

MAR 15 1960

Approved For Release 2000/05/24 : CIA-RDP75

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SEN

lowed. His great interest in Alaska was a natural concomitant of his devotion to the West, and a demonstration of his own pioneer spirit—a spirit which led to his creative exploration of so many fields of human activity.

In this connection I am pleased to report that the House of Representatives of the Alaska Legislature has voted to name a mountain in Alaska after Richard Neuberger and has recommended a specific peak to the Board of Geographic Names. It is a 7,747-foot-high mountain, visible from the Alaska Highway, in the construction of which Dick Neuberger, when in the Armed Forces in World War II, played so active a part. The vote was unanimous, and testifies to the appreciation of the 40 house members of Richard Neuberger's great record of service to Alaska during the last 20 years of his fruitful life.

Dick Neuberger was always a great friend and supporter of any group or category of our citizens who for one reason or another were disadvantaged or denied equality of opportunity. Thus, he was a protector of the Indians in fields where he felt their rights were being invaded, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, was able to secure the conservation of some of their tribal timber properties which were in danger of being despoiled, thus serving at one time the causes of human and resource conservation.

He raised his voice repeatedly against discrimination in employment because of age. He felt that a great injustice was done not only to the men and women who, after a certain time of life, were denied employment even though fully capable—an injustice not merely to the individuals and their families—but also to the entire fabric of our society.

On the other end of the age scale, he strongly supported a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps—on the model of the CCC of President Franklin Roosevelt's administration—which was passed by the Senate last year and now awaits action by the House. Likewise, he urged the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy to give our youngsters a chance to be trained for service abroad.

He was a strong supporter of education in all its aspects and for the development of better low-cost housing.

With all his interest in national affairs, ranging over a wide variety of subjects, he was devoted and indefatigable in protecting and advancing the requirements of his own State, although never at the expense of the larger regional and still larger national interests.

In this, as in all his other endeavors, he was greatly aided by his devoted helpmeet, Maurine. Of her our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] said, when last Wednesday the Senate was paying its tributes to Dick Neuberger:

If there ever was an instance of a widow deserving to succeed to and carry on the work of her husband, it is Maurine Neuberger because she is the surviving member of a partnership that inspired the people of Oregon and those of us in Washington who saw that partnership in action.

Mr. President, I feel that this gracious and generous tribute from the other side of the aisle on the part of one who has so graced this body and brought such great distinction to her sex, will be widely shared in this body, in a spirit equally above partisanship, as so gallantly displayed by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Now that Maurine Neuberger has announced her candidacy for the Senate, it is my confident hope that she will be with us after the fall election to carry on the great work which will forever enshrine the name of Neuberger in American annals.

Yesterday, I gave a brief account of the memorial service last Sunday in Portland, Oreg., which a number of our Senate colleagues and members of Dick Neuberger's staff attended. I neglected to mention that among those who journeyed to Portland and spoke at the memorial services was Justice William O. Douglas, and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD include mention of his name, by inserting at the end of the first paragraph "Among those who accompanied the senatorial party was Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who along with Senator Johnson, Senator Douglas, and myself, was one of the speakers at the memorial services."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made, as indicated.

SPEECH OF SENATOR DODD ON ANTI-SEMITISM, THE SWASTIKA EPIDEMIC, AND COMMUNISM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, just prior to becoming ill, the very able and distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] completed for delivery on the Senate floor, a very excellent and thought-provoking speech on anti-Semitism, the swastika epidemic, and communism.

Unfortunately, his present illness has made it impossible for him to deliver this speech as he intended. I am sure I speak for all of his colleagues here in the Senate when I say that we wish him a speedy recovery and early return to this body.

The speech is a very careful and detailed analysis of the contrast between anti-Semitism in West Germany and in Soviet Russia. It sets forth the determined effort made by Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and his government to wipe out the last vestiges of nazism and anti-Semitism in West Germany.

Because I feel that it is timely and significant during this week when Chancellor Adenauer is visiting the United States, a period when his government is under unjustified attack as a result of anti-Semitic incidents, I am particularly pleased to have been asked by the Senator from Connecticut to have his prepared text printed in the RECORD.

This thought-provoking speech merits the attention of all of us here in the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Senator Dodd which he prepared for delivery be printed in the RECORD.

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS PREPARED BY SENATOR DODD FOR DELIVERY TO THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES ON ANTI-SEMITISM, THE SWASTIKA EPIDEMIC AND COMMUNISM

Last Christmas night, swastikas and anti-Jewish inscriptions were painted on the synagogue in Cologne. The incident was the signal for an epidemic of swastika painting on synagogues and Jewish institutions throughout Germany and the free world. There were incidents in almost every West European country, in the United States, Canada, and Latin America, and in Australia. Day after day for a period of weeks, the American press and the press in other countries carried headline stories on the swastika epidemic.

Freemen everywhere were horrified by the reappearance of this symbol of intolerance and persecution, under whose aegis 6 million Jews had been brutally murdered by the Nazi regime. At the close of the war in Europe, an incredulous world had recoiled from the fact of this crime—a crime that can never be completely understood, completely explained, or properly requited. Slowly, almost unwillingly, sadly, mankind moved to the acceptance of this terrible truth.

The reemergence of the swastika not only brought back to memory the most terrifying act of Nazi bestiality: it again posed the question of anti-Semitism before the conscience of the entire world.

For anti-Semitism is not a specifically German problem—it is a world problem. It exists both in the free world and in the Communist world, in all those countries where there are Jewish communities and, for that matter, in many countries where the Jewish communities are tiny or non-existent. It varies in degree and in quality from one country to another. In most countries of the free world it has been reduced to residual proportions. In other countries, it is a massive and current phenomenon. But its existence is something that must be combated, no matter what the degree or quality, because prejudice can lead to hatred—and hatred, unbridled, can lead us once again to a totalitarian Gehenna.

It must be combated because it contradicts the doctrine of universal love which is the heart of our religion and because it does violence to the foundation of our society.

It must be combated because, even in its milder forms, it constitutes a danger to our sanity and moral probity.

It must be combated because it is a tool of the Communist conspiracy.

It is a problem with many parts. To combat it effectively, we must view these parts in proportion, so that our actions may be governed by an intelligent assignment of our energies.

The need for a sense of proportion is something that cannot be overemphasized.

A sense of proportion is the key both to sanity and morality. In the world in which we live today, it may very well be a key to our survival.

Our everyday judgments, our code of morality, our legal system, our political decisions—all are governed, or should be governed, by our sense of proportion.

It is not enough to be able to distinguish right from wrong. There are many gradations of evil, and the civilized society distinguishes between them in its structure of laws. Similarly, it is not enough to be able to distinguish the beneficent from the harmful, the safe from the dangerous.

Without a sense of proportion we should find ourselves equating petty larceny with rape, measles with leprosy, a toy chameleon with a crocodile.

STATINTL

In the balanced mind, in the same society, everything is scaled, everything has its measure or its value.

When an individual loses his sense of proportion, he can no longer cope effectively with the problems of everyday life. When a nation loses its sense of proportion, it courts disaster.

In the light of our reaction to the swastika epidemic events, I wonder whether the free world has not already lost much of its sense of proportion, whether it is not suffering from some kind of mesmeric condition that has destroyed its capacity for judgment. If this is so, then the Kremlin's experts in psychological warfare have achieved a signal victory.

Now that the headlines generated by the epidemic have disappeared from our front pages, and now that the hysteria that accompanied them has died down, I believe we can learn much from a careful analytical postmortem.

Where were the origins of this international rash of anti-Semitic incidents? Does the neo-Nazi movement really constitute a serious danger? Did the Communists instigate the epidemic or did they simply exploit it for cold war purposes? What effect has it had on the Western Alliance? Does anti-Semitism still remain a major world problem—and if it does, how does it manifest itself in various countries and at what points is the problem most acute? These are some of the questions we ought to try to answer.

But I believe the free world has most to learn from a self-analysis of its own reactions to the epidemic. I believe that such an analysis will reveal that, at the height of the outbreak, the free world was afflicted with an almost total collapse of its sense of proportion—so that, in our eyes, small dangers became big dangers while massive and imminent dangers were ignored—so that scattered violations of human dignity in country A made us roar our protest at the top of our lungs, while, in country B, violations of human rights and human dignity a thousand times as grave and ten thousand times as numerous commanded our total silence.

We would be less than human if we did not react with indignation to the persecution of the Jews in any country. My argument is that our indignation to be meaningful must also be governed by a sense of proportion—and it was not so governed at the time of the swastika epidemic. I do not argue for less indignation; I argue for more indignation—for an indignation that responds in proper measure to every crime and every injustice.

In country B—the Soviet Union—there are some 3 million Jews. In a land where all minorities are persecuted, they are the most persecuted of all minorities. They have been the victims of a policy that can only be described as physical and cultural genocide. They are without political representation, without community organizations, almost without religious or cultural rights and without opportunity for higher education or employment.

Summing up the plight of the Soviet Jews, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith said in 1958:

"The prospects for Soviet Jewry are dire and gloomy: at best, the extinction of a once-flourishing and rich cultural tradition and life; at worst, the completion by the Communists of the heinous work begun by the Nazis—the liquidation by forcible assimilation of this community of 3 million Jews."

Between the brutality of Soviet anti-Semitism and the brutality of Nazi anti-Semitism, there is little to choose. About all that is lacking so far in the U.S.S.R. is the gas chambers. For this deficiency, the Communists have made up, at least in part, by employing Siberia and the firing squads as substitute instruments of death.

The crimes that have characterized Soviet anti-Semitism have not been perpetrated by hotheads or juvenile delinquents.

They have been perpetrated, or else instigated, by the Soviet state itself, first under the command of Josef Stalin and then under the command of the present Prime Minister, Nikita Khrushchev. In my opinion, this fact makes these crimes a thousand times more damnable.

