SRY4
t.J89/2
V94/2/pt.2
pt.2
1042
89/4
J89/2
V94/2/pt.2

VOTING RIGHTS

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

ITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
NITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 1564

TO THE 15TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

A11600 679341

MARCH 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31 AND APRIL 1, 2, 5, 1965

PART 2

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

VOTING RIGHTS

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 1564

TO ENFORCE THE 15TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31 AND APRIL 1, 2, 5, 1965

PART 2

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

45-755 O WASHINGTON : 1965

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
BIRCH BAYH, Indiana
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota
JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Maryland

EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
HIRAM L. FONG, Hawaii
HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York

DATES OF HEARINGS

	Page
March 23, 1965	1
March 24, 1965	79
March 25, 1965	161
March 29, 1965	251
March 30, 1965	305
March 31, 1965	583
April 1, 1965	625
April 2, 1965	729
April 5, 1965	799

CONTENTS

Statement of—

March 23, 24, 25, 1965:

Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Attorney General of the United States — Page 8

March 29, 1965:

Charles J. Bloch, attorney at law, Macon, Ga — 251

March 30, 1965:

Judge Leander H. Perez, Plaquemines Parish, La — 305

March 31, 1965:

A. Ross Eckler, Acting Director, Bureau of the Census — 587

John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, Civil Service Commission — 605

Paul Rogers, Jr., assistant attorney general of the State of Georgia — 615

April 1, 1965:

Robert Y. Button, attorney general of the State of Virginia — 639, 696

Frederick T. Gray, former attorney general of the State of Virginia — 710

James J. Kilpatrick, editor, Richmond News-Leader, Richmond, Va., and vice chairman, Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government — 629

Hon. John J. Sparkman, a U.S. Senator from the State of Alabama — 625

Thomas J. Watkins, attorney at law, Jackson, Miss — 664

April 2, 1965:

T. Wade Bruton, attorney general of the State of North Carolina — 775

Frank Mizell, attorney at law, representing the registrars of the State of Alabama, accompanied by Eli Howell, attorney, Montgomery, Ala — 729

April 5, 1965:

Hon. John Stennis, a U.S. Senator from the State of Mississippi — 804

Hon. Strom Thurmond, a U.S. Senator from the State of South Carolina — 833

Hon. John J. Williams, a U.S. Senator from the State of Delaware — 799

Statements submitted by—

Hon. Harry F. Byrd, a U.S. Senator from the State of Virginia — 977

Hon. William A. Egan, Governor, State of Alaska — 988

Hon. Hiram L. Fong, a U.S. Senator from the State of Hawaii — 189

Albert P. Gallinghouse, registrar of voters, parish of Orleans, La — 1000

W. B. Hicks, Jr., executive secretary, Liberty Lobby, Washington, D.C — 991

Hon. Lister Hill, a U.S. Senator from the State of Alabama — 981

Hon. Richard J. Hughes, Governor, State of New Jersey — 583

Hon. Edward V. Long, a U.S. Senator from the State of Missouri — 4

Hon. George McGovern, a U.S. Senator from the State of South Dakota — 984

Walter P. Reuther, president, United Auto Workers — 994

Hon. A. Willis Robertson, a U.S. Senator from the State of Virginia — 985

Hon. Hugh Scott, a U.S. Senator from the State of Pennsylvania — 6

Thomas A. Skornia, chairman, Marin, Calif., Democratic Assembly — 1002

Irby Turner, Jr., attorney at law, Belzoni, Miss., and member of the the Mississippi State Legislature — 990

Roy Wilkins, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People — 1004

Sidney Zagri, legislative counsel, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America — 996

EXHIBITS

Page
Copy of S. 1564 ---- 1
Estimates on voting as of November 1, 1964, as prepared by the Bureau of the Census, and submitted by Attorney General Katzenbach ---- 80
Prosecutions brought by the Justice Department listed by States under 18 U.S.C. 241, 242 ---- 108
Voter qualifications of different States at the time the 15th amendment was submitted ---- 128
Editorial, "An Immoral Law," from the Wall Street Journal, dated March 22, 1965 ---- 135
Editorial, "A Question of Perversion," from the Wall Street Journal, dated March 24, 1965 ---- 137
Civil service laws that will apply to examiners appointed under section 4(a) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 ---- 174
Letter dated April 2, 1965, addressed to Hon. James O. Eastland from Attorney General Katzenbach, re commentary on S. 1517 ---- 203
Lassiter v. *Northampton County Board of Elections*, 360 U.S. 45 ---- 208
Williams v. *Mississippi*, 170 U.S. 213 ---- 212
Guinn and Beal v. *United States*, 238 U.S. 347 ---- 217
Article, "LBJ's Voting Bill Strafed by Lake" ---- 241
William Alston, et al. v. *L. M. Butts, et al.* (elections registration, North Carolina) ---- 246
Supplemental memorandum prepared by Charles J. Bloch with respect to section 9 of S. 1564 ---- 301
The following were submitted for the record by Judge Leander Perez:
(1) *US* v. *Mary Ethel Fox, Registrar of Voters, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana* ---- 310
(2) Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics ---- 325
(3) "Is the NAACP Subversive?" as prepared by the Patrick Henry Group, Richmond, Va ---- 359
(4) "Activities in the Southern States," speech by Senator Eastland from the Congressional Record dated May 25, 1961 ---- 457
(5–A) "Highlander Folk School," prepared by Georgia Commission on Education ---- 462
(5–B) "Baptist Bible Tribune," dated January 31, 1964 ---- 464
(5–C) "Common Sense," dated November 1, 1960 ---- 472
(6) "Whither Solid South?" a study in politics and race relations, by Charles Wallace Collins ---- 476
(7) Excerpts, *Herndon* v. *Lowry*, 301 U.S. 242 ---- 480
(7–A) Pages 95–107 from the booklet "The Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities," prepared by the State of Louisiana ---- 506
(8) Booklet entitled "American Negro Problems" ---- 519
The following were submitted for the record by Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.:
(1) Letter dated March 29, 1965, from Hon. John Sparkman ---- 491
(2) Editorial, "A Speech and a Bill," from the Charlotte News dated March 16, 1965 ---- 492
(3) Article, "Voting Bill 'Piles Wrong on Wrong'," by James J. Kilpatrick printed in the Evening Star of March 25, 1965 ---- 494
(4) "The Voting Bill," an editorial in the Evening Star of March 19, 1965 ---- 495
(5) "Question Lingers on Voting Bill" by Richard Wilson, printed in the Evening Star of March 24, 1965 ---- 496
(6) "Vote Test Here Simple, and Same for Everyone," an article by Bill Wright printed in the Fayetteville Observer of March 23, 1965 ---- 497
(6–A) Military personnel, dependents, and civilians working on military installations in four North Carolina counties ---- 499
(7) Editorial, "Illogical Is the Word," from the Evening Star dated March 26, 1965 ---- 500
(8) Letter dated March 26, 1965, addressed to Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr., from William Joslin, chairman, State board of elections, Raleigh, N.C ---- 501
(9) Editorial, "Special Laws and Blanket Indictments," from the Greensboro Daily News, dated March 23, 1965 ---- 502
(10) Article, "Vote Bill Won't End Protests," from the Evening Star ---- 503

The following were submitted for the record by Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.—Continued

Page

(11) Editorial, "Debating the Rights Bill," from the Evening Star of March 29, 1965 503
(12) Editorial, "Incongruities in the Drama," from the Wall Street Journal dated March 25, 1965 504
(13) Letter dated March 25, 1965, from Thomas F. Butt, chancellor, and probate judge, State of Arkansas 554
(14) Editorial from the National Observer of March 29, 1965 557
(15) Article, "Your Vote," by John Chamberlain, as printed in the Evening Star of March 25, 1965 558
(16) Editorial, "LBJ's Voting Bill Ignores Basic Law of Democracy," from the Nashville Graphic of March 18, 1965 559
(17) Article, "But Vote Bill Does Need Analysis," by A. T. Burch, from the Chicago Daily News of March 26, 1965 559
Louisiana v. *United States*, the Supreme Court of the United States, decided March 8, 1965 566
Telegram dated March 20, 1965, addressed to Hon. John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce, from Hon. James O. Eastland 584
Letter dated March 22, 1965, addressed to Hon. James O. Eastland from Hon. John T. Connor 585
Telegram dated March 20, 1965, addressed to Hon. A. Ross Eckler, Director, Bureau of the Census 585
Letter dated March 23, 1965, addressed to Hon. James O. Eastland from Hon. A. Ross Eckler, enclosing table showing by States the estimated population of voting age as of November 1, 1964 586
Letter dated April 2, 1965, addressed to Hon. James O. Eastland from Hon. A. Ross Eckler, enclosing compilation of voting figures for six States (Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia) 849
Letter dated April 6, 1965, addressed to Hon. James O. Eastland from Hon. A. Ross Eckler, enclosing compilation of voting figures for the remaining 44 States 870
Negro registration in certain Virginia counties, submitted by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick 634
Copy of statement of Attorney General Robert Y. Button, of Virginia, before the House Judiciary Committee 706
Application for registration in the State of Virginia 716
"Right To Vote," by Kenneth Crawford, as printed in Newsweek magazine, March 1, 1965 731
Applications for registration in the State of Alabama, submitted by Senator Edward M. Kennedy 754
Application for registration in the State of Alabama, submitted by Mr. Mizell 762
New York State regents literacy test 766
Alabama registration and voting statistics 771
Report of 50 North Carolina counties on voting and literacy test statistics 787
Instructions for registration in Mecklenburg County, N.C 792
North Carolina literacy test 794
New Hanover County, N.C., board of elections literacy test 795
Amendment to S. 1564 intended to be proposed by Mr. Williams of Delaware 799
Amendment to S. 1564 intended to be proposed by Mr. Williams of Delaware 799
Editorial, "Voting Discrimination" as printed in the Evening Star of April 4, 1965 844
Letter dated April 7, 1965, addressed to Mr. Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk, Senate Judiciary Committee, from Clarence Mitchell, Washington bureau, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People 1004
Analysis of educational facilities afforded to Negroes and white in the State of Mississippi 1017
In the State of Louisiana 1103
In Sumter County, Ala 1161
1964 Status report of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice 1175
A compendium of various tables of statistics and other data relating to S. 1564 1456

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20233

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

April 2, 1965

Honorable James O. Eastland
Chairman
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 21510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

My letter of March 23, sent in response to your telegram of March 22, stated that we were compiling the county figures showing the number of votes cast for President in November 1964. We have completed this work for six States (Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia), and the tables for those States are enclosed. We are including in these tables the population of voting age as reported in the 1960 Census. We shall forward the tables for the other States by the middle of next week.

As I indicated in the testimony before the Committee, we do not now have current estimates of the population of voting age by counties and the preparation of such estimates will require additional resources.

Sincerely yours,

A. Ross Eckler

A. Ross Eckler
Acting Director
Bureau of the Census

Enclosures

FORM BC-185 (4-1-63)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

ALABAMA
(Code 63)

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 67	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Autauga	3459	6353	3651			
2 Baldwin	13,400	22,236	4527			
3 Barbour	4831	7338	5787			
4 Bibb	3126	5807	1990			
5 Blount	6869	14,368	378			
6 Bullock	2630	2387	4450			
7 Butler	4975	8363	4890			
8 Calhoun	16,845	44,739	9036			
9 Chambers	7187	15,369	6497			
10 Cherokee	3809	8537	782			
11 Chilton	6847	12,861	1947			
12 Choctaw	2910	5192	3982			
13 Clarke	5384	7899	5833			
14 Clay	4014	6470	926			
15 Cleburne	2828	5870	385			
16 Coffee	6123	14,221	2985			
17 Colbert	10,840	21,680	4575			
18 Conecuh	3421	5907	3635			
19 Coosa	2718	4201	1794			
20 Covington	9175	18,466	2876			
21 Crenshaw	3824	6310	2207			
22 Cullman	12,262	25,848	285			
23 Dale	5933	14,861	2743			
24 Dallas	6607	14,400	15,115			
25 De Kalb	11,694	23,878	441			
26 Elmore	7596	12,510	4808			
27 Escambia	7551	12,779	5685			
28 Etowah	21,833	41,563	7661			
29 Fayette	4490	8277	1291			
30 Franklin	7135	12,412	645			
31 Geneva	5576	11,357	1606			

ALABAMA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for president: 1964	Population of voting age, April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Greene	1,711	1649	5001			
33 Hale	2446	3594	5999			
34 Henry	3485	5165	3,169			
35 Houston	11774	22095	6899			
36 Jackson	5875	19298	1175			
37 Jefferson	138,839	256,319	116,160			
38 Lamar	3775	7503	1027			
39 Lauderdale	12,571	31089	3726			
40 Lawrence	3617	10509	2471			
41 Lee	7,516	17547	8913			
42 Limestone	5404	16,173	3579			
43 Lowndes	1858	1900	5122			
44 Macon	4831	2818	11886			
45 Madison	27496	54516	10666			
46 Marengo	4466	6,104	7791			
47 Marion	5713	12656	403			
48 Marshall	10140	26997	637			
49 Mobile	69981	121589	50793			
50 Monroe	4756	6631	4894			
51 Montgomery	30497	62911	33056			
52 Morgan	12381	30955	4159			
53 Perry	2566	3441	5202			
54 Pickens	4162	7336	4373			
55 Pike	5176	9126	5259			
56 Randolph	4991	9196	2366			
57 Russell	6414	13761	10531			
58 St. Clair	6802	12244	2035			
59 Shelby	7980	14771	2889			
60 Sumter	2058	3061	6814			
61 Talladega	12658	25635	9333			
62 Tallapoosa	7263	15310	4999			
63 Tuscaloosa	19263	47076	15332			
64 Walker	14692	28148	2890			

ALABAMA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age, April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
65 Washington	3994	5293	2297			
66 Wilcox	1946	2624	6085			
67 Winston	4829	8559	47			
Sources: Votes cast for President compiled by the Governmental Affairs Institute, Washington, D.C. from official state sources. Population of voting age from the 1960 Census of Population.						

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

GEORGIA
(Code 58)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 159	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age April 1960 — White	Nonwhite			
1 Appling	4159	5862	1401			
2 Atkinson	1968	2486	812			
3 Bacon	3315	4203	536			
4 Baker	1514	1139	1285			
5 Baldwin	6170	16109	9235			
6 Banks	1806	3850	213			
7 Barrow	4593	7865	1332			
8 Bartow	7448	14943	2393			
9 Ben Hill	3612	5931	2436			
10 Berrien	6731	6179	964			
11 Bibb	43472	60429	26812			
12 Bleckley	3556	4528	1380			
13 Brantley	2140	2854	384			
14 Brooks	3369	5059	3711			
15 Bryan	2290	2287	1111			
16 Bulloch	7543	10101	4337			
17 Burke	4242	4358	6600			
18 Butts	2795	3195	2099			
19 Calhoun	1355	1654	2393			
20 Camden	3495	3447	2059			
21 Candler	2505	2714	1200			
22 Carroll	9778	19234	3595			
23 Catoosa	7065	12370	172			
24 Charlton	1753	2077	810			
25 Chatham	56317	78118	31563			
26 Chattahoochee	437	8061	1830			
27 Chattooga	5462	11460	1025			
28 Cherokee	6587	13964	517			
29 Clarke	12394	23895	6740			
30 Clay	904	1130	1441			
31 Clayton	10357	23996	2456			

GEORGIA - Con.							
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population age of voting April 1960					
		White	Nonwhite				
32 Clinch	1790	2373	1256				
33 Cobb	37510	43291	4568				
34 Coffee	7111	9682	2977				
35 Colquitt	9056	15982	4081				
36 Columbia	4003	5096	2364				
37 Cook	3395	5213	1755				
38 Coweta	7368	11891	5579				
39 Crawford	1680	1596	1611				
40 Crisp	5093	6451	3858				
41 Dade	2605	4803	70				
42 Dawson	1571	2148	1				
43 Decatur	7071	9069	5515				
44 De Kalb	86602	148167	12407				
45 Dodge	5661	7392	2328				
46 Dooly	3133	3581	2866				
47 Dougherty	18024	29897	14163				
48 Douglas	5816	8595	1268				
49 Early	3169	4013	3277				
50 Echols	583	832	246				
51 Effingham	3356	4008	1756				
52 Elbert	5059	7752	3127				
53 Emanuel	5590	7627	3005				
54 Evans	2371	2738	1308				
55 Fannin	6267	8111	31				
56 Fayette	2345	3585	1190				
57 Floyd	18239	38236	5949				
58 Forsyth	3153	7328	4				
59 Franklin	3622	7611	776				
60 Fulton	166745	247892	117049				
61 Gilmer	4326	5431	7				
62 Glascock	970	1281	351				
63 Glynn	13053	18750	6762				
64 Gordon	5577	11441	669				

GEORGIA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1960	Population of voting age, April 1960				
		Wh. Te	Nonwh. Te			
65 Grady	4810	7205	3364			
66 Greene	3791	3565	2998			
67 Gwinnett	13528	24299	1841			
68 Habersham	5007	10676	518			
69 Hall	12299	27726	2789			
70 Hancock	1999	1727	3576			
71 Haralson	5315	8571	642			
72 Harris	3106	3310	3102			
73 Hart	4308	7382	1832			
74 Heard	1868	2661	590			
75 Henry	6708	10429	3539			
76 Houston	10790	17742	4228			
77 Irwin	2757	3759	1602			
78 Jackson	5617	10228	1309			
79 Jasper	1923	1725	1705			
80 Jeff Davis	2620	4116	909			
81 Jefferson	4203	7937	4780			
82 Jenkins	2417	5485	2210			
83 Johnson	2622	3455	1261			
84 Jones	3185	2655	2185			
85 Lamar	3118	4078	2118			
86 Lanier	1380	2158	756			
87 Laurens	9285	13178	6284			
88 Lee	1285	1427	1795			
89 Liberty	3670	5310	3176			
90 Lincoln	1296	1974	1336			
91 Long	1582	1527	635			
92 Lowndes	11174	20746	8454			
93 Lumpkin	2044	4565	79			
94 McDuffie	3781	4625	2740			
95 McIntosh	1788	1643	1823			
96 Macon	2799	3171	4077			
97 Madison	3531	5962	989			

GEORGIA - Con.							
	COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age April 1960				
			White	Nonwhite			
98	Marion	1084	1353	1609			
99	Meriwether	4673	6547	4890			
100	Miller	1932	3095	946			
101	Mitchell	4464	6055	4971			
102	Monroe	3243	3107	2652			
103	Montgomery	2287	2520	1288			
104	Morgan	3139	3415	2469			
105	Murray	3490	6209	51			
106	Muscogee	33471	74662	22549			
107	Newton	6298	9045	3767			
108	Oconee	2314	3228	681			
109	Oglethorpe	1990	2964	1709			
110	Paulding	4427	7353	603			
111	Peach	3555	3650	4562			
112	Pickens	3885	5264	251			
113	Pierce	2963	4432	1135			
114	Pike	2010	2584	1643			
115	Polk	7837	15065	2442			
116	Pulaski	2721	3018	1843			
117	Putnam	2214	2297	2204			
118	Quitman	607	581	707			
119	Rabun	2347	4392	43			
120	Randolph	2618	2578	3663			
121	Richmond	35026	61315	24785			
122	Rockdale	3475	4708	1512			
123	Schley	954	961	903			
124	Screven	3706	4557	3729			
125	Seminole	1721	2648	1255			
126	Spalding	10239	16657	5252			
127	Stephens	4854	7975	1355			
128	Stewart	1410	1465	2681			
129	Sumter	5501	7730	6710			
130	Talbot	1306	1437	2507			

(4-5: Georgia)

GEORGIA - Con.							
	COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
			White	Nonwhite			
131	Taliaferro	965	917	1073			
132	Tattnall	4912	7377	3135			
133	Taylor	2469	2767	2004			
134	Telfair	3786	4938	2087			
135	Terrell	2490	3038	4057			
136	Thomas	9563	13,179	7644			
137	Tift	6936	10,241	3513			
138	Toombs	5228	7513	2444			
139	Towns	2429	2942	1			
140	Treutlen	2053	2473	968			
141	Troup	11309	20,579	8577			
142	Turner	2391	3422	1535			
143	Twiggs	1964	1969	2255			
144	Union	3608	3437	1			
145	Upson	6378	11159	3615			
146	Walker	11393	26511	1388			
147	Walton	5224	9342	3016			
148	Ware	10137	15671	4763			
149	Warren	1454	1911	2224			
150	Washington	4126	5373	5451			
151	Wayne	5801	8204	1918			
152	Webster	661	775	975			
153	Wheeler	1829	2236	824			
154	White	2360	4047	169			
155	Whitfield	11849	24437	1085			
156	Wilcox	2694	3309	1282			
157	Wilkes	3089	3621	3101			
158	Wilkinson	3135	3135	2279			
159	Worth	4019	5324	3776			
(5-5: Georgia)							

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

LOUISIANA
(Code 72)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

PARISH Number of parishes, 64	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age, Aug. 1, 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Acadia	16,169	22,399	4,557			
2 Allen	6,491	8,357	2,310			
3 Ascension	8,076	10,110	4,171			
4 Assumption	5,168	5,877	3,237			
5 Avoyelles	7,976	15,845	4,717			
6 Beauregard	6,348	8,682	2,145			
7 Bienville	4595	5,617	4,077			
8 Bossier	11,759	23,696	6,847			
9 Caddo	52,355	87,774	41,749			
10 Calcasieu	40,331	62,987	14,924			
11 Caldwell	3,143	3,843	1,161			
12 Cameron	2,447	3,642	239			
13 Catahoula	2,947	4,110	1,919			
14 Claiborne	4,399	6,415	5,032			
15 Concordia	4,831	6,963	4,582			
16 De Soto	5,268	6,543	6,753			
17 East Baton Rouge	69,116	87,985	36,908			
18 East Carroll	1,749	2,990	4,183			
19 East Feliciana	2,386	7,643	6,081			
20 Evangeline	10,138	13,652	3,342			
21 Franklin	6,229	8,954	4433			
22 Grant	4746	6,080	1,553			
23 Iberia	16,337	20,200	7,165			
24 Iberville	7,877	8,733	7,060			
25 Jackson	6,073	6,607	2,535			
26 Jefferson	68,965	98,103	14,970			
27 Jefferson Davis	5,639	12,892	2,881			
28 Lafayette	26,885	35,513	9,473			
29 Lafourche	18,209	25,737	3,078			
30 La Salle	5,183	6,799	549			
31 Lincoln	7,480	9,611	5,723			

LOUISIANA - Con.						
PARISH	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age: Apr. 1 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Livingston	4,017	12,306	1,818			
33 Madison	2,478	3,334	5,181			
34 Morehouse	7,113	10,311	7,208			
35 Natchitoches	8,500	11,328	7,444			
36 Orleans	163,644	257,495	125,752			
37 Ouachita	25,198	40,185	16,377			
38 Plaquemines	5,679	8,633	2,897			
39 Pointe Coupee	4,574	6,085	5,273			
40 Rapides	28,114	44,823	18,141			
41 Red River	2,569	3,294	2,181			
42 Richland	5,245	7,601	4,608			
43 Sabine	6,246	8,251	2,143			
44 St. Bernard	14,230	15,836	1,105			
45 St. Charles	7,500	8,117	2,621			
46 St. Helena	2,025	2,363	2,082			
47 St. James	5,681	4,892	3,964			
48 St. John the Baptist	5,652	4,982	4,279			
49 St. Landry	22,727	25,550	14,982			
50 St. Martin	7,468	9,781	4,664			
51 St. Mary	12,857	17,991	7,176			
52 St. Tammany	14,577	16,032	5,038			
53 Tangipahoa	16,841	22,311	9,401			
54 Tensas	1,847	2,287	3,533			
55 Terrebonne	15,366	24,393	5,464			
56 Union	5,684	7,021	3,006			
57 Vermilion	14,188	19,710	2,429			
58 Vernon	7,260	9,279	1,268			
59 Washington	12,263	16,804	6,821			
60 Webster	9,932	15,713	7,045			
61 West Baton Rouge	3,727	3,974	3,502			
62 West Carroll	3,412	6,171	1,389			
63 West Feliciana	1,120	2,814	4553			
64 Winn	5,559	6,790	2,590			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

MISSISSIPPI
(Code 64)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 82	Votes cast for president 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Adams	6,993	10,888	9,340			
2 Alcorn	5,294	13,347	1,756			
3 Amite	2,845	4,449	3,560			
4 Attala	4,672	7,522	4,262			
5 Benton	1,170	2,514	1,419			
6 Bolivar	5,411	10,031	15,934			
7 Calhoun	3,518	7,188	1,767			
8 Carroll	2,141	2,469	2,704			
9 Chickasaw	3,417	6,388	3,054			
10 Choctaw	2,246	3,728	1,105			
11 Claiborne	1,310	1,688	3,469			
12 Clarke	3,844	6,072	2,488			
13 Clay	3,074	5,547	4,444			
14 Coahoma	5,136	8,708	14,604			
15 Copiah	4,745	8,153	6,407			
16 Covington	3,425	5,329	2,032			
17 De Soto	3,389	5,338	6,246			
18 Forrest	10,419	22,431	7,495			
19 Franklin	2,302	3,403	1,842			
20 George	3,039	5,276	580			
21 Greene	2,061	3,518	859			
22 Grenada	3,803	5,792	4,323			
23 Hancock	4,051	6,813	1,129			
24 Harrison	21,642	55,042	9,670			
25 Hinds	41,889	67,836	36,138			
26 Holmes	3,225	4,773	8,757			
27 Humphreys	1,947	3,344	5,561			
28 Issaquena	490	640	1,081			
29 Itawamba	3,267	8,523	463			
30 Jackson	13,728	24,447	5,113			
31 Jasper	3,230	5,327	3,675			

(1-3: Mississippi)

MISSISSIPPI - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
32 Jefferson	1,327	1,666	3,540			
33 Jefferson Davis	2,586	3,629	3,222			
34 Jones	14,104	25,943	7,427			
35 Kemper	2,376	3,113	3,221			
36 Lafayette	3,922	8,674	3,239			
37 Lamar	3,706	6,484	1,071			
38 Lauderdale	14,874	27,806	11,924			
39 Lawrence	2,609	3,478	1,720			
40 Leake	4,513	6,754	3,397			
41 Lee	7,574	18,709	5,130			
42 Leflore	5,969	10,274	13,567			
43 Lincoln	7,187	11,072	3,913			
44 Lowndes	6,668	16,466	8,362			
45 Madison	3,534	5,622	10,366			
46 Marion	5,974	8,997	3,630			
47 Marshall	2,592	4,342	7,168			
48 Monroe	6,612	13,426	5,610			
49 Montgomery	3,330	4,700	2,627			
50 Neshoba	5,724	9,143	2,565			
51 Newton	4,973	8,014	3,018			
52 Noxubee	2,050	2,997	5,172			
53 Oktibbeha	4,185	8,423	4,952			
54 Panola	4,415	7,639	7,250			
55 Pearl River	4,744	4,765	2,473			
56 Perry	2,054	3,515	1,140			
57 Pike	6,961	12,163	6,936			
58 Pontotoc	3,401	8,772	1,519			
59 Prentiss	3,362	9,535	1,070			
60 Quitman	2,401	4,176	5,673			
61 Rankin	7,873	13,246	6,944			
62 Scott	4,967	7,742	3,752			
63 Sharkey	1,244	1,862	3,152			
64 Simpson	5,220	8,073	3,186			

MISSISSIPPI - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population of Voting Age April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
65 Smith	4283	6,597	1,293			
66 Stone	1,955	2,465	868			
67 Sunflower	4,378	8,785	13,524			
68 Tallahatchie	3,381	5,049	6,483			
69 Tate	2,673	4,506	4,326			
70 Tippah	3,456	7,513	1,281			
71 Tishomingo	2,911	8,068	359			
72 Tunica	1,044	2,011	5,822			
73 Union	4,176	9,512	1,626			
74 Walthall	3,168	4,536	2,490			
75 Warren	9,040	13,530	10,726			
76 Washington	7,615	14,837	20,619			
77 Wayne	3,815	5,881	2,556			
78 Webster	3,121	4,993	1,174			
79 Wilkinson	1,576	2,340	4,120			
80 Winston	4,159	6,808	3,611			
81 Yalobusha	2,644	4,572	2,441			
82 Yazoo	5,005	7,598	8,719			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

SOUTH CAROLINA
(Code 57)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 46	Votes cast for president: 1964	Population of voting age April 1 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Abbeville	4,137	8,733	3,215			
2 Aiken	35,089	33,646	10,040			
3 Allendale	3,512	2,531	3,205			
4 Anderson	20,068	47,542	9,598			
5 Bamberg	3,785	4,371	3,809			
6 Barnwell	5,052	5,652	3,242			
7 Beaufort	6,179	12,098	7,247			
8 Berkeley	9,637	10,122	7,619			
9 Calhoun	2,203	2,623	3,318			
10 Charleston	47,673	77,904	35,499			
11 Cherokee	7,885	16,037	3,360			
12 Chester	6,797	11,172	5,664			
13 Chesterfield	7,083	12,099	5,219			
14 Clarendon	3,792	5,223	7,735			
15 Colleton	6,688	8,203	6,180			
16 Darlington	11,727	16,906	9,900			
17 Dillon	5,515	8,725	5,529			
18 Dorchester	6,713	7,121	5,370			
19 Edgefield	3,313	4,103	3,764			
20 Fairfield	4,625	4,975	5,536			
21 Florence	17,503	27,047	15,951			
22 Georgetown	7,127	8,855	7,173			
23 Greenville	46,633	102,365	18,605			
24 Greenwood	11,132	19,218	6,764			
25 Hampton	3,698	4,711	4,052			
26 Horry	13,737	27,516	7,429			
27 Jasper	2,545	2,689	3,333			
28 Kershaw	7,785	11,256	5,903			
29 Lancaster	9,712	16,213	4,762			
30 Laurens	9,446	19,775	6,816			
31 Lee	3,645	4,394	5,446			

(1-2: South Carolina)

SOUTH CAROLINA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
32 Lexington	16,846	28,774	4,762			
33 McCormick	1,437	1,915	2,248			
34 Marion	5,243	8,103	7,684			
35 Marlboro	4,286	8,230	5,932			
36 Newberry	8,794	13,204	4,954			
37 Oconee	8,272	19,762	2,230			
38 Orangeburg	16,663	16,381	17,355			
39 Pickens	9,391	24,015	2,356			
40 Richland	45,245	79,050	32,670			
41 Saluda	3,933	5,573	2,327			
42 Spartanburg	38,446	73,317	17,047			
43 Sumter	11,504	22,004	15,380			
44 Union	7,707	12,836	4,125			
45 Williamsburg	7,058	7,560	10,535			
46 York	15,642	31,799	10,196			

FORM BC-185 (6-1-60)

VIRGINIA (Code 54)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 98	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Accomack	6,683	13,146	6,142			
2 Albemarle	6,315	15,670	2,576			
3 Alleghany	2,685	6,675	256			
4 Amelia	2,239	2,261	1,924			
5 Amherst	5,410	16,523	2,693			
6 Appomattox	3,791	4,245	1,142			
7 Arlington	54,363	162,364	5,214			
8 Augusta	8,372	21,314	864			
9 Bath	1,286	3,976	340			
10 Bedford	7,914	15,258	3,044			
11 Bland	1,570	3,504	146			
12 Botetourt	4476	9,045	776			
13 Brunswick	4446	4,637	4734			
14 Buchanan	7,124	16,762	8			
15 Buckingham	2,733	3,776	2,206			
16 Campbell	9,145	15,516	3,291			
17 Caroline	3,243	3,793	3,210			
18 Carroll	6,146	13,614	41			
19 Charles City	1,348	582	2,126			
20 Charlotte	3,178	5,014	2,500			
21 Chesterfield	25,871	35,955	4,862			
22 Clarke	2,206	4,016	786			
23 Craig	1,244	2,053	3			
24 Culpeper	3,665	6,964	2,068			
25 Cumberland	1,977	1,819	1,647			
26 Dickenson	5,639	9,791	64			
27 Dinwiddie	4,285	5,212	8,527			
28 Essex	1,550	2,241	1,665			
29 Fairfax	84,283	140,605	9,110			
30 Fauquier	5,619	10,726	3,093			
31 Floyd	2,985	6,017	308			

(1-5: Virginia)

VIRGINIA - Con.							
	COUNTY	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
32	Fluvanna	1,834	2,746	1,376			
33	Franklin	5,737	12,801	1,728			
34	Frederick	5,474	12,479	232			
35	Giles	5,167	9,629	232			
36	Gloucester	3,583	5,341	1,782			
37	Goochland	2,699	3,121	2,312			
38	Grayson	6,352	10,173	329			
39	Greene	1,104	2,331	328			
40	Greensville	4,519	4,499	3,785			
41	Halifax	6,144	11,377	6,769			
42	Hanover	7,751	12,432	3,302			
43	Henrico	42,082	66,822	3,397			
44	Henry	8,184	17,805	4,113			
45	Highland	989	2,046	16			
46	Isle of Wight	4,394	4,991	4,317			
47	James City	2,839	4,845	2,056			
48	King and Queen	1,489	1,735	1,617			
49	King George	1,729	3,200	1,609			
50	King William	1,775	2,491	1,864			
51	Lancaster	2,911	3,613	1,976			
52	Lee	8,626	14,072	100			
53	Loudoun	6,879	12,014	2,334			
54	Louisa	2,103	4,917	2,472			
55	Lunenburg	2,977	4,611	3,534			
56	Madison	1,923	3,783	596			
57	Mathews	2,286	3,809	1,062			
58	Mecklenburg	8,227	16,474	6,624			
59	Middlesex	1,995	2,586	1,363			
60	Montgomery	8,489	18,091	960			
61	Nansemond	7,415	6,965	9,806			
62	Nelson	2,534	5,693	1,813			
63	New Kent	1,365	1,325	1,229			
64	Norfolk	Now part of Chesapeake City					

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

VIRGINIA - Con.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
65 Northampton	3,103	5,340	4,786			
66 Northumberland	2,418	3,965	2,123			
67 Nottoway	4,499	5,564	3,455			
68 Orange	3,107	6,269	1,429			
69 Page	5,419	9,131	271			
70 Patrick	3,776	7,076	616			
71 Pittsylvania	12,373	22,835	8,604			
72 Powhatan	2,152	2,376	1,563			
73 Prince Edward	4,064	5,135	2,896			
74 Prince George	3,295	8,760	2,420			
75 Prince William	8,963	24,477	2,217			
76 Princess Anne	New	part of	Virginia	Beach	City	
77 Pulaski	6,726	14,202	1,030			
78 Rappahannock	1,127	2,608	540			
79 Richmond	1,540	2,713	1,132			
80 Roanoke	19,536	35,014	2,211			
81 Rockbridge	4,806	12,662	1,127			
82 Rockingham	8,363	22,976	427			
83 Russell	7,367	13,783	297			
84 Scott	9,269	14,626	193			
85 Shenandoah	7,168	13,416	188			
86 Smyth	7,952	12,191	327			
87 Southampton	New	part of	Franklin	City		
88 Spotsylvania	3,367	6,262	1,503			
89 Stafford	4,364	8,594	971			
90 Surry	2,140	1,479	1,842			
91 Sussex	2,775	2,662	3,706			
92 Tazewell	9,417	23,237	1,071			
93 Warren	4,390	8,211	587			
94 Washington	9,226	21,146	546			
95 Westmoreland	2,499	3,836	2,352			

VIRGINIA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
96 Wise	10,539	22,602	685			
97 Wythe	5,863	12,299	523			
98 York	6,389	9,596	2,428			
INDEPENDENT CITIES						
99 Alexandria	25,683	50,548	6,025			
100 Bristol	3,723	9,373	672			
101 Buena Vista	1,153	3,390	156			
102 Charlottesville	9,704	15,904	3,369			
Chesapeake ✓	18,621	30,450	9,428			
103 Clifton Forge	2,102	2,920	600			
104 Colonial Heights	3,620	6,049	17			
105 Covington	3,206	6,206	751			
106 Danville	12,724	22,404	6,388			
107 Falls Church	3,707	5,720	114			
Franklin ✓	6,131	7,239	7,435			
108 Fredericksburg	3,928	6,717	1,471			
109 Galax	1,416	3,073	152			
110 Hampton	22,288	40,795	10,825			
111 Harrisonburg	3,590	6,747	436			
112 Hopewell	5,691	8,854	1,549			
113 Lynchburg	16,834	27,728	6,574			
114 Martinsville	4,824	8,084	2,972			
115 Newport News	25,894	44,258	20,974			
116 Norfolk	51,546	129,423	45,376			
117 Norton	1,196	2,764	188			
118 Petersburg	7,775	12,528	9,821			
119 Portsmouth	24,544	44,286	21,055			
120 Radford	3,358	5,032	333			
121 Richmond	62,890	90,508	53,719			
122 Roanoke	28,496	52,527	9,519			
123 South Boston	1,843	2,639	969			
124 South Norfolk	Now	part of	Chesapeake City			
125 Staunton	5,680	13,290	1,288			
126 Suffolk	3,044	5,272	2,769			
127 Virginia Beach 4	23,442	38,287	6,581			

(4-5: Virginia)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

VIRGINIA - Con.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
128 Waynesboro	4,531	8,667	548			
129 Williamsburg	2,093	3,509	523			
130 Winchester	4,437	9,200	708			
		21,376	1839			
[1] Includes Fairfax County and Fairfax C.T.						
[2] Includes Norfolk County and South Norfolk C.T.						
[3] Includes Southampton County and Franklin C.T.						
[4] Includes Princess Anne County and Virginia Beach City.						

