp. 184, 185.

TABLE 6.—Soviet higher education—enrollments in full-time day and evening programs (excluding extension-correspondence students), total, by nationality, and Jewish students

[In thousands]

Year	Total of full-time (day) and evening students	Number of students accounted in major nationality groups	Unaccounted residual	Jews (specifically identified)	Year	Total of full-time (day) and evening students	Number of students accounted in major nationality groups	Unaccounted residual	Jews (specifically identified)
1929	204.2			27.6	1959	1,833.0	1,211.8	121.2	(¹)
1931	408.9			45.9	1959	1,841.6	1,221.7	119.9	(¹)
1933	456.3			56.7	1960 (usual statistical releases)	1,400.9	1,278.0	121.9	(¹)
1934	527.3			64.3	1960 (special tabulation identifying all nationalities)	1,400.9	1,270.0	(78.1)	45.8
1935	563.5			74.9	1961	1,811.0	1,381.2	129.8	(¹)
1950	846.1	747.8	97.3	(¹)	1962	1,661.0	1,618.9	142.1	(¹)
1956	1,279.9	1,159.1	118.8	(¹)					
1957	1,320.3	1,200.1	120.2	(¹)					

¹ Not identified.

Sources: Source 5, appendix table A-5, p. 316, and sources thereto; source 6, p. 657 and sources thereto; source 7, p. 673; and table 3 above.

TABLE 7.—Soviet professional higher education graduates employed in the national economy, total and Jews, by Union republic as of December 1960

Union republic	Total, all nationalities	Number of Jews	Percent	Union republic	Total, all nationalities	Number of Jews	Percent
Russian S.F.S.R.	2,053,306	160,732	7.86	Latvian S.S.R.	40,807	3,611	8.85
Ukrainian S.S.R.	685,861	83,589	12.20	Kirgiz S.S.R.	29,776	1,073	3.60
Belorussian S.S.R.	110,177	12,636	11.47	Tadzhik S.S.R.	23,366	1,159	5.00
Uzbek S.S.R.	108,936	8,161	7.49	Armenian S.S.R.	41,063	204	0.50
Kazakh S.S.R.	124,818	4,148	3.32	Turkmen S.S.R.	22,506	485	2.16
Georgian S.S.R.	106,670	1,818	1.70	Estonian S.S.R.	24,211	868	3.58
Azerbaijani S.S.R.	78,213	4,110	6.61	U.S.S.R. total	3,545,234	290,707	8.20
Lithuanian S.S.R.	37,230	1,800	6.41				
Moldavian S.S.R.	33,284	3,206	18.62				

Source: Source 4, pp. 70-71.

TABLE 8.—Comparison of the proportion of Jews in the Soviet urban population, in total number of higher education graduates, and among students in higher education, by Union republic

[In percent]

Union republic	Proportion of Jews in urban population, 1959	Proportion of Jews in total number of higher education graduates, 1960	Proportion of Jews among students in higher education, 1960	Union republic	Proportion of Jews in urban population, 1959	Proportion of Jews in total number of higher education graduates, 1960	Proportion of Jews among students in higher education, 1960
Russian S.F.S.R.	1.42	7.68	3.11	Latvian S.S.R.	3.12	8.85	3.71
Ukrainian S.S.R.	4.39	12.20	4.47	Kirgiz S.S.R.	1.24	3.60	1.51
Belorussian S.S.R.	6.03	11.47	5.09	Tadzhik S.S.R.	1.92	5.00	1.96
Uzbek S.S.R.	3.46	7.49	2.86	Armenian S.S.R.	.11	.50	.26
Kazakh S.S.R.	.69	3.32	1.08	Turkmen S.S.R.	.58	2.16	.79
Georgian S.S.R.	3.01	1.70	1.62	Estonian S.S.R.	.80	3.58	.63
Azerbaijani S.S.R.	2.27	6.61	2.62	U.S.S.R. total	2.27	8.20	3.22
Lithuanian S.S.R.	2.36	6.41	1.55				
Moldavian S.S.R.	14.81	18.62	6.37				

Sources: Tables 4, 5, and 7 above.

TABLE 9.—Number of higher education graduates employed in the national economy of the U.S.S.R., 1941-62, total, accounted nationalities, and Jewish professionals

[In thousands]

Year	Total	Accounted major nationalities ¹	Residual of other nationalities	Jews properly identified	Source
1941	909.0	718.6	190.4	(2)	No. 4, p. 69.
1954	2,008.5	1,700.0	300.5	(2)	No. 9, p. 261, 1959.
1959	3,235.7	2,809.7	426.0	(2)	No. 10, p. 617.
1960 (usual statistical releases)	3,545.2	3,091.2	454.0	(2)	No. 10, 1960, p. 663.
1960 (special tabulation identifying all nationalities)	3,545.2	3,091.2	(163.3)	⁵ 290.7	No. 4, p. 67.
1961	3,824.0	3,346.4	477.6	(2)	No. 10, 1961, p. 586.
1962	4,049.7	3,552.2	497.5	(2)	No. 7, p. 473.