How does the free world react to the merciless persecution of the 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union? It closes its eyes to it. Instead of protests and indignation, we witness demands for increased trade with the Soviet bloc, for stepped-up cultural exchange programs, for state visits by the Soviet terrorist in chief.

In country A—Germany—there are some 30,000 Jews who enjoy complete freedom of religion, complete equality before the law, complete acceptance. While there is a residue of anti-Semitism from the terrible days of Hitler, the Government has done its utmost to combat this residue and to make restitution to the Jews for their suffering under nazism.

Suddenly there is a rash of swastika smearing and of other minor acts of vandalism, perpetrated, for the most part, by juvenile delinquents. No Jew is physically assaulted, no Jewish building seriously damaged. The Government moves with the utmost vigor to punish those responsible. The press, pulpit, and political parties join in unanimous condemnation of the hate smearers.

And how does the free world react to this situation?

Overnight, the West German democracy was placed in the pillory, rendered suspect, morally isolated from its Western allies—and this in the critical period preceding the summit conference.

The reaction was strongest in Great Britain. Forty thousand Londoners marched in a protest parade; German maids were dismissed by their employers; orders for German goods were demonstratively canceled by a number of British concerns; and some editors even suggested a reexamination of Germany's role in the Western alliance.

In our own country, although the reaction was milder and more mixed, the swastika campaign brought a flood of protests from U.S. editors, from Members of Congress, and from religious leaders. "The fact that acts of anti-Semitism can take place under present circumstances," said one of our most respected newspapers, is a "clear indication that the sickness still lurks deep in the German soul."

One of my old colleagues in the House said that it was high time the President and Congress considered whether our massive economic and military assistance is making a contribution to the sad events in Germany.

It is to the eternal credit of the Jewish leaders that they kept their sense of proportion while so many people, who had far less reason to fear the re-emergence of the swastika, were losing theirs. Heaven knows, no Jew could have been blamed for reacting strongly—even excessively—to the news of the swastika epidemic. Instead, the recognized leaders of the Jewish community, in this country and abroad, spoke with statesmanlike restraint and balance. By their sanity, by their morality, by their abjuration of vengeance and hatred and racism, they showed an example to the entire free world.

Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress, and Premier David Ben-Gurion of Israel, both told their colleagues that the record of the Bonn Government toward the Jews was beyond reproach and that it would be nazism upside down to hold the German people guilty in perpetuity for the crimes of the Hitler regime.

Mr. Ben Epstein, director of the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, in an interview over the German radio on January 14, rejected the theory that some international Nazi organization was responsible for the epidemic. He said that while two members of the neo-Nazi party had been responsible for the original incident in Cologne, the epidemic which followed was essentially a wave of imitative behavior by juvenile delinquents and other irresponsible elements.

Dr. Hendrik G. van Dam, president of the Jewish community in Berlin, in an article entitled "Anti-Semitism Without Jews," assailed "the merciless anti-Germanism" in other countries and the tendency to seek any evidence in support of a collective judgment of the German people and he warned against those journalists who "attempt to prove that the Germans never change, that the Federal Republic, therefore, is not fit to be a member of an alliance, and indeed cannot be trusted."

But in the general hysteria that existed for several weeks, these voices of reason were swallowed up. Only the most assiduous readers of the press noticed them.

The swastika epidemic was something that lent itself intrinsically to sensationalism, and the democratic press cannot be blamed for treating it as a matter for page 1 reportage. But in doing so, in my opinion, it served—unwittingly—as a vehicle for a Soviet campaign of saturation propaganda.

After several weeks of swastika headlines and exaggerated reactions, the threat of world communism and the Berlin crisis became items of minor importance in the public mind. If the headlines and the hysteria could be taken as a guide, the real menace confronting the free world was not Communist aggression, but the revival of nazism and anti-Semitism in Germany.

Encouraged by the reaction of the free world to the swastika incidents, the Communists propaganda apparatus had a field day. No charges were too extreme, no language too extravagant. Pravda on January 8, for example, charged that "this organized racist campaign had been launched as if at a signal given by Adenauer" and it said that its purpose is to "clear the road for a wide propaganda in favor of a Nazi ideology, openly fascist."

The following day the Communist German radio charged that the entire campaign had been organized by the West German office of psychological warfare under the direction of Defense Minister Strauss.

The orgy achieved its peak on February 1, when Mr. Khrushchev wrote in an open letter to Chancellor Adenauer: "People are prosecuted in your country for their thoughts, for their progressive ideas. You actually occupy the same position occupied by Hitler." It would be difficult to find a comparably insulting letter from one head of state to another, even on the eve of war.

The purpose of all this propaganda was obvious. It was designed, very simply, to further isolate West Germany, to further divide the Western Alliance, and to soften our policy by appealing to our still vivid memories of Nazi brutality. In particular, it was designed to appeal to the people of Britain, where antinazism is frequently combined with a strong general dislike of Germans and Germany.

The ultimate goal of this propaganda is the city of West Berlin.

GERMANY'S POSTWAR RECORD

The questions of neonazism and anti-Semitism in West Germany have been posed—and these questions can only be answered by a detailed evaluation of Germany's postwar history.

As executive trial counsel at the major Nuremberg trial, I had spread before me

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1960

in nightmarish detail the whole incredible story of Nazi barbarism and of its fiendish persecution of the Jewish people. Almost equally incredible, was the story of how this party of madmen and fanatics had achieved power over a nation of 70 million people, and enslaved their minds and warped their characters.

To those of us who were close to the problem in the immediate postwar period, the problem of denazification seemed almost insurmountable. How could tens of thousands of administrators be dismissed—and an administration still be maintained? How could minds be purged of the Nazi virus and a sense of morality and civic responsibility restored? How could teachers be found so that the new generation of Germans could be schooled in dedication to the ideals of democracy? There were many of us who felt at the time that the restoration of Germany would be a work of generations.

I have seen the bottom of the abyss from which the German people had to come—and, for my own part, I cannot help marveling that they have traveled so far in so short a period of time. There is still much to be done. There are certain hard unpleasant facts that must be confronted. But when we compare the Germany of today with the Germany of yesterday, there is every reason for optimism and confidence.

For the great progress that has been made, I believe that Germany and the free world will remain eternally indebted to the statesmanship and humanity of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and of men like Mayor Brandt of Berlin and his predecessor, Mayor Ernst Reuter. But one leader or a few leaders by themselves could not explain the rate of recovery in Germany. The fact is that there were in Germany far more anti-Nazis and non-Nazis than we had been inclined to believe.

For more than a decade now, West Germany has had a freely elected parliamentary regime, a free press, and a free society which is watchful of individual liberties.

In successive elections, at Federal, State and municipal levels, the overwhelming majority of the German voters have given their support to the Christian Democratic Party or to the Social Democratic Party. Both of these parties are completely dedicated to democratic ideals, are staunchly anti-Nazi, liberal in their approach to social problems, solidly pro-Western in their orientation. Of the long list of splinter parties, the largest is the Free Democratic Party, which in 1958 won the backing of 7.7 percent of the electorate. These splinter parties are also, for the most part, essentially democratic in orientation, some of them liberal, some of them middle-of-the-road, some of them conservative.

The one significant exception, the German Reichspartei, is neo-Nazi in outlook, and is led by a group of diehard ex-Nazis. But it has a national membership of only 13,000 and obtained only 1 percent of the vote in the last election. This means that it has no representation in parliament, because under German electoral law, a party must obtain a minimum of 5 percent of the popular vote before it is given representation. In addition, there are half a dozen other ultranationalist reactionary splinter groups which, between them, were able to obtain 1.32 percent of the total vote.

On the basis of the electoral record of the past decade, it is obvious that there remains a core of unregenerate Germans who are prepared to vote to resurrect the past. But it is a very tiny core, representing no more than about 2.5 percent of the total electorate.

The important thing is the trend. Before the Nazi Party came to power, it obtained an increasing percentage of the German vote in successive elections—18.3 percent in 1930, 37.1 percent in 1932, 44.2 percent in March 1933. Has the trend since the end of the

war been toward a revival of Nazi extremism, or toward the parties of moderation? Here, I believe, the proof is conclusive: In 1949 the Christian Democratic Party and the Social Democratic Party between them polled 60 percent of the vote. In 1953, the figure rose to 74 percent, in 1957 to 82 percent.

These, in my opinion, are the basic facts—the central criteria in appraising Germany's political evolution since the end of the war.

What remains to be done?

EX-NAZIS IN GOVERNMENT: EAST AND WEST

There is still a problem of former Nazis in government. The Jewish organization, the B'nai B'rith, speaks of some 900 of them, of whom several hold high office. This is a relatively small number compared with the scores of thousands of Nazis who were dismissed from office—but it is still reason for concern. There is also a number of ex-Nazis who hold positions of importance in private life as editors, writers, publishers, bankers, and industrialists.

It is proper that the problem of ex-Nazi officeholders should be openly discussed by the West German people and by their allies. But it becomes a trifle outrageous when Khrushchev and his German quislings mount their pulpits and prate self-righteously about ex-Nazis in the West German Government.

In Communist Europe there was no process of denazification. In East Germany and in every European country where the Communists have taken power, they have opened their ranks to the most vicious Nazis and Nazi collaborators. Their past was no handicap; quite the contrary, for the dirty work which the Communist regime had to do, a gangster past constituted a decided recommendation.

I have in hand a documentation compiled by the investigating committee of free jurists in Berlin. In it are listed some hundreds of former Nazis who now hold important posts in the Communist government of East Germany, or in its armed forces. Here are their photographs, their Nazi party numbers, the record of their date of entry into the Nazi party, the lists of their awards and decorations from the Hitler government. In it you will find such names as that of Dr. Kurt Schumann, president of the East German Supreme Court; Selgried Dallmann, chairman of the Law Committee of the People's Chamber; the chief editor of the official Communist theoretical periodical "German Foreign Policy," Hans W. Aust; and a long roster of political leaders, leading judges, officers, publicists, and educators.