OFFICE OF
THE DIRECTOR

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

IN REPLY REFER TO:

APR 6 1965

Honorable James O. Eastland
Chairman
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

My letter of April 2 transmitted to you tables showing figures on the number of votes cast for President in November 1964, by county, for the States of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia. The corresponding figures for the remaining forty-four States (and the District of Columbia) are enclosed.

This completes the package of material we were compiling for you in response to your telegram of March 22.

Sincerely yours,

A. Ross Eckler

A. Ross Eckler
Acting Director
Bureau of the Census

Enclosures

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

ALASKA
(Code 01)

Title

ELECTION DISTRICT [1] (Number of election districts, 19)	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
Election district, No. 1	4,595	5,569	1,479			
2	1,842	1,751	590			
3	2,396	2,508	1,362			
4	5,307	5,157	700			
5	1,306	1,143	510			
6	1,485	2,357	516			
7	2,205	2,770	80			
8	22,588	46,202	3,861			
9	938	1,647	142			
10	2,627	3,035	423			
11	1,587	3,711	668			
12	855	2,861	1,220			
13	1,198	1,062	1,113			
14	1,715	373	2,162			
15	1,966	2,117	1,682			
16	10,750	24,614	3,001			
17	1,401	706	2,142			
18	1,791	1,093	1,991			
19	712	141	1,246			

[1] Election Districts established as of December 7, 1961

(Alaska)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

ARKANSAS (Code 71)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 75	Votes Cast for President. 1964	Population Age: White	Population Age: Nonwhite	% Voting April 1966		
1 Arkansas	6990	10,584	2809			
2 Ashley	6710	9,012	4,258			
3 Baxter	4891	6,584	3			
4 Benton	11663	23,309	63			
5 Boone	6646	10,414	4			
6 Bradley	4103	5,837	2,372			
7 Calhoun	2322	2,496	1,056			
8 Carroll	4110	7,633	8			
9 Chicot	4903	4,817	5,555			
10 Clark	6037	9,419	2,725			
11 Clay	5321	12,645	3			
12 Cleburne	3875	5,647	1			
13 Cleveland	2165	3,246	832			
14 Columbia	7533	10,646	4808			
15 Conway	6602	7,323	1,674			
16 Craighead	13541	26,047	881			
17 Crawford	6852	12,505	340			
18 Crittenden	8302	10,569	12,871			
19 Cross	4580	7608	2,640			
20 Dallas	3447	4,122	2,049			
21 Desha	5236	6,103	4,802			
22 Drew	4121	5,926	2,506			
23 Faulkner	9417	12,850	1,246			
24 Franklin	4298	6,363	63			
25 Fulton	2557	4,237	4			
26 Garland	21629	27,811	2,964			
27 Grant	3047	4,794	256			
28 Greene	7037	14,835	11			
29 Hempstead	5891	8,333	3,717			
30 Hot Spring	7522	11,367	1,584			
31 Howard	3063	5,667	1,210			

(1-3: Arkansas)

ARKANSAS - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age: White	Of Voting April 1960 Nonwhite			
32 Independence	6960	12,386	321			
33 Izard	2486	4,949	36			
34 Jackson	6828	11,117	1,736			
35 Jefferson	22969	27,284	17,505			
36 Johnson	4683	7,715	137			
37 Lafayette	2967	3,839	2,447			
38 Lawrence	5538	10,016	112			
39 Lee	4011	4,545	5,957			
40 Lincoln	3882	4,619	3,579			
41 Little River	3194	3,923	1,415			
42 Logan	5896	10,270	163			
43 Lonoke	7477	11,121	2,518			
44 Madison	4726	5,552	7			
45 Marion	2759	3,938	2			
46 Miller	9493	14,327	4,290			
47 Mississippi	14911	26,739	9,638			
48 Monroe	4237	5,101	3,914			
49 Montgomery	2202	3,372	20			
50 Nevada	3625	4,619	1,940			
51 Newton	2769	3,403	2			
52 Ouachita	10698	12,021	6,163			
53 Perry	2387	2,892	82			
54 Phillips	9790	10,431	12,208			
55 Pike	2787	4,786	188			
56 Poinsett	8679	14,636	1,446			
57 Polk	4608	7,686	8			
58 Pope	7780	12,431	370			
59 Prairie	3310	5,179	938			
60 Pulaski	79289	118,811	27,822			
61 Randolph	4009	7,427	94			
62 St. Francis	7038	7,963	8,403			
63 Saline	9313	16,990	1,340			
64 Scott	2964	4,625	3			
(2-3: Arkansas)						

ARKANSAS - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age: White	Of Voting April 1960 Nonwhite			
65 Searcy	3163	4942	1			
66 Sebastian	23493	38,180	2,485			
67 Sevier	3383	5,910	499			
68 Sharp	3047	4,104	0			
69 Stone	2340	3718	1			
70 Union	15580	21,725	7,590			
71 Van Buren	3352	4,565	56			
72 Washington	17070	33,359	311			
73 White	11,684	19,172	659			
74 Woodruff	3693	4,836	2,652			
75 Yell	4948	7,395	253			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

ARIZONA (Code 86)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 14	Votes Cast For President: 1964	Population of Voting Age: April 1 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Apache	3892	3686	9359			
2 Cochise	16,697	29,815	1,098			
3 Coconino	11,037	15,956	5,152			
4 Gila	10,537	12,573	1,591			
5 Graham	5,438	6,440	686			
6 Greenlee	4,279	5860	91			
7 Maricopa	265,326	362,276	18,361			
8 Mohave	4,334	4,247	345			
9 Navajo	9,649	9601	8,046			
10 Pima	101,278	144,974	8,762			
11 Pinal	16,872	27,690	4,604			
12 Santa Cruz	3,460	5,877	96			
13 Yavapai	13,556	17,726	484			
14 Yuma	14,410	24,261	2,025			

(Arizona)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

CALIFORNIA
(Code 93)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 58	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population age: White	Population age: Nonwhite			
1 Alameda	427,340	490,808	78,375			
2 Alpine	215	138	90			
3 Amador	5,098	5,799	92			
4 Butte	40,419	50,328	907			
5 Calaveras	5,397	6,585	129			
6 Colusa	4,606	7,071	234			
7 Contra Costa	178,245	217,520	14,723			
8 Del Norte	5,727	9,610	362			
9 El Dorado	14,610	18,181	149			
10 Fresno	136,308	193,753	14,893			
11 Glenn	7,290	10,290	109			
12 Humboldt	38,499	58,462	1,574			
13 Imperial	21,492	38,239	2,976			
14 Inyo	5,915	6,892	510			
15 Kern	109,308	153,259	10,704			
16 Kings	18,840	26,025	1,652			
17 Lake	8,302	9,379	243			
18 Lassen	6,201	7,836	370			
19 Los Angeles	2,730,918	3,488,289	342,637			
20 Madera	13,862	20,888	1,841			
21 Marin	75,364	88,049	3,525			
22 Mariposa	2,968	3,435	77			
23 Mendocino	18,227	29,942	1,010			
24 Merced	28,269	46,646	3,636			
25 Modoc	3,358	4820	178			
26 Mono	1,516	1,419	79			
27 Monterey	64,844	106,743	9,943			
28 Napa	31,210	42,295	949			
29 Nevada	11,318	13,656	85			
30 Orange	401,165	394,706	5,340			
31 Placer	27,676	34,816	1,380			

(1-2: California)

CALIFORNIA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population Age:	of Voting April 1960			
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Plumas	5,713	6,891	258			
33 Riverside	141,788	176,080	9,388			
34 Sacramento	227,871	275,963	21,338			
35 San Benito	6,237	8,759	314			
36 San Bernardino	215,400	285,504	11,588			
37 San Diego	426,286	571,348	30,268			
38 San Francisco	323,908	451,072	82,702			
39 San Joaquin	95,839	137,798	14,244			
40 San Luis Obispo	37,186	48,935	1,896			
41 San Mateo	219,191	260,184	10,711			
42 Santa Barbara	86,486	99,354	3,730			
43 Santa Clara	320,527	359,082	11,982			
44 Santa Cruz	45,644	57,757	1,878			
45 Shasta	28,350	34,178	668			
46 Sierra	1,241	1,395	42			
47 Siskiyou	14,335	19,640	773			
48 Solano	50,240	70,251	8,881			
49 Sonoma	72,136	89,540	1,596			
50 Stanislaus	65,128	92,980	1,331			
51 Sutter	14,044	18,406	985			
52 Tehama	11,467	14,947	156			
53 Trinity	3,439	5,706	112			
54 Tulare	56,552	91,640	3,900			
55 Tuolumne	7,820	9,276	188			
56 Ventura	98,238	113,059	3,911			
57 Yolo	26,274	37,118	1,450			
58 Yuba	11,739	18,307	1,067			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

COLORADO (Code 84)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 63	Votes cast for President 1964	Population 21 yrs. of age and over, April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Adams	51,454	60,855	1,070			
2 Alamosa	3,976	5,364	83			
3 Arapahoe	51,358	61,553	474			
4 Archuleta	1,008	1,421	15			
5 Baca	2,118	3,633	33			
6 Bent	2,696	4,451	57			
7 Boulder	40,336	43,176	311			
8 Chaffee	3,951	4,964	19			
9 Cheyenne	1,283	1,542	1			
10 Clear Creek	1,767	1,841	3			
11 Conejos	3,076	4,069	21			
12 Costilla	1,589	2,014	39			
13 Crowley	1,163	2,297	23			
14 Custer	767	843	0			
15 Delta	4,826	9,722	31			
16 Denver	218,288	292,477	19,894			
17 Dolores	818	1,135	50			
18 Douglas	2,791	2,884	4			
19 Eagle	1,945	2,539	15			
20 Elbert	1,785	2,308	9			
21 El Paso	51,801	80,249	3,352			
22 Fremont	9,085	13,145	203			
23 Garfield	5,488	7,414	9			
24 Gilpin	666	476	2			
25 Grand	1,724	2,132	5			
26 Gunnison	2,443	3,046	21			
27 Hinsdale	201	143	0			
28 Huerfano	3,634	4,595	34			
29 Jackson	741	1,051	3			
30 Jefferson	76,812	73,056	226			
31 Kiowa	1,280	1,404	5			

COLORADO - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population age: 21 and over: White	Nonwhite	C.P. Voting April 1960		
32 Kit Carson	3,333	4,086	6			
33 Lake	3051	3,871	21			
34 LaPlata	8,001	10,336	314			
35 Larimer	24,585	31,740	178			
36 Las Animas	8,453	11,393	57			
37 Lincoln	2,439	3,211	3			
38 Logan	7731	11,287	41			
39 Mesa	21082	29,561	132			
40 Mineral	296	272	0			
41 Moffat	3,103	4,055	4			
42 Montezuma	4738	7,317	344			
43 Montrose	6,705	10,253	58			
44 Morgan	7520	11,850	45			
45 Otero	9,636	13,356	191			
46 Ouray	820	971	3			
47 Park	1009	1188	0			
48 Phillips	2,260	2,766	1			
49 Pitkin	1,504	1,519	12			
50 Prowers	5821	7,447	39			
51 Pueblo	48,531	67,165	1534			
52 Rio Blanco	2,153	2,896	9			
53 Rio Grande	3867	5,911	18			
54 Routt	2964	3,525	23			
55 Saguache	1725	2,345	2			
56 San Juan	407	469	1			
57 San Miguel	970	1,485	179			
58 Sedgwick	1239	2,445	58			
59 Summit	829	1,177	4			
60 Teller	1264	1,616	0			
61 Washington	2779	3,839	8			
62 Weld	29,679	40,703	496			
63 Yuma	4171	5,559	2			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

CONNECTICUT
(Code 16)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 8	Votes Cast For President: 1964 V	Population of Voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Fairfield	320,358	394,582	20,082			
2 Hartford	328,882	415,078	18,066			
3 Litchfield	61,006	74,587	586			
4 Middlesex	45,214	55,191	1,038			
5 New Haven	316,399	398,187	18,948			
6 New London	78,942	109,622	3,019			
7 Tolland	32,146	39,331	261			
8 Windham	34,318	42,655	228			

V Excludes 1,313 write-in votes in state as a whole.

(Connecticut)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

DELAWARE
(Code 51)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 3	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of Voting Age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Kent	22,054	32,779	5,455			
2 New Castle	146,893	164,670	20,458			
3 Sussex	32,379	35,801	8,086			

(Delaware)

Washington, D.C.
(District of Columbia)

County	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population of Voting age: April 1, 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
Washington	198,597	262,557	246,553			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

FLORIDA (Code 59)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 67	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population 21 yr: White	of Voting April 1960 Nonwhite			
1 Alachua	24,634	30,555	9898			
2 Baker	2,258	3,203	807			
3 Bay	20,695	31,940	4964			
4 Bradford	4,307	5580	1345			
5 Brevard	49,384	58,433	6494			
6 Broward	153,670	189,517	27009			
7 Calhoun	2773	3434	582			
8 Charlotte	8994	8659	427			
9 Citrus	4850	5174	829			
10 Clay	6919	9508	1276			
11 Collier	6458	8163	1364			
12 Columbia	7304	8092	3122			
13 Dade	376,421	537,445	75573			
14 De Soto	3763	6339	1343			
15 Dixie	1831	2138	363			
16 Duval	160,481	203,804	58430			
17 Escambia	57785	76,688	18041			
18 Flagler	1658	1789	846			
19 Franklin	2785	3186	779			
20 Gadsden	9763	11,711	12261			
21 Gilchrist	1251	1513	154			
22 Glades	983	1061	741			
23 Gulf	3660	4196	1138			
24 Hamilton	2460	2486	1621			
25 Hardee	4229	6734	552			
26 Hendry	3002	3430	1180			
27 Hernando	4657	5689	1151			
28 Highlands	8980	10,997	2351			
29 Hillsborough	121,905	213,450	31114			
30 Holmes	4418	6131	249			
31 Indian River	11,313	13,182	2637			

FLORIDA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population Voting Age White	Population Voting Age Nonwhite			
32 Jackson	11,450	14,057	5,390			
33 Jefferson	3,188	2383	2600			
34 Lafayette	1193	1536	152			
35 Lake	30670	30535	6438			
36 Lee	33090	30363	4677			
37 Leon	26,108	28241	12332			
38 Levy	3,566	4483	1568			
39 Liberty	1287	1525	240			
40 Madison	4943	4380	3067			
41 Manatee	35221	42391	5278			
42 Marion	19991	21001	9283			
43 Martin	7913	9291	1753			
44 Monroe	13778	25512	2919			
45 Nassau	5915	7054	2076			
46 Okaloosa	17851	30816	2697			
47 Okeechobee	2332	2970	533			
48 Orange	87132	137780	21771			
49 Osceola	8047	11697	1122			
50 Palm Beach	93450	119343	29541			
51 Pasco	15741	22529	2391			
52 Pinellas	178795	255369	18121			
53 Polk	65261	97314	19294			
54 Putnam	10067	13695	5289			
55 St. Johns	11807	13771	4331			
56 St. Lucie	14952	17228	6527			
57 Santa Rosa	9553	14710	1087			
58 Sarasota	35854	49533	4135			
59 Seminole	19203	24372	7050			
60 Sumter	3890	5346	1523			
61 Suwannee	5395	6409	2149			
62 Taylor	4369	5454	1724			
63 Union	1450	2886	1083			
64 Volusia	59889	74209	11615			

FLORIDA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population Size	of Voting April 1960			
		White	Nonwhite			
65 Wakulla	2023	2120	753			
66 Walton	6.202	7958	1086			
67 Washington	4225	5364	1021			

FORM BC-185
(4-1-60)

HAWAII
(Code 02)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 5	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of Voting Age: April 1960 White	 Nonwhite			
1 Hawaii	24,973	6,718	27,876			
2 Honolulu	155,395	108,774	177,104			
3 Kalawao						
4 Kauai	10,684	3,107	13,244			
5 Maui	16,219	4,408	19,662			

(Hawaii)

FORM BC-185
(4-1-60)

IDAHO
(Code 82)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 44	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age: White	of Voting April 1960 Nonwhite			
1 Ada	45,043	53,615	381			
2 Adams	1,439	1,789	4			
3 Bannock	21,308	25,578	725			
4 Bear Lake	3,266	3,821	2			
5 Benewah	2,777	3,503	134			
6 Bingham	10,595	13,501	809			
7 Blaine	2,454	2,797	9			
8 Boise	864	951	6			
9 Bonner	7,303	9,143	24			
10 Bonneville	20,373	24,026	262			
11 Boundary	2,483	3,278	45			
12 Butte	1,497	1,830	8			
13 Camas	574	529	—			
14 Canyon	24,067	32,909	429			
15 Caribou	2,725	3,066	2			
16 Cassia	6,617	8,213	84			
17 Clark	448	487	2			
18 Clearwater	3,213	5,060	44			
19 Custer	1,434	1,677	5			
20 Elmore	4,167	8,647	262			
21 Franklin	3,983	4,300	17			
22 Fremont	3,915	4,475	34			
23 Gem	4,307	5,297	18			
24 Gooding	4,375	5,513	17			
25 Idaho	5,178	7,403	138			
26 Jefferson	4,801	5,690	40			
27 Jerome	4,941	6,279	41			
28 Kootenai	14,311	17,536	102			
29 Latah	8,724	12,243	82			
30 Lemhi	2,563	3,344	30			
31 Lewis	2,044	2,561	40			

(1-2: Idaho)

IDAHO - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age: White	of Voting April 1960 Nonwhite			
32 Lincoln	1,586	2,050	16			
33 Madison	4,050	4,460	52			
34 Minidoka	5,938	7,261	63			
35 Nez Perce	13,157	15,498	447			
36 Oneida	1,879	1,974	8			
37 Owyhee	2,384	3,487	131			
38 Payette	5,272	7,222	109			
39 Power	2,127	2,122	92			
40 Shoshone	8,038	11,936	31			
41 Teton	1,273	1,290	—			
42 Twin Falls	19,156	24,102	94			
43 Valley	2,106	2,117	10			
44 Washington	3,682	4,933	122			
45 Yellowstone Nat. Park (part)	—	—	—			

(2-2: Idaho)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

ILLINOIS (Code 33)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 102	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age: White	of Voting April 1960 Nonwhite			
1 Adams	32,314	42,733	802			
2 Alexander	7,658	7,011	2,994			
3 Bond	6,873	8,805	59			
4 Boone	8,747	12,137	26			
5 Brown	3,438	4,042	2			
6 Bureau	18,658	23,676	29			
7 Calhoun	3,093	3,787	3			
8 Carroll	8,549	12,039	51			
9 Cass	7,260	9,235	3			
10 Champaign	47,802	70,206	4,390			
11 Christian	18,051	23,121	76			
12 Clark	8,967	10,658	7			
13 Clay	8,216	9,960	4			
14 Clinton	12,031	14,104	47			
15 Coles	20,255	26,240	143			
16 Cook	2,432,899	2,768,190	500,295			
17 Crawford	10,458	13,432	5			
18 Cumberland	5,307	6,149	2			
19 De Kalb	22,049	29,908	197			
20 De Witt	7,976	10,800	31			
21 Douglas	8,918	11,527	6			
22 Du Page	165,100	177,371	749			
23 Edgar	11,793	14,341	69			
24 Edwards	4,353	5,139	16			
25 Effingham	11,826	13,674	13			
26 Fayette	10,787	13,816	397			
27 Ford	8,077	10,112	30			
28 Franklin	21,201	26,603	32			
29 Fulton	20,815	26,897	85			
30 Gallatin	4,239	4,658	48			
31 Greene	7,909	11,053	18			

(1-4: Illinois)

ILLINOIS - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population Age 21 of Voting April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Grundy	10,768	13,463	25			
33 Hamilton	5694	6,611	2			
34 Hancock	11,756	15,458	17			
35 Hardin	2963	3596	15			
36 Henderson	4134	4954	11			
37 Henry	23,729	30,387	272			
38 Iroquois	16,452	20,433	87			
39 Jackson	19,178	23,469	1,790			
40 Jasper	6,020	6,960	6			
41 Jefferson	15,901	20,013	489			
42 Jersey	6,977	9,862	32			
43 Jo Daviess	9435	13,035	10			
44 Johnson	3987	4454	12			
45 Kane	87,094	123,853	2,764			
46 Kankakee	36,874	53,600	5,164			
47 Kendall	9,140	10,188	9			
48 Knox	27,850	37,614	1,180			
49 Lake	121,667	159,087	6,999			
50 La Salle	52,139	68,312	247			
51 Lawrence	9312	11720	123			
52 Lee	15,760	23,425	433			
53 Liningston	18,715	23956	675			
54 Logan	14,517	21,199	306			
55 McDonough	13,051	17,770	81			
56 McHenry	40,517	49,109	73			
57 McLean	38,670	50,032	710			
58 Macon	53,002	68900	3,026			
59 Macoupin	23,657	28,053	37			
60 Madison	95,124	129,173	6,236			
61 Marion	19,423	24,180	743			
62 Marshall	6,770	8,243	10			
63 Mason	7690	9703	4			
64 Massac	6,474	8,477	596			

ILLINOIS - Cont.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of Voting Age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
65 Menard	4813	5,898	9			
66 Mercer	8,630	10,536	14			
67 Monroe	8,541	9,656	11			
68 Montgomery	17,006	19,926	82			
69 Morgan	16,475	23,125	840			
70 Moultrie	6,236	8,512	5			
71 Ogle	17,347	22,892	28			
72 Peoria	80,687	112,231	5,165			
73 Perry	10,926	12,259	234			
74 Piatt	7038	9,026	1			
75 Pike	10,689	13,230	13			
76 Pope	2446	2,672	41			
77 Pulaski	5,048	4,364	2,003			
78 Putnam	2490	2,901	9			
79 Randolph	15,002	18,758	1,198			
80 Richland	8,140	10,112	8			
81 Rock Island	65,473	90,842	2,366			
82 St. Clair	102,231	130,177	24,995			
83 Saline	14,028	17,324	519			
84 Sangamon	76,166	89,003	3,532			
85 Schuyler	4921	5,624	3			
86 Scott	3,579	4,046	0			
87 Shelby	11,369	14,597	6			
88 Stark	3893	5,014	7			
89 Stephenson	20,106	28,140	724			
90 Tazewell	45,731	58,492	42			
91 Union	8,350	12,025	270			
92 Vermilion	44,271	57,024	2,719			
93 Wabash	6626	8,756	0			
94 Warren	9931	13,080	203			
95 Washington	7510	9,112	7			
96 Wayne	9943	11,930	5			
97 White	9963	12,432	52			
(3-4: Illinois)						

ILLINOIS - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age: White	of Voting April 1960 Nonwhite			
98 Whiteside	25,476	34,495	89			
99 Will	88,283	107,559	7,199			
100 Williamson	23,743	29,821	421			
101 Winnebago	88,754	119,833	4,271			
102 Woodford	12,162	14,600	12			

(4-4: Illinois)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

INDIANA
(Code 32)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 92	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age: White	of Voting April 1968 Nonwhite			
1 Adams	10,973	14,662	4			
2 Allen	100,353	131,063	5964			
3 Bartholomew	24,090	27,673	177			
4 Benton	5831	6,815	9			
5 Blackford	6829	8427	6			
6 Boone	14,181	16,648	34			
7 Brown	3544	3,992	2			
8 Carroll	8714	10,264	8			
9 Cass	18978	25,846	231			
10 Clark	25,156	34,103	1,554			
11 Clay	12,026	15,558	121			
12 Clinton	15,582	18,923	42			
13 Crawford	4380	5223	1			
14 Daviess	12,898	15,818	75			
15 Dearborn	13,198	16,799	129			
16 Decatur	10,315	11,937	3			
17 De Kalb	13,889	16,755	29			
18 Delaware	48,678	61,737	3192			
19 Dubois	13939	15,420	1			
20 Elkhart	41,914	61,484	1,166			
21 Fayette	11,393	14,206	294			
22 Floyd	23,638	29,406	1,097			
23 Fountain	10,278	11,570	10			
24 Franklin	6995	9,374	1			
25 Fulton	8819	10,492	30			
26 Gibson	16458	18,355	383			
27 Grant	32,494	43,265	1,654			
28 Greene	14,570	17,138	7			
29 Hamilton	19,681	23,327	220			
30 Hancock	12,993	15,551	24			
31 Harrison	9708	11,193	86			

(1-3: Indiana)

INDIANA - Con:						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population 21 & Over of Voting Age April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Hendricks	20,405	23,231	73			
33 Henry	22,697	29,204	276			
34 Howard	30,941	39,091	1,433			
35 Huntington	16,844	26,583	32			
36 Jackson	14,971	18,209	82			
37 Jasper	8,516	10,382	12			
38 Jay	11,318	13,896	64			
39 Jefferson	11,586	14,582	242			
40 Jennings	7811	9,809	151			
41 Johnson	20,663	24,842	217			
42 Knox	20,411	25,730	154			
43 Kosciusko	19,389	24,113	82			
44 Lagrange	5,640	9437	8			
45 Lake	209,533	248,498	44,818			
46 La Porte	38,594	55,523	2,884			
47 Lawrence	16,956	22,164	68			
48 Madison	57,729	73,268	2,698			
49 Marion	296,381	366,386	57,704			
50 Marshall	16,415	19,028	54			
51 Martin	5,146	5,889	14			
52 Miami	14,060	22,078	446			
53 Monroe	22,372	33,566	250			
54 Montgomery	15930	19,632	127			
55 Morgan	15428	19,102	14			
56 Newton	5,340	6,776	8			
57 Noble	13363	16,694	12			
58 Ohio	2308	2,514	38			
59 Orange	8710	10,376	133			
60 Owen	6160	7227	14			
61 Parke	7631	9,364	26			
62 Perry	9341	9,897	17			
63 Pike	7272	8306	17			
64 Porter	37,607	38,619	45			

INDIANA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast For President: 1964	Population of Voting Age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
65 Posey	9770	11,501	165			
66 Pulaski	6634	7,425	25			
67 Putnam	11630	14402	285			
68 Randolph	13506	17484	52			
69 Ripley	10553	12,345	10			
70 Rush	9025	11,934	137			
71 St. Joseph	106,346	134601	7358			
72 Scott	6203	8,161	4			
73 Shelby	16455	20,152	249			
74 Spencer	8834	9,569	117			
75 Starke	8321	10,225	23			
76 Steuben	8105	10,553	39			
77 Sullivan	11,360	14,035	26			
78 Switzerland	3640	4,420	13			
79 Tippecanoe	39,372	50,689	755			
80 Tipton	8,316	9464	6			
81 Union	3005	3,758	43			
82 Vanderburgh	73,407	96,157	5,648			
83 Vermillion	9,382	11,473	14			
84 Vigo	46751	65,195	2,962			
85 Wabash	14,535	19,236	51			
86 Warren	4425	5,066	2			
87 Warrick	11,640	13781	139			
88 Washington	8,573	10,574	4			
89 Wayne	30,724	43,465	2,058			
90 Wells	10,055	12,694	4			
91 White	10455	11,842	2			
92 Whitley	10,747	12,347	8			

FORM BC-185 (6-1-60)

IOWA
(Code 42)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 99	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age: White	of Voting Age 1960 Nonwhite			
1 Adair	4812	6,944	2			
2 Adams	3263	4685	2			
3 Allamakee	7200	9,347	4			
4 Appanoose	7856	10,673	78			
5 Audubon	4885	6,618	2			
6 Benton	10084	14,043	11			
7 Black Hawk	50516	67,816	2,463			
8 Boone	11,335	17,747	19			
9 Bremer	8939	12,389	20			
10 Buchanan	8923	12,852	32			
11 Buena Vista	8997	12,941	10			
12 Butler	6832	10,696	3			
13 Calhoun	6337	9,771	21			
14 Carroll	10207	13,352	3			
15 Cass	8198	11,392	10			
16 Cedar	7735	10,844	5			
17 Cerro Gordo	21,071	24,925	193			
18 Cherokee	7525	11,468	17			
19 Chickasaw	7182	8838	7			
20 Clarke	4312	5,364	5			
21 Clay	7749	11,043	1			
22 Clayton	9550	13,387	6			
23 Clinton	22533	33,129	218			
24 Crawford	8037	11,202	4			
25 Dallas	11,262	15,006	65			
26 Davis	4402	5,757	8			
27 Decatur	4985	6,478	6			
28 Delaware	8065	10,463	2			
29 Des Moines	19,762	27,385	335			
30 Dickinson	5938	7,777	7			
31 Dubuque	33823	45,121	75			

(1-4: Iowa)

IOWA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age: White	of Voting April 1960 Nonwhite			
32. Emmet	6,103	8,623	3			
33 Fayette	12,482	17,044	28			
34 Floyd	9,043	12,853	1			
35 Franklin	6,061	9,601	4			
36 Fremont	4,761	6,579	4			
37 Greene	5,986	8,931	3			
38 Grundy	6,808	8,742	3			
39 Guthrie	6,146	8,571	5			
40 Hamilton	8,332	12,102	78			
41 Hancock	6,133	8,647	11			
42 Hardin	9,304	14,083	7			
43 Harrison	7,787	10,713	10			
44 Henry	7,482	11,643	84			
45 Howard	6,211	7,699	6			
46 Humboldt	5,630	7,847	1			
47 Ida	4,884	6,413	1			
48 Iowa	7,102	9,947	3			
49 Jackson	8,205	12,184	7			
50 Jasper	15,561	21,427	33			
51 Jefferson	6,916	9,732	38			
52 Johnson	21,618	31,505	364			
53 Jones	8,672	12,246	63			
54 Keokuk	7,404	9,713	3			
55 Kossuth	10,674	14,442	12			
56 Lee	18,582	26,741	674			
57 Linn	62,029	81,693	748			
58 Louisa	4,481	6,319	1			
59 Lucas	5,260	7,214	9			
60 Lyon	5,935	8,284	2			
61 Madison	5,780	7,733	3			
62 Mahaska	10,205	14,847	50			
63 Marion	11,842	16,358	76			
64 Marshall	16,176	23,433	176			

(2-4: Iowa)