¹ Those of Union republic nationality (Russian, Ukrainian, etc.).
² Not identified.
³ Among which another 19 minor nationalities (totaling 110,200) are identified, though Jews are still censored out by this reference. The residual, net of identified minor nationalities, is 315,800, and of these the majority are obviously Jews.
⁴ Again 19 other nationalities are listed totaling 122,500; the remainder, including Jews, is 331,500.
⁵ Since the number of Jewish professionals is given as 291,000 other than Jews in the remainder accounted for 40,000.
⁶ Again 20 other nationalities are listed accounting for 129,400; the remainder, including Jews, is 348,200.
⁷ Again 20 other nationalities are listed totaling 139,600; the remainder, which included Jews, is 357,900.

TABLE 10.—Soviet research and academic personnel, total and Jewish representation therein, 1939-61

	1939	1947	1955	1958	1959	1960	1961
Total (thousands)	95.0	145.6	223.9	284.0	310.0	354.2	404.1
Jews (thousands)	20.0	24.4	24.6	28.9	30.6	33.5	36.2
Proportion of Jews (percent)	21.2	16.8	11.0	10.2	9.8	9.5	8.9

Source: Source 5, p. 760 and sources listed therein; and source 7, p. 584.

SOURCES

Source 1: Tsentral'noe Statisticheskoe Upravlenie pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR "Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1959 goda: SSSR," Moscow, 1962.

Source 2: Tsentral'noe Statisticheskoe Upravlenie pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR, "Itogi vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1959 goda" (for the 15 Soviet republics): Armenian, Azerbaidzhan, Belorussian, Estonian, Georgian, Kazakh, Kirgiz, Latvian, Lithuanian, Moldavian, Russian, Tadzhik, Turkmen, Ukrainian, Uzbek (Moscow 1962).

Source 3: M. Abramovich, "Jews in the 1959 Soviet Population Census," reprinted from Jews in Eastern Europe, n.d.; and F. Lorimer, "The Population of the Soviet Union," Geneva: League of Nations, 1946.

Source 4: Tsentral'noe Statisticheskoe Upravlenie pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR, "Vysshhee obrazovanie v SSSR," Moscow, 1961.

Source 5: Nicholas DeWitt, "Soviet Professional Manpower—Its Education, Training, and Supply," Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1955.

Source 6: Nicholas DeWitt, "Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R.," Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1961.

Source 7: Tsentral'noe Statisticheskoe Upravlenie pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR, "Narodnoe khoziaistvo SSSR v 1962 gody," Moscow, 1963.

Source 8: Tsentral'noe Statisticheskoe Upravlenie pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR, "Srednee spetsial'noe obrazovanie v SSSR," Moscow, 1962.

Source 9: Tsentral'noe Statisticheskoe Upravlenie pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR, "Dostizheniia sovetskoi vlasti za sorok let v tsifrah; statisticheskii sbornik," Moscow, 1957.

Source 10: Tsentral'noe Statisticheskoe Upravlenie pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR, "Narodnoe khoziaistvo SSSR v 1959 gody," Moscow, 1960; "Narodnoe khoziaistvo SSSR v 1960 gody," Moscow, 1961; "Narodnoe khoziaistvo SSSR v 1961 gody," Moscow, 1962.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to add to what my colleague from New York has said

about anti-Jewish activities in the Soviet Union by calling attention to the barbaric execution just reported of nine people, most of them Jews, according to the report in the New York Times, for so-called economic crimes in the Soviet Union—something that no other civilized nation on earth would think of doing, indicating the bald-faced hypocrisy of pretending that there is no anti-Jewish campaign in the Soviet Union, when, notwithstanding the tiny fraction of the population they represent, such barbaric punishments are imposed upon them as shown in the record. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SOVIET EXECUTION OF NINE ON MAY 4 IS REPORTED

Moscow, June 11.—Nine men convicted of "economic crimes" were executed by shooting here last May 4, reliable sources said today.

All those executed were said to have had Jewish names. One was identified as Roifman, who was tried last February together with other alleged members of a large ring of speculators. A man called Shakerman had been named as leader of the ring.