When the Berlin Jurists Association first printed its list of ex-Nazis in the service of communism, the German Communists—unable to deny the truth of the charges—replied with the assertion that all of these people had realized their past political errors and had developed into "upright democrats and fighters for peace." By this they mean to say that these people have now become Communists. Such a statement I would not be prepared to dispute. For a Communist to become a Nazi or a Nazi to become a Communist requires no real transformation. They are blood brothers.

DENAZIFICATION AND THE CASE OF DR. GLOBKE

In West Germany, as a result of the denazification process, the apparatus of government was purged of virtually every Nazi who was personally guilty of crimes against humanity. In an operation which involved scores of thousands of people, it was inevitable that there should be some errors of judgment. A number who were guilty escaped punishment, while some who were innocent were wrongly punished. But, in general, the denazification courts made exceptions only for those former Nazi party members who could prove that they used their positions for anti-Nazi purposes, or

that their party membership was a simple formality necessary to protect their positions or livelihood.

On the basis of the evidence I have seen, I am inclined to believe that, while there is still a fair amount of housecleaning to be done, many of the ex-Nazis at present employed by the West German Government have demonstrated their innocence. Each case must be considered on its merits; no sweeping judgment could possibly be fair.

About Refugee Minister Oberlaender and Interior Minister Schroeder I have serious doubts. They were not personally involved in any crimes against humanity; Oberlaender, in fact, has voluntarily submitted himself to an examination by a committee of former resistance fighters. Both men have strongly opposed the neo-Nazi movement. But the fact remains that they did belong to the Nazi party and not to the opposition. In the case of Dr. Hans Globke, secretary of the Chancellor's office, however, I have examined a documentation which completely persuades me of the man's innocence.

The story of Dr. Globke illustrates how exceedingly complex the business of making judgments can be. The Communists raise his name at every opportunity. They charge that he was coauthor of a legal commentary on the infamous Nuremberg racial laws. This is true. This information, in itself, would predispose most decent people against Globke. How, they would ask, could such a man be innocent?

In the terrible politics of our time, men have frequently been confronted with choices that torture the soul. If one sees an opportunity to serve the cause of freedom in the ranks of the Nazi movement, does one reject the opportunity because it is morally repugnant—or does one accept? It is not an easy choice; and if one accepts, it is not an easy thing to explain or live down. In fact, during World War II, more than one resister posing as a collaborator was shot down by fellow resisters to whom his identity was unknown.

As a functionary Ministry of the Interior, Hans Globke was given the task of preparing a legal commentary on the Nuremberg law. He was not a Nazi; he was by tradition a devout Catholic who abhorred the brutality of godlessness of the Nazi regime. The specific choice which confronted him was whether to resign and leave the drafting to some fanatical Nazi, or to assume the responsibility and draw up the commentary in a manner which would leave the greatest number of loopholes for Jews, half-Jews, quarter-Jews, and one-eighth Jews. In a torment of conscience, Globke at one point came to Cardinal Konrad von Preysing, then bishop of Berlin, and suggested that he resign his post. The bishop urged him not to resign because he was in a position to render invaluable services to the anti-Nazi cause.

The loopholes existing in Globke's legal commentary were effectively utilized by thousands of German Jews, many of whom have written letters in his defense. Among other things, according to this testimony, Globke served as their chief go-between with the Ministry of the Interior. Dr. Walter Jellinek, a Jewish professor at Heidelberg University, has written to him: "You belong to the very few men of the Hitler era whom I remember with gratitude and with pleasure."

Under Secretary of Justice Walter Strauss, himself a "non-Aryan," has stated that he can prove Globke saved the lives not only of thousands, but of tens of thousands of German Jews. Dr. Jacob Kaiser, chairman of the Christian Democratic Party and a veteran of Hitler's concentration camps, has testified that Globke played a key role in the anti-Nazi resistance from the beginning of the war, that he helped draw up plans for the overthrow of the Nazi regime, and that he had been slated to take over the post of Minister of Education if the plot of

5208

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

March 15

July 20 had succeeded. Cardinal von Preysing has testified that over and above his fundamental opposition to nazism, Globke always "sought to obstruct or prevent unlawful actions and acts of injustice and violence on the part of the Nazis, to the fullest extent possible to him." And there are many more such testimonials from people of unimpeachable anti-Nazi records.

Perhaps the most important testimony comes from Dr. Hans Gisevius, Allen Dulles' close contact with the German resistance and author of the book "To The Bitter End." Dr. Gisevius has stated repeatedly that few people rendered more decisive services to the resistance than Globke. I met Gisevius during the course of my duties in Nuremberg and like everyone else who met him, I was enormously impressed. Perhaps better than any other man he knows the moral dilemma which confronted Globke because he himself served the resistance in the ranks of the Nazi secret police.

I have been greatly impressed by the fact that, as a result of the growing body of evidence in Globke's defense, key Jewish organizations concerned with the German situation no longer list his name among the ex-Nazis whose presence in government they consider suspect.

This has been a rather long digression. But since Dr. Globke has been wrongly accused not only by the Communists but by uninformed Western editorialists, I wanted to take advantage of this opportunity to set the record straight.

RESTITUTION AND REEDUCATION

There have been many articles in the Western press dealing with the continuing prevalence of anti-Semitic attitudes among the West German people, the inadequate treatment of the Nazi era in German history textbooks, the unwillingness of the older generation to confront or speak openly about the so-called recent past, the ignorance of German youth concerning the crimes of the Hitler era.

There is a good deal of validity in these criticisms.

But on checking back through a number of such articles I have discovered that, almost without exception, they have been based on public opinion polls or studies conducted by German organizations or on articles or statements by prominent German educators and political leaders. This demonstrates, in my opinion, that there are a substantial number of Germans who understand the weaknesses in their society, who are doing their utmost to expose them, and who are endeavoring to devise remedies. The severest critics of the weaknesses in West German society have, in fact, been the West German people themselves. This is as it should be in a democracy. What is more, it proves that the West German system, despite certain weaknesses, is essentially healthy.

According to a report shortly to be made public by the American Council on Germany, there is a growing trend in West Germany toward public castigation of what happened during the Nazi period. The trend is becoming more and more evident in the press, in the TV programs, in the movies, and, most important of all, in the schools.

"It has taken 15 years," says the report, "but this year marks the beginning of a really noticeable awareness of Nazi crimes and a determination to bring them out into the open, to examine the developments which led up to 1933 and to answer the demanding questions of this generation of youth about the period in their country's history which they did not know."

The report quotes instance after instance of new school programs designed to teach the terrible truth about the Nazi era to German students. It also describes the rapidly expanding program of adult education now being conducted by the Institute on Current

Events, the People's High Schools, and other bodies.

The horrors of the Hitler regime are also being brought home to the German people by the series of so-called concentration-camp trials involving former camp directors. These trials have been front-page news throughout the German press. In general, I am not a believer in gory details when it comes to newspaper reporting. But in this case I believe the German press has rendered a service by its detailed and graphic reporting.

Incidentally, the Bonn Government has been so assiduous in tracking down Nazi criminals and bringing them to trial that hundreds of Nazis have fled the country. Certainly no Nazis with criminal records have dared to return to their fatherland. In Egypt alone, there is a colony of some 600 Nazi refugees from anti-Nazi Germany—where many of them are working hand-in-glove with Communist agents in spreading anti-Semitic propaganda and exacerbating Arab-Israeli relations. Those who believe that West Germany is some kind of paradise for former Nazis, might do well to ruminate on the meaning of this inverted historical situation.

Among the older generation, who supported the Hitler regime either through their action or inaction, there has admittedly been a tendency to forget the past or at least not to talk about the evils of the past. Frankly, I do not find this surprising. It is only human to want to put painful memories out of one's mind. But even this older generation has given many evidences of understanding and of contrition. Indeed, it has been remarked that the hundreds of thousands of Germans who came to performances of "The Diary of Anne Frank," sat through the play in a stunned silence more eloquent than any spoken repentance.

But most indicative, in my opinion, of the vast progress Germany has made was the reaction of the German people to the incident at Cologne and the rash of anti-Semitic incidents which followed it. The rabbi of the Cologne synagogue received thousands of wires and letters from individual Germans, expressing their personal indignation and their shame. The Protestant churches, the Catholic bishops, the trade unions, the student and youth organizations joined in condemnation of the desecrations. Virtually every newspaper in the country thundered editorially against the delinquents and criminals who were fanning the evil embers of the past and defaming their country, and they demanded the most stringent measures against them. In Berlin, 15,000 students marched in an anti-Nazi protest demonstration. So great was the public pressure that even the Mutual Society of SS Veterans adopted a resolution threatening expulsion of anyone guilty of an anti-Semitic act. The Federal Government and the Land governments acted with the utmost vigor to track down the perpetrators and to punish them.

On January 20, Prof. Carlo Schmid, Vice president of the Bundestag, made a remarkable statement to the Bundestag in the name of all four parties. I quote one paragraph from this statement:

"It is a disgrace that this could happen in our country. This disgrace is not mitigated by the fact that in other countries, too, walls have been smeared with swastikas and abuse of the Jewish people. We Germans have no right to point our fingers at others. It is true that in other countries there has been ruffianism under the sign of the swastika; but in our country 6 million Jews were murdered in the name of this symbol. For this reason, what has happened in Germany during these weeks is a greater disgrace than it would be elsewhere. And for the same reason, our reaction against it must be stronger and must proceed from greater introspection."

When Professor Schmid concluded his statement, the entire Bundestag rose and applauded enthusiastically. No more significant statement of contrition has ever been spoken in a parliamentary body.

The attitude of the German Government on the question of restitution provides perhaps the most concrete evidence of its determination to extirpate the evil vestiges of the past and somehow to atone for the terrible crimes that were committed in the name of the German people.