IOWA - Con.							
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population age: White	of Voting April 1960 Nonwhite				
65 Mills	4899	7,983	10				
66 Mitchell	6,373	8,222	1				
67 Monona	6187	8,560	7				
68 Monroe	4791	6,550	41				
69 Montgomery	6601	9,363	13				
70 Muscatine	13577	26,740	78				
71 O'Brien	8637	11,374	8				
72 Osceola	4301	5,862	1				
73 Page	9,209	13,978	47				
74 Palo Alto	6647	8,442	3				
75 Plymouth	10613	13,744	6				
76 Pocahontas	6,072	8 447	1				
77 Polk	111,953	155,576	5,978				
78 Pottawattamie	31799	48,210	376				
79 Poweshiek	8334	11,377	19				
80 Ringgold	3840	5,046	2				
81 Sac	7302	10,318	1				
82 Scott	51098	76,081	1,062				
83 Shelby	7137	9,105	1				
84 Sioux	12323	14712	15				
85 Story	20,610	28,532	220				
86 Tama	9608	12,979	218				
87 Taylor	4942	6,132	7				
88 Union	6263	8,830	10				
89 Van Buren	4257	6,308	9				
90 Wapello	19546	28,258	274				
91 Warren	10351	12,036	20				
92 Washington	7919	11,826	13				
93 Wayne	5062	6,645	2				
94 Webster	19635	28,284	177				
95 Winnebago	6017	7,995	2				
96 Winneshiek	9759	12,547	7				
97 Woodbury	44218	63,749	1,043				

IOWA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age: White	of Voting April 1960 Nonwhite			
98 Worth	4723	6,192	34			
99 Wright	7836	11,678	9			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

KANSAS
(Code 47)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 105	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population age:	of Voting April 1960			
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Allen	6,252	12,333	187			
2 Anderson	3,780	5,721	19			
3 Atchison	8,229	11,859	826			
4 Barber	3,624	5,321	21			
5 Barton	12,221	18,562	337			
6 Bourbon	7,323	10,446	361			
7 Brown	5,636	8,430	267			
8 Butler	15,532	22,774	154			
9 Chase	1,793	2,539	27			
10 Chautauqua	2,640	4,001	52			
11 Cherokee	9,497	14,000	224			
12 Cheyenne	2,040	3,012	2			
13 Clark	1,665	2,161	3			
14 Clay	4,873	7,084	10			
15 Cloud	6,043	9,198	8			
16 Coffey	3,606	5,581	6			
17 Comanche	1,524	2,090	0			
18 Cowley	14,797	23,327	705			
19 Crawford	16,644	24,421	316			
20 Decatur	2,712	3,659	2			
21 Dickinson	8,847	13,791	127			
22 Doniphan	3,824	5,690	245			
23 Douglas	17,353	23,838	1,547			
24 Edwards	2,377	3,159	13			
25 Elk	2,273	3,492	4			
26 Ellis	8,020	11,369	33			
27 Ellsworth	3,537	5,025	23			
28 Finney	5,883	8,635	115			
29 Ford	8,761	12,206	149			
30 Franklin	8,221	12,255	223			
31 Geary	5,745	14,582	2,320			

(1-4: Kansas)

KANSAS - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age:	of Voting April 1960			
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Gove	1813	2,315	3			
33 Graham	2408	3,064	120			
34 Grant	1775	2,799	7			
35 Gray	1793	2,601	5			
36 Greeley	866	1,151	6			
37 Greenwood	4801	7,414	6			
38 Hamilton	1421	1,798	9			
39 Harper	3810	6,162	20			
40 Harvey	10,415	15,377	299			
41 Haskell	1409	1,631	7			
42 Hodgeman	1434	1,801	12			
43 Jackson	4336	6,480	213			
44 Jefferson	4485	6,908	85			
45 Jewell	3535	4,813	4			
46 Johnson	69,179	81,664	632			
47 Kearny	1315	1,711	7			
48 Kingman	4175	6,003	13			
49 Kiowa	2130	2,872	2			
50 Labette	11,062	16,208	743			
51 Lane	1370	1,789	1			
52 Leavenworth	13,089	27,756	3,270			
53 Lincoln	2703	3,689	10			
54 Linn	3679	5,492	43			
55 Logan	1941	2,253	39			
56 Lyon	11,462	16,119	378			
57 McPherson	9826	14,891	63			
58 Marion	6341	9,476	29			
59 Marshall	6822	10,188	13			
60 Meade	2492	3,254	4			
61 Miami	7570	12,409	461			
62 Mitchell	3880	5,645	2			
63 Montgomery	17,416	26,796	1,832			
64 Morris	3323	4760	37			

KANSAS - Con.							
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of Voting Age: April 1960					
		White	Nonwhite				
65 Morton	1,561	1,845	6				
66 Nemaha	5683	7,754	31				
67 Neosho	8,296	12,127	204				
68 Ness	2615	3,362	1				
69 Norton	3736	5,168	24				
70 Osage	5460	8,150	24				
71 Osborne	3401	4,876	13				
72 Ottawa	3052	4,499	12				
73 Pawnee	4074	6,767	164				
74 Phillips	4000	5527	12				
75 Pottawatomie	5070	7,592	33				
76 Pratt	5,129	7,354	163				
77 Rawlins	2261	3098	0				
78 Reno	23,973	34,851	699				
79 Republic	4674	6,590	3				
80 Rice	6098	8,582	63				
81 Riley	12,137	22,267	1,431				
82 Rooks	3124	5,620	26				
83 Rush	2901	3890	7				
84 Russell	4977	7,002	23				
85 Saline	16,357	30,834	1,053				
86 Scott	2177	2,984	3				
87 Sedgwick	120,181	187,605	11,082				
88 Seward	5462	8798	152				
89 Shawnee	56,625	80,745	5,996				
90 Sheridan	1847	2,785	1				
91 Sherman	3010	4,066	20				
92 Smith	3871	5,192	2				
93 Stafford	3641	4814	22				
94 Stanton	970	1,151	16				
95 Stevens	2020	2,459	39				
96 Sumner	10450	15,518	145				
97 Thomas	3348	4,300	2				

KANSAS - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population Age:	Of Voting April 1960			
		White	Nonwhite			
98 Trego	2,162	3,158	2			
99 Wabaunsee	3,152	4,204	88			
100 Wallace	1,018	1,201	15			
101 Washington	4,705	6,986	5			
102 Wichita	1,197	1,514	1			
103 Wilson	5,556	8,444	48			
104 Woodson	2,431	3,668	0			
105 Wyandotte	65,351	93,108	17,593			

FORM EC-185
(4-1-60)

KENTUCKY
(Code 61)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 120	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Adair	5,927	8,846	474			
2 Allen	4,342	8,204	170			
3 Anderson	3,586	5,424	238			
4 Ballard	3,409	5,388	274			
5 Barren	9,380	17,181	1,345			
6 Bath	3,587	5,535	279			
7 Bell	11,227	19,414	763			
8 Boone	8,522	12,971	99			
9 Bourbon	5,316	10,066	1,696			
10 Boyd	18,437	32,496	618			
11 Boyle	6,962	12,806	1,549			
12 Bracken	2,819	4,909	54			
13 Breathitt	5,383	8,465	34			
14 Breckinridge	5,911	8,765	407			
15 Bullitt	5,330	8,868	153			
16 Butler	3,992	5,948	56			
17 Caldwell	4,598	8,160	609			
18 Calloway	8,886	14,633	432			
19 Campbell	28,264	54,714	544			
20 Carlisle	1,853	3,812	58			
21 Carroll	3,105	5,037	149			
22 Carter	6,987	12,234	8			
23 Casey	5,356	8,395	26			
24 Christian	12,630	30,262	7,897			
25 Clark	6,237	12,191	1,285			
26 Clay	6,343	10,541	232			
27 Clinton	3,369	5,365	27			
28 Crittenden	3,497	5,681	78			
29 Cumberland	3,164	4,739	281			
30 Daviess	23,755	40,662	1,934			
31 Edmonson	2,647	4,849	59			

KENTUCKY - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Elliott	2,351	3,584	—			
33 Estill	4,102	7,659	32			
34 Fayette	44,192	75,076	13,141			
35 Fleming	4,352	6,842	235			
36 Floyd	14,041	22,257	203			
37 Franklin	12,494	17,864	1,841			
38 Fulton	3,672	4,208	1,063			
39 Gallatin	1,517	2,464	65			
40 Garrard	3,935	5851	556			
41 Grant	3,545	6,122	41			
42 Graves	12,390	19,492	1,053			
43 Grayson	5,894	9,671	51			
44 Green	4,286	6,997	347			
45 Greenup	10,764	17,033	87			
46 Hancock	2,190	3,298	90			
47 Hardin	11,264	42,742	3,376			
48 Harlan	13,428	26,353	2,136			
49 Harrison	5,246	8,820	378			
50 Hart	5,295	8,105	813			
51 Henderson	10,785	18,991	2,093			
52 Henry	4,363	6,771	497			
53 Hickman	2,774	4,076	431			
54 Hopkins	11,297	22,717	2,187			
55 Jackson	3,597	6,047	3			
56 Jefferson	227,823	337,340	48,154			
57 Jessamine	4,530	8,122	829			
58 Johnson	6,157	11,946	1			
59 Kenton	38,795	74,570	2525			
60 Knott	5,230	8,898	89			
61 Knox	7,770	14,299	269			
62 Larue	3,957	6,207	317			
63 Laurel	8,665	14,545	148			
64 Lawrence	4,455	7,297	39			
(2-4: Kentucky)						

KENTUCKY - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
65 Lee	2,543	4,196	26			
66 Leslie	3,774	5,405	-			
67 Letcher	8,063	15,934	392			
68 Lewis	4,294	7,510	13			
69 Lincoln	5,277	9,551	581			
70 Livingston	2,979	4,620	60			
71 Logan	8,494	12,271	1,437			
72 Lyon	2,006	3,903	454			
73 McCracken	20,808	33,691	3,834			
74 McCreary	3,683	6,632	1			
75 McLean	3,755	6,031	34			
76 Madison	11,200	20,588	1,668			
77 Magoffin	3,853	6,021	4			
78 Marion	5,344	8,648	722			
79 Marshall	7,668	10,831	11			
80 Martin	3,306	5,103	1			
81 Mason	6,952	10,783	1,048			
82 Meade	4,136	9,719	471			
83 Menifee	1,401	2,544	10			
84 Mercer	5,317	9,144	564			
85 Metcalfe	3,252	5,250	205			
86 Monroe	5,010	7,234	219			
87 Montgomery	4,583	7,570	796			
88 Morgan	3,887	6,501	3			
89 Muhlenberg	9,741	14,751	827			
90 Nelson	7,296	11,371	985			
91 Nicholas	2,378	4,356	117			
92 Ohio	6,287	11,332	219			
93 Oldham	3,884	8,066	912			
94 Owen	3,389	5,273	213			
95 Owsley	1,744	3,193	11			
96 Pendleton	3,815	6,255	49			
97 Perry	9,947	18,052	536			

KENTUCKY - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
98 Pike	21,253	36,970	347			
99 Powell	2,625	3,747	66			
100 Pulaski	13,278	20,848	389			
101 Robertson	1,119	1,666	12			
102 Rockcastle	4,476	7,261	2			
103 Rowan	4,396	8,129	26			
104 Russell	4,293	6,763	84			
105 Scott	4,639	9,286	1,111			
106 Shelby	6,333	10,500	1,415			
107 Simpson	4,144	6,680	923			
108 Spencer	1,954	3,262	214			
109 Taylor	5,709	9,887	547			
110 Todd	4,091	6,173	1,115			
111 Trigg	3,714	4,894	849			
112 Trimble	2,178	3,193	4			
113 Union	5,181	8,196	785			
114 Warren	15,831	27,386	2,757			
115 Washington	4,351	6,147	601			
116 Wayne	5,144	8,403	217			
117 Webster	4,964	6,856	813			
118 Whitley	9,599	15,759	107			
119 Wolfe	2,597	3,611	1			
120 Woodford	4,213	6,611	974			
(4-4: Kentucky)						

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

MAINE
(Code 11)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 16	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Androscoggin	37,521	52,670	67			
2 Aroostook	27,546	54,716	1,071			
3 Cumberland	73,209	111,608	492			
4 Franklin	8,671	11,831	11			
5 Hancock	13,719	20,248	43			
6 Kennebec	36,120	54,285	121			
7 Knox	11,426	18,374	44			
8 Lincoln	9,083	11,726	10			
9 Oxford	18,956	26,457	29			
10 Penobscot	43,215	72,928	787			
11 Piscataquis	7,254	10,624	16			
12 Sagadahoc	9,739	13,859	75			
13 Somerset	15,235	23,771	38			
14 Waldo	8,721	13,338	11			
15 Washington	13,128	20,280	280			
16 York	47,422	60,860	185			

(Maine)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

MARYLAND (Code 52)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 23	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Allegany	32,809	52,303	641			
2 Anne Arundel	64,706	101,232	17,086			
3 Baltimore	195,073	280,974	9,454			
5 Calvert	5,100	5,377	2,747			
6 Caroline	6,406	9,838	2,135			
7 Carroll	16,783	32,040	1,296			
8 Cecil	13,184	25,200	1,761			
9 Charles	10,001	11,909	4,564			
10 Dorchester	9,891	14,131	5,053			
11 Frederick	23,812	40,337	2,709			
12 Garrett	7,139	11,659	–			
13 Harford	23,518	39,570	4,128			
14 Howard	15,018	18,695	2,146			
15 Kent	6,121	7,185	2,184			
16 Montgomery	155,667	186,770	7,221			
17 Prince Georges	128,219	183,991	16,245			
18 Queen Annes	6,007	7,564	2,506			
19 St. Marys	8,709	16,125	3,278			
20 Somerset	7,682	8,131	3,972			
21 Talbot	8,364	10,236	3,436			
22 Washington	32,614	54,671	1,367			
23 Wicomico	16,143	24,154	6,068			
24 Worcester	6,686	10,431	4,167			
INDEPENDENT CITY						
4 Baltimore	316,805	408,653	179,742			

(Maryland)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

MASSACHUSETTS
(Code 14)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 14	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Barnstable	35,355	42,911	1,333			
2 Berkshire	64,331	87,915	919			
3 Bristol	186,636	251,768	2,925			
4 Dukes	3,214	3,672	197			
5 Essex	282,945	359,897	1,784			
6 Franklin	25,624	34,155	125			
7 Hampden	178,219	260,122	8,162			
8 Hampshire	43,645	62,276	354			
9 Middlesex	576,810	760,421	9,925			
10 Nantucket	1,787	3,344	80			
11 Norfolk	256,012	311,413	1,658			
12 Plymouth	120,335	148,407	2,731			
13 Suffolk	298,254	422,255	40,140			
14 Worcester	271,631	365,026	2,267			

(Massachusetts)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

MICHIGAN
(Code 34)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 83	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Alcona	2,815	3,790	23			
2 Alger	3,755	5,224	28			
3 Allegan	23,194	31,920	514			
4 Alpena	11,472	15,602	7			
5 Antrim	4,863	6,128	49			
6 Arenac	3,852	5,748	37			
7 Baraga	3,736	4,084	127			
8 Barry	13,650	19,563	23			
9 Bay	41,706	59,250	384			
10 Benzie	3,662	4,598	52			
11 Berrien	60,162	81,249	6,576			
12 Branch	13,034	20,371	75			
13 Calhoun	52,026	76,952	5,438			
14 Cass	14,742	19,258	2,075			
15 Charlevoix	6,428	7,745	118			
16 Cheboygan	6,381	8,241	56			
17 Chippewa	10,658	17,675	531			
18 Clare	5,197	3,710	6			
19 Clinton	14,837	20,662	58			
20 Crawford	2,160	3,916	122			
21 Delta	14,507	19,616	81			
22 Dickinson	11,297	15,092	5			
23 Eaton	21,555	27,992	82			
24 Emmet	6,937	9,936	350			
25 Genesee	148,878	192,748	18,854			
26 Gladwin	4,683	6,066	7			
27 Gogebic	11,319	15,346	33			
28 Grand Traverse	13,693	20,331	214			
29 Gratiot	12,778	20,983	51			
30 Hillsdale	13,090	20,245	29			
31 Houghton	14,791	22,473	49			

(1-3: Michigan)

MICHIGAN - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
32 Huron	13,626	19,157	11			
33 Ingham	86,829	116,904	4257			
34 Ionia	16,113	24,039	783			
35 Iosco	7,044	9,599	114			
36 Iron	8,423	10,712	18			
37 Isabella	11,727	17,040	314			
38 Jackson	49,247	74,216	5,081			
39 Kalamazoo	68,104	95,230	3,069			
40 Kalkaska	2,084	2,617	13			
41 Kent	153,959	202,656	7,805			
42 Keweenaw	1,235	1,604	18			
43 Lake	2,770	2,414	978			
44 Lapeer	14,624	23,645	248			
45 Leelanau	4451	5,333	121			
46 Lenawee	28,260	43,561	220			
47 Livingston	16,441	21,552	183			
48 Luce	2,331	4922	64			
49 Mackinac	4717	6,053	138			
50 Macomb	176,521	217,268	3,461			
51 Manistee	8,444	11,421	125			
52 Marquette	20,696	32,578	935			
53 Mason	9,846	13,131	72			
54 Mecosta	7,677	11,426	111			
55 Menominee	10,682	14,418	77			
56 Midland	21,655	26,726	64			
57 Missaukee	3,075	3,760	12			
58 Monroe	38,111	55,101	1,021			
59 Montcalm	14,177	20,948	52			
60 Montmorency	2,236	2,636	1			
61 Muskegon	59,634	76,992	6,249			
62 Newaygo	10,349	13,348	327			
63 Oakland	297,508	376,393	12,296			
64 Oceana	6,743	9,420	94			

MICHIGAN - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1965				
		White	Nonwhite			
65 Ogemaw	4,426	5,694	3			
66 Ontonagon	5,150	6,327	9			
67 Osceola	5,690	7,887	39			
68 Oscoda	1,721	2,087	1			
69 Otsego	3,462	4,335	16			
70 Ottawa	44,735	53,816	173			
71 Presque Isle	5,337	7,277	6			
72 Roscommon	4,074	4594	8			
73 Saginaw	73,582	97,956	9,299			
74 St. Clair	41,735	60,393	1,396			
75 St. Joseph	16,623	25,075	445			
76 Sanilac	13,874	18,890	13			
77 Schoolcraft	4,076	5,094	46			
78 Shiawassee	21,503	30,364	48			
79 Tuscola	16,905	24,612	123			
80 Van Buren	19,564	26,647	1,993			
81 Washtenaw	67,890	94,118	7,697			
82 Wayne	1,094,724	1,334,046	299,769			
83 Wexford	7,446	10,806	17			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

MINNESOTA
(Code 41)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 87	Votes cast for President, 1964	Population of voting age, April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Aitkin	5,890	7353	40			
2 Anoka	45,005	43,661	170			
3 Becker	10,220	13,164	513			
4 Beltrami	9,166	11,806	1164			
5 Benton	7,520	9,276	4			
6 Big Stone	4,172	5,240	8			
7 Blue Earth	18,797	25,680	34			
8 Brown	11,937	16,316	7			
9 Carlton	12,359	16,156	356			
10 Carver	16,558	13,321	10			
11 Cass	7,754	9,365	694			
12 Chippewa	7,365	9,668	13			
13 Chisago	6,889	8,305	9			
14 Clay	16,285	21,343	35			
15 Clearwater	3,739	5,106	130			
16 Cook	1,742	1880	89			
17 Cottonwood	7,528	9611	2			
18 Crow Wing	14,349	18,734	34			
19 Dakota	42,328	42,619	98			
20 Dodge	5,620	7,594	9			
21 Douglas	10,175	12,965	12			
22 Faribault	10,775	13,999	9			
23 Fillmore	10,651	14,339	11			
24 Freeborn	16,709	22,042	72			
25 Goodhue	15,584	20,020	50			
26 Grant	4,366	5,374	4			
27 Hennepin	396,727	502,760	9,368			
28 Houston	7,326	9528	14			
29 Hubbard	4843	5599	42			
30 Isanti	6,018	8173	47			
31 Itasca	16,231	20,724	337			

MINNESOTA - Con.							
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite				
32 Jackson	7,021	4174	1				
33 Kanabec	4,024	5329	8				
34 Kandiyohi	13,156	18,277	30				
35 Kittson	3,946	4977	7				
36 Koochiching	7,491	9742	126				
37 Lac qui Parle	6,180	8103	1				
38 Lake	5,925	7623	27				
39 Lake of the Woods	1,765	2465	17				
40 Le Sueur	9,325	11,584	10				
41 Lincoln	4,428	5765	1				
42 Lyon	9,822	12,978	6				
43 McLeod	11,316	14,849	3				
44 Mahnomen	2,619	3086	338				
45 Marshall	6,490	8349	8				
46 Martin	12,126	15,923	10				
47 Meeker	8,378	11,084	1				
48 Mille Lacs	6,872	8456	162				
49 Morrison	11,032	14,369	5				
50 Mower	20,140	27,131	25				
51 Murray	6,152	7960	17				
52 Nicollet	8,736	13,793	65				
53 Nobles	9,960	13,098	11				
54 Norman	5,301	6975	4				
55 Olmsted	28,950	37,713	173				
56 Otter Tail	20,565	30,273	50				
57 Pennington	5,534	7327	18				
58 Pine	7,420	10,036	374				
59 Pipestone	5,851	7817	25				
60 Polk	16,111	21,175	47				
61 Pope	5,764	7176	4				
62 Ramsey	191,592	244,676	5340				
63 Red Lake	2,450	3210	1				
64 Redwood	9,277	12,465	69				

MINNESOTA - Con.							
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age April 1960 White	Nonwhite				
65 Renville	10,437	13,576	11				
66 Rice	14,843	22,140	54				
67 Rock	5,287	6,661	-				
68 Roseau	5,293	6,882	43				
69 St. Louis	105,183	137,328	1014				
70 Scott	10,570	11,919	18				
71 Sherburne	5,940	7184	113				
72 Sibley	7,436	9737	3				
73 Stearns	32,166	42,351	87				
74 Steele	10,939	14,665	4				
75 Stevens	5,137	6249	2				
76 Swift	6,524	8,691	1				
77 Todd	9,702	13,474	7				
78 Traverse	3,322	4385	5				
79 Wabasha	7,504	9923	7				
80 Wadena	5,334	6,933	14				
81 Waseca	7,217	9540	2				
82 Washington	27,022	28809	221				
83 Watonwan	6,445	8555	4				
84 Wilkin	4391	5903	20				
85 Winona	17,770	24053	34				
86 Wright	14,185	17,128	8				
87 Yellow Medicine	7,464	9260	52				

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

MISSOURI
(Code 43)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 114	votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Adair	7,808	12,711	81			
2 Andrew	5,805	7153	9			
3 Atchison	4,523	5888	7			
4 Audrain	10,703	15076	924			
5 Barry	10,064	12,244	8			
6 Barton	5,505	7382	5			
7 Bates	8,676	10,546	76			
8 Benton	4,507	5979	21			
9 Bollinger	4,917	5563	–			
10 Boone	22,453	30,274	2018			
11 Buchanan	36,665	57,688	1679			
12 Butler	13,326	19523	1384			
13 Caldwell	4,600	6027	4			
14 Callaway	8,599	13731	1338			
15 Camden	5,129	5966	14			
16 Cape Girardeau	20,207	24778	637			
17 Carroll	7,063	8792	149			
18 Carter	1,993	2438	–			
19 Cass	10,323	17656	214			
20 Cedar	4,725	6278	7			
21 Chariton	5794	7917	496			
22 Christian	5,878	7735	4			
23 Clark	3,883	5503	9			
24 Clay	37,990	50448	486			
25 Clinton	5398	7423	188			
26 Cole	18,195	23735	2192			
27 Cooper	7731	9011	670			
28 Crawford	6,104	7829	5			
29 Dade	3,572	5037	42			
30 Dallas	4,251	6153	2			
31 Daviess	4,613	6470	24			

MISSOURI - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age. Apr. 1 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 De Kalb	4,026	4950	1			
33 Dent	4,648	6,704	1			
34 Douglas	3,873	5,902	2			
35 Dunklin	11,932	21,606	699			
36 Franklin	21,777	26,724	315			
37 Gasconade	5,798	8,093	3			
38 Gentry	4,875	6,063	5			
39 Greene	54,119	77,300	1605			
40 Grundy	5,774	8450	15			
41 Harrison	5,303	7886	4			
42 Henry	8,844	12,662	156			
43 Hickory	2,011	3,001	–			
44 Holt	3,597	5,304	5			
45 Howard	4,846	6,257	618			
46 Howell	9,600	13,424	51			
47 Iron	3,780	4,874	30			
48 Jackson	240,056	348,389	49,424			
49 Jasper	33,526	49,721	726			
50 Jefferson	26,803	37,114	489			
51 Johnson	10,760	16,586	567			
52 Knox	3,390	4,309	12			
53 Laclede	8,365	11,581	111			
54 Lafayette	12,893	15,419	611			
55 Lawrence	12,430	15,267	521			
56 Lewis	4,520	6631	255			
57 Lincoln	7,264	9,046	360			
58 Linn	8,618	11,373	155			
59 Livingston	8,023	9981	195			
60 McDonald	6,543	7575	30			
61 Macon	8,226	11,135	183			
62 Madison	4,474	5,793	26			
63 Maries	3,246	4355	3			
64 Marion	11,919	17,920	968			

MISSOURI - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age - April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
65 Mercer	2,324	3,932	3			
66 Miller	6,642	8,532	18			
67 Mississippi	5,680	8,709	2212			
68 Moniteau	5,382	6736	116			
69 Monroe	5,031	6720	284			
70 Montgomery	5,899	7020	319			
71 Morgan	5,210	6325	109			
72 New Madrid	9,998	13,180	2749			
73 Newton	14,799	18,282	122			
74 Nodaway	10,479	13,772	14			
75 Oregon	3,900	6189	3			
76 Osage	5,320	6476	8			
77 Ozark	2,604	4210	3			
78 Pemiscot	7,741	15,212	4557			
79 Perry	6,293	8600	11			
80 Pettis	14,396	21,341	1095			
81 Phelps	9,531	14,838	154			
82 Pike	7,217	9795	851			
83 Platte	9,202	13,711	220			
84 Polk	6,641	9144	4			
85 Pulaski	5,239	23,682	1773			
86 Putnam	3,031	4773	2			
87 Ralls	3,583	5054	120			
88 Randolph	9,473	14,091	719			
89 Ray	6,923	10,101	257			
90 Reynolds	2,365	3017	4			
91 Ripley	4,372	5703	4			
92 St. Charles	23,550	29,106	539			
93 St. Clair	4,554	5713	30			
94 St. Francois	16,357	22,972	124			
95 St. Louis	348,620	407,699	10865			
97 Ste. Genevieve	5,084	6756	43			
98 Saline	10,943	15,883	941			

MISSOURI - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
99 Schuyler	2,521	3427	R			
100 Scotland	3402	4335	5			
101 Scott	10,724	17243	1472			
102 Shannon	3,216	4189	1			
103 Shelby	4,368	6024	108			
104 Stoddard	8,958	16228	769			
105 Stone	4212	5149	8			
106 Sullivan	4,747	6026	6			
107 Taney	5,285	6542	1			
108 Texas	7836	10801	10			
109 Vernon	9035	14216	21			
110 Warren	4,226	5396	179			
111 Washington	6,194	7657	68			
112 Wayne	5024	5337	5			
113 Webster	7165	8598	8			
114 Worth	2264	3627	-			
115 Wright	6,758	8829	56			
INDEPENDENT CITY						
96 St. Louis	267,562	369053	120970			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

MONTANA
(Code 81)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 56	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Beaverhead	3231	4471	20			
2 Big Horn	3993	3803	1420			
3 Blaine	2,703	3685	680			
4 Broadwater	1,204	1598	1			
5 Carbon	3,633	5159	13			
6 Carter	1,029	1449	2			
7 Cascade	26,714	41304	753			
8 Chouteau	3,276	4108	45			
9 Custer	5,101	7720	49			
10 Daniels	1,730	2180	3			
11 Dawson	4,637	6582	13			
12 Deer Lodge	6,259	11,174	141			
13 Fallon	1,595	2205	3			
14 Fergus	6,293	8231	38			
15 Flathead	14370	19204	118			
16 Gallatin	11,248	14770	82			
17 Garfield	896	1132	1			
18 Glacier	3,697	4186	1858			
19 Golden Valley	604	722	-			
20 Granite	1,187	1810	9			
21 Hill	6,604	9567	490			
22 Jefferson	1,631	2519	36			
23 Judith Basin	1,502	1797	5			
24 Lake	5,986	7001	649			
25 Lewis and Clark	13,687	16517	216			
26 Liberty	1,155	1422	5			
27 Lincoln	4,709	6827	25			
28 McCone	1,507	1820	2			
29 Madison	2,403	3204	7			
30 Meagher	913	1584	10			
31 Mineral	1,274	1661	11			

(1-2: Montana)

MONTANA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
32 Missoula	21,004	25514	255			
33 Musselshell	2,012	2935	10			
34 Park	5,453	8077	33			
35 Petroleum	401	545	2			
36 Phillips	2,857	3349	159			
37 Pondera	2,877	3873	255			
38 Powder River	1,099	1403	24			
39 Powell	3,040	4208	127			
40 Prairie	1,048	1306	5			
41 Ravalli	5,662	7487	35			
42 Richland	4,131	5804	17			
43 Roosevelt	4,078	4934	1171			
44 Rosebud	2,321	2851	545			
45 Sanders	3,013	4069	178			
46 Sheridan	2,754	3706	26			
47 Silver Bow	21,239	28065	170			
48 Stillwater	2,271	3283	4			
49 Sweet Grass	1,514	2061	-			
50 Teton	3,199	4146	27			
51 Toole	2,874	4355	23			
52 Treasure	536	729	2			
53 Valley	5,125	8856	390			
54 Wheatland	1,373	1835	17			
55 Wibaux	737	950	-			
56 Yellowstone	33,239	44239	430			
57 Yellowstone Nat. Park (part)	—	33	-			

FORM BC-185
(4-1-60)

NEBRASKA
(Code 46)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 93	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population of voting age Aug 1, 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Adams	12,027	18,342	165			
2 Antelope	4,670	6,233	1			
3 Arthur	369	384	-			
4 Banner	563	701	-			
5 Blaine	521	617	1			
6 Boone	3,798	5,409	3			
7 Box Butte	4,693	6,612	240			
8 Boyd	2,008	3,650	10			
9 Brown	2,157	2803	5			
10 Buffalo	10,861	15,697	26			
11 Burt	4,533	6,431	27			
12 Butler	4,635	6,479	-			
13 Cass	6,922	10,312	19			
14 Cedar	5,403	7281	3			
15 Chase	1,988	3,685	2			
16 Cherry	3,672	4749	87			
17 Cheyenne	5,818	8,215	47			
18 Clay	3,880	5543	4			
19 Colfax	4,179	6,289	11			
20 Cuming	5,329	7513	3			
21 Custer	7,391	10,318	7			
22 Dakota	4,560	6,650	142			
23 Dawes	4,087	5592	124			
24 Dawson	8,367	11,604	26			
25 Deuel	1,505	1947	1			
26 Dixon	3,757	4966	2			
27 Dodge	13,543	19,615	54			
28 Douglas	139,093	192,939	14154			
29 Dundy	1,623	2352	3			
30 Fillmore	4,433	5995	9			
31 Franklin	2,650	3403	1			

NEBRASKA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Frontier	1,931	2688	-			
33 Furnas	3,680	4978	1			
34 Gage	10,446	17,276	34			
35 Garden	1,665	2165	4			
36 Garfield	1,244	1688	1			
37 Gosper	1,059	1533	-			
38 Grant	503	611	3			
39 Greeley	2,080	2683	1			
40 Hall	14,988	21,791	75			
41 Hamilton	3,991	5288	5			
42 Harlan	2,478	3,259	-			
43 Hayes	865	1133	-			
44 Hitchcock	2,095	2990	4			
45 Holt	5,933	8111	5			
46 Hooker	472	649	-			
47 Howard	3,044	4129	2			
48 Jefferson	5,079	7479	10			
49 Johnson	2,866	4027	1			
50 Kearney	3,119	4,226	1			
51 Keith	3,711	4721	5			
52 Keya Paha	826	1,027	1			
53 Kimball	2,815	4361	13			
54 Knox	5,364	7879	168			
55 Lancaster	58,390	93,194	1,971			
56 Lincoln	11,257	16,789	130			
57 Logan	563	665	-			
58 Loup	524	658	-			
59 McPherson	323	437	-			
60 Madison	10,816	15,948	93			
61 Merrick	3,539	5,161	2			
62 Morrill	2,877	4,172	26			
63 Nance	2,478	3,594	1			
64 Nemaha	4,020	5719	2			

NEBRASKA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
65 Nuckolls	3727	5,135	4			
66 Otoe	6.795	10,309	14			
67 Pawnee	2,277	3524	2			
68 Perkins	1,789	2461	-			
69 Phelps	4,593	6141	3			
70 Pierce	3,596	5227	-			
71 Platte	9,865	13808	6			
72 Polk	3,337	4599	-			
73 Red Willow	5,156	7761	14			
74 Richardson	6,095	8935	52			
75 Rock	1,211	1562	6			
76 Saline	5,905	8423	6			
77 Sarpy	9,999	16732	335			
78 Saunders	7,517	10861	8			
79 Scotts Bluff	13,333	19,201	315			
80 Seward	5,568	8212	6			
81 Sheridan	3,596	5096	213			
82 Sherman	2,394	3266	1			
83 Sioux	1,077	1512	15			
84 Stanton	2,313	3489	2			
85 Thayer	4,430	5934	2			
86 Thomas	531	647	-			
87 Thurston	2,894	3407	746			
88 Valley	3,202	4137	1			
89 Washington	5,339	7377	16			
90 Wayne	3,989	5785	4			
91 Webster	2,848	4026	1			
92 Wheeler	565	746	1			
93 York	6,242	8577	27			