At the end of the trial it was unofficially reported that the verdict called for nine death sentences. Today's report was the first indication that the sentences had been carried out.

However, one of the men reported shot May 4 had not been involved in the Shakerman case. He was identified unofficially as Klempert, a man whose trial and death sentence was reported by a Moscow newspaper last month.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Council of the Second Province of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It is another indication of the strong support of church groups and religious leaders for this moral cause.

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

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS BILL (H.R. 7152)

Whereas other religious leaders and church people of all political persuasions have united in support of this measure, identifying it as a moral issue transcending any political considerations: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the members of the Council of the Second Province record their support of this legislation and urge the Senate of the United States to adopt the measure without further delay; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be communicated to all Members of the U.S. Senate.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DODD

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the past weekend, our good friend and my senior colleague from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], was unanimously renominated for a second term as a U.S. Senator. The delegates to the Democratic State convention in Connecticut fully recognized the outstanding record of Tom Dodd, and honored him with their nomination.

Senator Dodd was nominated by the great Governor of our State, John N. Dempsey, who delivered a richly deserved tribute detailing our senior Senator's record. Accepting the nomination, Senator Dodd gave a most eloquent statement, outlining the philosophy he will carry into the coming campaign. I ask unanimous consent that the speeches of Governor Dempsey and Senator Dodd be inserted in the RECORD.

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

13108

REMARKS OF GOV. JOHN DEMPSEY IN NOMINATION OF THOMAS J. DODD FOR REELECTION AS U.S. SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT, DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION, HARTFORD, JUNE 6, 1964

The spirit in this great hall today is the spirit of victory, and this convention will make an important contribution toward that victory.

Once again we are moving into an election campaign of great significance to the future of the United States and the State of Connecticut.

We meet today while the terrible memory of the assassination of a beloved President haunts our national conscience. The inspiration and the high purpose which John F. Kennedy brought to public office will serve as a model for freemen everywhere.

Our standard bearer in this campaign is a leader who with courage and responsibility met the awesome challenges imposed on him by grave national tragedy—a great leader, a great Democrat, and a great American—Lyndon B. Johnson.

President Johnson's leadership carries forward the Democratic tradition of Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and John Kennedy—the tradition in which we as Democrats are proud to share.

It was my high honor this week to welcome President Johnson to Connecticut, and to hear his inspiring report to the Nation on America's strength and America's greatness. And let me tell you that President Johnson knows the Democratic Party of Connecticut is ready and eager for this year's campaign.

Strong bonds unite the Democrats of Connecticut. We are united in a common goal of service to our people. We are united in respect for our leadership. We are united by pride in the great Democratic record of achievement, both on the national level and right here in the State of Connecticut.

Every Democratic candidate in our State will carry proudly into this year's election campaign the great record of Democratic accomplishment. This pride is reflected in the platform which this convention has adopted—a platform which commits us to the continuing fulfillment of the Democratic tradition.

The Democratic Party cares about people. Our concern for people is reflected in every section of our fine platform. Together we have done much to create a fuller life for all the citizens of Connecticut. Together we have built educational and job opportunities for our young people. We have devoted the full resources of government to the care of the sick, the mentally ill, the mentally retarded, and those in need of rehabilitation. We have worked to bring a greater measure of dignity into the lives of all our older citizens.

We have dedicated ourselves to create here in Connecticut the great society of which President Johnson has so eloquently spoken. Together we are determined to press forward on this path of progress and to enlist the support of the people of Connecticut in the great national effort which President Johnson has mobilized.

It will be the privilege of this convention to give the President of the United States an ally in the campaign battles ahead—a man who has stood shoulder to shoulder with Lyndon Johnson since the early days of the New Deal—a man on whom the President looks as a valued friend and trusted adviser.

This man has established a public record of unsurpassed distinction in a career of Government service which began more than 30 years ago. The breadth of his experience and the depth of his unique preparation for high elective office is unmatched.

As director of the national youth administration program in Connecticut, he established programs here to provide education

and job opportunities for youth which became the model for action in other States.

Tireless in his zeal for justice, he has benefited by his experience as special agent for the FBI and his service as assistant to the U.S. Attorney General. In this capacity, he helped to establish, and was appointed assistant chief of the Justice Department's first civil rights section, and pioneered in the Federal prosecution of civil rights violations.

In World War II he was a keyman in the Justice Department's counterespionage and countersabotage operations.

He represented the Government of the United States as executive trial counsel, at the direct request of Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson, in the Nazi war crimes trials at Nuremberg in 1945-46.

In this capacity he made a lasting contribution to world law by demonstrating beyond reasonable dispute the legal enforceability of internationally accepted moral standards.