When they are completed, Germany's payments of restitution and reparations to Jewish victims of nazism and to the State of Israel will total almost \$6 billion. Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress, has declared that Israel has received more money from Germany than from all the Jews in the world put together.

Germany's commitment to pay restitution was entirely voluntary. This in itself is remarkable. Indeed, I believe it is unique in history. But Germany's restitution program is remarkable in many other ways.

It is remarkable because the commitment was made not at a time of general prosperity, but in the year 1951, when the Government was still attempting to cope with the gigantic problems of reconstruction and with the equally gigantic problem of the 9 million refugees and expellees from the Soviet zone.

It is remarkable that for a generosity that refused to be limited by an already generous initial commitment. As Dr. Goldmann pointed out, Germany's restitution payments will amount to two or three times as much as the figure German and Jewish experts had originally agreed upon.

It is remarkable because this onerous voluntary burden was assumed by unanimous vote of the Bundestag, with the complete support of the German press, with the backing of a clear majority of the German people, and in defiance of a threatened Arab boycott of Germany.

This is Germany's postwar record.

THE ORIGINS OF THE EPIDEMIC

Who was responsible—what was responsible—for the swastika epidemic? The white paper issued by the Bonn Government has, I believe, presented a frank and careful analysis of the epidemic. The white paper found that, of the 234 culprits apprehended, 8 percent had clear records of either neo-Nazi or Communist association, while 24 percent acted out of subconscious Nazi or antidemocratic motives. The German police uncovered no evidence to prove that the outbreak was controlled or centrally directed. On the other hand, the white paper made it clear that the neo-Nazi movement could not escape moral responsibility for the individual actions of its members.

It had been suggested by sources both inside Germany and abroad that the entire outbreak was the work of the Communists, bent on discrediting the Adenauer government. The white paper found that once the epidemic got underway, the Communists got in on the act. Of those apprehended, at least seven had proven records of Communist affiliation. Members of Communist youth organizations were found smearing swastikas and pasting up anti-Semitic placards, and agents of the East German police were found operating in Berlin and in some of the neo-Nazi organizations. But it found no proof of Communist masterminding. On the basis of the evidence available, the West German authorities concluded that the epidemic was essentially the work of nonpolitical elements—of hoodlums and juvenile delinquents.

"I believe the German white paper did the right thing in bending over backward to avoid any accusation that could not be conclusively substantiated. I cannot escape the

1960

feeling however, that the evidence of Communist involvement unearthed by the West German authorities tells only a small part of the story. And I am surprised that there should have been people who felt that somehow the charge of Communist instigation constituted a heinous libel against the Kremlin.

The specific charge that the Communists instigated the swastika epidemic may not be provable. But, from a strictly legal standpoint, is it libel to suggest that a many-times convicted rapist may be guilty of still another act of rape, or that a notorious forger and perjurer may have pulled off another act of deception? Where a crime of a specific type has been committed, is it not common procedure in every country to suspect those criminals whose records show a long list of crimes that are similar in purpose and method?

Whether or not the charge was intrinsically libelous depends on whether or not the Kremlin has a record of collaboration with Nazis or Nazi elements or a record of anti-Semitic instigation which might be relevant to the charge. Such a record does exist—and what a long and terrible record it is.

History records that when the League of Nations imposed economic sanctions against Fascist Italy in an effort to hamper or, if possible, prevent its rape of Ethiopia, the Soviet Government stepped into the gap and provided Mussolini with vast quantities of oil and other commodities essential to the conduct of his war.

History also records that when the Nazi Party in 1931 called for a plebiscite to oust the democratic government of Prussia, the Communist Party voted with the Nazis—even though the ousting of the government would have brought the Nazis to power.

History also records that in 1939 the Soviet state concluded a treaty with Hitler which made it possible for Hitler to unleash his war against the West; that this treaty contained secret annexes providing for the division of Europe between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia; that at the signing of this treaty, Stalin toasted Hitler with the words—"I know how much the German nation loves its Führer"; that Molotov gloated over the dismemberment of Poland with the shameful words—"One blow from the German Army and one blow from the mighty Red army, and this ugly duckling of Versailles ceased to exist."

History also records that until the Soviet Union itself was invaded, the Communist Parties throughout the world did their utmost to support the war efforts of Nazi Germany and to obstruct and sabotage the war efforts of the Allied democracies; that Walter Ulbricht, the present head of the East German Communist Party, said to his followers on November 23, 1939: "Not only the Communists, but also many social democratic and national socialist workers regard it as their task not in any circumstances to permit a breach of the pact. (By this he meant the Hitler-Stalin pact.) Those who intrigue against the friendship of the German and Soviet people are enemies of the German people and are branded as accomplices of British imperialists."

History also records that the Kremlin turned over to Hitler's Gestapo certain German Communists who were on the Nazi wanted lists. Among those thus turned over was Margarete Buber-Neumann, widow of the German Communist leader, Heinz Neumann, who had been executed by Stalin in 1937. Not even the limited, perverted sense of honor that is customary among thieves was evident in this practice.

History records that the Soviet regime has practiced anti-Semitism in its own territory, has engaged in a genocidal campaign against Jewish culture, has exported anti-Semitism to its satellite countries, and is currently employing the anti-Semitic motif in its

broadcasts to the Arab countries. The Kremlin has conducted, and is conducting today, an anti-Semitic propaganda strongly reminiscent of Goebbels and Streicher and that infamous forgery "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion." The general theme of this propaganda is that Jewish bankers and Zionists have combined with the American capitalists and imperialists to plot an attack against the Soviet Union and that Jewish religious and humanitarian organizations are all agents of American intelligence.

How can one possibly "libel" a government with such a record. That the Kremlin is morally capable of having instigated the swastika epidemic is, therefore, indisputable; and while moral reputation does not constitute proof, it does constitute justification for suspicion.

If we accept the finding of the white paper that the outbreak was essentially a psychological epidemic, I feel that the Kremlin still deserves a much larger share of the blame than the white paper has attributed to it. An epidemic is caused by a virus. The swastika epidemic may have been caused in part by the latent virus of anti-Semitism which exists in small pockets in Germany. But since the end of the war the chief breeding place of the virus of anti-Semitism has not been Germany nor has the chief instigator been the neo-Nazi movement. The chief breeding place has been, and remains today, the Soviet Union. The chief instigator is the international Communist movement.

No one can tell me that the Soviet state can encourage internal anti-Semitism on a massive scale, and can direct its exportation to the satellite countries and to the Arab world, without somehow spreading the infection to the peripheral areas. In this sense, even accepting the psychological epidemic theory without reservation, the Kremlin bears an inescapable moral responsibility.

THE RECORD OF SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

There should be no secret about Soviet anti-Semitism. The terrible ordeal of the Jewish people under the Kremlin's rule has been painstakingly set forth and documented in a whole series of studies by scholarly authorities. In addition to several full-length books on the subject, there have been studies by the American Jewish Committee, the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, the Jewish Labor Committee, the authoritative Jewish magazine Commentary, the internationally respected weekly, the New Leader, the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the 83d Congress, and by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. Scattered over a period of 2 decades, moreover, there were some dozens of carefully researched articles in newspapers like the New York Times and New York Herald-Tribune and in magazines like Life.

But for some strange reason, the terrifying story of persecution of the Jews under communism has not penetrated the public consciousness of the free world.

Perhaps the scholarly studies were too esoteric, too limited in distribution.

Perhaps the newspaper and magazine articles were too scattered and infrequent to be effective.

Perhaps the Jewish communities in the Western countries did not speak up as loudly as they should have for fear of further endangering their coreligionists behind the Iron Curtain.

Perhaps our minds are conditioned far more than we ourselves are prepared to admit by the most powerful and most subtle propaganda apparatus the world has ever known.

Whatever the reason may be, I am convinced from many conversations that, in the public mind, anti-Semitism is far more closely identified with Germany than it is with the Soviet Union. I do not blame the

public for this. I try to be a reasonably assiduous reader. I was aware before I began preparing this analysis that anti-Semitism existed on a very substantial scale throughout the Soviet sphere. But as I checked through the available documentation, I found myself constantly appalled.

I was appalled by the totality of Soviet anti-Semitism, by its utter ruthlessness, by its doctrinal and practical similarity to Nazi anti-Semitism. I was even more appalled to discover how little I knew, how little my friends knew, about this terrible crime against humanity which has been going on for more than two decades now.

Let me set forth here the full record of this crime.

For many years after the Bolshevik revolution, it was commonly believed, by conservatives as well as liberals, that, despite all its evil features, Communism did not practice discrimination on racial or religious grounds. It was equalitarian in the sense that all men, regardless of race or religion, were equally persecuted. Personally, I question this conception of equalitarianism—but there were, and still are, many people who seem to see some peculiar virtue in equality of persecution.

The myth that all men are equal under communism remains to this day one of the Kremlin's chief propaganda weapons in its appeal to the Negro, Jewish and other minorities in this country, to racial minorities in other countries, and to the colonial peoples.

The fact is that the Soviet Union is a gigantic prison-house of nations where minorities have been persecuted and exploited, and where genocide has been a common instrument of state police. It is an imperialist empire which, for its cold-blooded ruthlessness, has no equal in history.

The fate of the Jews under communism is most illustrative.

The treatment of minorities, historically, may be considered a gage of social and moral progress; and in modern times, it has become a guage of social sanity. Wherever minorities have been oppressed in Europe, the Jews have generally been among the first to suffer and they have often suffered the most acutely. This is so because they are dispersed and more helpless, and because differences of custom and religion and the survival of ancient prejudices make them convenient scapegoats for despotic regimes.