(3-3: Nebraska)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

NEVADA
(Code 88)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 17	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age, April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Churchill	3172	4656	284			
2 Clark	64,681	71,077	6300			
3 Douglas	2,137	2090	119			
4 Elko	4,641	6499	635			
5 Esmeralda	318	402	19			
6 Eureka	528	515	35			
7 Humboldt	2,527	3301	241			
8 Lander	729	936	67			
9 Lincoln	1,225	1356	32			
10 Lyon	2,724	3384	215			
11 Mineral	2,367	3084	440			
12 Nye	2,098	2686	218			
13 Ormsby	4,126	4373	367			
14 Pershing	1,224	1921	93			
15 Storey	433	385	6			
16 Washoe	38,520	51,766	2041			
17 White Pine	3,983	5519	106			

(Nevada)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

NEW HAMPSHIRE
(Code 12)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 10	Votes cast for President 1964	Population Age April 1960 White	Population Age April 1960 Nonwhite			
1 Belknap	13 932	17990	29			
2 Carroll	9 015	10 721	11			
3 Cheshire	19 584	26 649	36			
4 Coos	16 819	23 384	26			
5 Grafton	21 027	29 247	58			
6 Hillsborough	89 739	110 174	257			
7 Merrimack	32 382	42 969	79			
8 Rockingham	46 754	58 671	886			
9 Strafford	26 079	35 773	76			
10 Sullivan	12 762	17 159	30			

(New Hampshire)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

NEW JERSEY
(Code 22)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 21	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Atlantic	78,019	89,543	17586			
2 Bergen	393,465	483,523	11,554			
3 Burlington	88,945	123,994	8896			
4 Camden	185,761	323,201	19872			
5 Cape May	26,380	29,769	2322			
6 Cumberland	46,215	59510	7287			
7 Essex	396,477	505,035	108204			
8 Gloucester	64,052	73427	6692			
9 Hudson	272,009	385,399	23996			
10 Hunterdon	25,283	33309	528			
11 Mercer	122,214	152,286	19577			
12 Middlesex	215,618	250,082	9276			
13 Monmouth	157,055	188,247	18401			
14 Morris	128,913	157,219	3732			
15 Ocean	63,714	65,917	2141			
16 Passaic	179,699	249,561	14691			
17 Salem	26,545	30,246	4837			
18 Somerset	72,270	86,867	2638			
19 Sussex	26,197	29751	125			
20 Union	249,347	300,355	22335			
21 Warren	28,592	31,604	340			

(New Jersey)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

NEW MEXICO (Code 85)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 32	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population of voting age, April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Bernalillo	98,319	137,814	4435			
2 Catron	1,208	1,548	32			
3 Chaves	17,112	29,085	1184			
4 Colfax	5,029	7,487	56			
5 Curry	10,378	17,150	981			
6 De Baca	1,240	1723	3			
7 Dona Ana	18,085	29886	956			
8 Eddy	18,032	26,432	564			
9 Grant	7,314	10,154	99			
10 Guadalupe	2,713	3,758	7			
11 Harding	905	1041	1			
12 Hidalgo	1,634	2,666	23			
13 Lea	15,948	27,390	1376			
14 Lincoln	3,351	4,491	46			
15 Los Alamos	5,688	6,816	44			
16 Luna	3,969	5167	95			
17 McKinley	10,000	8415	8393			
18 Mora	2,527	2823	2			
19 Otero	9,560	17,965	1327			
20 Quay	4,515	6735	94			
21 Rio Arriba	9,757	10,178	1130			
22 Roosevelt	5,634	9105	71			
23 Sandoval	4,420	4024	2,511			
24 San Juan	13,892	20,197	5531			
25 San Miguel	8,505	12,038	81			
26 Santa Fe	18,519	23,882	634			
27 Sierra	3,149	4402	25			
28 Socorro	4,181	4916	226			
29 Taos	6,238	7084	554			
30. Torrance	2,635	3340	14			
31 Union	2,401	3486	2			

(1-2: New Mexico)

NEW MEXICO - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age - April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Valencia	11,757	16,681	2411			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

NEW YORK
(Code 21)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 62	Votes cast for President, 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Albany	147,152	168,260	6,154			
2 Allegany	18,039	25,162	102			
3 Bronx	539,594	865,060	100,255			
4 Broome	91,139	131,487	919			
5 Cattaraugus	32,933	47,486	813			
6 Cayuga	35,566	44,191	1,005			
7 Chautauqua	62,056	90,149	771			
8 Chemung	41,082	58,134	1,480			
9 Chenango	18,952	25,622	121			
10 Clinton	24,492	39,543	2,170			
11 Columbia	23,558	29,651	750			
12 Cortland	17,270	24,187	46			
13 Delaware	20,064	26,343	102			
14 Dutchess	79,725	109,210	6,836			
15 Erie	471,576	616,760	43,863			
16 Essex	16,585	20,957	118			
17 Franklin	17,329	25,047	904			
18 Fulton	23,147	32,800	211			
19 Genesee	23,841	31,540	705			
20 Greene	17,894	19,757	431			
21 Hamilton	2,873	2,700	3			
22 Herkimer	30,317	41,401	64			
23 Jefferson	35,914	52,876	215			
24 Kings	915,503	1,524,984	220,424			
25 Lewis	9,779	13,040	14			
26 Livingston	20,619	26,089	509			
27 Madison	23,180	30,941	199			
28 Monroe	285,582	356,215	12,974			
29 Montgomery	27,861	37,858	132			
30 Nassau	632,115	738,710	26,784			
31 New York	625,719	970,056	287,817			

(1-2: New York)

NEW YORK - Con.							
COUNTY	Votes cast for President, 1964	Population of voting age April 1960					
		White	Nonwhite				
32 Niagara	95,985	140,092	4520				
33 Oneida	113,210	161,763	2632				
34 Onondaga	192,014	251,085	7431				
35 Ontario	30,784	41,080	519				
36 Orange	78,924	111,235	5089				
37 Orleans	14,896	20,064	808				
38 Oswego	37,226	49911	110				
39 Otsego	23,859	31,842	111				
40 Putnam	21,879	19,644	104				
41 Queens	816,828	1,146,802	93,271				
42 Rensselaer	72,060	87,154	1,388				
43 Richmond	92,946	132,367	5094				
44 Rockland	72,442	79,214	4151				
45 St. Lawrence	41,307	62,354	201				
46 Saratoga	42,675	53,218	587				
47 Schenectady	73,820	97809	1,374				
48 Schoharie	11,391	13,779	52				
49 Schuyler	7,256	8795	56				
50 Seneca	13,376	19,960	272				
51 Steuben	40,645	58,260	535				
52 Suffolk	325,333	378,263	21,726				
53 Sullivan	24,775	28,168	1,009				
54 Tioga	17,567	21,624	130				
55 Tompkins	25,202	37,397	1100				
56 Ulster	59,326	73,256	2,395				
57 Warren	20,620	27,124	132				
58 Washington	21,993	28,884	268				
59 Wayne	29,342	40,969	862				
60 Westchester	393,235	486,175	40,343				
61 Wyoming	14,980	20,702	775				
62 Yates	8,663	11,252	87				
1/ Excludes 188 "write-in" and "blank and void" ballots, not allocated by county							

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

NORTH CAROLINA
(Code 56)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 100	votes Cast for President 1964	Population of voting age. April 1960				
		Wh.	Nonwh.			
1 Alamance	30,574	42,755	7439			
2 Alexander	7482	8370	566			
3 Alleghany	3941	4589	119			
4 Anson	5865	7847	5,218			
5 Ashe	9,156	11,276	115			
6 Avery	4179	6507	124			
7 Beaufort	9685	13,737	6176			
8 Bertie	4263	6,186	6,261			
9 Bladen	6685	9173	5147			
10 Brunswick	7961	7602	3170			
11 Buncombe	50,995	73,249	8510			
12 Burke	22,896	29,506	1931			
13 Cabarrus	25,099	35,165	5380			
14 Caldwell	19,579	25,520	1723			
15 Camden	1404	1988	1054			
16 Carteret	10,520	16,035	1932			
17 Caswell	4306	6026	4139			
18 Catawba	32,930	38,543	3,296			
19 Chatham	9406	11,237	4026			
20 Cherokee	6929	9102	226			
21 Chowan	3483	3825	2507			
22 Clay	2743	3112	37			
23 Cleveland	18,710	30,556	6474			
24 Columbus	13,475	17,830	7382			
25 Craven	12,113	22,994	8242			
26 Cumberland	22,957	58,279	18,789			
27 Currituck	2196	2845	1076			
28 Dare	2342	3467	337			
29 Davidson	31,027	41462	4491			
30 Davie	7546	8878	1080			
31 Duplin	10,990	14477	6955			

(1-4: North Carolina)

NORTH CAROLINA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population of Voting age April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
32 Durham	38,138	47,098	19,475			
33 Edgecombe	11,766	15,515	12,330			
34 Forsyth	61,891	87,219	24,952			
35 Franklin	6,651	9,842	5,554			
36 Gaston	37,326	64,154	8,365			
37 Gates	2,258	2,714	2,344			
38 Graham	3,135	3,324	125			
39 Granville	7,220	11,584	6,996			
40 Greene	3,613	4,793	3,268			
41 Guilford	75,604	116,748	27,292			
42 Halifax	13,709	16,496	13,766			
43 Harnett	13,360	20,061	6,150			
44 Haywood	16,239	23,055	500			
45 Henderson	14,846	21,062	1,170			
46 Hertford	4,947	5,606	6,102			
47 Hoke	3,033	3,998	3,747			
48 Hyde	1,641	2,201	1,100			
49 Iredell	24,123	31,094	5,517			
50 Jackson	8,088	9,227	841			
51 Johnston	17,849	28,259	6,395			
52 Jones	2,905	3,248	2,251			
53 Lee	7,483	12,041	2,803			
54 Lenoir	13,234	19,260	10,293			
55 Lincoln	13,173	14,893	1,546			
56 McDowell	10,488	14,693	755			
57 Macon	6,674	8,573	180			
58 Madison	7,165	9,574	75			
59 Martin	6,332	8,052	5,683			
60 Mecklenburg	96,171	123,787	34,150			
61 Mitchell	4,999	7,977	29			
62 Montgomery	7,318	8,119	2,075			
63 Moore	11,546	15,733	4,803			
64 Nash	15,559	21,761	10,573			

(2-4: North Carolina)

NORTH CAROLINA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population of voting age. April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
65 New Hanover	24,724	31,641	10,569			
66 Northampton	6,233	6,178	7,304			
67 Onslow	9,726	33,948	5,015			
68 Orange	14,991	19,385	4,978			
69 Pamlico	2,900	3,708	1,593			
70 Pasquotank	6,649	9,409	4,936			
71 Pender	5,166	5,631	4,085			
72 Perquimans	2,399	3,083	2,027			
73 Person	6,902	9,994	4,227			
74 Pitt	16,466	22,621	13,575			
75 Polk	5,782	6,104	766			
76 Randolph	24,377	33,477	2,591			
77 Richmond	11,639	16,019	5,514			
78 Robeson	17,387	20,851	21,424			
79 Rockingham	20,495	33,438	7,398			
80 Rowan	29,738	42,866	7,209			
81 Rutherford	16,656	24,020	2,572			
82 Sampson	15,701	17,378	8,203			
83 Scotland	5,073	7,812	4,686			
84 Stanly	16,855	22,056	2,164			
85 Stokes	9,562	11,796	1,025			
86 Surry	17,780	26,796	1,423			
87 Swain	3,828	3,878	756			
88 Transylvania	8,030	8,687	405			
89 Tyrrell	1,370	1,597	849			
90 Union	11,437	20,044	4,423			
91 Vance	8,638	11,005	6,520			
92 Wake	54,195	76,799	22,856			
93 Warren	4,758	4,439	5,490			
94 Washington	3,649	4,365	2,643			
95 Watauga	7,963	9,639	126			
96 Wayne	17,346	29,349	15,754			
97 Wilkes	20,190	23,779	1,444			

(3-4: North Carolina)

NORTH CAROLINA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1964	Population age April 1 white	of Voting 1960 nonwhite			
98 Wilson	12,240	20,566	10,770			
99 Yadkin	9,498	13,039	576			
100 Yancey	5,718	7,956	76			

FORM BC-185
(4-1-60)

NORTH DAKOTA
(Code 44)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 53	Votes cast for President. 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Adams	1,888	2482	1			
2 Barnes	7,008	9548	7			
3 Benson	4,060	4744	478			
4 Billings	688	787	1			
5 Bottineau	4,607	6377	8			
6 Bowman	1,827	2352	3			
7 Burke	2,434	3424	3			
8 Burleigh	15,419	18964	132			
9 Cass	28,669	38207	123			
10 Cavalier	4,231	5579	2			
11 Dickey	3,630	4727	4			
12 Divide	2,281	3243	12			
13 Dunn	2,432	3034	178			
14 Eddy	2,088	2797	9			
15 Emmons	3,315	4384	-			
16 Foster	2,244	2963	-			
17 Golden Valley	1,324	1695	-			
18 Grand Forks	18,175	27248	304			
19 Grant	2,488	3284	8			
20 Griggs	2,390	2937	1			
21 Hettinger	2,465	3268	1			
22 Kidder	2,151	2891	1			
23 La Moure	3,755	4953	6			
24 Logan	2,141	2840	-			
25 McHenry	4,379	6129	8			
26 McIntosh	2,841	3923	-			
27 McKenzie	2,938	3841	161			
28 McLean	5,547	7476	272			
29 Mercer	2,850	3800	57			
30 Morton	8,138	11233	48			
31 Mountrail	3,683	5261	344			

(1-2: North Dakota)

NORTH DAKOTA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Nelson	3,281	4,349	2			
33 Oliver	1,017	1,369	1			
34 Pembina	5,167	7,248	14			
35 Pierce	3,073	3935	15			
36 Ramsey	5,987	7577	93			
37 Ransom	3,717	4889	4			
38 Renville	1,997	2646	17			
39 Richland	7,955	10,846	62			
40 Rolette	3,458	3270	1823			
41 Sargent	3,033	3872	3			
42 Sheridan	1,911	2447	3			
43 Sioux	1,013	956	684			
44 Slope	765	982	–			
45 Stark	7,161	9510	28			
46 Steele	2,203	2825	11			
47 Stutsman	9,474	14,812	43			
48 Towner	2,417	3,221	9			
49 Traill	4,929	6,415	5			
50 Walsh	7,376	10,690	25			
51 Ward	17,735	25,536	333			
52 Wells	4,189	5,375	4			
53 Williams	8,439	11,962	110			

FORM EC-185
(4-1-60)

OHIO
(Code 31)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 88	Votes cast for President 1964	Population age 21 and over				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Adams	8707	11950	42			
2 Allen	38887	57527	3788			
3 Ashland	15801	23137	91			
4 Ashtabula	37287	54406	1094			
5 Athens	16844	27081	587			
6 Auglaize	16586	24990	30			
7 Belmont	37873	53208	1147			
8 Brown	10887	14738	325			
9 Butler	73691	103611	5533			
10 Carroll	8705	11804	165			
11 Champaign	12726	16770	677			
12 Clark	53387	71626	7032			
13 Clermont	29890	42931	573			
14 Clinton	12576	17501	419			
15 Columbiana	44533	63821	987			
16 Coshocton	14347	19741	195			
17 Crawford	20938	27871	207			
18 Cuyahoga	689347	889169	148723			
19 Darke	21014	27059	163			
20 Defiance	13755	17843	16			
21 Delaware	14475	20238	474			
22 Erie	25949	38308	2311			
23 Fairfield	27091	37732	126			
24 Fayette	10695	14455	484			
25 Franklin	285173	364240	47579			
26 Fulton	11577	16777	33			
27 Gallia	9148	14219	715			
28 Geauga	21635	25557	563			
29 Greene	35847	48488	3764			
30 Guernsey	15932	24739	435			
31 Hamilton	360306	460888	71683			

OHIO - Con.

COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting Age. April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Hancock	23157	31908	181			
33 Hardin	13,003	17384	138			
34 Harrison	8087	10,717	255			
35 Henry	10,939	14,798	13			
36 Highland	13,266	17853	461			
37 Hocking	8809	11,870	88			
38 Holmes	5665	11770	3			
39 Huron	18435	26876	285			
40 Jackson	12005	16,938	137			
41 Jefferson	44823	57877	2936			
42 Knox	18480	23,467	276			
43 Lake	61,834	83,004	1166			
44 Lawrence	20,392	31,165	999			
45 Licking	38,460	53,086	779			
46 Logan	15,167	20524	388			
47 Lorain	82,438	117,354	4436			
48 Lucas	185,892	256,470	23587			
49 Madison	10209	14654	1176			
50 Mahoning	124709	165,664	19839			
51 Marion	24,456	35337	1018			
52 Medina	24,950	36634	346			
53 Meigs	9106	13132	194			
54 Mercer	14,454	18,233	16			
55 Miami	32,364	43,781	837			
56 Monroe	6720	9322	5			
57 Montgomery	198,613	280,194	34708			
58 Morgan	5334	7497	238			
59 Morrow	8766	11162	10			
60 Muskingum	32,427	45779	1868			
61 Noble	5175	6706	6			
62 Ottawa	15,257	20581	176			
63 Paulding	7719	9357	159			
64 Perry	11711	16503	210			

(2-3: Ohio)

OHIO - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1964	Population Age: April 1960 White	of voting Nonwhite			
32 Hancock	23157	31908	181			
33 Hardin	13003	17384	138			
34 Harrison	8087	10717	255			
35 Henry	10939	14798	13			
36 Highland	13266	17853	461			
37 Hocking	8809	11470	88			
38 Holmes	5665	11770	3			
39 Huron	18435	26875	285			
40 Jackson	12005	16938	137			
41 Jefferson	44823	57877	2936			
42 Knox	18480	23467	276			
43 Lake	61834	83004	1166			
44 Lawrence	20342	31165	999			
45 Licking	38460	53086	779			
46 Logan	15167	20524	388			
47 Lorain	82438	117354	6436			
48 Lucas	185892	256470	23587			
49 Madison	10209	14654	1176			
50 Mahoning	124709	165664	19839			
51 Marion	24450	35337	1018			
52 Medina	24950	36634	346			
53 Meigs	9106	13132	194			
54 Mercer	14454	18233	16			
55 Miami	32364	42781	837			
56 Monroe	6720	9322	5			
57 Montgomery	198612	280194	34708			
58 Morgan	5334	7497	238			
59 Morrow	8766	11162	10			
60 Muskingum	32427	45779	1868			
61 Noble	5175	6706	6			
62 Ottawa	15257	20581	176			
63 Paulding	7719	9357	159			
64 Perry	11711	16503	210			

OHIO - Con.

COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
65 Pickaway	12,627	20,643	446			
66 Pike	7,898	10,268	168			
67 Portage	34,150	48,750	1290			
68 Preble	13,413	18,553	85			
69 Putnam	12,335	15,337	10			
70 Richland	43,633	65,833	3664			
71 Ross	22,327	34,558	1816			
72 Sandusky	21,735	32,159	451			
73 Scioto	35,024	49,149	994			
74 Seneca	24,054	37,599	442			
75 Shelby	15,194	18,972	199			
76 Stark	142,336	195,979	9757			
77 Summit	210,319	287,498	21,901			
78 Trumbull	81,401	117,073	6138			
79 Tuscarawas	33,585	46,271	454			
80 Union	10,489	13,440	257			
81 Van Wert	13,889	17,333	67			
82 Vinton	4537	5718	4			
83 Warren	23,388	35,037	500			
84 Washington	20,066	30,349	523			
85 Wayne	24,696	43,595	604			
86 Williams	13,200	17,793	16			
87 Wood	28,446	40,944	238			
88 Wyandot	9413	12,681	—			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

OKLAHOMA
(Code 73)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 77	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Adair	5,862	6,051	1,479			
2 Alfalfa	4,180	5,690	–			
3 Atoka	3,883	5,523	600			
4 Beaver	3,490	4,200	5			
5 Beckham	6,672	11,291	219			
6 Blaine	5,125	6,750	824			
7 Bryan	8,526	14,634	605			
8 Caddo	11,171	15,386	1,834			
9 Canadian	10,940	14,405	772			
10 Carter	15,631	23,037	2,163			
11 Cherokee	7,916	8,391	1,662			
12 Choctaw	5,687	7,957	1,761			
13 Cimarron	2,163	2,577	4			
14 Cleveland	21,255	27,948	417			
15 Coal	2,334	3,287	260			
16 Comanche	21,521	46,630	5,351			
17 Cotton	3,339	4,767	249			
18 Craig	6,379	10,515	765			
19 Creek	16,191	33,486	2,191			
20 Custer	7,826	12,090	845			
21 Delaware	6,445	7,148	1,024			
22 Dewey	3,055	3,852	96			
23 Ellis	2,572	3,583	2			
24 Garfield	23,472	32,088	959			
25 Garvin	10,483	16,493	617			
26 Grady	11,162	17,564	937			
27 Grant	4,112	5,426	6			
28 Greer	3,918	5,661	395			
29 Harmon	2,267	3,410	200			
30 Harper	2,619	3,651	1			
31 Haskell	3,897	5,295	336			

OKLAHOMA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
32 Hughes	6,169	8,619	1,053			
33 Jackson	8,360	16,113	1,068			
34 Jefferson	3,366	5,352	91			
35 Johnston	3,735	4757	434			
36 Kay	23,339	30,230	1,367			
37 Kingfisher	5,629	6,331	434			
38 Kiowa	5892	7,534	679			
39 Latimer	3,146	4,374	425			
40 Le Flore	11,009	16,704	948			
41 Lincoln	8,900	11,197	673			
42 Logan	8,066	9,715	3,032			
43 Love	2,526	3,396	233			
44 McClain	5,276	7,446	344			
45 McCurtain	8963	11,630	3,231			
46 McIntosh	4,925	5789	1,478			
47 Major	3737	4,966	16			
48 Marshall	3,419	4,510	223			
49 Mayes	9,576	11,236	857			
50 Murray	4,319	6,549	370			
51 Muskogee	24,638	39,751	7,054			
52 Noble	4,970	6,337	345			
53 Nowata	4,786	6,334	536			
54 Okfuskee	4534	5,233	1,776			
55 Oklahoma	174,301	240,093	33,730			
56 Okmulgee	14899	19,240	3,942			
57 Osage	13,090	19,539	1,314			
58 Ottawa	11,679	11,795	683			
59 Pawnee	4,667	6,604	413			
60 Payne	16,842	24,939	896			
61 Pittsburg	13,457	19,976	2,131			
62 Pontotoc	11,615	16,142	993			
63 Pottawatomie	17,735	24,373	1,507			
64 Pushmataha	3,895	5,245	387			

OKLAHOMA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
65 Roger Mills	2,271	3,103	110			
66 Rogers	9,651	11,794	697			
67 Seminole	10,256	14,743	2,478			
68 Sequoyah	7,150	9,201	1,087			
69 Stephens	14,595	22,669	536			
70 Texas	5,839	8,176	15			
71 Tillman	5,355	7,950	970			
72 Tulsa	138,254	190,966	17,554			
73 Wagoner	6,797	7,517	1,571			
74 Washington	20,953	24,219	1,169			
75 Washita	5,486	10,694	213			
76 Woods	5,636	7,583	6			
77 Woodward	6,028	9,114	39			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

OREGON (Code 92)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 36	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Baker	6,585	10,473	36			
2 Benton	16,486	21,726	367			
3 Clackamas	57,043	66,766	379			
4 Clatsop	12,413	17,435	227			
5 Columbia	10,268	13,291	44			
6 Coos	21,149	31,705	205			
7 Crook	3,586	5,440	11			
8 Curry	4,686	8,071	61			
9 Deschutes	10,095	13,859	69			
10 Douglas	25,717	38,705	165			
11 Gilliam	1,220	1,815	17			
12 Grant	3,032	4,541	18			
13 Harney	2,759	3,868	124			
14 Hood River	5,472	7,886	260			
15 Jackson	34,084	45,173	175			
16 Jefferson	2,938	3,464	404			
17 Josephine	13,801	18,446	58			
18 Klamath	17,599	27,010	1,037			
19 Lake	2,723	4,262	27			
20 Lane	74,200	93,358	645			
21 Lincoln	10,323	15,098	180			
22 Linn	23,308	33,798	84			
23 Malheur	7,983	12,182	712			
24 Marion	51,209	73,362	563			
25 Morrow	2,097	2,887	2			
26 Multnomah	243,739	322,634	12,647			
27 Polk	11,629	15,632	110			
28 Sherman	1,353	1,487	5			
29 Tillamook	7,573	10,928	43			
30 Umatilla	16,859	26,204	618			
31 Union	7,489	10,921	71			

(1-2: Oregon)

OREGON - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Wallowa	2,848	4,291	17			
33 Wasco	8,597	11,998	260			
34 Washington	50,181	53,734	182			
35 Wheeler	798	1,566	-			
36 Yamhill	14,463	19,494	98			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

PENNSYLVANIA
(Code 23)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 67	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Adams	19,860	29,955	223			
2 Allegheny	719,725	951,629	79,772			
3 Armstrong	31,796	47,762	496			
4 Beaver	83,993	119,619	5,972			
5 Bedford	17,147	25,028	111			
6 Berks	110,646	179,956	2,642			
7 Blair	50,531	85,792	658			
8 Bradford	21,162	31,914	59			
9 Bucks	129,176	173,184	3,028			
10 Butler	44,723	67,162	355			
11 Cambria	91,598	119,673	1,880			
12 Cameron	3,285	4,433	8			
13 Carbon	22,841	34,858	15			
14 Centre	26,195	44,161	645			
15 Chester	88,610	117,166	9,547			
16 Clarion	15,389	21,961	11			
17 Clearfield	30,652	42,959	171			
18 Clinton	14,372	23,691	34			
19 Columbia	22,903	33,445	56			
20 Crawford	39,991	46,361	547			
21 Cumberland	50,525	73,776	794			
22 Dauphin	89,431	129,013	11,612			
23 Delaware	259,095	311,317	21,494			
24 Elk	14,238	23,313	19			
25 Erie	104,886	145,604	3,733			
26 Fayette	61,559	98,906	4,247			
27 Forest	2,154	2,769	1			
28 Franklin	32,942	52,607	1,076			
29 Fulton	3,937	6,039	30			
30 Greene	15,327	23,891	217			
31 Huntingdon	14,039	23,105	467			

(1-3: Pennsylvania)

PENNSYLVANIA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
32 Indiana	29,330	44,099	239			
33 Jefferson	19,261	28,954	36			
34 Juniata	7,235	9,445	11			
35 Lackawanna	119,540	154,609	499			
36 Lancaster	105,508	166,793	1,988			
37 Lawrence	45,207	67,316	1,566			
38 Lebanon	33,845	55,636	275			
39 Lehigh	93,093	147,182	647			
40 Luzerne	152,071	230,327	663			
41 Lycoming	44,945	67,426	836			
42 McKean	19,007	33,590	73			
43 Mercer	50,563	73,739	2,703			
44 Mifflin	14,856	26,727	89			
45 Monroe	17,019	24,964	396			
46 Montgomery	239,075	310,649	12,353			
47 Montour	6,214	11,031	44			
48 Northampton	80,485	126,912	1,401			
49 Northumberland	45,244	67,117	138			
50 Perry	11,452	15,790	7			
51 Philadelphia	913,472	998,429	313,551			
52 Pike	5,426	6,316	15			
53 Potter	6,909	9,733	35			
54 Schuylkill	77,042	115,154	340			
55 Snyder	9,416	15,371	42			
56 Somerset	32,914	47,398	104			
57 Sullivan	3,038	3,847	34			
58 Susquehanna	14,417	19,760	41			
59 Tioga	14,495	21,324	59			
60 Union	9,216	15,184	549			
61 Venango	23,022	34,670	250			
62 Warren	16,657	28,831	93			
63 Washington	87,756	129,702	5,186			
64 Wayne	12,328	19,096	387			

PENNSYLVANIA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
65 Westmoreland	149,716	214,644	3,929			
66 Wyoming	8,144	10,085	16			
67 York	92,872	145,069	2,736			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

RHODE ISLAND
(Code 15)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 5	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Bristol	18,772	22,613	52			
2 Kent	56,773	67,316	250			
3 Newport	27,371	44,338	2,249			
4 Providence	262,897	361,053	7,629			
5 Washington	24,265	33,364	940			

(Rhode Island)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

SOUTH DAKOTA
(Code 45)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 67	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Aurora	2426	2745	5			
2 Beadle	10019	12574	21			
3 Bennett	1399	1369	299			
4 Bon Homme	4278	5109	40			
5 Brookings	7883	11520	47			
6 Brown	14631	19484	97			
7 Brule	3173	3[illegible]	25			
8 Buffalo	779	[illegible]	[illegible]			
9 Butte	3740	4940	22			
10 Campbell	1573	1947	2			
11 Charles Mix	5113	5933	520			
12 Clark	3282	4325	4			
13 Clay	4401	6235	33			
14 Codington	8946	11477	231			
15 Corson	2362	2148	755			
16 Custer	2318	2858	50			
17 Davison	7650	9801	48			
18 Day	5149	6228	125			
19 Deuel	2841	3982	5			
20 Dewey	2240	1797	899			
21 Douglas	2338	2899	—			
22 Edmunds	3150	3521	1			
23 Fall River	3732	6494	223			
24 Faulk	2199	2551	1			
25 Grant	4437	5747	5			
26 Gregory	3639	4273	132			
27 Haakon	1457	1802	16			
28 Hamlin	3086	3910	—			
29 Hand	3029	3731	1			
30 Hanson	2034	2533	—			
31 Harding	976	1313	4			

(1-3: South Dakota)

SOUTH DAKOTA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President 1964	Population of voting age [illegible]				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Hughes	5338	6719	253			
33 Hutchinson	5073	6[illegible]	2			
34 Hyde	1402	1533	20			
35 Jackson	928	10522	60			
36 Jerauld	1856	2405	1			
37 Jones	963	1119	25			
38 Kingsbury	4131	5458	2			
39 Lake	5405	6885	5			
40 Lawrence	7211	9727	54			
41 Lincoln	5576	7477	3			
42 Lyman	1919	2218	228			
43 McCook	3937	4784	3			
44 McPherson	2614	3454	1			
45 Marshall	3246	3869	77			
46 Meade	4463	7029	142			
47 Mellette	1183	1024	375			
48 Miner	2624	3180	2			
49 Minnehaha	37695	49385	362			
50 Moody	3762	4712	141			
51 Pennington	18807	30515	1300			
52 Perkins	2664	3441	17			
53 Potter	2214	2770	20			
54 Roberts	5498	6959	602			
55 Sanborn	2313	2738	4			
56 Shannon	2305	551	2349			
57 Spink	5073	7060	30			
58 Stanley	1299	1972	64			
59 Sully	1263	1454	13			
60 Todd	1997	1121	1204			
61 Tripp	4178	4725	223			
62 Turner	5030	6983	2			
63 Union	4555	6023	12			
64 Walworth	3801	4521	89			

(2-3: South Dakota)

SOUTH DAKOTA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
65 Washabaugh	559	347	165			
66 Yankton	6,955	10,753	166			
67 Ziebach	1001	792	443			

(3-3: South Dakota)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

TENNESSEE
(Code 62)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 95	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Anderson	21006	32526	1034			
2 Bedford	7882	12716	1603			
3 Benton	3974	4619	171			
4 Bledsoe	2843	3980	118			
5 Blount	20335	31329	1520			
6 Bradley	12410	20834	1047			
7 Campbell	8644	15274	140			
8 Cannon	2936	5127	108			
9 Carroll	7790	13154	1787			
10 Carter	13798	23669	238			
11 Cheatham	3553	5238	344			
12 Chester	3530	4879	685			
13 Claiborne	5433	10603	164			
14 Clay	1818	4006	96			
15 Cocke	7193	12748	373			
16 Coffee	9849	15876	583			
17 Crockett	3690	6933	1586			
18 Cumberland	6048	10343	6			
19 Davidson	124722	197949	44984			
20 Decatur	3242	4979	251			
21 De Kalb	3693	6477	183			
22 Dickson	6005	10666	729			
23 Dyer	9234	15484	2456			
24 Fayette	5558	4437	7215			
25 Fentress	3519	6703	2			
26 Franklin	8291	13328	1131			
27 Gibson	12733	22888	4903			
28 Giles	6318	11601	2161			
29 Grainger	3943	7045	100			
30 Greene	12829	24647	601			
31 Grundy	3461	6191	10			

TENNESSEE - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of Voting Age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Hamblen	9803	18,366	1099			
33 Hamilton	78,746	116,321	26,658			
34 Hancock	2,204	4,224	51			
35 Hardeman	5,125	8,653	4,072			
36 Hardin	5645	9734	578			
37 Hawkins	9903	17,120	602			
38 Haywood	4697	5497	6,295			
39 Henderson	5088	8988	862			
40 Henry	8,135	12,429	1977			
41 Hickman	3,896	6,796	324			
42 Houston	1859	2705	197			
43 Humphreys	4,146	6,613	323			
44 Jackson	2842	5551	27			
45 Jefferson	7,503	12,159	516			
46 Johnson	3816	6,198	86			
47 Knox	85,260	138,724	13,275			
48 Lake	2,403	4,047	1108			
49 Lauderdale	5,727	8,152	4137			
50 Lawrence	10,039	15,837	300			
51 Lewis	2,449	3,561	59			
52 Lincoln	6,589	12,621	1673			
53 Loudon	7,513	13,786	268			
54 McMinn	10,831	18,738	958			
55 McNairy	6,103	10,235	631			
56 Macon	3,292	7458	69			
57 Madison	21,505	25,617	10,416			
58 Marion	6,503	10,730	707			
59 Marshall	5,329	9473	1042			
60 Maury	12,321	20,323	4710			
61 Meigs	1740	2642	117			
62 Monroe	8449	12,318	507			
63 Montgomery	12,992	24,503	5916			
64 Moore	1,298	2012	146			

TENNESSEE - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting Age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
65 Morgan	3799	7625	296			
66 Obion	8474	15362	1849			
67 Overton	4413	8501	44			
68 Perry	1954	3183	85			
69 Pickett	1663	2462	5			
70 Polk	3798	6776	13			
71 Putnam	9302	16764	306			
72 Rhea	5367	8564	354			
73 Roane	11843	21079	878			
74 Robertson	7581	13748	2656			
75 Rutherford	13668	26387	3960			
76 Scott	4413	7792	3			
77 Sequatchie	1966	3176	1			
78 Sevier	9816	13906	105			
79 Shelby	212023	240499	119033			
80 Smith	4018	7321	333			
81 Stewart	2885	4637	150			
82 Sullivan	37199	65683	1438			
83 Sumner	12539	19472	2304			
84 Tipton	6894	9864	5048			
85 Trousdale	1475	2549	478			
86 Unicoi	4731	8737	7			
87 Union	2861	4713	21			
88 Van Buren	1158	1940	16			
89 Warren	6781	13251	630			
90 Washington	20865	37[illegible]5	1582			
91 Wayne	3688	6521	124			
92 Weakley	7845	14681	1016			
93 White	4186	9033	275			
94 Williamson	7782	11919	2616			
95 Wilson	8974	14781	2231			

FORM BC-165 (4-1-60)

TEXAS
(Code 74)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 254	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age, April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Anderson	8.181	13.114.	4.436.			
2 Andrews	3.565	7.011.	137.			
3 Angelina	13.484	20.049.	3.762.			
4 Aransas	2.101	3.921.	154.			
5 Archer	2.207	3.642.	18.			
6 Armstrong	909	1.283.	3.			
7 Atascosa	4.516	9.876.	92.			
8 Austin	3.915	7.450.	1.566.			
9 Bailey	2.562	4.930.	179.			
10 Bandera	1.639	2.577.	19.			
11 Bastrop	5.049	7.561.	2.867.			
12 Baylor	1.794	3.712.	112.			
13 Bee	4.832	11.895.	369.			
14 Bell	17.512	48.932.	6.228.			
15 Bexar	162.520	350.918.	29.072.			
16 Blanco	1.483	2.908.	75.			
17 Borden	419	612.	—.			
18 Bosque	3.721	7.313.	126.			
19 Bowie	17.410	25.576.	7.684.			
20 Brazoria	24.494	37.767.	5497.			
21 Brazos	12.019	19.987.	4.957.			
22 Brewster	1.887	3.520.	30.			
23 Briscoe	1.317	1.976.	65.			
24 Brooks	2.703	4.456.	9.			
25 Brown	7.293	15.924.	456.			
26 Burleson	3.147	4.926.	1.871.			
27 Burnet	3.410	5.753.	95.			
28 Caldwell	4.629	8.732.	1.504.			
29 Calhoun	4.434	8.657.	421.			
30 Callahan	3.039	5.274.	3.			
31 Cameron	25.659	73.664.	725.			