The qualities of leadership which he demonstrated in two terms as a Congressman won national respect; and those same qualities have been richly developed during his first term of service as U.S. Senator.

He has strongly supported and effectively advocated, in committee and on the floor of the Senate, the entire range of domestic programs which Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have sponsored.

He is a recognized leader in the battle for the civil rights bill, for medicare, for increased Federal aid to education, and for the several measures which make up President Johnson's antipoverity program.

His personal battle for progressive measures to combat juvenile delinquency and to establish more effective Federal regulation of traffic in narcotics and deadly weapons has won for him the acclaim of the entire Nation. And in the field of foreign affairs, he has coupled enthusiastic support for U.S. assistance to the free nations with unremitting vigilance against Communist aggression and subversion.

He has shown in countless actions that he recognizes the war for expanded freedom and opportunity at home, like the war in defense of freedom abroad, is a basically moral question.

He has proven himself a true champion of freedom and a determined foe of tyranny.

His inspired vision and unceasing efforts in defense of liberty and justice at home and throughout the world have richly justified the confidence of the people of the State of Connecticut.

All of you who know this man as I do, know him as a man of warmth, a man of heart, a man of compassion, a man dedicated to his country—a man of courage.

I have the high honor to place before this convention for nomination and reelection as U.S. Senator from Connecticut, the name of the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD.

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD IN ACCEPTING RENOMINATION AS DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR U.S. SENATOR, BUSHNELL MEMORIAL HALL, HARTFORD, CONN., JUNE 6, 1964

My friends, this is the third time I have spoken to you from this rostrum following nomination by our party as Democratic candidate for the U.S. Senate, and my heart is filled, not only with thoughts of today, but of the yesterdays that we have been through together.

Such an occasion presents a challenge, an opportunity, and a responsibility that no man can experience without mingled feelings of pride and humility, joy and anxiety.

I accept your nomination. I thank you for the chance you have given me to serve you once more.

I pledge to do my best to make the coming campaign not a sham battle of personalities and epithets, but a real contest of ideas

and ideals, a contest that will end in victory—victory for our party and for the causes we uphold.

An election campaign provides an opportunity, if we will but take it, for defining and redefining our policies and the philosophy which underlies them. This we have done today, and will continue to do in the weeks and months ahead.

Politics necessarily reflects a view of life and an attitude toward people. Our views and attitudes have been on the public record for a very long time.

For the Democratic Party is our oldest political party. It goes back to the earliest days of our country. It has had many opponents, and it has prevailed over them all.

Some of those opponents have held a rather dim view of the average man and have taken up as their mission the narrow task of protecting the privileges and advancing the well-being of an exclusive group. They have tried to draw a protective line around the special interests of this group, but for the great mass of men their message has been "No trespassing."

Other opponents of the Democratic Party historically have taken a negative, hostile attitude toward the problems of people. From the earliest days they have looked upon men as too backward to be allowed to vote; too irresponsible to be allowed to band together in labor unions; too lazy to be trusted with Government benefits; too greedy to be given a voice in the management of our natural resources. They have opposed practically every program which aimed at helping people with problems too big for them to solve by themselves. They have been completely unmoved by the crushing burdens borne by humble souls, and totally impervious to the currents of change. To them, life has appeared, not as a quest for personal fulfillment, but as some sort of endurance contest.

To most men and women their message has been, "Sink or swim."

Other opponents of our party have taken a negative attitude about Government itself. They have always professed to be full of sympathy about the dilemmas facing our people, but they have claimed that government, and especially the Federal Government, is helpless to do anything about them.

Child labor? "Oh, it's a shame," they said, "But we can't do anything about it. That's the responsibility of the family."

Sweatshops? "Well, that is the employers' business," they said.

Breadlines? "That is the concern of private charities."

Slums? "That is purely a local matter."

Civil rights? "Why, that is up to the States."

Medical care for the aged? "There is no real need for it. Most of these old people own houses or property they can sell to pay their hospitals bills," they said.

And so it goes. All that this group has ever had to say to the people is, "Let George do it."

This negative, hostile, helpless attitude is still very much with us today, and it is a major factor in the coming campaign. If you doubt this, just read what our friend from our neighboring State of New York, Governor Rockefeller, has to say about the group that has just taken control of the Republican Party.

We of the Democratic Party, of course, have made mistakes but they have been the mistakes of those who were fighting to solve our Nation's problems, not to sweep them under the rug.

From its first campaign under Thomas Jefferson in the year 1800 to its latest campaign under John F. Kennedy, in 1960, our party has been optimistic about the nature of men, compassionate toward their prob-