On the specific question of anti-Semitism, the Communist leaders, in the early days, made some very strong statements: "Anti-Semitism," said Stalin, in an interview with the Jewish Telegraphic Agency of America in January 1931, "is an extreme form of racial chauvinism, is the most dangerous survival of cannibalism—anti-Semitism, as a phenomenon hostile to the Soviet system, is severely punished by law. Active anti-Semites are punished by capital punishment under the laws of the U.S.S.R."

Thus spoke Stalin in 1931. But, in reality, anti-Semitism is as inherent in Marxist totalitarianism as it was in Nazi totalitarianism. Karl Marx himself was, in many of his statements, as virulently anti-Semitic as Goebbels. Over the decades, the Communists have done their utmost to conceal this fact. Marx's translators into English and the European languages carefully eliminated his anti-Semitic diatribes from editions of his books and writings. But the proof exists.

I have in the hand the first English translation of the unexpurgated papers of Karl Marx on the so-called Jewish question. It was printed only last year. In it, you will find that Marx referred to the distinguished German Social Democratic leader, Ferdinand Lassalle, whom he considered too moderate, as, I quote, "Judel Itzig—Jewish nigger." In another letter, Marx made the statement: "Ramsgate is full of Jews and fleas." In still another statement he said—

and I quote again—"emancipation from usury and money, that is, from practical real Judaism, would constitute the emancipation of our time."

This was not Hitler speaking. It was the recognized ideological father of Soviet communism. This was Karl Marx.

The persecution of the Jews in the Soviet Union can only be understood within the context of the Marxist ideology and of the Kremlin's broad general policy toward all minorities.

In the period immediately after the revolution, when they were still endeavoring to consolidate their regime, the Bolsheviks attempted to purchase the support of the national minorities by preaching the freedom and equality of peoples. The appointment to native Communist to party and Government posts was encouraged. The use of the various minority languages, which had been restricted under the czar, was also encouraged.

By the early thirties, Stalin had achieved absolute power. At this point, the toleration and encouragement of national culture gave way to a massive campaign against the languages and cultures of all the national minorities.

The development of a totalitarian state requires total conformity, it requires the reduction of all peoples to a single norm. The Russian language was selected as the instrument for the new cultural straitjacket because it happened to be the language of the largest national group and was the most widely spoken.

In the Ukraine, for example, Russian was again made the main language of instruction in almost 80 percent of the universities. Ukrainian specialists and scientists were assigned to other areas of the Soviet Union while increasing numbers of Russian specialists and scientists were imported into the Ukraine.

The apparatus of Government was ruthlessly purged of all those who were suspected of the sin of bourgeois nationalism. Ukrainian intellectuals, party leaders and administrators were the chief targets of this terror. The terror reached its zenith during 1937-38 when, it is estimated, some 200,000 persons were executed in the course of one year. I have documentary evidence concerning the massacre in the city of Vinitsa alone of 10,000 persons; and there is evidence that similar massacres occurred at many other points in the Ukraine.

The man in charge of the Ukraine during this period, I might point out, incidentally, was a certain N. S. Khrushchev, who last summer was invited to visit our country as an honored guest.

What happened to the Ukrainian people happened, with variations in pattern and degree, to all the other national minorities in the Soviet Union.

The imposition of Russian Communist control was even more marked in the case of the minor Moslem nationalities of central Asia. In all of these central Asian republics, Russians held the key posts in the ministries of security and of the interior and, in general, throughout the apparatus of party and government. In the so-called autonomous Kazakh Republic, for example, native Kazakhs, according to a report published in 1948, held only 2 percent of the administrative posts in the ministry of local industry and public health; 4 percent in light industry; 6.7 percent in textiles; and so on down the line.

The Negro in America unquestionably suffers from serious restrictions on rights and opportunities. He is now on his way up. But in the darkest days after emancipation, he enjoyed far greater rights than do some of the Asian minorities in the Soviet Union today.

In certain respects the persecution of the Jews and of Jewish culture in the Soviet

Union has been even more severe than that endured by other minorities. Physically their persecution is on a par with that of the Ukrainians. In terms of denial of opportunity, their treatment is even worse than that of the Kazakhs. Culturally, their persecution is total. Instead of being permitted a restricted representation in the apparatus of party and government, the Jews today are virtually excluded from all administrative positions of any importance. While all religion is persecuted and regulated, the Jewish religion is persecuted with particular ruthlessness.

Why is this so? I can think of several reasons. First of all, there is the fact that the Jews have both their own religion and their own national culture; this makes them eligible for persecution on both scores.

Secondly, the rulers of the Kremlin have apparently suspected them of mass disloyalty to the Soviet state. This is not surprising, for no Jew could be expected to enthuse over things like the Hitler-Stalin pact or Moscow's incitation of the Arabs against the State of Israel.

Perhaps even more important, the great majority of the Russian Jews have relatives in America. This makes them suspect, in Khrushchev's eyes of harboring pro-American sympathies.

Finally, Communist anti-Semitism, like czarist anti-Semitism, exploits the Jew as a scapegoat—a convenient outlet for popular resentment which might otherwise be directed against the regime.

A major shift in Soviet policy toward the Jews first became apparent in 1937-38. Zinoviev, Radek, and a few of the other old Bolsheviks who were liquidated in the great purges of the thirties had been born Jews. Of course, they could no more be considered Jews than Stalin and Khrushchev could be considered Christians. But there is reason to believe that in Stalin's paranoid mind, party opposition to his one-man rule somehow became identified with the accident of Jewish birth.

Perhaps more important, there seemed to be a growing possibility of a deal with Hitler. If this deal were consummated, every Jew in the Soviet Union would have to be considered an enemy of the regime.

Surreptitiously, the Soviet Government began to encourage anti-Semitic propaganda. Secret directives went out to the civil service to restrict recruitment of Jews and to demote or remove many of those who held office. Jewish schools and newspapers and community organizations were forcibly closed down. Thousands of the Jewish communal leaders were physically liquidated.

The Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union did not persuade the Kremlin to abandon its persecution of the Jews. Jews in the Red army fought heroically against the Nazi invader and, in many cases, rose to fairly high rank. But Stalin by this time apparently shared Hitler's psychopathic hatred of the Jews. The result was a policy of passive cooperation with the Nazi enemy in permitting their extermination.

When Hitler invaded Russia there were more than 5 million Jews in the Soviet Union proper and in the territories it had annexed under the Hitler-Stalin pact. More than 3 million of these vanished during World War II. Scores of thousands of those who vanished were victims of mass deportations to Siberia. The great majority, however, were captured by the Nazis and perished in their infamous extermination camps.

But the question arises: How is it that more Jews were not able to flee before the Nazi army? How is it that the Nazi were able to capture virtually intact the large Jewish communities in so many cities in Soviet territory?

Jewish organizations in this country are convinced that the Soviet Government did

nothing to facilitate the evacuation of the Jews from areas that were threatened by the Nazi army—even though they knew the fate that awaited the Jews under Nazi occupation. According to eyewitnesses before the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression in 1954, those Jews in the occupied territories who succeeded in escaping did so by fleeing individually or in small groups through the swamps and forests. They testified that Jews attempting to flee from threatened areas en masse or in large groups were turned back by Soviet guard units.

The attitude of the Soviet press during the war also deserves some comment. The Kremlin editorialists could find no words strong enough to denounce Nazi inhumanity. But they spoke always of "crimes against Soviet citizens." The systematic extermination of the Jews by the Nazi was, apparently, a crime that did not call for special mention or display of moral indignation.

For several years after World War II, Soviet policy toward the Jews continued to manifest two faces. In its propaganda to the free world, the Kremlin continued to pose as an opponent of anti-Semitism and all forms of racial discrimination. At home, the persecution was intensified. In increasing numbers, the Jews were forced out of administrative positions. Public hostility toward them was encouraged by a hundred subtle devices.

During the period of Soviet occupation, at least 40,000 Jews were deported to Siberia from Hungary alone and many thousands more were deported from Rumania.

Other terrors awaited the Jews of the satellite countries. In the immediate post-war period, the Communists did not yet have complete control of these countries. They were either in the process of consolidating control or preparing to seize power. What more convenient smokescreen could there be for them, what more effective diversion, than a campaign against the Jews, with a few old-fashioned pogroms thrown in?

In Poland during the course of 1946 there was a whole series of murderous attacks on Jews which cost several hundred Jewish lives. In the pogrom at Kielce alone, 41 Jews were killed by a mob, while the Communist militia stood idly by—or else arrested the Jews.

In Czechoslovakia there was also a series of bloody anti-Semitic incidents. The Communists tried to blame these incidents on the Fascists—but there is considerable evidence that they themselves instigated them. The Czechoslovakian Minister of Propaganda during this period, Vaclav Kopecky, referred to the Jews in his statements as "those bearded Solomons" or "this Jewish scum." In this propaganda he was abetted by the present Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, Antonin Zapotocky.

In Hungary, local Communist leaders organized bloody attacks on the Jewish people in the cities of Miskolcz and Kunmadaras. According to the testimony of Dr. Zoltan Klar, a Hungarian Jewish leader, and of Mr. Irving Engel of the American Jewish Committee, the Communist police did nothing to prevent the riots and in many cases they protected the instigators. Those responsible for the riots, moreover, were never punished.

But in 1948 Stalin apparently became impatient with the limited, gradual anti-Semitism of the previous decade. The cold war had sharpened. Tito had defected from Soviet control. The Jews of the Soviet Union and the satellite countries had shown unconcealed enthusiasm over the establishment of the State of Israel. In the warped mind of Stalin this situation called for an all-out offensive against everything that might be considered a "foreign" or "Western" influence. Anything which suggested adherence to a non-Russian group was automatically guilty of "bourgeois nationalism;" and friendship for anything outside the Soviet

1960

Union was stigmatized as "cosmopolitanism."