TEXAS - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age, April 1966				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Camp	2,577	3,146.	1,556.			
33 Carson	2,621	4,[illegible].	20.			
34 Cass	6,292	10,[illegible].	3,509.			
35 Castro	2,494	4,360.	156.			
36 Chambers	2,956	4,750.	1,144.			
37 Cherokee	8,537	16,460.	4,839.			
38 Childress	2,931	5,176.	284.			
39 Clay	3,020	5,318.	51.			
40 Cochran	1,761	3,282.	131.			
41 Coke	1,269	2,206.	4.			
42 Coleman	4,165	8,164.	176.			
43 Collin	11,193	23,448.	2,275.			
44 Collingsworth	1,872	3,632.	244.			
45 Colorado	5,574	8,493.	2,529.			
46 Comal	5,875	11,368.	265.			
47 Comanche	3,819	8,330.	4.			
48 Concho	1,256	2,331.	3.			
49 Cooke	7,211	13,143.	488			
50 Coryell	4,564	13,190.	719			
51 Cottle	1,353	2,410.	176			
52 Crane	1,569	2,565.	95.			
53 Crockett	1,211	2,221.	80.			
54 Crosby	2,892	5,234.	345.			
55 Culberson	787	1,459.	6.			
56 Dallam	1,759	3,836.	33.			
57 Dallas	304,158	493,340.	76,927.			
58 Dawson	4868	10,030.	501.			
59 Deaf Smith	3,897	6,455.	93.			
60 Delta	1,960	3,486.	422.			
61 Denton	13,494	26,011.	1,594.			
62 De Witt	5573	11,013.	1,699.			
63 Dickens	1,667	3,002.	137.			
64 Dimmit	1,688	4,839.	17.			

TEXAS - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population age of voting age: April 1, 1960 Wh. Te	Nonwh. Te			
65 Donley	1.776	2.801.	108.			
66 Duval	4.789	7.145.	7.			
67 Eastland	6.752	13.135.	207.			
68 Ector	22.386	46.963.	2.591.			
69 Edwards	712	1.405.	7.			
70 Ellis	10.062	21.069.	5.114.			
71 El Paso	55.927	160.240.	5.861.			
72 Erath	5.498	10.[illegible].	108.			
73 Falls	5.131	[illegible].	3.630.			
74 Fannin	7.200	14.926.	1.357.			
75 Fayette	5.677	11.980.	1.634.			
76 Fisher	2.567	4.619.	95.			
77 Floyd	3621	6.567.	379.			
78 Foard	980	1.861.	138.			
79 Fort Bend	9.699	17.879.	4.373.			
80 Franklin	1944	3.218.	199.			
81 Freestone	3.892	5.272.	2.531.			
82 Frio	2.117	5.052.	32.			
83 Gaines	3.201	6.470.	156.			
84 Galveston	42.173	65.820.	16.685.			
85 Garza	1.827	3.524.	179.			
86 Gillespie	3.966	6.514.	12.			
87 Glasscock	363	666.	7.			
88 Goliad	1.541	2.892.	361.			
89 Gonzales	4.545	9.066.	1.752.			
90 Gray	8.650	18.205.	514.			
91 Grayson	19.728	42.364.	3.712.			
92 Gregg	20.598	32.941.	8.508.			
93 Grimes	3.247	5.065.	2.665.			
94 Guadalupe	7.368	14.664.	1.924.			
95 Hale	9.592	19.155.	834.			
96 Hall	2.453	4.104.	436.			
97 Hamilton	3.056	5.354.	8.			

TEXAS - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
98 Hansford	2,056	3491.	11.			
99 Hardeman	2,532	4,776.	453.			
100 Hardin	7,146	11,965.	2,126.			
101 Harris	382,985	586,839.	136,118.			
102 Harrison	11,930	15,994.	10,287.			
103 Hartley	1,003	1,290.	1.			
104 Haskell	3,421	6,554.	321.			
105 Hays	5,064	16,352.	659.			
106 Hemphill	1,213	1,934.	—.			
107 Henderson	6,714	11,249.	2,222.			
108 Hidalgo	33,756	87,137.	396.			
109 Hill	6,696	13,743.	1,917.			
110 Hockley	5,733	11,289.	578.			
111 Hood	2,087	3,590.	34.			
112 Hopkins	5,651	11,126.	1,180.			
113 Houston	5,366	8,341.	3,906.			
114 Howard	9,367	22,[illegible].	889.			
115 Hudspeth	665	1,806.	9.			
116 Hunt	9,879	21,544.	3,214.			
117 Hutchinson	10,000	19,045.	371.			
118 Irion	550	731.	10.			
119 Jack	2,444	4,828.	52.			
120 Jackson	3,452	6,840.	967.			
121 Jasper	5,537	9,892.	2,748.			
122 Jeff Davis	479	884.	2.			
123 Jefferson	73,594	112,761.	30,692.			
124 Jim Hogg	1,530	2,716.	5.			
125 Jim Wells	8,837	17,287.	228.			
126 Johnson	9,642	20,908.	915.			
127 Jones	4,920	11,472.	573.			
128 Karnes	4,174	7,929.	243.			
129 Kaufman	6,691	14,411.	4,637.			
130 Kendall	2,173	3,721.	35.			

TEXAS - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
131 Kenedy	146	43.5.	—			
132 Kent	678	1.063.	24.			
133 Kerr	5.608	11,065.	476.			
134 Kimble	1.383	2.497.	9.			
135 King	214	347.	30.			
136 Kinney	594	1331.	98.			
137 Kleberg	6.230	14,748.	655.			
138 Knox	2.216	4.526.	273.			
139 Lamar	8,965	18 342.	3.576.			
140 Lamb	6.349	11,434.	747.			
141 Lampasas	2.970	5.743.	175.			
142 La Salle	1,212	3 057.	6.			
143 Lavaca	5.517	11,559.	1.173.			
144 Lee	2.809	4,459.	1152.			
145 Leon	3 022	4,128.	2.640.			
146 Liberty	8 257	14,216.	3.796.			
147 Limestone	5,263	10.187.	3.120.			
148 Lipscomb	1,352	2.102.	27.			
149 Live Oak	2.226	4.176.	14.			
150 Llano	2.384	3.542.	35.			
151 Loving	79	125.	10.			
152 Lubbock	39,463	78 842.	5984.			
153 Lynn	3 030	5,642.	310.			
154 McCulloch	2.761	5,550.	195.			
155 McLennan	34 346	78 640.	13 232.			
156 McMullen	443	617.	—			
157 Madison	1945	3,185.	1 210.			
158 Marion	2.303	2.463.	2.218.			
159 Martin	1,297	2.760.	95.			
160 Mason	1.535	2.455.	10.			
161 Matagorda	6,555	11, 171.	2 870.			
162 Maverick	2.661	7.143.	21.			
163 Medina	4.997	10 106.	108.			

TEXAS - Con.							
	COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Non-white			
164	Menard	985	1,302.	16.			
165	Midland	20,605	33,490.	3,282.			
166	Milam	5,709	11,686.	2,120.			
167	Mills	1723	3,124.	2.			
168	Mitchell	3,159	6,107.	403.			
169	Montague	4,856	10,616.	2.			
170	Montgomery	8,196	12,348.	3,246.			
171	Moore	4,157	7,280.	25.			
172	Morris	3,594	5,615.	1,541.			
173	Motley	1004	1,814.	132.			
174	Nacogdoches	7,519	18,093.	3,543.			
175	Navarro	8,453	17,323.	4,586.			
176	Newton	2,955	4,647	1,703			
177	Nolan	5,162	11,676	400			
178	Nueces	54,558	104,417	5,780			
179	Ochiltree	2,737	5,244	13			
180	Oldham	670	985	4			
181	Orange	15,645	29,535	3,111			
182	Palo Pinto	5,541	12,303	550			
183	Panola	5,437	7,483	2,470			
184	Parker	7,458	14,163	268			
185	Parmer	2,779	5,038	106			
186	Pecos	3,473	6,390	45			
187	Polk	3,700	5,958	2,194			
188	Potter	24,419	61,607	4,654			
189	Presidio	1,588	3,021	2			
190	Rains	1,168	1,839	158			
191	Randall	13,881	19,025	54			
192	Reagan	1,022	1,954	117			
193	Real	743	1,227	4			
194	Red River	4,654	7,927	1,984			
195	Reeves	3,545	8,930	307			
196	Refugio	3,091	5,278	514			

TEXAS - Con.							
	COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age - April 1960				
			White	Nonwhite			
197	Roberts	495	675	7			
198	Robertson	4.247	6.173	3.413			
199	Rockwall	1.756	2.927	607			
200	Runnels	4.132	8 910	236			
201	Rusk	12.033	16. 907	5.421			
202	Sabine	2.230	3 421	956			
203	San Augustine	1.940	3.062	1.437			
204	San Jacinto	2.626	1.878	1.678			
205	San Patricio	9.384	21 773	4.552			
206	San Saba	2.277	4 219	37			
207	Schleicher	903	1.625	36			
208	Scurry	5,137	11. 155	288			
209	Shackelford	1.424	2.618	78			
210	Shelby	5.711	9,838	2.655			
211	Sherman	1092	1.531	1			
212	Smith	25,472	89 152	12 421			
213	Somervell	854	1.770	2			
214	Starr	4.742	8.374	7			
215	Stephens	2.874	5.720	253			
216	Sterling	384	625	10			
217	Stonewall	1.199	1.841	64			
218	Sutton	1.051	2.109	18			
219	Swisher	3 230	5.715	168			
220	Tarrant	154 158	287. 360	32.945			
221	Taylor	22,620	55 618	2.548			
222	Terrell	658	1.469	7			
223	Terry	4.132	8.518	361			
224	Throckmorton	1130	1.876	12			
225	Titus	5 219	8922	1.592			
226	Tom Green	16,443	36,652	1.845			
227	Travis	63 958	108 111	15 281			
228	Trinity	2.428	3665	1114			
229	Tyler	3037	5.187	1.044			

TEXAS - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
230. Upshur	6.262	9.161	2.660			
231 Upton	1.604	3.226	150			
232 Uvalde	4.326	9.151	104			
233 Val Verde	4.902	12.488	435			
234 Van Zandt	5.676	11,679	725			
235 Victoria	12,369	22,957	2.328			
236 Walker	4.436	9.129	4.308			
237 Waller	3,149	3527	3,158			
238 Ward	3,954	7,969	222			
239 Washington	4,962	8,947	3,239			
240 Webb	11,182	32,843	155			
241 Wharton	9,620	16,949	4,168			
242 Wheeler	2,586	4,857	164			
243 Wichita	27,730	69,902	5,055			
244 Wilbarger	4,742	10,446	856			
245 Willacy	3,388	9,384	60			
246 Williamson	9,202	18,693	2,575			
247 Wilson	4,195	7,306	132			
248 Winkler	3679	7,183	205			
249 Wise	5,241	10,628	70			
250 Wood	5,466	9,899	1,504			
251 Yoakum	2,286	4,315	49			
252 Young	4,946	10,875	165			
253 Zapata	1,149	2,315.	10.			
254 Zavala	2,385	5,232.	32.			

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

UTAH (Code 87)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 29	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
1 Beaver	1,981	2,345	13			
2 Box Elder	11,964	12,281	478			
3 Cache	15,953	18,922	95			
4 Carbon	7,802	11,178	113			
5 Daggett	282	631	2			
6 Davis	28,654	30,222	507			
7 Duchesne	2,571	3,334	160			
8 Emery	2,537	2,897	22			
9 Garfield	1,479	1,844	9			
10 Grand	2,275	3,365	11			
11 Iron	4,575	5,353	71			
12 Juab	2,245	2,544	10			
13 Kane	1,124	1,371	9			
14 Millard	3,435	4,002	23			
15 Morgan	1,407	1,471	1			
16 Piute	634	755	3			
17 Rich	761	887	—			
18 Salt Lake	182,044	204,356	3,025			
19 San Juan	2,364	3,043	1,064			
20 Sanpete	5,167	6,224	14			
21 Sevier	4,565	5,672	35			
22 Summit	2,832	3,051	6			
23 Tooele	7,750	9,025	354			
24 Uintah	4,579	5,283	486			
25 Utah	44,848	53,426	268			
26 Wasatch	2,578	2,761	1			
27 Washington	4,323	5,137	63			
28 Wayne	812	893	1			
29 Weber	49,872	57,186	1,574			

(Utah)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

VERMONT (Code 13)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 14	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Addison	8,258	11,154	21			
2 Bennington	11,257	15,359	37			
3 Caledonia	8,990	13,773	16			
4 Chittenden	30,869	41,164	160			
5 Essex	2,423	3,576	6			
6 Franklin	12,086	16,933	33			
7 Grand Isle	1,503	1,799	—			
8 Lamoille	4,412	6,489	4			
9 Orange	6,642	9,368	9			
10 Orleans	7,907	11,250	8			
11 Rutland	20,406	28,480	29			
12 Washington	17,763	26,189	38			
13 Windham	12,555	18,622	76			
14 Windsor	18,023	25,806	53			

(Vermont)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

WASHINGTON
(Code 91)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 39	Votes Cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age. April 1960				
		White	NonWhite			
1 Adams	4,273	5,484	69			
2 Asotin	5,436	7,720	26			
3 Benton	28,372	33,785	278			
4 Chelan	17,822	24,569	127			
5 Clallam	13,455	17,333	569			
6 Clark	41,790	55,434	381			
7 Columbia	2,187	2,872	3			
8 Cowlitz	24,501	33,583	163			
9 Douglas	6,376	8,298	37			
10 Ferry	1,459	1,795	360			
11 Franklin	10,058	12,147	690			
12 Garfield	1,532	1,796	1			
13 Grant	14,427	24,213	867			
14 Grays Harbor	23,027	32,857	520			
15 Island	6,999	10,746	228			
16 Jefferson	4,456	5,481	161			
17 King	450,640	549,317	29,580			
18 Kitsap	37,714	48,986	1,508			
19 Kittitas	8,592	12,200	67			
20 Klickitat	5,674	7,635	158			
21 Lewis	19,022	25,634	58			
22 Lincoln	5,213	6,693	45			
23 Mason	8,071	9,638	203			
24 Okanogan	10,495	13,995	927			
25 Pacific	6,860	9,183	119			
26 Pend Oreille	2,965	4,030	87			
27 Pierce	125,973	186,448	8747			
28 San Juan	1,750	1,977	15			
29 Skagit	22,328	31,213	437			
30 Skamania	2,414	3,068	11			
31 Snohomish	81,405	99,100	811			

WASHINGTON - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for Pres. 1964	Population age Apr. 1 of voting 1960 White	Nonwhite			
32 Spokane	111,581	164,941	3,142			
33 Stevens	7578	10,093	385			
34 Thurston	21021	32489	301			
35 Wahkiakum	1624	2064	27			
36 Walla Walla	17,594	25,870	536			
37 Whatcom	31,422	42,094	606			
38 Whitman	13,538	17,743	182			
39 Yakima	52,730	79,635	3006			

(2-2: Washington)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

WEST VIRGINIA
(Code 55)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 55	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Barbour	7,291	8,903	108			
2 Berkeley	14,085	20,444	875			
3 Boone	11,076	14,975	188			
4 Braxton	6,654	8,517	68			
5 Brooke	13,198	16,929	237			
6 Cabell	45,394	65,220	3,082			
7 Calhoun	3,901	4,527	6			
8 Clay	4,548	5,914	37			
9 Doddridge	3,168	4,234	1			
10 Fayette	24,041	30,257	3,766			
11 Gilmer	3,948	4,586	1			
12 Grant	3,958	4,645	122			
13 Greenbrier	14,661	18,941	1,097			
14 Hampshire	4,854	6,682	85			
15 Hancock	19,010	22,820	842			
16 Hardy	4,304	5,347	137			
17 Harrison	35,669	47,811	821			
18 Jackson	9,381	10,562	6			
19 Jefferson	6,793	9,400	1,480			
20 Kanawha	108,894	139,181	8,402			
21 Lewis	8,227	13,254	76			
22 Lincoln	9,288	10,513	3			
23 Logan	20,775	26,830	2,450			
24 McDowell	21,730	28,438	7,761			
25 Marion	29,764	38,556	1,647			
26 Marshall	17,932	23,697	296			
27 Mason	10,978	13,616	472			
28 Mercer	27,203	36,005	4,045			
29 Mineral	10,145	12,840	364			
30 Mingo	15,420	18,750	1,129			
31 Monongalia	23,831	32,469	721			

(1-2: West Virginia)

WEST VIRGINIA - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 Monroe	5,752	6,780	198			
33 Morgan	3,686	4,919	110			
34 Nicholas	9,506	13,630	8			
35 Ohio	33,184	43,004	1,239			
36 Pendleton	3,794	4,719	71			
37 Pleasants	3,626	4,105	—			
38 Pocahontas	5,033	5,934	246			
39 Preston	10,279	15,265	63			
40 Putnam	11,075	13,142	16			
41 Raleigh	30,558	38,032	5,162			
42 Randolph	10,996	15,147	178			
43 Ritchie	4,961	6,795	3			
44 Roane	7,271	9,666	16			
45 Summers	6,999	8,795	742			
46 Taylor	6,734	9,121	124			
47 Tucker	3,978	4,646	15			
48 Tyler	4,797	6,192	11			
49 Upshur	7,380	10,529	60			
50 Wayne	16,918	21,670	19			
51 Webster	4,691	7,140	3			
52 Wetzel	9,454	11,653	5			
53 Wirt	2,185	2,597	10			
54 Wood	36,507	46,754	408			
55 Wyoming	12,565	16,594	623			

(2-2: West Virginia)

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

WISCONSIN
(Code 35)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 71	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Adams	3,489	4,823	18			
2 Ashland	7,591	10,146	286			
3 Barron	14,056	20,094	41			
4 Bayfield	5,777	7,121	200			
5 Brown	52,064	68,303	689			
6 Buffalo	5,759	8,312	7			
7 Burnett	4463	5,589	113			
8 Calumet	9,274	12,207	31			
9 Chippewa	17,214	25,616	40			
10 Clark	12,704	18,201	52			
11 Columbia	16,370	22,311	34			
12 Crawford	6,663	9,329	14			
13 Dane	95,426	127,940	1,686			
14 Dodge	26,308	38,127	327			
15 Door	8,714	12,796	61			
16 Douglas	19,839	27,320	116			
17 Dunn	10,458	15,455	35			
18 Eau Claire	24,521	34,474	30			
19 Florence	1,627	2,047	2			
20 Fond du Lac	30,778	44,192	95			
21 Forest	3,552	4,212	132			
22 Grant	17,211	25,155	23			
23 Green	10,929	15,723	17			
24 Green Lake	7,768	9,822	4			
25 Iowa	7,907	11,310	6			
26 Iron	3,480	4,917	9			
27 Jackson	6,357	8,826	193			
28 Jefferson	22,084	30,803	51			
29 Juneau	7,567	10,438	84			
30 Kenosha	45,356	59,112	556			
31 Kewaunee	7,780	10,413	3			

(1-3: Wisconsin)

WISCONSIN - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
32 LaCrosse	29,803	43,046	91			
33 Lafayette	7,671	10,318	3			
34 Langlade	8,081	11,317	30			
35 Lincoln	9,796	13,657	20			
36 Manitowoc	31,815	44,249	81			
37 Marathon	37,426	50,766	63			
38 Marinette	15,013	20,687	23			
39 Marquette	3,816	5,493	2			
40 Milwaukee	439,459	612,662	33,685			
41 Monroe	11,524	18,297	95			
42 Oconto	10,795	14,401	93			
43 Oneida	10,355	12,880	65			
44 Outagamie	40,198	54,895	471			
45 Ozaukee	18,123	21,656	28			
46 Pepin	3,229	4,232	3			
47 Pierce	9,666	12,957	20			
48 Polk	11,003	15,015	79			
49 Portage	16,498	21,167	26			
50 Price	6,705	8,824	2			
51 Racine	59,306	80,730	2,562			
52 Richland	7,548	10,443	8			
53 Rock	48,684	65,815	1,347			
54 Rusk	6,405	8,388	13			
55 St. Croix	13,456	16,563	25			
56 Sauk	15,656	21,509	64			
57 Sawyer	4,613	5,485	392			
58 Shawano	13,105	18,941	1,213			
59 Sheboygan	39,745	53,294	32			
60 Taylor	6,898	9,737	3			
61 Trempealeau	9,589	14,355	9			
62 Vernon	10,898	15,623	10			
63 Vilas	5,679	5,542	354			
64 Walworth	24,009	31,366	136			
(2-3: Wisconsin)						

WISCONSIN - Con.						
COUNTY	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960 White	Nonwhite			
65 Washburn	5,062	6,265	25			
66 Washington	20,791	26,172	26			
67 Waukesha	75,429	88,784	114			
68 Waupaca	15,389	22,139	23			
69 Waushara	6,441	8,554	6			
70 Winnebago	44,835	64,463	139			
71 Wood	23,787	33,094	108			
Menominee V	726	—	—			
V Created from Shawano and Oconto counties within the Menominee Indian Reservation, effective as of April 29, 1961.						

FORM BC-185 (4-1-60)

WYOMING
(Code 83)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 23	Votes cast for President: 1964	Population of voting age: April 1960				
		White	Nonwhite			
1 Albany	8942	12,022	144			
2 Big Horn	5358	6,568	23			
3 Campbell	2802	3,364	16			
4 Carbon	6482	8,768	113			
5 Converse	2809	3,739	13			
6 Crook	1994	2695	4			
7 Fremont	10,794	12934	1387			
8 Goshen	5353	6907	17			
9 Hot Springs	2608	3725	79			
10 Johnson	2492	3253	11			
11 Laramie	24,622	34,338	772			
12 Lincoln	4084	4755	35			
13 Natrona	21,302	27906	333			
14 Niobrara	1965	2365	7			
15 Park	7443	9249	33			
16 Platte	3360	4296	4			
17 Sheridan	9238	11921	68			
18 Sublette	1691	2154	6			
19 Sweetwater	7913	10429	201			
20 Teton	2049	1802	5			
21 Uinta	3115	4395	48			
22 Washakie	3408	4686	64			
23 Weston	2892	4360	24			
24 Yellowstone Nat'l Park (part)	—	266	1			

Sources: Votes Cast For President Compiled by the Governmental Affairs Institute, Washington, D.C. From official state sources. Population of voting age from the 1960 Census of Population.

FORM BC-185 (4-1-80)

WYOMING
(Code 83)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Title

COUNTY Number of counties, 23	Dem.	Rep.	Total			
1 Albany	6,019	2,923	8,942			
2 Big Horn	2,690	2,668	5,358			
3 Campbell	1,196	1,606	2,802			
4 Carbon	4,322	2,160	6,482			
5 Converse	1,250	1,559	2,809			
6 Crook	780	1,214	1,994			
7 Fremont	5,985	4,809	10,794			
8 Goshen	2,749	2,604	5,353			
9 Hot Springs	1,380	1,228	2,608			
10 Johnson	852	1,640	2,492			
11 Laramie	16,059	8,563	24,622			
12 Lincoln	2,273	1,811	4,084			
13 Natrona	11,167	10,135	21,302			
14 Niobrara	843	1,122	1,965			
15 Park	3,745	3,698	7,443			
16 Platte	1,890	1,470	3,360			
17 Sheridan	4,747	4,491	9,238			
18 Sublette	791	900	1,691			
19 Sweetwater	5,969	1,944	7,913			
20 Teton	968	1,081	2,049			
21 Uinta	1,929	1,186	3,115			
22 Washakie	1,695	1,713	3,408			
23 Weston	1,419	1,473	2,892			
24 Yellowstone Nat'l Park (part)	—	—	—			
Total	80,718	61,998	142,716			

(Wyoming)

At this point in the record, statements of Senators Byrd, of Virginia, Hill, McGovern, and Robertson, and Governor Egan, of Alaska, will be inserted and are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S SO-CALLED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

This is a statement about the administration's so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965. I am making it as a Member of the U.S. Senate representing Virginia under oath to unhold the Federal Constitution.

I am intensely aware of the democratic liberties to be achieved through our form of government, and to be guarded by it.

I am also dedicated to preservation of the principles and requirements of our State-local-Federal system and the checks and balances necessary to protect it.

The Federal Government of this country has worked itself into fiscal, monetary, and military difficulties which are exceedingly serious.

Now the Federal administration is allowing itself to be influenced beyond reason by the emotion of domestic hysteria; and by its own actions it is inflaming so-called civil rights issues.

The so-called voting rights bill now before Congress is an act of the present administration. It admittedly was drafted by the Federal Attorney General.

It is a vicious bill. It clearly bears the unreasonable stamp of hysteria. Even Chairman Emanuel Celler, the New York chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has called it "harsh."

The administration has pushed its consideration ahead of everything else. Committee hearings have been arbitrarily limited. Efforts to amend it are discouraged.

There is a terrific administration pressure to pass the bill before Easter. But this statement is not made with such intemperate haste. Instead, it is made with all deliberate speed.

I have analyzed all provisions of the bill. They are iniquitous in effect and contemptible in design. The administration has been advised of the odium in which I hold its proposal.

I have also studied the Federal Attorney General's testimony. He admits drafting the bill. Neither the bill nor the testimony is worthy of men entrusted with high office in the National Government of this country.

The proposal is made in the name of voting justice. It would be less hypocritical and more accurate to describe it as Federal law designed for vindictive use against six States selected in advance.

It is a proposal grossly to offend Virginia; and not only this. It is subversive of the Constitution of the United States and the whole system under which we are governed.

The Attorney General has documented his own cynicism. He has proclaimed his impatience with judicial process, and his lack of faith in it.

I quote directly from the prepared testimony of the Federal Attorney General before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 23, 1965. He said:

"* * * the judicial process, upon which all existing remedies depend, is institutionally inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

I never expected to hear a responsible member of the legal profession or an Attorney General of the United States take such an attitude or make such a public statement about the judicial process.

Based on this rejection of government by law and not men, this Federal Attorney General seeks in a voting rights bill to arrogate judicial power to himself in areas of his own choosing.

A written constitution protects us from despotic rule. For this protection against oppressive government we rely on the checks and balances of division of power and separation of powers.

The power of government is divided between State and Federal Government And in both State and Federal Government, legislative, judicial, and executive powers are separated.

The Federal Attorney General, speaking for the administration, is demanding that the legislative branch of the Federal Government empower him—a political appointee in the executive branch—to preempt the judicial branch in areas he has chosen to punish.

That is not all. He is demanding power by Federal legislation to usurp the constitutional power of States he has already chosen to be his victims.

There is more. He is demanding this power under general Federal law which by his own design is limited to enforcement in only a handful of States.

He decries racial discrimination in voting practices, but he deliberately wrote this bill to exempt all voting discrimination in a four-fifths majority of the 50 States from its application.

The Federal Attorney General tortures legal reasoning in the scheme he contrived to include and exclude States from the vengeful clutches of his bill.

The State he wants to incriminate are caught by his own dictates combined with a devious statistical formula. Under terms of the bill—

The Federal Attorney General—by asserting that the voting requirements in a target area are racially discriminatory—may indict a whole State or any subdivision as violating the Constitution of the United States and Federal law; and

If 50 percent of the voting age people in the area were not registered to vote on November 1, 1964, or if 50 percent did not choose to vote in the 1964 presidential election, the State or locality—with never a day in court—is automatically guilty of the Federal Attorney General's indictment.

When a State or locality is convicted by this kangaroo procedure, the Federal Attorney General orders invasion of the State or subdivision by an unspecified number of Federal registrars.

Occupation of the State or subdivision by the Federal registrars will continue for an unspecified and indefinite period of time.

The purpose of the Federal registrars is to impose and enforce the will of the Federal Attorney General with respect to voting laws, ordinances, and practices in the State or locality.

The practices, operations, and locations, etc., of the Federal registrars are limited only by the whim of the Federal Attorney General, but they will include registration of persons to vote when they claim they have been disqualified under State or local requirements. And the Federal registrars will collect annual poll taxes in States where they are imposed.

(And the Federal Attorney General says he will extend his authority to all elections—Federal and State, general and primary, and local and district, including those for bond issues and the like.)

The State or locality has no rights to any sort of judicial appeal until it is actually incriminated by the Federal Attorney General's drumhead court. Then it may enter an appeal from the position of a culprit already convicted and sentenced.

The appeal in that position cannot be to test the validity of the Federal Attorney General's action. It is in the nature of an appeal for a pardon which is necessary before the State or locality can be released from the clutches of the Federal Attorney General and his Federal registrars.

But like the State or locality, the pardon appeal is virtually prejudged by the terms of the bill.

The appeal can be made only in a remote specially selected three-judge Federal court in Washington, D.C. (The Federal Attorney General says this is desirable for uniformity of decision.

The State or locality is convicted by the Federal Attorney General of racial discrimination in voting practices, but much more than this is involved in getting a pardon from the Federal Attorney General's special court at the doorstep of the Federal Justice Department in Washington, which is headed by the Federal Attorney General.

This court is allowed to grant a pardon to a State or locality only when it is able to prove to the court's satisfaction that for 10 past years not only the State or locality, but also everybody in it, "acting under color" of its laws or ordinances, has been totally innocent not only of racial discrimination in voting practices, but also totally innocent of all discrimination suggestive of voting discrimination.

(The Federal Attorney General says complying with the "equal but separate education" doctrine of the Federal Supreme Court which stood as the law of the land for a half century would be an example of a practice suggestive of voting discrimination.)

Until a State or locality convicted by the Federal Attorney General is given such a pardon, under such conditions, by such a court, it is not allowed to enforce any change in any of its election laws or ordinances without permission from a district Federal court in Washington.

The extremes to which the administration and its Attorney General have gone to exempt the majority of States and convict a minority are beyond the realm of reason.

They demonstrate the bias and prejudice under which the bill was conceived and with which it will be enforced. The bill itself is literally based on discrimination as between States.

There is nothing in the Virginia constitution or statutes which can be honestly interpreted as discriminatory with respect to voting rights or registration.

I doubt that the Federal Attorney General can find a State where it is simpler or easier for anyone to register than it is in Virginia, or where election practices are cleaner.

If in truth, or consequence, there is any evidence of discriminatory voting practice or procedure in Virginia I am unaware of it.

If there is any evidence of racial discrimination in the registration laws or voting practices in Virginia, the Federal Attorney General has not given it the usual Federal fanfare.

Even the Federal Civil Rights Commission—with all of its bias and prejudice and snooping—has found that—

> In Virginia there appears to be no racial discrimination with respect to voter registration and that Negroes "appear to encounter no significant racially motivated impediments in voting."

Despite all the activity of his own agents combined with that of the Civil Rights Commission agents, the Federal Attorney General says there is no "widespread" voting discrimination in Virginia.

But the Federal Attorney General persists in misrepresenting Virginia as a State with discriminatory registration laws or engaging in discriminatory voting practices.

He admits that this bill which he has drafted for the administration is fixed so that he can incriminate Virginia.