In the fall of 1948, with one sweeping administrative decree, Stalin and his cultural commissar, Andrei Zhdanov, completely eliminated what remained of Jewish cultural and communal life in the Soviet Union. Nominally, the campaign was directed against the Zionists. Of course, everyone who considered himself a Zionist had long previously perished in Stalin's concentration camps. In reality, the new Soviet anti-Semitism was directed not against Zionism, but against the Jewish religion and all those of Jewish origin, even if they were Communists.

In this respect, I see nothing to distinguish the anti-Semitism of Stalin from the anti-Semitism of Hitler.

At one stroke, all Jewish schools were closed. Jewish newspapers were shut down. The Yiddish publishing house, Eines, was also closed. The Jewish anti-Fascist committee in Moscow was dissolved and its leaders arrested. More than 450 Jewish writers, artists and intellectuals—the cream of the Jewish intelligentsia in the Soviet Union—were executed.

Despite restraints and persecution, Russia under the czar had been the world center of Yiddish culture. In the early period of cultural tolerance, the Soviet Union had the largest number of Yiddish schools in the world, the greatest number of Jewish pedagogical institutions, the only Jewish institution of higher learning in Yiddish, and Yiddish departments in many universities. There were 4 Yiddish state publishing houses and 14 state theaters. And there were 35 periodicals and newspapers, 4 of them dailies.

Some of these institutions and publications had ceased to exist during the anti-Semitic purges of 1936-38. Others had ceased to exist during the war. But with the Zhdanov decree, everything ceased. Where there had once been a flourishing Jewish culture, there was now a desert.

One year after the Zhdanov decree, in September 1949, there took place the first of a whole series of spectacular Communist show trials involving Jewish defendants. The scene of this first trial was Budapest. The chief defendant was the former Minister of the Interior, Laszlo Rajk.

Rajk himself was not a Jew. In fact he was generally considered anti-Semitic. He had used his post to instigate the pogroms in Miskolcz and Kunmadaras, or else to protect those Communists who had instigated them. Three of Rajk's codefendants, in this trial, however, were Jewish—and they were forced to sign confessions that they had served as "Zionist spies." These so-called Zionist spies had, according to the charges, conspired with America, England and Tito's Yugoslavia to overthrow the Communist Government.

To the accompaniment of an ominous propaganda about the "world Zionist conspiracy," Rajk and his chief codefendants were sentenced to death.

A few years later, it was the turn of Czechoslovakia. In November 1952 there took place the great Prague trial of Rudolf Slansky, former Secretary-General of the Party, and his alleged confederates. In this trial, 11 of the 14 defendants, including Slansky, were Jews. To make sure that this fact was not missed by the public, the official indictment bore the words—"I quote—of Jewish origin" after the name of each Jewish defendant.

As Communists, it goes without saying, all of these defendants had long previously renounced their Jewish religion and they were violently opposed to Zionism. This apparently was not considered any serious obstacle by the professional brainwashers who prepared Slansky and his colleagues for their appearances in court.

The trial, from the first, was an obscene anti-Semitic orgy. The defendants confessed that they had been participants in a worldwide Jewish conspiracy operating in the service of American and British imperialism. For variety, their conspiracy was sometimes referred to as a "capitalist-imperialist-Trotskyist-Tifolst plot." Involved in this plot, if one were to believe the confessions, were former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Henry J. Morgenthau, Mr. Bernard Baruch, Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, and the Yugoslav Communist leader Moshe Pijade.

All of the evils of the Communist regime and all of the suffering of the Czechoslovak peoples were charged to the account of Slansky and his codefendants and their American and British imperialist masters. They confessed to planning the disorganization of the Czechoslovak economy, to contriving artificial scarcities of food and fuel and the inflation of the national currency. The commentaries of the Czechoslovak press, in referring to the Jewish defendants, employed such adjectives as "huckstering," "profiteering," "bloodsucking," "Judases," "scum with a dark past."

On November 25, 11 defendants, 8 of them Jews, were sentenced to death by hanging. The sentences were carried out a few days later.

There is a footnote to the stories of the Rajk trial in Hungary and the Slansky trial in Czechoslovakia. In the fall of 1956, after Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin's crimes, it was announced that the Rajk trial had been a frameup from beginning to end and that the confessions had been extorted. The rehabilitation of some of Slansky's codefendants implied a similar admission.

What a commentary on the practice of justice under communism.

Needless to say, the Slansky trial was accompanied by a wholesale dismissal of Jews from all public office. The trial also served as a signal for a further intensification of the campaign of official anti-Semitism throughout the Soviet empire. This campaign reached perhaps its lowest point in the infamous "Moscow doctors' plot."

On January 13, 1953, the Soviet Ministry of Internal Security announced that nine prominent doctors, six of whom were Jews, had been arrested on the charge of murdering two Politburo members, Andrei Zhdanov and Alexander Shcherbakov, by medical mistreatment. They were also accused of having attempted the murder of a number of top-ranking officers of the Soviet armed forces. The arrested doctors, said the Kremlin, had all confessed that they had carried out their crimes on orders of the world Zionist conspiracy and that these orders had been transmitted from Israel by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.

According to the American Jewish Yearbook for 1954, the so-called doctors' plot resulted in a universal orgy of denunciations, demotions and arrest of Jewish citizens throughout the Soviet empire. All this, it said, was accompanied by a barrage of propaganda designed to prove that all Jews were apt to be traitors, spies, imperialist agents, embezzlers, and outright murderers.

On March 5, 1953, Stalin died. The public campaign against the arrested Jewish doctors and against the Jews ceased. On April 4 the Ministry of the Interior made the startling announcement that the doctors' plot had been a frameup: the evidence had been falsified and the confessions extorted. This seemed to be a step in the right direction. It caused many people to hope that, with Stalin's death, anti-Semitism in the Soviet sphere had also perished.

Everything that has happened since 1953, however, proves conclusively that Moscow has never abandoned its anti-Jewish campaign.

In Moscow the 13 doctors were released—but this was the only concession granted.

The thousands of Jews in prison remained in prison. Zionism remained illegal. Jewish culture and communal life and Jewish emigration remained under total ban, the Jewish religion under a near-total ban. And the basic charges made in the Slansky trial and in the Moscow doctors' plot were repeated and repeated until they achieved the status of articles of faith for all Communists.

Two weeks after the Moscow doctors were released, on April 16, 1953, the head of the Czechoslovak delegation to the U.N., Foreign Minister Vaclav David, upheld all the charges that had been made in the Slansky trial and reiterated the accusation that the Zionists and other Jewish organizations were hot beds of American sabotage and espionage. Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Vishinsky backed his Czechoslovak protégé to the hilt on this occasion.

In Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania, the rash of anti-Jewish show trials continued for more than a year after the release of the Moscow doctors. In Czechoslovakia alone there were four such trials between May of 1953 and April of 1954. The last of these trials, which took place in Bratislava, had a new twist. None of the defendants were Jewish, but they were charged with the crime of having protected Jews or having failed to punish them.

These show trials, involving amalgams of Jewish and non-Jewish Communists, received considerable international publicity. The persecution of the Jewish community leaders and Zionist leaders, unfortunately, received far less publicity. Literally thousands of these leaders had been imprisoned in the satellite countries—in particular in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania—during 1948 and 1949. During the course of 1953-54, some hundreds of these were brought to trial, charged with Zionist activities and aid to Jewish emigrants.

These trials were secret, but some of the details inevitably leaked out. Writing in the magazine "Commentary," Peter Meyer reported that in the Spring of 1954 the secret trials in Rumania reached such numbers as to constitute a mass terror. Not less than 100 Jewish leaders were tried and sentenced in one month, he said. One of the trials involved 22 members of a Socialist Zionist youth group. Its leader defied the Communist court with these words: "You have tortured and killed many of our members in your dungeons. This crime will never be forgotten." He and his comrades were all sentenced to 20 years in prison.

The 5-year period that followed the Zhdanov decree of 1948 is remembered by the Jews of the Soviet Union as "the black years." The facts about this period were documented as early as 1951 by the Jewish scholar, Dr. Solomon Schwarz in his book, "The Jews in the Soviet Union." But despite such documentations and despite the blatant anti-Semitism of all the show trials that took place during this period, the Kremlin was able to pretend to its followers in the free world, as late as 1956, that there was no anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

Even high-ranking Jewish Communists, who should have had access to the facts, assured their followers—and assured themselves—that the charges of anti-Semitism made by Jewish organizations were slanderous fabrications.

In February 1956 there took place the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, at which Khrushchev made his famous denunciation of the crimes of the Stalin era. A slackening of control inevitably followed this speech. In his speech to the party congress, Khrushchev said nothing about the persecution of the Jews. But shortly after the congress, on April 4, 1956, the Polish Jewish paper *Folkshtimme* confirmed the fact that the hundreds of Jewish

writers who had disappeared in the wake of the Zhdanov decree, had been executed.

To the scattered Jewish following which the Communist Party still maintained in the free world, the article in *Folkshtimme* struck a shattering blow. Some of the most eloquent condemnations of Soviet and anti-Semitism have been written by former Jewish Communists and by official Communist Party delegations who went to the Soviet Union to check on the facts. Their eyes were opened by what they saw.

I want to quote a few paragraphs from one of the many revealing articles that appeared in the world Communist press during the period of disarray that followed these revelations. These paragraphs are extracted from the report of a delegation of the British Communist Party to the Soviet Union and they were printed in the London Communist weekly *World News* in October 1958:

"For some years prior to the death of Stalin, rumors began to spread that all was not well in the Jewish field, and that well-known Jewish writers and intellectuals had disappeared. Then came the revelations of the 20th Congress, and, later, specific charges in the *Folkshtimme*.

"Naturally these charges created consternation and bewilderment in the ranks of Jewish Communists in all countries, so that it became a matter of urgency and of importance to expose their truth or falsehood.

"The first piece of concrete information came from a visit to the Lenin State Library. Here there exists a Yiddish and a Hebrew section. It turned out that there is nothing in Yiddish later than 1948, when publication of Yiddish papers and journals must therefore have ceased.

"The Soviet Encyclopedia, which in its 1932 edition devoted about 160 columns to the Jews, reduces this in the 1952 edition to four columns. The biographies of many eminent Jews had been removed. Marx was no longer referred to as a Jew.

"The first task, therefore, was to meet a few Jewish writers and to examine their reactions to this. Official requests to this end were made, but we were informed that this was not possible as they were all on holiday, while Halkin (a Jewish writer who survived), who was at home, was too ill to receive anyone.

"Then came the discovery from private conversations by Comrade Levy with Jews that the years 1948-52 were known among them as 'The Black Years,' the period during which many Jews were dismissed from their posts, Jewish poets and writers were arrested and charged with treason and executed, Yiddish disappeared from the street and market place, the population closed up together, becoming tense and nervy, and young Jews who might otherwise have merged with the general population and have forgotten that they were Jews, awoke to a new sense of unity in distress.

"But let it be said that this fear did not emanate from any general feeling of antagonism from among the Russian population, but from official or quasi-official sources; from the security police, in fact."

This report, I want to emphasize, was written not by critics of the Soviet regime, but by members of the British Communist Party.

The furor which such articles caused in the world Communist movement resulted in a few very minor concessions. In the course of 1957, for the first time since the revolution, the Jews were permitted to establish a small theological seminary in Moscow. Permission was also granted for the publication of a small number of prayer books in Hebrew, for the staging of some Yiddish music recitals, for the printing of a few works of Yiddish writers in Russian translation,

But this is as far as the concessions went. Despite repeated promises to Communist delegations which visited the Soviet Union after 1955, the reestablishment of a Yiddish theater and Yiddish press and Yiddish publishing house was never permitted. Instead, there was an accelerated discrimination against Jews in public life, in the national economy and in the educational field.

The Jewish population of the Soviet Union represents approximately 1.4 percent of the country's total population. In 1958, only 3 of the 1,336 members of the Supreme Soviet—one-fourth of 1 percent of the total, could be identified as Jews. On a per capita basis, this would signify that the Jews had only one-sixth the political representation to which they were entitled.

So far as is known, no Jew is to be found in the foreign service, among the higher ranks of the armed forces, or in the various military academies. Jews are also excluded from leading posts in the Communist Party, from the central party newspapers and the foreign section of the Soviet press. Jews are progressively being excluded from admission to the universities.

The facts which I have just listed here were part of a statement issued by the American Jewish Committee in conjunction with their meeting with First Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan in January 1959. Since that time, there seems to have been a further deterioration in the position of the Soviet Jews.

What is the situation today in the Soviet Union? Let me list only a few items from the current catalogs on Soviet anti-Semitism that have been compiled by the *New York Times*, the *New York Herald Tribune*, the *New Leader*, and other publications.

A few months ago the synagogue in the town of Malachovka near Moscow was set afire.

The synagogues of Chernovtsy, Bobruisk, Korosten, Baranovich, Rakhov, Novoselitsa, Orenburg, Chernigov, Staline, Babushkin, and other cities have been closed down by the security authorities.

In the city of Kharkov, where there are 70,000 Jews, there is not a single synagogue to serve their religious needs.

The synagogue at Voronezh has been taken over by the authorities for use as a grain warehouse. The Jewish community has been unable to raise the money required to redeem it.

In Yevpatoriya, in the Crimea, the authorities confiscated 25,000 rubles raised by the Jewish community to rent a building for a synagogue.

Deprived of synagogues, the Jews have attempted to pursue their worship in private prayer meetings. Such prayer meetings have been reported forcibly dispersed in the cities of Kharkov, Olevsk, Tula, Bobruisk, Vitebsk, and other places. In Vitebsk the Jews were threatened with 10 years in prison if they resumed their meetings.

In Bendery, Baranovich, Minsk, Kishinev, Voronezh, and Kiev, Jewish cemeteries have been desecrated and memorials defaced.

In Kiev, Kharkov, Kulbyshev, Rostov, Kishinev, Odessa, and Lvov, a ban was imposed on the baking of matzoh, the unleavened bread which plays a central role in the Passover observance. To my mind, there could be no more pitiless or more pointless deprivation than this.

For the Jewish population of almost 3 million, there are only 60 rabbis in the whole of the Soviet Union. Their average age is well over 70. In the case of the Orthodox religion in Russia, there is 1 priest for every 5,000 faithful. This is bad enough. But in the case of the Jewish religion there is only 1 rabbi for every 50,000 Jews. With virtually no replacements in sight, the situation is bound to become worse over the coming years.

The Orthodox church and the Moslem religion have been permitted to maintain a number of seminaries. The only Jewish seminary permitted is limited to an attendance of 20 students. Patricia Blake, in her article in *Life* magazine last December, has described how these 20 students pursue their studies in the corners of the Moscow synagogue, because no space has been made available for their seminary.

The teaching of Hebrew remains under the ban imposed at the time of the revolution. In the 40 years of Soviet rule, no more than several thousand Hebrew prayerbooks have been printed; only several hundred distributed.

Openly anti-Semitic books and publications are appearing with increasing frequency. The villains in this literature all adhere to a single stereotype. They all have unmistakably Jewish names; they are all moneygrubbers, without human feeling, dishonest in their relations with the state and their fellow men.

Whether a Jew is religious or nonreligious, whether he is pro-Communist or anti-Communist, he has no way of escaping the fate which the Soviet regime has ordained for his people. The word "Jew" is stamped on his internal passport—the document which is the key to a man's existence in every Communist country. This inscription is not intended as a religious identification because the members of no other religious groups are thus identified. The Soviet internal passport does state the nationality of the bearer—but the Kremlin apparently does not recognize the Jews as a nationality because it refuses to grant them the most elementary communal rights enjoyed by the smallest and most primitive national groupings in the U.S.S.R. The marked passports of the Soviet Jews serve only one purpose—the same purpose served in its time by the yellow badge which the Nazis compelled the Jews to wear for purpose of self-identification. To every factory manager, to every university president, to every party bureaucrat, to every minor official, it constitutes a directive to treat the bearer as a member of a hostile and inferior breed; it constitutes a command to hate and to persecute.

As I was winding up the work on this analysis, I received a communication from a group of professors of the Social Sciences Division of Fairleigh Dickenson University, who had toured the Soviet Union last summer. Appalled by the many evidences of Soviet anti-Semitism, they wrote letters last November and December to 10 leading Soviet educators and editors, including Aleksel Adzhubel, editor of *Izvestia* and son-in-law of Nikita Khrushchev. Their letters pointed out that the Jews do not appear to enjoy the rights guaranteed by Soviet laws and professed by the Communist philosophy, and they asked for a detailed explanation of this anomalous situation. To date only one Soviet editor has deigned to reply. The reply said that their letter had been forwarded to somebody else.

In their letter to me, the group of American professors wrote: "Our observations have led us to the unhappy conclusions that anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R. is not an atavistic remnant of czarist Russia, but is the official policy of the Government of the U.S.S.R."

In Rumania, in Hungary, and especially in Poland under Prime Minister Gomulka, there appears to have been limited improvement in the treatment of Jews. In these countries, while they still suffer from discrimination and economic disabilities, Jewish cultural and religious life now enjoy somewhat increased freedom. This limited improvement in the satellite countries is, of course, subject to instant recall if it ever serves Communist purposes.

Why is there this difference between Soviet policy toward the Jews and the policy

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1960
presently pursued in some of the satellites? I can think of two reasons.

The first reason is that the Soviet Government is more directly interested than are the satellites in influencing Arab opinion in the Middle East and in preventing any settlement between the Arab States and Israel. Soviet anti-Semitism and Soviet strategic objectives in the Middle East complement each other. Arab nationalism must be wooed and fanned by constantly identifying Israel and Zionism with British and American imperialism.

Let me give you one example of the Kremlin's propaganda to the Arab world. I quote from the publication, "The State of Israel—Its Position and Policies," printed by the Soviet state publishing house in 1958:

"The Zionist movement represents a form of the nationalistic ideology of the rich Jewish bourgeoisie, intimately tied to imperialism and to colonial oppression of the people of Asia. Zionism has tied itself to American and other Western capitalism and, with Jewish terrorist tactics, attacked its Arab neighbors. The national liberation movement of the people of the Middle East, spearheaded by its native leaders (such as President Nasser, King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia, and King Iman Ahmad of Yemen) is constantly threatened by naked Jewish aggression. The clear duty of all Marxists and Communists in this situation is to help the Asian and African people crush the reactionary Jewish forces."

The second explanation I can think of for the intensified anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union today is the personally irrational attitude of Prime Minister Khrushchev. The Anti-Defamation League has stated that the primitive, vulgar anti-Semitic tone characteristic of Khrushchev's occasional interviews and outbursts on the subject of the Jews is unmistakable. This evaluation coincides with that of the most prominent Jewish member of the Canadian Communist Party, Mr. J. B. Salsberg, after a 2-hour interview with the Soviet Premier in August 1956.

According to Mr. Salsberg, Khrushchev first of all denied that there was anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and then went on to list a whole series of personal objections to Jews. He quoted the Soviet Prime Minister as saying that:

"Wherever a Jew settles, the first thing he does is build a synagogue.

"Of the thousands of Soviet citizens who have toured abroad, only three failed to return. All of them were Jews.

"* * * [He, Khrushchev] agreed with Stalin that the Crimea, which had been depopulated at the war's end, should not be turned into a Jewish colonization center, because, in case of war, it would be turned into a base for attacking the U.S.S.R."

"I was much disturbed by the above remarks," concluded Mr. Salsberg. "They reflect a backward prejudice against the Jewish group as a people. * * * Khrushchev's statements smack of White Russian chauvinism * * * his approach to the problem of Jewish nationality is an unforgivable violation of social democracy. If Khrushchev's distrust of the Jewish people is warranted, then this is a terrible indictment, not of Soviet Jewry, but of Stalinist crimes and of distortions in the nationalities policy, in particular as it is applied to the Jewish people."