He admits also that he has designed this administration bill so that he can exempt Texas from its application.

In advance he has said that he will incriminate Virginia and exempt Texas.

He says Virginia is caught in his numbers game because 41 percent (not 50 percent) of its voting age people voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

But he says Texas, where 44 percent (not 50 percent) of its voting age people voted in the presidential election of November 1964, is not to be subjected to the application of his numbers racket.

When the Federal Attorney General was asked why Texas was to be exempt, he said:

"Texas is out for the reason that it does not have a literacy test. The literacy tests are the devices that have been primarily used in order to prevent Negroes from registering."

For those who may be misled by the Federal Attorney General into believing that Virginia has a literacy test, I shall compare the so-called voting tests and other requirements for voting in Virginia and Texas.

Both States voted less than 50 percent in the presidental election of November 1964.

Both States have a relatively high percentage of nonwhite population.

Both States in November 1964 required the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting in all but Federal elections.

The voting lists for the 1964 presidential election in Texas were composed of the names of persons certified by the poll tax collectors as having either paid their $1.75 poll tax, or as having formally applied for and received a certificate of exemption from payment for voting in the Federal election.

Like Texas, Virginia voters were exempt from payment of their $1.50 poll tax as a requirement for voting in the 1964 Federal election. The voting lists in Virginia were composed of the names of persons who had been registered under the Virginia voting registration laws.

In Texas, the so-called test is applied to prospective voters by the tax collector when they undertake to pay their poll tax; or when they formally apply for a certificate of exemption.

In Virginia the prospective voter is billed for his poll tax along with other taxes. He is asked simple questions of identification when he registers to vote at the office of a registrar.

In Texas the prospective voter must be able to understand the questions asked by the tax collector, and give the answers. In certain cases a husband can apply in behalf of his wife, and a wife can apply in behalf of her husband.

In Texas, article 5.14 of the election code requires the following questions to be answered:

Name?
Age?
Sex?
Race? (This is presumed to have been outlawed by a recent Federal court decision.)
Occupation?
Length of residence in the State of Texas?
U.S. citizenship?
Native-born or naturalized citizen?
State or country of birth?
Length of residence in county?
Texas post office address (if residence is in an incorporated city or town give the ward, street, and number of residence in lieu of post office address, and length of residence in such city or town)?
Political party affiliation?

In Virginia, title 24, section 68, of the code requires the following questions to be answered in writing by the person registering, without assistance:

Name?
Age?
Date and place of birth?
Residence?
Occupation?
Have you ever voted before?
State, county, and precinct where you last voted?
(Members of armed services are required to give their service, serial number, and discharge date where pertinent.)
(Naturalized citizens are required to give date, court, and State where they received their naturalization papers, along with their petition and certificate numbers.)
All persons registering are required to sign the following oath:
"I _____ do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I am entitled to register under the constitution and laws of this State, and that I am not disqualified from exercising the right of suffrage by the constitution of Virginia.

But the Federal Attorney General, while admitting that both States are ensnared in his voting numbers trap, reveals that he has written this bill for the administration so that—

He can exempt Texas by simply asserting that Texas has no literacy test; but
He can incriminate Virginia by inferring that Virginia has some kind of a voting test that will not get his approval.

The fact is that in State and local elections on questions of bond issues, debt, and other matters of public finance, Texas voters must own taxable property.

There is no such requirement in Virginia.

For State and local elections Texas requires payment of poll taxes for 1 year; Virginia requires their payment for 3 years, but the 3-year requirement does not apply to new voters coming of age or moving into the State.

What does the Federal Attorney General do about poll taxes? He exempts Texas from application of his bill. But his bill provides that his Federal registrars sent to poll tax States will collect the taxes for 1 year—as in Texas—from persons they qualify to vote.

Beyond this, he has testified that neither he nor his Federal registrars will "recognize" the 3-year poll tax requirement—as in Virginia.

But while the Federal Attorney General refuses to recognize the requirement to pay poll taxes for 3 years as a requirement to vote, he provides in his bill that he and his Federal registrars can disenfranchise persons they have qualified to vote contrary to State laws if they do not vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed."

The people of Virginia, and the Nation, are justified in the condemnation of legislation such as the Federal administration and its Attorney General propose in the so-called "Voting Rights Act of 1965."

They would pin a rose on Texas, but incriminate Virginia.
And when they incriminate Virginia, they deny it the judicial process accorded a murderer.

They would convict Virginia of voting discrimination, but deny it a pardon until it has proved its innocence of something else for 10 years.

They admit there is already ample law under which allegations of discrimination can be tested in the judicial process, but they want this special law to bypass judicial process for the punishment of the States of their choice.

For purposes of this law, the Federal administration and its Attorney General condone an eighth-grade education voting test in New York, but they want the power to qualify a moron to vote in Alabama.

They decry discrimination devices, but they have proposed a law which, in itself, is a discrimination device.

The Federal Attorney General has no patience with the judicial process for the victims of this bill. He wants the power to deal with them himself.

The Federal administration and its Attorney General propose to incriminate certain States by means of dictator-type decree and a statistical formula.

They demand for themselves the right, under certain conditions which they name, to disenfranchise people they themselves qualified to vote.

The Federal administration and its Attorney General propose, by a single Federal statute to take away the constitutional rights of States and substitue Federal executive decree.

If this can be done for this administration, for the purposes of this bill, to punish the States it has chosen, it can be done at other times for other purposes to destroy the constitutional rights of others, the Constitution notwithstanding.

It is significant that this bill would extend Federal control over all elections—Federal, State, local, and party primaries.

Federal agents are not to confine their control only to elections for political office. They extend it to State and local elections with respect to public finance—bond issues, credit, expenditures, etc.

Simply by changing the statistical formula the Federal administration and its Attorney General can be empowered to extend their control over any and all States they wish to give this treatment.

What would remain of our form and system of government if all elections in all States and localities were controlled by the Central Government?

Only last month 99.9 percent of the people in Moscow voted in an election of candidates who had no opposition. And when Mr. Khrushchev voted, he was not required even to produce identification.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LISTER HILL IN OPPOSITION TO S. 1564

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: S. 1564, the so-called voting rights bill of 1965, is, without exaggeration, the most unconstitutional piece of legislation I have seen proposed during my more than 40 years in the Congress.

I am here to register my opposition to S. 1564 and to any other proposal that would allow a politically appointed Attorney General, at his sole discretion, to take control of the election machinery for State, local, and Federal elections and the qualifications of electors in a sovereign State or in any subdivision thereof, merely by reason of his finding or discretion that that State has a test as a qualification for voting and that less than 50 percent of persons in such State registered or voted in connection with last November's presidential election.

Mr. Chairman, the formula of the proposed so-called voting rights bill is so drawn as to arbitrarily adjudge a handful of States guilty of discrimination in the field of voting and to leave the overwhelming majority of the States free to discriminate in any way they choose. In other words, 41 out of the 50 States would not be covered in any way under the proposed legislation.

A careful examination of the bill clearly reveals the discriminatory, punitive, and harsh nature of it. The Wall Street Journal, not a southern paper, not written or published in the South, recently referred to the bill as an "immoral law."

The New Republic, again not a southern publication, in an April 3, 1965 editorial, referred to the bill as a "tough measure," as "the toughest since Reconstruction" and then finally it called the bill outrightly "a Reconstruction measure."

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the bill must be "the toughest since Reconstruction" as Mr. Beckel of the New Republic puts it. It must be tougher, for as the members of this committee will recall, at the time the 14th amendment was being considered, Congressman Thaddeus Stevens, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reconstruction—who could hardly be called a southern sympathizer—strongly

asserted his belief that "the States have the right, and always have had it, to fix the elective franchise within their own States." And he went on to say that, in his opinion, the States would not and should not allow Congress to regulate the restrictions and qualifications for their voters.

Mr. Chairman, while I am opposed to the bill before this committee and the arbitrary and unprecedented manner in which it seeks to sweep aside some of the most vital provisions of the Constitution of the United States, I should like to make it abundantly clear, as I have on past occasions, that I believe all qualified Americans should have the right to vote. I am not willing, however, to lend my hand to any broom that would sweep aside the Constitution and the rights of the individual States—North, South, East, or West—or that would arbitrarily sweep into a corner a certain handful of States for discriminatory and punitive treatment.

In the very beginning, article I, section 2 of the Constitution vested in the State governments the power fixing the qualifications for voters. This section provides as follows:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

Some 124 years after the adoption of the Constitution, when the people of the United States saw fit to change their method of electing U.S. Senators they provided, in the 17th amendment, as follows:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years: and each Senator shall have one vote."

Then there is this language:

"The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

The Supreme Court of the United States, which interprets the Constitution, declared unanimously in the famous *Lassiter* case in 1959 that the States may, without violating the Constitution, use literacy tests as a prerequisite to eligibility for voting. The exact language of the opinion is as follows:

"We do not suggest that any standards which a State desires to adopt may be required of voters. But there is wide scope for exercise of its jurisdiction. Residence requirements, age, previous criminal record are obvious examples indicating factors which a State may take into consideration in determining the qualifications of voters. The ability to read and write likewise has some relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot."

The same opinion quoted from a previous ruling of the High Court, in what is known as the *Guinn* case, as follows:

"No time need be spent on the question of the validity of the literacy test, considered alone, since, as we have seen its establishment was but the exercise by the State of a lawful power vested in it not subject to our supervision, and, indeed, its validity is admitted."

So, as we see, Mr. Chairman, from the very beginning and down through the years, the Constitution and the Supreme Court decisions interpreting its provisions are abundantly clear as to the rights of the States to set voter qualifications.

The bill before this committee, S. 1564, is entitled "A bill to enforce the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States." The bill thus pretends to be "appropriate legislation" to prevent the voting right of citizens of the United States from being denied or abridged by States on account of race or color. In fact, the bill is not that at all. Its real purpose is to establish voting qualifications to displace those now established by State laws. Precisely, it is a bill to abolish State voting qualification laws whether they are valid or invalid, fair or unfair, and whether they are administered by States in violation or not in violation of the Constitution of the United States. It is a bill clothed in the garments of the 15th amendment for the purpose of concealing its unconstitutional design. This is shown in the language of section 2 of the bill, which reads as follows:

"No voting qualification or procedure shall be imposed or applied to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color."

For those who insist on clothing this bill with the 15th amendment, let me briefly recall that amendment's legislative history to show that it did not intend to give Congress power to pass legislation such as that before this committee.

The joint resolution, proposing the amendment which was later to become the 15th amendment to the Constitution, read as follows:

"SECTION 1. The right of any citizen of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of the race, color, or previous condition of slavery of any citizen or class of citizens of the United States."

On February 10, 1869, the Senate amended and passed the resolution to include a provision that no discrimination shall be made in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of nativity, property, education, or creed. If the 15th amendment as amended and passed by the Senate on February 10, 1869, had been concurred in by the House and ratified by the States, the States would have lost their rights to prescribe literacy tests or other educational qualifications for their voters. The House, however, adamantly refused to do so.

A New York Times editorial on February 15, 1869, expressed the sentiments and reaction of the overwhelming majority of people throughout the country when it said:

"The amendment as reported by the Reconstruction Committee and passed by the House is simple and moderate. * * *

"The Senate amendment is sweeping enough to justify the charge of being revolutionary preferred by Mr. Conkling and others * * *."

Remember, the Senate amendment to which the editorial refers would have prohibited any State literacy test.

Following a great storm of protest throughout the country, the Senate backed away from its effort to restrict the rights of the States to prescribe educational and property qualifications for their voters. The debates in Congress at that time make it clear beyond any doubt that the 15th amendment was not intended in any way to restrict or take away from the States their rights to prescribe educational or property qualifications of voters.

So, we see, Mr. Chairman, that the 15th amendment was not intended to give Congress the power to strike down State literacy tests and a long line of Supreme Court decisions have upheld this.

Mr. Chairman, section by section, the provisions of this bill are harsh, drastic and far reaching. They are unprecedented and alien to our system of law and justice. They are foreign to our constitutional form of government and violative of the intent and express language of that great document.

I have called the bill as a whole arbitrary, discriminatory, and punitive. Much testimony has been taken by this committee exposing the bill as such and much has been written on it. I commend the distinguished and brilliant lawyer and jurist, the senior Senator from North Carolina, Senator Sam Ervin, and other members of the committee for the great service they have rendered the people of the Nation in this regard. I am prepared to further expose the unconstitutionality and harshness of this bill and to discuss it at length, if it comes to the floor of the Senate for consideration. I certainly hope it does not and I urge the committee to reject it. As I do, I would remind the members of this committee what the bill and its proponents are asking this Congress to do.

They are asking that this Congress by legislative act declare six States and certain counties in three other States guilty of discrimination in their voting procedures because they legally and constitutionally maintained on last November 1 a voter qualification test and less than 50 percent of their people were registered on that date or voted in the 1964 November election.

They are asking that the Congress automatically outlaw in those States adjudged guilty by it any testing of ability to read, write, or understand any matter, and to outlaw any requirement regarding moral character as a legal qualification to voting.

They are asking the Congress to impose on the handful of States covered by the bill a punishment of 10 years coverage, beginning with the date of a final judgment by a court of discrimination, whether the judgment was entered prior to or after enactment of the bill.

They are asking the Congress to give a politically appointed Attorney General, whoever he may be at any given time, the power to replace local registrars with civil service examiner, if, by findings or his discretions, he thinks there may be discrimination practiced in voting procedures.

They are asking the Congress to give a politically appointed Attorney General, through the civil service examiners appointed by him, the power to determine the qualifications required for listing, with no procedude for contesting such determinations.

They are asking the Congress to disregard the judicial competency and integrity of Federal judges in the States covered by the bill, to impugn the Federal judiciary system, and to establish a three-man court in the District of Columbia to entertain any judicial actions growing out of the bill and its application.

They are asking the Congress to establish the principle, for the first time in the history of this country, that a State must submit to a three-man court outside its jurisdiction, in this instance in the District of Columbia, any proposal or legislation duly enacted by State legislature, composed of representatives of the people of an individual State, for approval before it can be put into effect as the law of that State.

They are asking the Congress to single out a handful of States for this unjust, unconstitutional, and harsh treatment and, by the formula of the bill, leave the others to discriminate at will.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the provisions, the import, and the drastic consequences af S. 1564, the so-called voting rights bill before this committee, are and should be of vital concern to more than just the handful of States covered by it. The American people may discover some day that changes that would be brought about by enactament of S. 1564 and the principles established by it could affect not merely voting rights, but the rights of citizens in almost every other field of law. For, indeed, the bill we discuss here today constitutes a revolution in American law.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that if, by the passage of a single law of Congress, the rights of the States can be taken away from them with the excuse that it is merely desired to prevent some possible abuse of power, then the United States will no longer be goverened by a written Constitution.

I am one who continues to believe that in these turbulent and trying times it is vitually important that we maintain and preserve the rudder to our ship of state—our written Constitution—and, again, I ask the committee to reject S. 1564, the bill before it.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN IN SUPPORT OF S. 1564, THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

I am most pleased to have this opportunity to express my strong support for S. 1564, the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965.

A little more than 2 weeks ago President Johnson appealed for legislation designed to guarantee the right to vote to every American citizen, regardless of race or color. I believe that President Johnson spoke for millions of Americans when he said, "Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right. There is no duty which weighs more heavily on us than the duty we have to insure that right * * *. It is wrong to deny any of your fellow Americans the right to vote in this country."

For more than 100 years American Negro citizens have been trying to obtain the most basic right of American citizenship, the right to vote and the right to share in the election of public officials. For more than 100 years the right to vote has been denied to large segments of the American citizenry, solely because of the color of their skin. The conscience of America now demands that action be taken to secure this precious right for all Americans.

I am convinced that this legislation enjoys strong public support not only in my State of South Dakota, but in the East and West, in the North and South. I believe that the American people fully realize that denying one American citizen the right to vote hurts all of us. As the poet, John Donne wrote, "No man is an island, entirely of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main * * *. Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind." To deprive the American Negro of the right to vote is to deprive us all of the essence of our heritage and democracy.

There is broad public support for the Voting Rights Act in South Dakota. A short while ago in Sioux Falls some 250 or more students and faculty members from Augustana College marched in support of this legislation during the worst blizzard if the winter. Church leaders, students, farmers, businessmen, and other interested citizens of South Dakota have written me to express their full support for it.

I do hope that sympathetic consideration will be given to some of the suggestions which have been made to improve and broaden the coverage of this bill. I am hopeful that a formula can be arrived at which will put an end to some of the substantial pockets of discrimination not presently covered by its wording.

We now have a chance to prove that we really believe in the principal that all American citizens are entitled to vote for their representatives. This is a task in which we must not fail.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON ON S. 1564, THE NEW VOTING RIGHTS BILL

In order to become a Member of the U.S. Senate, every man certified by his State government as having been duly elected must stand before the Presiding Officer of the Senate and take a solemn oath that he will support and uphold the Constitution. In my opinion, there is no more justification for a Member of the Senate to elect what parts of the Constitution he will support and uphold and what parts he will deliberately violate than it is for Martin Luther King and his misguided followers to decide what State and local laws they will obey and what they will deliberately violate.

The new voting bill, S. 1564, violates the constitutional right of sovereign States in a number of respects, but especially with respect to the provisions of the bill that make all literacy tests illegal and which change State laws requiring the payment of a modest poll tax by all citizens a specified time before a general election. S. 1564 also rests upon a deduction from an assumption which is bad logic as well as bad law. For instance, we are told that election officials in Virginia are violating the 15th amendment which prohibits a State from restricting a man's vote on account of his race. We are told that Virginia falls into that category because in the last presidential elelction less than 50 percent of the adult voters of Virginia voted. The facts are—and deductions can only be made from facts and not from assumptions—that the adult population in Virginia in the summer of 1964 was 2,524,000. That included 157,000 members of military establishments, most of whom had not acquired a legal voting residence in the State; all college students without legal residence in the State, and all crews of ships that were in a Virginia port at the time the census was taken. In November of 1964, 1,311,023 were registered to vote in Virginia which was 51 percent of the population of voting age. However, only 1,042,267 voted, which was 41 percent of the population of voting age.

If all of the Virginians who were registered last year had gone to the polls on election day in November, this new bill would not apply to Virginia.

But because approximately 269,000 of those registered did not vote, this bill would enable the Federal authorities to presume that Virginia is discriminating.

Thus, Virginia could be brought under this bill, while New York is excluded, despite the fact that the literacy test in the Empire State prevents many Puerto Ricans from voting.

In New York an applicant for registration must present an elementary or high school diploma, or pass a test of his ability to comprehend English. The New York Times reports that many adults among New York City's 750,000 Puerto Ricans are elementary school dropouts who are literate in Spanish, but not in English.

Nevertheless, administration spokesmen have told a House subcommittee that this bill could not provide relief for these Puerto Ricans, because more than 50 percent of New York's voting age population voted last year.

In this connection, I understand that Puerto Rico has passed a law to prohibit the teaching of English in its schools. Yet, there are those in this country who would favor making this island 1,600 miles from our shores the 51st State.

Of all the States that have literacy tests, Virginia's is the simplest. Simpler than the North Carolina test which was approved unanimously by the Supreme Court in the *Lassiter* case in 1959.

Members of Congress who seem to be determined to rush this new voting bill through with inadequate committee hearings and very limited floor debate are either ignorant of or else conveniently unmindful of the voting pattern of the 13 States which ratified a Constitution to form a more perfect Union. They are also ignorant of or conveniently unmindful of the history of the formation of the 15th amendment.

Prior to the adoption of our Federal Constitution, the States possessed unlimited and absolute sovereignty. They retained the same sovereignty after the Constitution was adopted, except so far as they granted certain powers to the Federal Government, or prohibited themselves from doing certain acts. Every State reserved to itself the exclusive right of regulating its own internal government and police. Before the adoption of the Civil War amendment, there

was not to be found in the Constitution of the United States "a single sentence, paragraph, or word which (gave to) the National Government power over the qualifications of voters in any of the States." *Blair* v. *Ridgely*, 41 Missouri 63, 97 Am. Dec. 248.

Indeed, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, each State had diverse qualifications for suffrage, and most of the State constitutions imposed property qualifications of various sorts.

During the period in which the struggle for universal male suffrage was being fought, it was never asserted that the Congress of the United States or any Federal constitutional provision could alter State voting requirements. In fact, the following observation was made by the U.S. Supreme Court, in the case of *Luther* v. *Borden*, 48 U.S. (7 How.) 1, 35 (1849):

"And certainly it is no part of the judicial function of any court of the United States to prescribe the qualifications of voters in a State giving the right to those to whom it is denied by the written and established constitution and laws of the State or taking it away from those to whom it is given."

Nothing in the Constitution of the United States provided a different rule for suffrage in Federal elections. Article I, section 2, provides that "Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature" in voting for Members of the House of Representatives, while the 17th amendment makes the same provision for U.S. Senators. Article II, section 1, provides that "Each State shall appoint in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors" to vote for President and Vice President. These provisions vest in Congress no power to prescribe voting qualifications, and this omission cannot be deemed an oversight, for when the framers of the Constitution desired to give Congress power to alter State rules in respect to elections of Federal officials, they found no difficulty in doing so, as illustrated by article I, section 4, which permits Congress to alter State laws in respect to the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives "at any time by law."

The powers of the States to prescribe voting qualifications are as absolute and unlimited today as they were in 1789, with one exception. The 15th amendment prohibits the States from denying or abridging the right to vote on the basis of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Attempting to rely upon this Civil War amendment, the Federal Government has introduced a bill purporting to cure alleged discriminations against the right to vote.

Section three of the proposed legislation would prohibit a State from requiring "any test or device as a qualification for voting." in any Federal, State, or local election, provided that a determination was made by the Director of the Census "that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964." That such a finding in no way establishes a conclusive presumption of discriminatory practices will be discussed later. At this point, the unconstitutionality of prohibiting a State from requiring a literacy test as a qualification for voting should be discussed.

Twenty States, North and South, have exercised their power under the Constitution of the United States to require some sort of literacy test as a prerequisite to voting.

The Attorney General of the United States now argues that the proposed administration bill to abolish such tests, is justified, indeed, is grounded, on the provisions of the 15th amendment.

I submit that the Attorney General is in error. There is nothing in the legislative history of the 15th amendment to suggest that the 40th Congress of the United States intended the amendment to change, in any way, the powers of a State to regulate voting qualifications.

The House of Representatives was first to pass the 15th amendment. When the House version was reported to the Senate, that body amended the original House version to ban discrimination based on nativity, property, and education. Thereupon, the House defeated this amended version by a vote of 133 to 37. (Congressional Globe, 40th Cong., 3d sess., Feb. 15, 1869, p. 1226.)

At this point the Senate, rather than delay longer the passage of the bill, receded from its amendment. (Id., of p. 1329.) The final conference report contained the present text of the 15th amendment. (Id., at p. 1623.) A constant criticism heard while the debate was going on in the Senate was to the effect that the Senate was giving way to the House. (Id., at p. 1639.)

It is to war with reason to suggest that Congress, after having expressly deleted a provision banning educational qualifications from the amendment, should have intended that the watered down version which finally became the 15th amendment should encompass a provision which had been expressly deleted.

It is clear that the deletion of the educational voting restriction ban forecloses any congressional action in this field. A State will be well within its constitutional prerogatives to provide that none but those who pass the eighth grade, or high school, or college, or law school, or who can read English, or Latin, or Greek, can vote at Federal or State elections.

In order to justify its attack on State literacy tests, which, as we have seen are not prohibited by the 15th amendment, the Federal Government is forced to rely upon a questionable presumption. This presumption, as mentioned earlier, concludes that discrimination exists in any State wherein less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered in November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

The press reports that these States are Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Virginia, South Carolina, and Alaska.

In order to overcome this questionable presumption, and it will shortly be explained why it is questionable, the burden is upon the accused State to successfully refute any allegations of discrimination, and this action may be taken only in the three-judge District Court of the District of Columbia.

Note carefully that the State can be found guilty of denying the right to vote, not only in Federal elections, but in State elections, by an administrative official outside the judicial system. The only time that the Federal Government constitutionally can get involved in such an area is where there has been a judicial determination in the first instance that the Constitution of the United States has been violated.

As mentioned earlier, the administrative presumption provided for in the act is highly suspect.

Spokesmen for the State of Alaska immediately protested that the severe cold of our 49th State often precluded a large turnout on election day. No discrimination, and yet the presumption would require extensive litigation by Alaska's officials in the District of Columbia courts.

In Virginia, white and Negro members appointed by the Virginia Civil Rights Advisory Committee found no evidence of discrimination in voting in Virginia. Congressional Record, March 17, 1965, page 5151 (unbound volume). Again, in order to overcome the presumption, extensive litigation by a State in the District of Columbia would be required.

Other factors which render the presumption highly suspect are plain voter apathy.

A special report of the Southern Regional Council released November 2, 1958, includes the following statement:

"In certain areas it undoubtedly has become more difficult for Negroes to register, because of new voting restrictions and stricter applications of the old requirements. In some sections where political leaders have fanned racial prejudices, Negroes are even more hesitant about attempting to register than they were 2 years ago. But, in many parts of the South, lack of political consciousness remains the greatest barrier. Leaders of both races long have contended that if all bars to Negro voting were removed tomorrow, there would not be a great rush to the polls.

"This is not expected until Negroes have been able to raise their economic and educational levels. Their leadership has been broadened and they have reached a position where their political participation promises more tangible results. Neither the new civil rights legislation nor the Federal agencies created by it promise any quick or dramatic improvement in Negro suffrage. Even where registration boards are cooperative, a gradual process of political educations obviously will be required."

As late as 1960, Attorney General Rogers, appearing before the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, stated that it was his hope that "there will be greater effort on the part of the Negro to register and vote, because consitutional rights cannot be enforced unless the people attempt to exercise them."

In light of such evidence, Congress should not indulge in such a presumption as created by the proposed legislation.

The other section of the bill that I wish to discuss today is section 5(e), which provides, in part, that:

"No person shall be denied the right to vote for failure to pay a poll tax if he tenders payment of such tax for the current year to an examiner, whether or not such tender would be timely or adequate under State law."

Again, I submit this section is unconstitutional as an attempt to destory the States powers to establish such voting qualifications as they deem adequate.

The 24th amendment, of course, prevents the States from making payment of a poll tax a condition of the right to vote in Federal elections. That amendment reads:

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

It seems obvious that an examination of this wording reveals that the amendment was clearly intended to in no way prevent the States from making payment of a poll tax a condition of the right to vote in State and local elections. Its single and only purpose was to prevent the States from making payment of a poll tax a condition of the right to vote in Federal elections.

It would appear equally obvious that should a State decide to exercise its power, undiminished by the 24th amendment, and require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a State election, that power constitutionally includes the power to specify that such a tax be paid on or before a date certain.

While acknowledging the power of a State to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a State election, Congress would attempt to qualify that power by statute, and I do not believe that mere legislation can amend the Constitution by taking away the right of a State to prescribe certain voting qualifications.

Finally, in closing, section 8 should be briefly discussed. That section provides that:

"Whenever a State or political subdivision for which determinations are in effect under section 3(a) shall enact any law or ordinance imposing qualificiations or procedures for voting different than those in force and effect on November 1, 1964, such law or ordinance shall not be enforced unless and until it shall have been finally adjudicated by an action for declaratory judgment brought against the United States in the district court for the district that such qualifications or procedures will not have the effect of denying or abridging rights guaranteed by the fifteenth amendment. All actions hereunder shall be heard by a three-judge court and there shall be a right of direct appeal to the Supreme Court."

This section is equally as objectionable as the two sections previously discussed. It gives the Federal Government the absolute power to determine which, if any, State qualifications on voting shoudld be upheld. It allows, in effect, the Federal Government to set its own future standards for voting, a provision which is in direct conflict with the Constitution, and destroys forever the revered theory that there is a presumption of legality attaching to State legislation.

Regardless of the size of the majority that may be against me; regardless of the political expediency that may be involved, I hope and pray that as long as I have the great honor and the coveted privilege to be a Member of the U.S. Senate from Virginia, I shall never consciously vote to violate my oath to uphold and support the Constitution of the United States.

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, April 4, 1965.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to be heard on S. 1564, entitled "A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States." S. 1564 is a tremendously important legislative proposal. I wholeheartedly support its passage. However, due to the press of the current legisla-

tive session here in Alaska, I will not be able to appear before the committee, nor will we be able to have other than members of Alaska's cougressional delegation at our Nation's Capital at this time.

While it appears from the transcript of the testimony of the Attorney General of the United States, presented to the House Judiciary Committee on H.R. 6400, that the terms of the bill apply to the State of Alaska, the committee will surely be interested to know that by no stretch of the imagination could the bill apply to Alaska.

In the first place, the State of Alaska did not maintain any "test or device as a qualification for voting" on November 1, 1964, nor at any other time.

To "maintain a test or device as a qualification for voting" would be a clear-cut violation of article V, the suffrage and elections article of Alaska's constitution. Article V, in its entirety, follows:

"SUFFRAGE AND ELECTIONS

"SECTION 1. Every citizen of the United States who is at least 19 years of age, who meets registration requirements which may be prescribed by law, and who is qualified to vote under this article, may vote in any State or local election. He shall have been, immediately preceding the election, for 1 year a resident of Alaska and for 30 days a resident of the election district in which he seeks to vote. He shall be able to read or speak the English language as prescribed by law, unless prevented by physical disability. Additional voting qualifications may be prescribed by law for bond issue elections of political subdivisions.

"SEC. 2. No person may vote who has been convicted of a felony involving moral turpitude unless his civil rights have been restored. No person may vote who has been judicially determined to be of unsound mind unless the disability has been removed.

"SEC. 3. Methods of voting, including absentee voting, shall be prescribed by law. Secrecy of voting shall be preserved. The procedure for determining election contests, with right of appeal to the courts, shall be prescribed by law.

"SEC. 4. The legislature may provide a system of permanent registration of voters, and may establish voting precincts within election districts.

"SEC. 5. General elections shall be held on the second Tuesday in October of every even-numbered year, but the month and day may be changed by law."

I personally doubt that the constitution of any other State in our great Nation contains more liberal voting provisions than the constitution of the State of Alaska.

As a practical matter, the American citizens of native and Eskimo ethnic origin in Alaska probably come closer to having a 100-percent voting record among those who are of voting age than does any other specific group of citizens of our 50 States. There are no voting impediments whatsoever placed in the way of Alaska's 8,000 to 9,000 fine American citizens of Negro origin. All that is required for anyone to vote in Alaska's State elections is that the voter be a citizen of the United States who is at least 19 years of age, a resident of Alaska for 1 year, and able to read or speak the English language as prescribed by law.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, Alaska's secretary of State, the administrator of Alaska's elections, calculates that at least 60.7 percent of the citizens of voting age who were qualified to vote and who claim Alaska as their voting residence, voted in the November 1964 presidential election.

Most of the military population of Alaska, of course, maintains voting residence in other States of our Union. And there are certain reasons why a far greater percentage of other Federal employees in Alaska maintain voting residence in other States than is the case elsewhere.

State of Alaska voting records reveal that there have been very few challenges of prospective voters at the polling places over the farflung voting precincts of the vast area that is Alaska.

There are no prior registration requirements in Alaska for State or National general elections. In Alaska's larger communities, prior registration is required for local municipal elections.

I have no doubt that the State of Alaska can establish, to the satisfaction of the U.S. Attorney General, that Alaska had never maintained a "test or device." Further, I am confident that we can establish, to the satisfaction of the Director of the Census, that a far greater percentage than 50 percent of the qualified voters claiming residence in Alaska did indeed cast their ballots in both the presidential election of 1964 and in the 1960 presidential election.

I note, in section 4(b) of S. 1564, that the determination of the U.S. Attorney General or of the U.S. Director of the Census is "final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register." I hope these determinations have not already been made and that the State of Alaska will have opportunity to present evidence to the U.S. Attorney General and the U.S. Director of the Census proving that Alaska does not in fact constitutionally, by law, or in practice exercise any voting "test or device." We will also prove that the percentage of Alaska voters participating in the only presidential elections in which we have ever been privileged to take part, numbered far in excess of 50 percent of those persons of voting age and claiming voting residence in Alaska.

Discrimination or denial of voting or other civil rights to any resident of Alaska is prohibited by Alaska's constitution and by strong, effective, implementing statutes of this State. Strong penalties are provided in Alaska law for violation of such statutes.

Therefore, a great injustice has been visited upon our State through the erroneous inclusion of Alaska in press releases on the wire services which have implied that Alaska may not meet some of the standards for voting procedures proposed in the provisions of S. 1564.

The official view of the executive branch of the government of the State of Alaska is that it is quite likely the provisions of S. 1564, as originally submitted, are not broadly inclusive enough to insure total compliance with the intent of the proposed legislation.

It is obvious from public statements of a number of Members of the U.S. Senate that amendments will be offered to your committee which would accomplish the broadening of authority that may be necessary.

I want to express my sincere appreciation of your kindness in permitting me this opportunity to explain the State of Alaska's position with respect to S. 1564 and H.R. 6400 and in allowing me to present through this communication to your committee the facts regarding Alaska's voting requirements, which are either the most liberal of all the great States in our Union, or at least are among the most liberal voting provisions of all our sister States.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. EGAN, *Governor.*

(Additional statements submitted for the record are as follows:)

IRBY TURNER, JR., ATTORNEY AT LAW, BELZONI, MISS., MEMBER OF THE MISSISSIPPI STATE LEGISLATURE

From the great heritage of legal principles obtained from the common law of Great Britain and throughout our history granting to the people of our country great protections and freedoms, one of the foremost and indeed perhaps the cornerstone of those principles is that a man is presumed innocent until proven guilty. No matter how heinous the crime, this privilege has always been afforded the accused, and we treasure it today as one of the blessings of liberty.