This is the Khrushchev who today accuses Konrad Adenauer of being another Hitler.

ANTI-SEMITISM, PATRIOTISM, AND CHRISTIANITY

Having set forth the facts about Soviet anti-Semitism, I now want to deal with anti-Semitism in this country. I have purposely observed this sequence because anti-Semitism in this country can, I believe, only be evaluated against the background of Communist anti-Semitism.

Thanks to our free press and thanks to the energetic attitude of the leaders of both political parties, active anti-Semitism is not now a serious problem in our country. But I would warn against complacency. There is, let us be frank about it, a good deal of passive—or polite—anti-Semitism which expressed itself in various forms of discrimination and segregation.

Moreover, here and there, scattered across the country, there are little hate groups who make the Jews the chief target of their venom. More frequently than not, they have high-sounding names which describe them as "Christian" or "patriotic"—when in reality they are both anti-Christian and anti-patriotic.

When Hitler was alive and the depression was still upon us, these groups were able to make some headway. Today they are isolated and without influence. But under certain circumstances, they could again become dangerous.

There is already some evidence that the KKK and other extremists in this country maintain contact with ex-Nazi grouplets scattered around the world. In terms of membership, this pro-Nazi international today has no more than nuisance value. But there is reason to believe that it commands substantial funds which leading Nazis smuggled out of Germany before the collapse of the Hitler regime, and that these Nazi expatriates hate the Western democracies with undiminished passion and yearn for a revival of the Nazi-Soviet pact. In any case, this is a matter that could well stand investigation.

I believe we should keep our eye on these old professional merchants of hate.

I find much more reason for concern, however, in the fact that those involved in the swastika epidemic in our own country have been, for the most part, high school students and teenagers.

Since last Christmas, some 70 synagogues in the United States have been desecrated and a number of Jewish cemeteries have been vandalized. Some of the outrages were perpetrated by members of youthful neo-Nazi clubs, which had their fuhrers and flaunted the swastika emblem. A report from Kansas City this February 1st, for example, said that 13 youths had been suspended from high school for membership in such neo-Nazi clubs. From the many arrests that have been made, however, it would appear that most of the swastika painters operated as individuals or in groups of two or three, and were not members of any organization.

The actions of these young people bore many features of the standard psychological epidemics to which juveniles in every country are prone. But I would urge that we do not dismiss the matter with this easy analysis. A serious study should be made to determine the personal backgrounds of the young people involved, their political attitudes—if any—and the possible social and political consequences of this new type of epidemic.

Perhaps we, in America, too, must find ways of improving the education of our young people—yes, and of our adult population too. Somehow we must communicate to them the unspeakable evil which the swastika and the hammer and sickle both stand for. Somehow we must make them understand that anti-Semitism is anti-American—that it is today an instrument of communism, as it was yesterday an instrument of nazism—and those who ply it in this country, are unwittingly the tools of the Communist conspiracy.

Even more important, we must make them understand that anti-Christianism goes with anti-Semitism, as godlessness goes with totalitarianism. It is no accident, in my opinion, that the two great godless movements of our time, nazism and communism,

should both be vehemently anti-Semitic. But in checking through some of the writings of Karl Marx, I have been amazed to discover how similar his views on the relationship between Christianity and Judaism were to the views of the Nazi pagan philosophers.

The Nazis objected to Judaism because, in their eyes, it was the root monotheistic religion, because their creed of race and hate and war and brutality could not be reconciled with belief in God. They objected to Christianity because, in their eyes, it derived from Judaism, because its doctrine of universal love was as difficult to reconcile with their pagan beliefs.

Let me read to you what Karl Marx himself had to say on this same subject:

"Christianity sprang from Judaism. Christianity is the sublime thought of Judaism, Judaism is the everyday practical application of Christianity. But this application could become universal only after Christianity had been theoretically perfected as the religion of self-alienation of man, from himself and from nature."

By their statements both Marx and Hitler have made it clear that any movement which sets out to persecute Judaism inevitably winds up by rejecting and persecuting Christianity.

As free men who worship God, we cannot ignore the existence of anti-Semitism, even on a small scale, in this country or in other countries. We cannot ignore the desecration of a single synagogue, any more than we can ignore the taking of a single life.

Let us strive, therefore, to achieve a clearer understanding of the nature and origins of this evil, and let our leaders and our educators join in an effort to control and ultimately eliminate the virus in our own country.

Let us join in condemning every manifestation of anti-Semitism, wherever it may occur.

Let us give every assistance and encouragement to the Government of West Germany in the long and inevitably difficult struggle to eradicate the last vestiges of the Nazi evil.

Let us do all of these things. But in doing so, let us not lose our sense of proportion and priority. Let us not permit ourselves to be so distracted by the actions of a handful of juvenile delinquents and by the saturation propaganda of the Kremlin, that we take our eyes off the chief source of human injustice in the world today.

Let us raise our voices against the inhuman persecution of the Jews which is today practiced in the Soviet Union, and let us use our offices at every opportunity to persuade the Soviet leaders to grant equality of treatment to their Jewish subjects.

Let us protest, too, at every available opportunity, against the continued enslavement of the 100 million people of captive Europe, and against the vicious oppression of other minorities in the Soviet Union.

Under the Nazi regime many Christians and numberless Jews were united in a community of suffering. Under communism, the community of suffering is total. Thus, by a strange arrangement of circumstances, the godless totalitarians who have sought to destroy both Judaism and Christianity may have laid the foundation for an understanding that will grow best because it will have survived the worst.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the growing interest in area assistance, and particularly in the rural development program, which has resulted from the work going forward in 30 States and Puerto

Rico, prompts me to call attention to the action taken by the Extension directors of the United States in the annual meeting of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities last November.

The policy statement, entitled "Extension in Rural Development," received unanimous approval by all the Extension directors. It originated with the agency's committee on organization and policy, a group of State directors and leaders of home demonstration programs.

Among the major recommendations by the directors were the following:

Use by all States of rural development approaches to aid in the development of potential resources in "lagging" rural communities.

Closer coordination at the local level of Extension program planning and rural development to promote more effective utilization of county or area resources.

Encouragement of and assistance in forming State and area interagency committees to stimulate rural development in all States.

Establishment of a clear channel within existing Extension organization framework with identifiable leader positions to carry out the Rural Development effort. This has been urged by other governmental departments and agencies so as to give more effective coordination to all participating in the work, both private and governmental.

Pointing out that no rural family today can escape the technological revolution in agriculture, the Extension directors observe in their policy statement:

It is obvious that many families are lagging in the present race for an improved position. The same is true of communities. We believe that much of the prevailing frustration is the consequence of an intense and to some extent fruitless search for logical directions. We also believe that families and communities in such situations can be assisted through combined educational approaches.

In the emerging community where progress is being made, an increasing dependence on nonfarm income is obvious. Also found in such communities are effective local leaders who assume a larger responsibility to the rural community.

Out of this matrix of forces comes our proposal for Extension in rural development.

Started in 1955-56 on a pilot basis, the rural development program has as its aim the development of farm, marketing, industrial, educational, and other resources in areas with large numbers of small, low production farms. The program is going forward in some 200 counties in 30 States and Puerto Rico.

From the beginning, Extension Services in the participating States have assigned local staff members to support Rural Development Committee in their work. In addition, local representatives of both Federal and State agencies, as well as private organizations, have given wholehearted support to these committees.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further business in the morning hour?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President—
Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the Senator from Arizona seeking recognition to speak in the morning hour, or at the conclusion of the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in the morning hour.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona has a short piece of morning hour business. Following the morning hour the Senator from Arizona will seek recognition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I state that at approximately 12:30 I approached the present occupant of the chair and requested that I be recognized at the conclusion of the morning hour.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I think the Senator will find that my name was on the list ahead of his, at 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Chair recalls that the Senator from Illinois did speak with the Chair at about 12:20 or 12:30, and the present occupant of the chair did say to the Senator from Illinois that he would recognize him immediately after the morning hour.

Mr. GOLDWATER obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry. Does the Senator from Arizona yield for that purpose?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Do not the rules provide a way to clear up this debate by providing that the first Senator to address the Chair shall be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is absolutely correct, when the rule is invoked.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I recognize that the rule is exactly as the Senator from Louisiana has outlined, but the Senator from Louisiana will recognize that custom prevails to a certain extent in this body. I asked that my name be placed on the list at 12 o'clock, and it heads the list. If Senators wish to have a race to see who can first rise and address the Chair, I will gladly yield and go to luncheon. I came here with the expectation of being recognized in accordance with the custom of this body.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, while I wish to be very courteous to my good friend from Arizona, let me say that it all depends on who first catches the eye of the Chair.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may observe that my good friend in the Chair (Mr. Young of Ohio) is a member of the opposition party. I would hardly expect him to recognize a Republican first, with all deference to him. Let us have a little contest, and if the Senator is first on his feet, I will gladly go to luncheon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator recall that some years ago, when the rule was applied more nearly in accordance with the Senate rule itself, one way of obtaining recognition was for a Senator to start shouting for recogni-

tion even before he reached his seat? That gave him a slight headstart.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It does not make that much difference to the junior Senator from Arizona. His remarks will not shake the world, or disturb the dome over our heads. I shall be glad to make them at any time I can obtain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. GOLDWATER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia for an insertion in the Record, with the understanding that I will not lose my right to the floor.

(The matter inserted by the Senator from Virginia appears elsewhere in the Record under the appropriate headline.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had recognized the Senator from Illinois in the morning hour.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understood the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to suggest the absence of a quorum. I should like a ruling—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withdrew that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Delaware withdrew the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

LEASING OF PORTION OF FORT CROWDER, MO.—CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8315) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. GOLDWATER addressed the Chair.