From our own American forebears certainly one of our greatest gifts and bulwarks toward democracy was the contribution of our written Constitution, a document intended to preserve the rights of the States that compose this Union and the rights of the people therein. Americans recognize that the division of power between State governments and the Federal Government has been throughout history and is today a great deterrent of tyranny, that same force that has signaled the decline of so many other nations throughout the course of history. Thus, if an accused is granted a presumption of innocence, no matter how heinous the crime, how much more important it is that a State in the preservation of its rights left to it under the Constitution be afforded the same privilege?

The Constitution of the United States has placed certain restrictions upon States concerning voting rights. The 15th amendment provides that no State shall deprive a person of the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The 19th amendment forbids any State to deprive any person of the right to vote on account of sex. No other restrictions are placed in the Constitution, and thus except for those restrictions and subject to them, the States have under the Constitution the right to be the judge of the criteria of their own electors.

Under the Civil Rights Act of 1960 means were set up to challenge any racial discrimination used in voting qualification procedures. Courts have under that

act even gone so far as to establish Federal referees to conduct registration in areas in which the court found discrimination existed. But at least in such cases discrimination had to be proved. The principle of jurisprudence of the presumption of innocence still remained. And those means are still available today to correct any areas in which discrimination is proven to exist.

Under the proposed bill a mere showing of numbers brings about a presumption of guilt, and it becomes incumbent upon the State to prove its innocence. Lethargy in legal doctrines of the past becomes subject to the penalty of laches. However, here lethargy is rewarded by abolishment of the procedure that the industrious have complied with.

Indeed, this bill, under the guise of the 15th amendment, boldly takes from States all rights to set qualifications for voters under certain circumstances regardless of whether there is discrimination in voting registration or not. Assume if you will, a mythical State with testing requirements where 50 percent of the registered voters failed to vote because of lethargy, apathy, a State in which there was no racial discrimination in voting, but a State in which one subdivision thereof had been found guilty of racial discrimination 9 years before. Under section 3 of the bill the qualifications for registration of the State would be abolished. The State would be without remedy for relief, not because of present discrimination but because of discrimination some 9 years before, long before the passage of this act. The rights of that State would be brutally stripped from her. Ex post facto laws are barred by the Constitution. Yet the rights of a State are taken here under a procedure that if not ex post facto by law, is certainly ex post facto in character.

Further this bill usurps the legislative power of the State. Any State during a period in which determinations are in effect is barred from making changes in its qualifications or procedures for voting until the law passed has been adjudicated nondiscriminatory by a court. Another legal principle—that a law is presumed valid until held otherwise—is overtunred by this bill. I assume from this section that even a bill providing for the establishment of voting machines in such a State would have to be adjudicated nondiscriminatory before it could go into effect. Would you allow your legislative rights to be so infringed upon that any law you passed would have to be ruled upon by a Federal court before going into effect? Of course not. I believe that each of you would stand forth in righteous anger to protect your legislative rights. Are the sovereign States of this Union entitled to less?

And, perhaps, the greatest tragedy is that this bill receives its impetus from violence and mob action in the streets. Has this great country sunk so low that the pressures of street mobs rule logic and democratic processes?

Some may say that the mobs represent a problem, and that all barriers to solution must be immediately overcome, regardless of the consequences. Within those barriers are democratic processes and the constitutional rights of States. Some may say, "The end justifies the means," but I implore you not to adopt that Marxian doctrine as the basis for our future America.

STATEMENT OF W. B. HICKS, JR., EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, LIBERTY LOBBY, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON S. 1564, VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am W. B. Hicks, Jr., executive secretary of Liberty Lobby, representing the more than 100,000 persons who subscribe to our legislative reports, testifying on the President's Voting Rights Act of 1965.

A punitive law

The President's law is punitive. It is designed to punish the South for what it has done for nearly a hundred years in semilegal contravention of the 15th amendment—for what it has done to the political ambitions of those who would exploit the Negro vote—and, for what it did to Lyndon Johnson last November.

The punishment contemplated is more than severe—it is a death sentence.

For the next 10 years, this law forbids the poorest and least educated part of the Nation to use any qualifications for voting other than age and residence. The result of this punishment can be seen as clearly as if it had already happened.

First, the rise of a new class of Southern States politician—a breed of demagogs—coming into political power on a wave of pie-in-the-sky promises of free State money for everyone.

Next, the futile attempts to carry out those promises by taxing the farms, business, and industry of the South at ever-increasing rates, even while failing to satisfy the demands of the poor for more—and more and more and more.

Then, the flight of business and industry from the unbearable demands of the welfare state, and the tragic streams of white refugees following their jobs to the north and west.

Finally, the necessary establishment of the all-black States as Federal "reservations," populated only by government bureaucrats and their Negro dependents, but—unlike their counterparts on the Indian reservations—represented in Washington by a powerful voting bloc of nearly 40 Congressmen and 8 Senators.

Let there be no question about it. If the President's law is passed, the South will disappear from the civilized world just as surely and certainly as did Haiti in 1804. Under the terms of this punitive law, the South will be sentenced to government by its least capable inhabitants for 10 long years. No civilization so governed has ever survived. There is no reason to believe that this one will.

It is clear that the President's law is designed to punish, rather than to correct an "evil." There is no provision in the law to allow the "guilty" South to "mend its ways." No opportunity is offered to reform and avoid the punishment, no matter how much the pepole might be willing to sacrifice to escape the chilling implications of the death sentence.

In the long run, we will all pay.

For are we not one nation, faced with one threat—and that one at our very throat? How can the rest of us survive the amputation of the South from our economy—and our civilization?

Even granting that the South has sinned, as so many believe, by trying to have its cake and eat it, too—by using literacy tests to restrict Negro vote while letting white vote without restriction—did we not all help establish the pattern for the South—never insisting, until now, that the South make the hard decision—the decision to apply the same necessary standards to whites as well as blacks?

Now, are we to give the South no opportunity to choose; to do the the thing that is necessary to its own survival, as well as ours? Are we to pass a law—or a death sentence?

An unconstitutional ex post facto law

The very first article of the Constitution forbids the passage of ex post facto laws. An ex post facto law is one that makes it a crime today to have done some act yesterday, or that increases the punishment today for the crime of yesterday.

Good law is never ex post facto. Good law demands that the governed have the opportunity to obey the law and also to know what the punishment is for not obeying.

The President's law is ex post facto. Look how it is framed—so that if on November 1, 1964, the State did so-and-so, then the State is "guilty"—and the ex post facto nature of this law is obvious.

Why does it not say, instead, that if on some future date, the State is doing this or that, then the State will guilty?

Notice that the law goes back 10 years to establish the guilt of the State. What is this, but ex post facto law?

Those who support this law will explain that, according to the 15th amendment, it is already illegal to discriminate in voting rights, so that the Congress is justified in going back to include last year's "crime" in this year's law.

This argument tries to separate crime and its punishment—but the two are not separable. Would it be justice to increase the penalty for tax evasion to life imprisonment today, then to sentence last year's tax dodger to "life," even through the limit of the law at the time of the crime was only 5 years? To do so would be unconstitutional, ex post facto law.

The President's law is ex post facto, in that it first increases the penalty for voter discrimination, then applies the new punishment to the already committed act of the past.

Punishment for voting rights discrimination has been provided under the 14th amendment, which allows for reducing the representation of discriminating States. It is provided for through filing suits under the 15th amendment. It is also provided for under the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964. If the punishment provided for under these laws is not sufficient, then let the punishment be increased, but not by an ex post facto law.

The punishment is unconstitutional

A right or power that is recognized in the Constitution can only be changed or taken away by amending the Constitution. The President's law does not seek to legally amend the Constitution, but to illegally take away the constitutional power of certain States to set nondiscriminatory voting qualifications.

Only 6 years ago, in the case of *Lassiter* v. *Northhampton County Board of Elections*, Justice Douglas and the Supreme Court ruled that, as in the previous case of *Guinn* v. *United States*, "A State may, consistently with the 14th and 17th amendments, apply a literacy test to all voters irrespective of race and color."

The Constitution still stands. It has not changed. But, the President's law proposes to punish the South by depriving the States of a power granted and upheld in the Constitution. Regardless of what the South has done, there is no way for the Congress to legally do what the President wishes. Yet, today, the Congerss prepares to violate the Constitution by taking away the vital power to set voter qualifications from the States of the South.

A plea for commonsense

Commonsense cries out in vain: "Seek willing compliance and reconciliation; the Union is in danger." Does the Congress hear?

Instead, the mood of the Congress is one of punishment and divisiveness.

Can the President's law be changed into something more effective, more legal, and less punitive than it is?

Not by the suggestions so far offered, of "making the law stronger," and "broadening it," etc.

What this law needs applied to it is commonsense—not common politics.

It needs to be altered from a law to punish the South to a law to prevent future discrimination. This could be done by simply abandoning the use of references to the past, such as the November 1, 1964, date, and to the incidents of the past 10 years.

A new date of effectiveness could be set, such as 1965 or 1966, without even altering the formula that determines "discrimination." Thus, the ex post facto nature of the law would be removed, as well as its punitive aspects.

Instead of forbidding any use of literacy qualifications, the law could be made both constitutional and effective by simply allowing for Federal examiners to oversea the administration of State tests in cases where complaints are lodged charging discrimination.

If we are sincerely interested in effective, constitutional legislation to prevent discrimination, we will adopt such a course as outlined above.

If on the other hand, we persist in placing political expediency above the Constitution and commonsense, we are leaving to unborn generations of Americans the painful task of retracing our steps. In that case, we can only hope that they will have the courage and strength that we do not have—and that they will learn from our mistakes.

Liberty Lobby will support a constitutional, nonpunitive Voting Rights Act that meets the following requirements:

(1) An act that becomes effective no sooner than January 1966. This will allow time for States to alter their voting requirements to conform with the act, and it will also allow time for insuring its effectiveness for the 1966 elections.

(2) An act that will prevent the use of discriminatory voting tests anywhere the Nation; not just in certain States.

(3) An act that will allow the use of truly objective literacy or educational standards wherever the people of a political subdivision or a State decide they are needed. The act could be written to require that such tests be in written, or "multiple-choice" form to insure objective grading standards, and should provide that the original test forms be maintained as public records open to inspection.

(4) The act could provide that any time the Attorney General felt there was a violation of the 15th amendment, he could (as in H.R. 6400) send Federal examiners to inspect the original test forms.

If the Federal examiner found that different standards of qualification had been applied to different applicants, he could then inform the Attorney General, who would file suit in a Federal court for immediate hearing on the case, and appropriate punishment for the officials involved could be meted out by the court.

Likewise, if any State or political subdivision failed to properly administer or maintain their records of voting tests, an immediate injunction could issue. One punishment that might be established would be a court order to a political subdivision to require immediate retesting of all its voters. Such provisions

should be sufficient to insure against violation. The act would have teeth—but not fangs. It would accomplish what the President says he wants to accomplish, without violating the Constitution or commonsense.

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA—UAW,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1965.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Senate Judiciary Committee,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: I am attaching a statement by UAW President Walter P. Reuther, on the pending voting rights legislation, which we request you include in the printed hearings of your committee on this legislation.

It is our understanding that Senator Phil Hart, of Michigan, has secured permission that statements by proponents of the voting rights bill may be included, and we are therefore making this request.

Sincerely yours,

ROY L. REUTHER,
Director, UAW Citizenship Department.

STATEMENT OF WALTER P. REUTHER, PRESIDENT, UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS, AFL–CIO, PRESIDENT, INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL–CIO

It is with mixed feelings of hope for the future and regret for the past that we express the support of the United Automobile Workers and the industrial union department for the pending administration legislation to give life to the 15th amendment to the Constitution. Today we have high hopes that at last the 15th amendment will become a reality for our millions of Negro fellow citizens too long denied their voting birthright. Our million and a half members of the UAW and our 6 million members of the industrial union department are proud that we have been and that we remain in the forefront of the movement to win equal justice under law for every American, regardless of his color, religion, or national origin.

But it is also with sorrow that we must acknowledge how long our great constitutional prinecipls of liberty, equality, and suffrage for Negro Americans have been empty promises, which the American people have suffered to go by default generation after generation. The 15th amendment, enacted almost a century ago, states that Congress shall have "power to enforce" by appropriate legislation the guarantee that the right of citizens to vote "shall not be denied * * * on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." It is a tragic irony of American history and politics that following the Civil War, Congress passsed legislation to enforce the 15th amendment, but that after the Hayes-Tilden Compromise of 1876 which promised an end to Reconstruction, all the effective laws were repealed and the great emancipation amendments relegated to empty promises.

Nor can we find much cheer in the fact that three times within a decade—first in 1957, then in 1960, and again in 1964—Congress extensively examined voting discrimination against Negro Americans and enacted laws intended to secure, but inadequate to secure, 15th amendment rights. Nor was the Congress unaware of the scope of the power the administration now urges it to employ. It will be recalled that in 1960 such great champions of equal rights as Senators Humphrey, Hart, Javits, and others, fought unsuccessfully for congressional establishment of Federal registrars to achieve speedy and fair registration of the masses of Negro Americans in the South who were disfranchised then and remain disfranchised today.

We are now a century after emancipation and the freedom amendments to the Constitution and almost 200 years after the citizens of Boston established the great principle of the citizen-taxpayer's right to representation by officials of his own choosing—the first principle of a democratic society. The voting rights law now to be enacted must accordingly be so complete and effective that it will universally enforce the 15th amendment, and make its promise a reality for every citizen in next year's national elections. That is what the pending bill can and must achieve.

First and foremost, the bill provides for Federal registration officials to achieve the enrollment of disfranchised Negro citizens. Certainly, with great masses of Negro citizens still systematically denied the right to register and vote, and when the piecemeal processes of litigation have proved so slow and ineffective, expeditious registration by Federal officials has become a remedial necessity. After all, if an election is held and the citizen is denied the right to vote therein, he has lost that constitutional privilege forever when the polls close.

It is with the knowledge that delay means defeat for the Negro voter that southern officials have used every means to delay the registration of Negro citizens. When suits have been filed, State registrars have resigned for months and years to prevent enrolling Negro voters. In some cases they have opened the polls only briefly and sporadically, or indulged in slowdowns, with the result that Negro citizens have had to stand in line for days just to get into a registrar's office. Once in the office, they have been subjected to discriminatory registration standards, to loaded literacy tests, and to outright discrimination in the administration of registration requirements. Efforts to correct this situation in the courts have proved inadequate, because the defending officials have known that judicial delay in registration could mean defeat of registration. Thus in successive elections since 1957 the clear congressional intent of the 1957, 1960, and 1964 Civil Rights Acts has been defeated. Here, we submit, is the record that compels appointment of Federal officials who, employing legitimate State voter qualifications, will register voters for Federal, State, and local elections without further discrimination or delay.

The second great principle of the pending legislation is the abolition of literacy tests in States where they have been utilized as methods of discrimination to disfranchise Negro voters. Certainly, here too is a minimum measure necessary to enforce the 15th amendment. For the record is crystal clear that in certain Southern States, when it comes to voting rights, "literate" is a euphemism for "white," and "illiterate" means "colored." Moreover, it is a hollow irony that the very States which continue to deny the vote to Negroes on the literacy pretense, are the ones whose entire population is consistently shown to be the least literate among our 50 States, and that these are the very States which have denied their Negro citizens an adequate public education through a system of segregated and inferior public schools. Thus we have the white Mississippi legislature operating an inferior and illegally segregated public school system for Negro children, and then turning around and saying to these same wronged citizens, "You are not educated enough to decide who shall govern you." In short, "literacy" is used as the device for perpetuating white supremacy rule and defeating the guarantee of the 15th amendment.

S. 1564 is a good bill because it deals forthrightly with the problem of literacy and other tests and because it meets the need for a Federal registration system. It goes a long way toward the goals of the UAW and IUD. It goes a long way toward the goals so eloquently expressed by President Lyndon B. Johnson in his historic address to Congress on Monday, March 15. But it does not go the whole way. Good as the bill is, it very definitely needs strengthening.

The UAW and IUD are part of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. We subscribe wholeheartedly to the proposals of the Leadership Conference (presented by Roy Wilkins, chairman, on March 24) to strengthen the bill in at least the following respects:

"(1) The total elimination of the poll tax as a restriction on voting in State and local elections as well as in Federal elections.

"(2) The elimination of the requirement in the bill that a prospective registrant must first go before the State official to attempt to register before going to the Federal registrar or examiner. The prospective registrant ought not to be put to the delays, the hardships, and the indignity of attempting to satisfy hostile State officials before he can come to the Federal registrar.

"(3) Extended coverage of the registrar or examiner provisions of the bill, so that persons who have been wrongfully denied the right to vote, regardless of their geographical locations, will have the benefits of these provisions of the legislation.

"(4) Further and maximum protection of registrants and voters both those who will be registered under the bill and those already registered, and prospective registrants, from all economic and physical intimidation and coercion. In extending such protection, the Federal Government should use the full range of its powers, criminal, civil, and economic, to protect the citizens from the beginning of registration process until his vote has been cast and counted."

The prompt enactment of the pending legislation should achieve great and worthy national purposes. First, it will secure to millions of Negro citizens the equality of participation in the democratic process which is their constitutional liberty. Second, Negro suffrage in the South will serve to restore the moral fiber of the South and of the Nation, by ending the debasing political and social apartheid system. The power of the vote will help to replace the bitterly divided dual societies with a working alliance between the leadership of the responsible Negro and white communities—an alliance for the achievement of common understandings and solutions. Finally, the great image of America as the land of liberty and equality which has been so badly tarnished in recent years will be restored to its former position. At a time when the people in the underdeveloped nations are searching for the relevant social economic revolution to promote their human aspirations, it is vital that the Nation born in dedication to liberty and equal rights speak to them with a clear conscience. With the voice of a clear conscience restored, not Communist or totalitarian demagogs but those who point the way to the democratic ideal will provide the pattern for the peoples whose own Declarations of Independence are being written in the 20th century. Enactment of this legislation will thus be a vital symbol of our rededication to the great principles of liberty and equality, for which Americans have given their lives at Bunker Hill and Gettysburg, at Philadelphia, Miss., and on the road from Selma to Montgomery, Ala.

STATEMENT BY SIDNEY ZAGRI, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFERS, WAREHOUSEMEN, AND HELPERS OF AMERICA, ON S. 1564 AND RELATED BILLS

My name is Sidney Zagri, legislative counsel for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. On behalf of the General Executive Board and General President Hoffa, representing 1,780,000 members and their families, I wish to express appreciation for the courtesy extended me in being invited to appear on S. 1564 and other related bills.

Only 2 days ago accompanying me before the House Judiciary Committee we had 190 Teamster wives from Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. Their presence was symbolic of DRIVE's (Democrat, Republican, Independent Voter Education—the political arm of the Teamsters Union) devotion to extending citizenship participation in the vital issues of our day and in the important business of electing our friends and defeating our enemies. They were there because of their deep conviction in the importance of extending voting rights guaranteed by the 14th and 15th amendments to all Americans. They were there, and asked me to express to the committee their strong feeling that the death of another Teamster wife, Mrs. Viola Gregg Liuzzo, who was slain near Montgomery, Ala., while engaged in transporting civil rights marchers back to Selma, shall not have been in vain.

Mrs. Liuzzo was also a member of DRIVE and was in Selma, Ala., because of her deep-seated dedication to the principle that all Americans irrespective of race, color, creed, or national origin should enjoy the same rights under the Constitution, that none should be deprived of any of these rights because of bias or discrimination.

There are certain facts which cannot be denied:

1. That large numbers of the citizens of the United States are denied the right to vote on account of their race or color.

2. That many State and local officials are determined to deny these rights.

3. That such denials are sometimes accomplished through violence, threats of violence, economic reprisals, and other forms of intimidation.

4. That in many areas of the United States the literacy test, interpretation test, tests of "moral character," are frequently abused so as to deny qualified citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, creed, or national origin.

5. That the delays incidental to granting the right to vote to citizens of the United States regardless of their race, color, or national origin under existing legislation have been excessively and unreasonably limited.

6. The existing process of law is incapable of overcoming systematic and ingenious discrimination; that the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1963 have been ineffective in dealing with voter discrimination. The voter referee plan provided for in these three statutes has proven to be merely a paper advance for the Negro and not worth the paper the statutes were written on. In none of the cases brought under the statutes has a district judge exercised his option

to appoint a referee. In only one of these cases has the judge consented to hear the application of Negroes. In addition to the one on whose complaint the Attorney General's suit was based, the remaining 22 suits brought where injunctions were imposed on local registrars no contempt citations were ever issued by the district courts for registrar noncompliance.

With all of these laws on the statute books, the Civil Rights Commission reports that in 100 southern counties selected for review in 1960 and again in 1963, the ratio of Negroes of voting age who are registered to Negroes of voting age has increased only about 3½ percent.

It is clear that discrimination is extensive, varied, and that existing laws are ineffective.

It is also clear that the legal remedy must be coextensive with the problem and that the means proposed be adequate to the task. Unless there is a comprehensive approach, the battle of civil rights will not be transferred from the streets to the legislative halls and the courts.

A piecemeal approach will result in more frustrations and will play into the hands of the extremists—the Ku Klux Klan, and the White Citizens Councils on the one hand and the Black Muslims on the other.

The brutality and violence of Selma will return another time and at another place. The martyrdom of Rev. James J. Reeb and Viola Gregg Liuzzo will be succeeded by new martyrs, and bloodshed will again become the order of the day under the dominance of the Klan and other leaders of the radical right.

The piecemeal approach of past voting rights bills has come back to haunt us and the passage of a similar bill now would have the same effect. The question has been asked: "What went wrong to trigger the violence in Selma? What can be done now to right this tragic situation?"

For these reasons, it becomes important to examine the administration bill and to strengthen those sections which offer less than a comprehensive solution to the manifold aspects of voter discrimination.

The essential prerequisites of an effective voting rights bill must include:

1. It must be national and not sectional in application.
2. It must have an automatic triggering mechanism and not rely upon the discretion of the Executive or the courts for initiating action.
3. It must eliminate all existing devices used to discriminate in denying voting rights.
4. It must protect the individual from economic and physical reprisals for exercising such rights.
5. It must remedy the wrongs of discrimination by setting aside elections and calling for new elections within a reasonable period after the registration or mechanism has been instituted.

The bill must be national and not regional or sectional in approach

The areas primarily affected by the administration bill consist of 6 Southern States and 34 counties in North Carolina.

In this week's issue of the New Republic, Alexander M. Bickel places the Reconstruction tag on the administration bill. He states: "* * * it is a Reconstruction measure, for it applies exclusively—with one or two incidental exceptions—to the hard-core Southern States and Black Belt counties * * *." Southerners will rightfully resent a bill which is aimed exclusively at them when discrimination in voting rights is a national and not a sectional problem. The experience with the Reconstructon era will be repeated when the South struck back with terror tactics of the Ku Klux Klan. The reform will be accepted more gracefully in all parts of the country if the approach is a national one.

The bill does not help the Negro or other minority groups in a State which does not have a literacy test. For example, in Newton County, Ark., 78 percent of the whites are registered, but not one Negro. The bill will not apply since Arkansas does not have a literacy test. Neither does Florida nor Tennessee have a literacy test, but 22 counties in Tennessee and 5 counties in Florida have less than 50 percent of the qualified voters registered or voting in the last election. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has found extensive civil rights discrimination against the voting rights of Negroes in these two States.

In Texas, only 44.4 percent of the adult population voted in the last presidential election. Only 38 percent of the citizens of Mexican origin in that State go to the polls. There are some voting districts in Texas near the border of Mexico where there are what is known as boss-controlled machines, and the vote reported often is unanimous or nearly unanimous for the boss, candidate.

In New York City, the literacy test prevents large numbers of Spanish-speaking Puerto Ricans from voting.

The problem with the administration bill is to be found in the formula which triggers the voter registration mechanism. The requirement of a literacy test and 50 percent or less of the qualified voters not registering or voting is somewhat arbitrary and certainly results in a sectional approach. The mere existence of a literacy test is not necessarily an indication of discrimination. It exists in 11 States where more than 50 percent of the qualified voters are registered and voted in the last election. On the other hand, there are States where no literacy tests exist, as in the case of Texas, where only 44.4 percent of the qualified voters were registered and voted in the last election.

The 50-percent requirement does not directly reflect the status of discrimination of Negroes, since there are many counties where a sufficiently large number of whites registered and very few Negroes and yet the total number of eligible voters registered and/or voting will exceed 50 percent. Notable examples are to be found in the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's report on counties in Tennessee and Florida, as well as among Puerto Ricans in New York City, where widespread voting rights discrimination takes place but over 50 percent of the eligible voting population voted in the last election.

Recommendation: I recommend the adoption of section 3 of H.R. 4552 (the Lindsay bill) which provides the President would appoint Federal registrars, if the court makes a finding that 50 or more persons have been discriminated against in a given area and failed to act within 40 days. This approach triggers the mechanism without reference to the existence of either literacy tests or the 50-percent formula and yet requires the establishment of discrimination in at least 50 cases, which is a reasonable basis for the action prescribed.

The need for an automatic triggering device

Section 4(a) of H.R. 4600 provides that the Attorney General may request the Civil Service Commission to appoint examiners if "he believes such complaints to be meritorious" or that "in his judgment the appointment of eximiners is otherwise uecessary to euforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment * * *."

Without casting any reflection on any Attorney General past or present, I need not remind the Members of the Congress that the Attorney General has been the most powerful political appointee in the Cabinet, particularly during the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. For this reason, the Congress should be wary of giving additional discretionary power to the Attorney General which could be used as a political instrument to perpetuate the party in power. It is conceivable that under section 4(a) the Federal registrars could be requested by the Attorney General only in areas where political advantages could be found and a refusal to exercise this power in areas where it would be politically disadvantageous. Since this power relates directly to voter registration and to voting, it is a power that must be jealously guarded and taken ont of politics as much as possible.

Recommendation: Adoption of section 3 of H.R. 4552, which makes it mandatory upon the President to appoint Federal registrars if the court fails to act within 40 days and 50 persons have signed sworn complaints that they have been deprived of their right to vote.

Elimination of discrimination devices

In his memorable voting rights address to the Congress on March 15, President Johnson stated:

"Experience has clearly shown that the existing process of law cannot overcome systematic aud ingenious discrimination. No law that we now have on the books—and I have helped to put three of them there—can insure the right to vote when local officials are determined to deny it."

Literacy tests and other discriminatory devices.—The thrust of the principal bills under consideration banning the discriminatory administration of literacy tests, interpretation tests, understanding tests, good moral character vouchers is not an interference with the States' right to enact responsible regulations covering State and local elections. Nor would a statute proscribing the poll tax in all State and local elections be an interference as it could be established that the poll tax was not primarily for the purpose of raising revenue but for the purpose of keeping people from voting. Then Congress would be within its power to act under the 15th amendment. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission's reports are abundant with documentations that support the premise that all of these tests

and devices have been created for the sole purpose of barring Negroes and other minority groups from voting.

Recommendations:

1. In areas where a pattern of discrimination has been found, Federal registrars should be instructed (1) to conduct house-to-house registration; (2) with a flexible literacy test device to be applied as described above; (3) officials in such areas will be prohibited from closing registration books more than a month before an election or from refusing to accept any registrant who has satisfied all qualifications any time up to such a 30-day period.

In this connection, I would also recommend the establishment of voter education information centers which would undertake the affirmative responsibility of familiarizing those wishing to vote with registration forms and qualifications.

2. The Resnick bill provision repealing the poll tax in State and local elections should be adopted. The administration bill requiring the Federal Government to collect poll taxes for the States has the effect of giving Federal sanction to discriminatory poll tax laws in local elections which are inconsistent with the mandate of the 24th amendment to the Constitution.

Economic and physical reprisals to prevent exercise of voting rights

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission in its 1961 report documented the use of economic coersion as an instrument of intimidation to prevent Negroes from registering and voting. What is there in the administration bill to protect the "Negro tenant farmer and sharecropper in Fayette and Haywood Counties, Tenn., of being evicted from their farms and being subjected to other forms of reprisal including the cutting off of supplies, refusal of credit, and cancellation of insurance policies?"

How can the Negro sharecropper continue to exist, if the "white banker cuts off his credit"? In Fayette County, Tenn., one white banker was quoted as saying, "My secretary's got the names of 324 who registered. I tell them, anybody on that list, no need coming into this bank. He'll get no crop loans here. Every store has got that list."

As bad as the problem of economic intimidation may be at the present time, it will get much worse as reaction among the leaders of the existing power structure of the South begin to feel the full impact of any of the key bills before the Congress.

On March 25, 1965, Governor Johnson, of Mississippi, told the press that President Johnson's statement on voting rights provoked nausea and that he would not call a special session of the State legislature until such time as a voter rights bill had been enacted by the Congress. As the automated cotton economy makes more and more people dependent upon the large landowners, different forms of economic coercion will develop. For example, licensing laws could be enacted for the purposes of licensing farmhands who in turn could have their licenses revoked if they were to exercise their voting registration rights under the law.

Recommendations:

1. Criminal sanctions will not be enforced in southern courts and by southern juries. Therefore, cease-and-desist orders comparable to those presently employed by the National Labor Relations Board should be issued by a Federal Voter Registration Commission, as suggested by the Resnick bill, which could be enforced by Federal courts under contempt proceedings, if necessary.

2. Any person engaged in denial of voting rights would be declared to be ineligible to participate in any of the Federal programs presently available to business and to farmers.

Setting aside elections and calling for new elections within reasonable period after the registration mechanism has been instituted

The administration bill simply provides that any qualified voter who has been denied the righ to vote shall have his vote counted. The administration bill does not undo the damage caused by discrimination by requiring that the newly qualified votes be counted. Under the Taft-Hartley law, the National Labor Relations Board requires that, where intimidation or coercion is established in connection with a NLRB election, the election will be set aside to purge the coersive effect of the intimidation on all eligible voters.

Recommendation: I suggest that the provision of the Lindsay bill setting aside elections because of discrimination be adopted and that new elections be called within a reasonable period after the voter registration mechanism has been put into motion.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
March 31, 1965.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I enclose a copy of a statement which was issued as a news release by Mr. Albert P. Gallinghouse, registrar of voters for the Parish of Orleans, La.

This statement, I understand, has appeared in the New Orleans newspapers, and Mr. Gallinghouse has requested that I send it to you to be included in the record of the hearings on the voting rights bill. I would appreciate your doing this, if possible.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, *U.S. Senator.*

(By A. P. Gallinghouse, registrar of voters, Orleans Parish, La.)

MARCH 22, 1965.

In a statement released today, Orleans Parish Registrar of Voters A. P. Tim Gallinghouse said that he has now had an opportunity to analyze the provisions of President Johnson's alleged voting rights legislation:

"As a lawyer, never have I read a proposal embodying such an unconstitutional delegation of authority and power as is found in this bill. This move by the national administration ignores the most basic and fundamental constitutional principles recognized and respected in this country since its founding by our forefathers.

"The Federal Government under the Constitution can only exercise those powers specifically delegated to it by the Constitution. Certainly, it was intended by the architects of the Constitution that those articles pertaining to delegated and reserved powers, and more specifically article I, section 2, give the States, and only the States, the right to prescribe the qualifications for voting.

"There is only one way in which Congress can legally take this authority from the States, and that is by constitutional amendment.

"I believe, and so does the great majority of the people of Louisiana, that every qualified citizen should be able to vote, regardless of race, color, or creed. We cannot, however, condone Congress giving, by statute, to the executive department of our Federal Government, at the insistance of the President, the power to determine who should register and vote in all local, State, and Federal elections.

"This is a brazen grab for political power by the Federal Government to satisfy those who would promise to deliver millions of controlled votes in return for favors granted.

"I think it most important to point out that as the Federal Government grows larger and stronger, the citizen grows smaller and weaker. This is a Government of law, not of men.

"It has been said that power corrupts, and that absolute power corrupts absolutely. How applicable we find these words at this time.

"Less the full impact of this legislation escape the people of the New Orleans area, I wish to emphasize its more important provisions. Needless to say, the objectives of this bill are both vindictive and discriminatory. The irony of the President's action is that in his efforts to prevent alleged discrimination in voting, he is sponsoring legislation that in itself is patently discrminatory.

"It is obvious to me, a sit should be to everyone, that this bill was drafted most carefully so that it would apply only to certain States and political subdivisions. It is more than mere coincidence that the affected areas to a great degree in the November general election voted against the President. The States that supported and voted for the President are exempt or excluded from the application of this bill.

"Under section 3 of the bill the criteria for determining the States and political subdivisions to be affected are that there must be less than 50 percent of the adult population registered or that less than 50 percent of the adult population voted in the November general election.

"Under section 3 the U.S. Attorney General has the sole power to determine if a test or device was used by a State or political subdivision on November 1,

1964, as a qualification for voting. This provision is one example, among others, showing what unlimited authority, power, and discretion the Attorney General has in this bill.

"Section 3 further prohibits the use of any test that determines the qualifications of an applicant for registration, including the ability to read and write, and good moral character.

"This prohibition is in direct conflict with article 1, section 2, of the Constitution that authorizes the States to determine voter qualifications. Moreover, it violates requirements in the Louisiana constitution.

"Should this legislation be approved, in my judgment there is a strong possibility of 50,000 illiterates being put on the registration rolls in Orleans Parish alone. I do not wish to reflect on these people; however, it would be impossible for them to vote without assistance. They could not read the names of candidates on the voting machine, nor could they understand the important election issues that require the concentration of even the most intelligent and well-informed voters. More importantly these illiterates would be subject to pressures, influence, coercion, and intimidation from those who customarily vote as a block. Instead of improving our electorate and public officials, we would be turning back the clock 50 to 100 years.

"These provisions are all in violation of our Louisiana constitution, which, much to the everlasting credit of our lawmakers, requires good moral character of applicants for registration.

"The Federal registrars put the names of registrants on a list of persons eligible to vote. The names are submitted to local officials at least 45 days before election day.

"Federal registrars may strike registrants if they have been properly challenged, but this, in my opinion, will never happen.

"Registrants under section 5 (those registered by Federal registrars) can be removed by the Federal registrars if they do not vote during the 3-year period. This is also in conflict with our State law in Louisiana since under our permanent registration procedure in Orleans Parish, we must cite a voter if he has not voted during a 2-year period.

"Under section 5 there is also a proviso that were the effect of this legislation not so tragic, I would most certainly find it humorous. As we all know, the poll tax is at this time being used in Texas. We in Louisiana abolished such a tax years ago because we thought it unfair. Even though there has been a clamor in the Halls of Congress against discrimination and the use of the poll tax as a requirement for voting, the President's bill makes it possible to continue the poll tax. The voter need only to pay it to a Federal registrar before election day in affected States. Texas, the President's home State, would not be involved in any way.

"Under section 8 no new State or local laws on voting procedures different than those in effect on November 1, 1964, may be passed without the approval of the three-judge Federal court in the District of Columbia. This section in effect gives a Federal court the authority to set voting requirements within a State, a clear violation of the Constitution. There is no question in my mind, nor should there be in the mind of anyone else, that this legislation is unconstitutional, unfair, vindicative, and discriminatory.

"This proposal abrogates the inherent constitutional rights of the States to enact, regulate and supervise their voting and election laws. Further, the bill does not apply to 44 States, many of which have literacy tests. Who is to protect the citizens of these States from discrimination? Heaven help us if this legislation passes, but if it does, then it should apply to all 50 States. Could it be that the President could not muster enough support if he made the law applicable to all States?

"Also, in section 3 is the limited avenue of escape for any State or political subdivision to avoid being included within the scope of this bill. This section permits an application to a three-judge Federal court in the District of Columbia to exclude a State or political subdivision if the law is not applicable to it. The burden of proof is, therefore, placed upon the local officials to show that they are not engaged in discriminatory practices. Incredible as it might seem, the Justice Department would no longer have to prove discrimination, and local officials would be presumed guilty until proved innocent.

"Since local officials must file their request with a Federal court in the District of Columbia, it is obvious that the Federal Government does not feel that a Federal court in the affected areas will reach a decision favorable to its interest. Moreover, there are more stumbling blocks and added inconvenience for local officials to litigate in a court as far removed as one in the District of Columbia.

"Under section 4 the U.S. Attorney General has the unlimited power, authority, and discretion to decide when Federal registrars will be required.

"Twenty or more residents of a political subdivision falling under the law may complain that they have been denied the right to vote because of their color. The Attorney General decides on his own whether the complaint has merit. There is no court hearing, no testimony, and no opportunity for the local officials to be heard. The Attorney General also has the authority to ask for Federal registrars under any other conditions where he, and he alone, deems it necessary.

"Under section 5 the Federal registrars may register any applicant who has not been qualified by local registrars within 90 days prior thereto. The applicant has only to establish his age, residence, sanity, and lack of felony conviction.

"In other words, it is not required that he be able to read and write. He may have committed numerous misdemeanors that require jail sentences and otherwise have compiled an impressive criminal record. There would be no requirement of good moral character. A male applicant could acknowledge or a female applicant could give birth to countless illegitimate children. They would be registered under the provisions of this bill. Common law marriage, which is prohibited under Louisiana law, would not be a bar to registration.

"It cannot be repeated too often that under existing State law and under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 any citizen who feels that he is being denied the privilege of voting because of his color has a right to go into court and obtain relief. In fact, the Justice Department will file suit in his behalf. There are adequate remedies on the statute books, making this legislation unnecessary.

"I urge every citizen who reads these comments to wire or write your Congressmen and Senators. Tell them we believe in all of our citizens having the privilege of voting if they are qualified by standards established by our State that are fair, impartial, and nondiscriminatory.

"Now is the time for courage. The future of constitutional Government in the United States hangs in the balance. Shall we permit our Government to submit to mob action, or shall we return to the democratic processes we have practiced and revered for many years? You have a right to demand strong and vocal opposition by your Representatives in Washington. Insist that they stand up and be counted. Anything less will indicate that they are part and parcel of this unconstitutional cove by the Federal Government based upon political expediency and the desire of the politicans to perpetuate themselves in office."

WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 26, 1965.*

STATEMENT TO THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

There are submitted herewith in support of a bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, petitions containing nearly 1,000 signatures of citizens and voters from all parts of the State of California. These peitions evidence the concern of all Californians, from the cow counties adjacent to Oregon, to the deserts adjoining Mexico, that all Americans should enjoy, without hindrance or discrimination because of race or color, the right to vote which was thought to have been guaranteed to them almost 100 years ago by the ratification of the 15th amendment.

The signatures represented here were gathered through the auspices of the Marin Democratic Assembly at the 13th Annual Convention of the California Democratic Council held in Sacramento, March 19, 20, and 21. The issue before Congress and the Nation, however, is utterly nonpartisan, and certainly is not confined to one State or region. Those of us from Marin County, Calif., who collected these signatures, were moved to do so by the tragic yet helpful events of recent weeks and months. We were moved to do so in order to join and support our many friends and neighbors who left their homes and livelihoods:

(1) Carpenters who contributed their time, energy, and skills to rebuild burned and bombed churches and freedom schools;

(2) Attorneys who amassed more than 600 depositions in Mississippi alone, proving beyond doubt the enormity of the deprivation of constitutional rights in general and the right to vote in particular, in that State;

(3) Clergymen and others who have joined their countrymen from all over the Nation to show their commitment, on the streets and highways of Alabama, to the cause of equal and certain voting rights for all.

As the President said a week ago Wednesday, the time for justice has come, and it will not be denied.

The signers of these petitions urge the Congress, with all possible speed, to enact as submitted, the voting rights bill of 1965.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS A. SKORNIA,
Chairman, Marin Democratic Assembly.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE
TWENTY WEST FORTIETH STREET • NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018 • BRyant 9-1400

Please direct reply to:
Washington Bureau
100 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Washington 1, D. C.
Telephone: National 8-5794

April 7, 1965

Mr. Joseph A. Davis
Chief Clerk
Senate Judiciary Committee
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Davis:

Attached is a copy of the testimony presented to the House Judiciary Committee by Mr. Roy Wilkins.

On behalf of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights I am requesting that the attached testimony be inserted in the hearing record on S. 1517. As we have previously indicated in a letter to the chairman of the committee, it was our hope that Mr. Roy Wilkins, Chairman of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and Mr. Joseph Rauh, Counsel, would be heard. However, in view of the fact that the hearings are closing and we have no wish to cause delay on this important legislation, we are asking that the testimony that we prepared to the House be inserted in lieu of an appearance by Mr. Wilkins and Mr. Rauh.

Also attached are suggested amendments. We prepared these at the request of members of the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5. These amendments are designed to cover the four points presented on page 2 of Mr. Wilkins' testimony. You will also note that at the conclusion of the amendments there is a statement indicating that we have other technical suggestions which we believe could be worked into the legislation in informal conference.

Sincerely yours,

Clarence Mitchell

Clarence Mitchell
Director
Washington Bureau

CM:cw

Statement of Roy Wilkins, Executive Director, NAACP and Chairman of the LCCR, before House Subcommittee No. 5, on H.R. 6400, March 24, 1965, 10 a.m.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I am Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and chairman of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. The Leadership Conference is a cooperative group of 90 organizations united for freedom and justice in our country. Accompanying me is Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., who is counsel for the Leadership Conference.

We are here today because the best efforts of sincere men and women have not yet eradicated the blight of racial discrimination in voting. President Lyndon B. Johnson is in the forefront of those who recognize that this discrimination in voting still exists as was evidenced by his magnificent speech and pledge of March 15. Our organizations deeply appreciate the leadership of the President on this matter. Influential Republican spokesmen in both Houses and among the leaders of the party outside the Congress have likewise urged strong and sweeping legislation to correct this discrimination. Also several Republicans have introduced their own bills and a number of others have joined in bi-partisan sponsorship of the Administration bill.

The history of the struggle for the right to participate in Federal, state and local elections goes back to the period of Reconstruction. Some of the impediments imposed by state legislatures have been removed by court action on the part of the Federal Government and private organizations such as that which I have the honor to serve as Director. Examples are the grandfather clause. Guinn v. U. S. 232 U. S. 347 (1915); the white primary, Nixon v. Herndon 273 U.S. 536 (1927); Nixon v. Condon, 286 U.S. 73 (1932); Smith v. Allwright 321 U.S. 649 (1944); and the racially exclusive pre-primary party caucus Terry v. Adams 345 U.S. 461 (1953).

In 1957, the Congress passed a statute which gave the Attorney General the power to institute civil actions on behalf of those who were deprived of the right to vote. At that time the men and women of good will assumed that the right to vote would be safe in the hands of the Federal judiciary. In some measure this was not a vain hope. Because of this statute, the courts struck down voting discrimination in Georgia, U.S. v. Raines, 362 U.S. 17 Terrell Co., Georgia (1960); Alabama, U.S. v. Alabama, 192 Fed. Supp. 677, Macon Co., Alabama (1961); and Tennessee, U. S. v. Beaty, 288 F2d 655, Fayette Co., Tennessee (1961). On March 8, 1965, the Supreme Court in U. S. v. Mississippi 33 U.S.L.W. 4258 and Louisiana v. U.S., 33 U.S.L.W. 4262, made further inroads against voting discrimination in Louisiana and Mississippi. Yet, it is clear that the legal technicalities, the slow pace of court decisions and in some instances complete judicial hostility have combined to restrict the participation of voters in national, state and local elections.

In 1960 Congress strengthened the 1957 voting rights law. Only last year Congress tried again to make the 1957 law more effective. All three laws put together have not done the job of making the Fifteenth Amendment a living document. In too many areas of the Nation, Negroes are still being registered one by one and only after long litigation. We must transform this retail litigation method of registration into a wholesale administration procedure registering all who seek to exercise their democratic birthright. The time is long overdue to sweep the last vestiges of voting restrictions into the sea.

The nation has paid a great price for these restrictions. It has paid the price of getting into office public officials who are not responsive to the will of all the people. It has paid the price of mayhem, riots and murder because those who sought the right to vote were opposed by those who were willing to suppress rights with violence themselves or at least stand by while othere perpetrated unspeakable crimes against American citizens. It is the hope of those who constitute the Leadership Conference that this time, by placing the executive branch of the Federal Government in a position to expedite registration and voting, we will have a formula for ending this long standing evil.

The Administration bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee, Congressman Celler, is a good bill. It goes further than any other bill ever introduced on this subject and obviously it is an effort to correct disfranchisement on a wide scale. However, in our opinion, the bill is not enough. More is needed if it is to do the whole job. The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights strongly urges Congress to strengthen this bill in at least the following four respects:

1) The total elimination of the poll tax as a restriction on voting in state and local elections as well as in federal elections.

2) The elimination of the requirement in the bill that a prospective registrant must first go before the state official to attempt to register before going to the Federal registrar or examiner. The prospective registrant ought not to be put to the delays, the hardships, and the indignity of attempting to satisfy hostile state officials before he can come to the Federal registrar.

3) Extended coverage of the registrar or examiner provisions of the bill, so that persons who have been wrongfully denied the right to vote, regardless of their geographical location, will have the benefits of these provisions of the legislation.

4) Further and maximum protection of registrants and voters both those who will be registered under the bill and those already registered, and prospective registrants, from all economic and physical intimidation and coercion. In extending such protection, the Federal Government should use the full range of its powers, criminal, civil and economic, to protect the citizens from the beginning of registration process until his vote has been cast and counted.

I would like to make special reference to the poll tax because this is complicated by developments in recent years. Our organization has traditionally insisted that the poll tax should be eliminated by the statute. Others have argued that it should be ended by constitutional amendment. Those who favored the constitutional amendment approach prevailed. Although we did not favor this method we made a good faith attempt to see that the 24th Amendment was ratified by the states of the union. It is a sad commentary on the vision of those who control the states that they have grudgingly acceded to the requirements of the constitutional amendment by continuing to charge a poll tax in state and local elections. Here we see the ultimate in absurdity. It is possible to vote for a Presidential candidate in Virginia without paying a poll tax but, if one is to vote for a member of the state legislature or alderman in a separate election, he must pay a poll tax.

The practice in Mississippi illustrates more strikingly how the poll tax payments can be manipulated to deter voting by Negro citizens and poor people generally. Dr. Aaron Henry, president of our Mississippi State Conference of branches

who lives in Clarksdale, uses the following language to describe the process:

"The poll tax is a great deterrent to voting in Mississippi. It must be paid on or before the first day of February in the year that one intends to vote. A voter must pay the tax for two years before he can vote. You cannot pay back taxes. During the month of January we are at our peak in unemployment. This is the most likely time of the year not to have the $3 necessary to pay the poll tax in Coahoma County (in many counties the tax is $2 but in Coahoma County it is $3). Our experience here in Coahoma County is that one cannot pay taxes for another except in the immediate family. A man may pay the poll tax for his wife or she for him but not for one not living in your household."

Historically, the poll tax is clearly a device used for attempting to prevent Negroes from voting. There are those who have constitutional reservations and for this purpose, Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., who serves as counsel for the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, is prepared to present views. We urge that the Congress approach this matter with the intention of doing the whole job at last.

The President has set an outstanding example by his appeal to the nation on March 15, but the legislation must match the boldness of the President if we are to come to grips with this problem.

We have reviewed quickly here the recent attempts at corrective legislative action. It is apparent to all that the 1957, 1960 laws and Title I of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, while good efforts, did not by any means reach the heart of the problem. We now know the extent of the evil and our experience at attempts to enforce legislation for the past seven years have made clear the ingenious evasions which must be rooted out. We, therefore, urge that the pending Administration bill be strengthened to such a degree that it will not be necessary in the next two years or four years or seven years to come back and add another patch in an effort to guarantee the basic American right to vote and to live under a government by consent of the governed.

Attached is a list of the cooperating organizations in the Leadership Conference. It is compelling evidence of the broad support for voting legislation that although our organizations had only three days in which to consider the views I have expressed and many of them had to call emergency meetings of their boards in order to obtain authorization to add their names, more than 70 signified their endorsement. At least three other organizations not in the Conference have asked that their names be added, as their way of indicating their deep concern for swift passage of a strong and effective bill.

* * *

THIS STATEMENT IS ENDORSED BY THE FOLLOWING COOPERATING ORGANIZATIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS:

AME ZION CHURCH
ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA SORORITY
AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA
AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
AMERICAN ETHICAL UNION
AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS
AMERICAN NEWSPAPER GUILD
AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION
ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH
B'NAI B'RITH WOMEN
BROTHERHOOD OF SLEEPING CAR PORTERS
CATHOLIC INTERRACIAL COUNCIL
CHRISTIAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH
CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN SERVIVE COMMISSION
CITIZENS LOBBY FOR FREEDOM & FAIR PLAY
COLLEGE YCS NATIONAL STAFF
COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ACTION - UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST
DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY
EPISCOPAL SOCIETY FOR CULTURAL & RACIAL UNITY
IMPROVED BENEVOLENT & PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS OF THE WORLD
INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO
INTERNATIONAL LADIES GARMENT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA
INT'L UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO & MACHINE WORKERS
JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE
JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE
JEWISH WAR VETERANS
NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES
NAT'L ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COLORED WOMEN'S CLUBS
NAT'L ASSOCIATION OF NEGRO BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.
NAT'L ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BROKERS, INC.
NAT'L CATHOLOC SOCIAL ACTION CONF.
NAT'L CATHOLIC CONF. FOR INTERRACIAL JUSTICE
NAT'L COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL
NAT'L COUNCIL OF CHURCHES - COMMISSION ON RELIGION & RACE
NAT'L COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN
NAT'L COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN
NAT'L FEDERATION OF SETTLEMENTS & NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS
NAT'L NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
NAT'L STUDENT CHRISTIAN FEDERATION
NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE
NEGRO AMERICAN LABOR COUNCIL
N.A. FEDERATION OF THE THIRD ORDER OF SAINT FRANCIS
PHI BETA SIGMA FRATERNITY
PIONEER WOMEN
PRESBYTERIAN INTERRACIAL COUNCIL
RETAIL, WHOLESALE & DEPT. STORE UNION
SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
STATE, COUNTY, MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES
UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS
UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ASSOCIATION - COMMISSION ON RELIGION & RACE
UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST FELLOWSHIP FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE
UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS OF AMERICA
UNITED CHURCH WOMEN
UNITED PACKINGHOUSE, FOOD & ALLIED WORKERS
UNITED STEEL WORKERS OF AMERICA
UNITED TRANSPORT SERVICE EMPLOYEES OF AMERICA
U. S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION
U. S. YOUTH COUNCIL
WOMEN'S INT'L LEAGUE FOR PEACE & FREEDOM
WORKERS DEFENSE LEAGUE
NAT'L BOARD, YWCA
ZETA PHI BETA SORORITY
UNITED PRESBYTERIAN OFFICE OF CHURCH AND SOCIETY
CONGRESS OF RACIAL EQUALITY

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS OUTSIDE THE CONFERENCE ENDORSING STATEMENT:

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS
GENERAL BOARD OF CHRISTIAN CONCERNS OF THE METHODIST CHURCH
RANDOLPH FOUNDATION

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

To H.R. 6400

I

POLL TAX

(i) Leadership Conference testimony March 24, 1965 urged:

"1) The total elimination of the poll tax as a restriction on voting in state and local elections as well as in federal elections."

(ii) Suggested language for proposed amendment:

"On line 6, page 6, delete all of Sec. 5(e) and on line 13, page 11, insert a new section as follows: 'Sec. 12. No state or political subdivision shall deny or deprive any person of the right to register or to vote because of his failure to pay a poll tax or any other tax or payment as a pre-condition of registration or voting.' Renumber Sections 12 and 13."

(iii) This amendment would have the effect of abolishing the poll tax in Mississippi, Alabama, Virginia and Texas (Arkansas has already passed a constitutional amendment authorizing the abolition of the poll tax and an implementing statute is expected promptly).

II

APPLYING DIRECTLY TO FEDERAL EXAMINER

(i) Leadership Conference testimony on March 24, 1965 urged:

"2) The elimination of the requirement in the bill that a prospective registrant must first go before the state official to attempt to register before going to the Federal registrar or examiner. The prospective registrant ought not to be put to the delays, the hardships, and the indignity of attempting to satisfy hostile state officials before he can come to the Federal Registrar."

(ii) Suggested language for proposed amendment:

"On line 19, page 4, change the comma after the word 'vote' to a period and delete the remainder of Sec. 5.(a)."

(iii) This amendment would have the effect of permitting an applicant for registration to go directly to the Federal examiner without first having to try out the state authorities.

III

EXPANDED COVERAGE

(i) Leadership Conference testimony on March 24, 1965 urged:

"3) Extended coverage of the registrar or examiner provisions of the bill, so that persons who have been wrongfully denied the right to vote, regardless of their geographical location, will have the benefits of these provisions of the legislation."

(ii) Suggested language for proposed amendments:

"On line 19, page 3, after the word 'residents' insert '(i)' and on line 20, page 3, after the words 'section 3(a)' insert the following: 'or (ii) of a political subdivision with respect to which the Director of the Census has certified to the Attorney General that the number of persons of any race or color who were registered to vote on November 1, 1964 was less than 25 percent of the number of all persons of such race or color of voting age residing in such subdivision,'"

"On line 15, page 4, insert a new subsection as follows: '(c) Whenever the Attorney General receives complaints in writing from twenty or more residents of a political subdivision not covered by the provisions of section 4 (a), alleging that they have been denied the right to vote under color of law by reason or race or color and he believes such complaints to be meritorious, the Attorney General shall appoint a hearing officer to hold a hearing and determine whether there exists in such political subdivision a pattern or practice of denial of the right to vote on account of race or color. Whenever the Attorney General certifies that a hearing officer has determined that such a pattern or practice does exist in such political subdivision, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint examiners for such subdivision in accordance with section 4(a). The determination of the hearing officer shall be reviewable in a three-judge district court convened in the District of Columbia in an action for declaratory judgment against the United States by the affected political subdivision or by one or more of the twenty residents making the original complaint. The findings of the hearing officer if supported by substantial evidence shall be conclusive. There shall be no stay of any action of the examiners appointed by the Civil Service Commission unless and until the said three-judge district

court shall determine that the findings of the hearing officer are not supported by substantial evidence,"

(iii) These amendments would have the effect of broadening the coverage of HR 6400, While leaving intact the excellent automatic provisions of the Administration bill covering Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia, Virginia, South Carolina and 34 counties of North Carolina, they would provide for examiners in other political subdivisions if

(1) less than 25 percent of a racial group were registered on November 1, 1965 and twenty residents complained to the Attorney General that they had been denied the right to vote, or

(2) twenty residents in any subdivision complained to the Attorney General that they had been denied the right to vote and a hearing officer found, after hearing, that there is a pattern or practice of discrimination in such subdivision.

IV

PREVENTING INTIMIDATION

(i) Leadership Conference testimony March 24, 1965 urged:

"4) Further and maximum protection of registrants and voters both those who will be registered under the bill and those already registered, and prospective registrants, from all economic and physical intimidation and coercion. In extending such protection, the Federal Government should use the full range of its powers, criminal, civil and economic, to protect the citizen from the beginning of registration process until his vote has been cast and counted."

(ii) Suggested language for proposed amendments:

"On line 16, page 7 delete the entire Section 7, and substitute the following:

'Sec. 7 No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall fail or refuse to permit a person to vote whose name appears on a list transmitted in accordance with section 5 (b), or is otherwise qualified to vote, or fail or refuse to count such person's vote, or intimidate, threaten or coerce any person for registering or attempting to register, or assisting one registering or attempting to register, or for voting or attempting to vote under the authority of this Act or otherwise."

"On line 14, page 10, insert a new subsection as follows:

'(g) Whoever shall deprive or attempt to deprive any person of any right secured by section 2 or 3 or who shall violate section 7 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of $500 for each act of deprivation, or violation, or attempt. Such penalty shall be collected on behalf of the affected individual by a civil action, brought by the United States in the district court for the district in which such act, violation, or attempt occurs or in the district in which the person responsible for such act, violation, or attempt is found. In any action brought hereunder involving any person acting under color or law who is in the employment

of any state or political subdivision, said state or political subdivision shall be jointly liable and shall be made a party.'"

"On line 14, page 8, add the following at the end thereof: 'If the life of any person is placed in jeopardy, he shall be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.'"

"On line 2, page 9, add the following at the end thereof: 'If the life of any person is placed in jeopardy, he shall be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.'"

"On line 14, page 10, insert a new subsection as follows:*

'(g) Whenever an examiner has been appointed under this Act for any political subdivision, the Attorney General may assign representatives of the Department of Justice, including agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and United States Marshals, to observe any registration of voters, the conduct of any election, and the tabulation of votes at any election in such political subdivision. Such representatives shall be entitled to enter and to remain in any registration or voting place, or place where votes are tabulated. No person shall interfere with or refuse to admit to any such registration, or voting or tabulation place any representative of the Department of Justice. Any person who shall violate this provision shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. In addition, the Attorney General may institute for the United States, or in the name of the United States, an action for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order or other order, enjoining violations of this subsection.'"

---

* If the earlier suggestion of a civil penalty is adopted as subsection (g), this would, of course, become subsection (h).

(iii) These amendments would have the effect of broadening the prohibition on intimidation to cover all registrants and voters, provide for a $500 civil penalty for victims of acts of intimidation, increase penalties for violations of the Act where life is placed in jeopardy, and provide for F.B.I. agents and U.S. Marshals to observe registration, voting and counting.

* * * * * * *

The above constitute the substantive amendments agreed upon by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights to strengthen the bill. A number of language and technical suggestions are being made to the Justice Department and we would appreciate an opportunity to discuss these suggestions with Committee counsel.

Analysis of Educational
Facilities Afforded to
Negroes and Whites in the
State of Mississippi

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

JACKSON DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. STATE OF MISSISSIPPI; ET AL., Defendants.	CIVIL ACTION NO. 3312

ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES OF STATE OF MISSISSIPPI; MRS. PAULINE EASLEY, CIRCUIT CLERK AND REGISTRAR OF CLAIBORNE COUNTY; J. W. SMITH, CIRCUIT CLERK AND REGISTRAR OF COAHOMA COUNTY; T. E. WIGGINS, CIRCUIT CLERK AND REGISTRAR OF LOWNDES COUNTY.

COMPARISON OF
EDUCATION FOR NEGROES
AND WHITE PERSONS
1890 - 1963

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NUMBER 11(a) AS TO THE ENTIRE FACTUAL BASIS ON WHICH THE UNITED STATES MAKES THE ASSERTION CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPH 31 OF THE COMPLAINT THAT PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PROVIDED FOR NEGROES WERE AND ARE INFERIOR TO THOSE PROVIDED FOR WHITE PERSONS

The factual basis of the allegation that public education facilities provided for Negroes in Mississippi were and are inferior to those provided for white persons is as follows:

A. SINCE AT LEAST 1890 ALL PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN MISSISSIPPI HAVE BEEN SEGREGATED BY RACE AND UNTIL OCTOBER 1, 1962, ALL PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN MISSISSIPPI HAD BEEN SEGREGATED BY RACE.

Mississippi Constitution, Article 4, section 207.

On October 1, 1962, James Meredith, a Negro student, was admitted to the University of Mississippi Undergraduate School by Court order. He graduated on August 18, 1963. On June 6, 1963, Cleve McDowell, a Negro student, was admitted to the Law School of the University of Mississippi. All other public educational institutions in Mississippi are segregated at the present time.

B. SINCE AT LEAST 1890 THERE HAVE BEEN MORE NEGRO CHILDREN THAN WHITE CHILDREN OF SCHOOL AGE IN MISSISSIPPI.

State of Mississippi School Census

Year	White	Negro
1890 1/	207,652	292,581
1910 2/	301,548	410,089
1929 3/	379,678	493,987
1949 4/	393,804	492,349
1960 5/	329,215	337,871

1/ E-O-3 Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1891-92 and 1892-93, p.III.

2/ E-O-5 Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1909-10 and 1910-11, p. 145.

3/ See following page.
4/ " " "
5/ " " "

C. THE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN MISSISSIPPI PROVIDED FOR WHITE CHILDREN HAVE BEEN AND ARE SUPERIOR TO PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES PROVIDED FOR NEGROES.

1. White public school teachers were and are more highly trained than Negro public school teachers in Mississippi.

	Graduate Degree(s)	College Degree	Not H.S. Graduate
1929-1930			
White	334 6/	3,263 6/	358 6/
Negro	Not available	400 7/	2,719 7/
1939-1940 8/			
White	459	5,977	11
Negro	Not available	600	3,000
1949-1950 9/			
White	710	5,943	0
Negro	27	1,194	710
1953-1954 9/			
White	1,493	6,742	0
Negro	90	2,350	78
1960-1961 9/			
White	2,345	8,252	0
Negro	489	6,328	0
1961-1962 10/			
White	2,473	8,585	0
Negro	553	6,829	0

3/ E-O-7 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1929-1930 and 1930-1931, p. 99.

4/ E-O-18 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1949-1950 and 1950-1951, p. 114.

5/ E-O-75 Statistical Data School Session 1961-1962, Mississippi State Department of Education (1962), p. 1.

6/ through 10/ See following page.

6/ E-O-8 Twenty Years of Progress 1910-1930 and A Biennial Survey Scholastic Years 1929-1930 and 1930-1931 of Public Education in Mississippi, p. 87.

7/ E-O-37 Report of the Committee of Investigation of the Teacher Training Facilities Provided for Negroes in Mississippi (1930) (Bulletin #61, State of Mississippi, Dept. of Ed.), pp. 35, 51.

8/ E-O-13 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1939-1940 and 1940-1941, pp. 17, 39.

9/ E-O-40 Public Education in Mississippi: Reports of Advisory Study Group to the Legislative Education Study Committee (1961), vol. 1, p. 236.

10/ E-O-75 Statistical Data School Session 1961-1962, Mississippi State Department of Education (1962), p. 34.

2. White teachers were and are more highly paid than Negro teachers.

1890-1891 11/

Average Monthly Salary

White	$ 32.41
Negro	22.54

1909-1910 12/

	Average Monthly Salary	
	City Districts	County Districts
White	$ 63.03	$ 42.38
Negro	29.08	20.52

Average Yearly Salary of Classroom Teachers 13/

1941-1942

White	$ 735.39
Negro	232.93

1949-1950

White	1,805.69
Negro	710.56

1953-1954

White	2,176.55
Negro	1,244.08

1961-1962

White	3,742.39
Negro	3,236.75

11/ E-O-3 Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for Scholastic Years 1891-92 and 1892-93, p. IV.

12/ E-O-5 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1909-10 and 1910-11, p. 103.

13/ E-O-75 Statistical Data School Session 1961-62, Mississippi State Department of Education (1962), p. 42.

3. In Mississippi more white teachers are provided per white child in attendance than per Negro child in attendance.

Pupil-Teacher Ratio	
1931-1932	14/
White	23-1
Negro	34-1
1939-1940	15/
White	25.5-1
Negro	35.1-1
1951-1952	16/
White	26-1
Negro	34-1
1961-1962	17/
White	23-1
Negro	28.5-1

14/ E-O-8 Twenty Years of Progress, 1910-1930 and a Biennial Survey Scholastic Years 1929-30 and 1930-31 of Public Education in Mississippi, p. 67.

15/ E-O-13 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1939-40 and 1940-41, pp. 39, 59 [computed: number of teachers/ average daily attendance].

16/ E-O-67 Statistical Data School Session 1951-52, Mississippi State Department of Education, p. 24.

17/ E-O-75 Statistical Data School Session 1961-62, Mississippi State Department of Education, pp. 1, 39 [computed: number of teachers/average daily attendance].

4. More money is spent for instruction of white children than Negro children in Mississippi.

Instructional Cost Per Child in Average Attendance

	1900-1901 18/	1929-1930 19/	1939-1940 20/	1949-1950 21/	1956-1957 22/	1960-1961 23/
White	$ 8.20	$40.42	$31.23	$78.70	$128.50	$173.42
Negro	2.67	7.45	6.69	23.83	78.70	117.10

18/ E-O-4 Bienniel Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1899-1900 and 1900-1901, p. 17.

19/ E-O-7 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1929-1930 and 1930-1931, pp. 99, 103 [computed: total instructional costs/ average daily attendance].

20/ E-O-13 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1939-1940 and 1940-1941, pp. 59, 75 [computed: total instructional cost/average daily attendance].

21/ See following page.
22/ " " "
23/ " " "

21/ E-O-18 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1949-1950 and 1950-1951, pp. 114, 133 [computed: total instructional cost/average daily attendance].

22/ E-O-21 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1955-1956 and 1956-1957, pp. 113, 155 [computed: total instructional cost/average daily attendance].

23/ E-O-23 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1959-1960 and 1960-1961, pp. 33, 77 [computed: total instructional cost/average daily attendance].

(a) In 1961-62 most school districts in Mississippi spent far more for the instruction of each white child than for the instruction of each Negro child. 24/

Following are comparisons of expenditures above the state minimum program for instruction in Mississippi school districts, listed on a per-child basis:

District	White	Negro
Aberdeen Sep.	$ 54.78	$ 11.15
Alcorn Co.	19.39	-
Amite Co.	70.46	2.24
Amory Sep.	70.65	28.22
Anguilla	130.85	21.15
Attala Co.	62.67	12.42
Baldwyn Sept.	32.45	10.04
Bay St. Louis Sep.	105.55	19.43
Benton Co.	59.42	15.63
Biloxi Sep.	128.92	86.25
Bolivar Co. 1	125.10	2.32
Bolivar Co. 2	117.63	3.16
Bolivar Co. 3	177.37	4.46
Bolivar Co. 4	101.55	23.86
Bolivar Co. 5	123.65	5.68
Bolivar Co. 6	-	14.26
Brookhaven Sep.	58.56	20.79
Calhoun Co.	38.96	21.28
Canton Sep.	35.79	17.00
Carroll Co.	81.26	7.08
Chickasaw Co.	55.42	.62
Choctaw Co.	46.84	16.97
Claiborne Co.	142.64	19.88
Clarke Co.	56.82	16.11
Clarksdale Sep.	146.06	25.07
Clay Co.	64.07	15.31
Coahoma Co.	139.33	12.74
Coffeeville	68.95	6.55
Columbia Sep.	90.73	27.82
Columbus Sep.	106.74	54.92
Copiah Co.	49.88	7.11
Corinth Sep.	79.94	41.32
Covington Co.	52.53	23.95
Desoto Co.	87.66	3.74
Drew Sep.	104.06	20.93
East Jasper	111.22	8.57
East Tallahatchie	69.15	6.61

24/ E-0-77 Southern School News, February 1962, p. 6. The figures were taken from a report of the State of Mississippi Department of Education. This report was not officially published until after a newspaper report referred to it. The non-official source is used here because the United States does not have this report at the present time.

District	White	Negro
Forrest Co.	$ 67.76	$ 34.19
Forrest Sept.	86.48	40.58
Franklin Co.	77.62	13.86
George Co.	66.53	34.65
Greene Co.	69.50	11.37
Greenville Sep.	134.43	34.25
Greenwood Sep.	116.78	46.45
Grenada Co.	91.51	13.31
Grenada Sept.	79.00	27.38
Gulfport Sept.	93.34	50.76
Hancock Co.	64.16	-
Harrison Co.	58.91	14.24
Hattiesburg Sep.	115.96	61.69
Hazlehurst Sep.	90.95	9.76
Hinds Co.	80.24	10.41
Hollandale	117.81	18.00
Holly Bluff	191.17	1.26
Holly Springs Sep.	99.78	7.84
Holmes Co.	117.92	5.73
Houston Sep.	44.75	-
Humphreys Co.	116.62	15.35
Indianola Sep.	72.26	15.17
Itawamba Co.	34.99	46.06
Iuka Sep.	29.73	25.32
Jackson Co.	76.51	68.99
Jackson Sep.	149.64	106.37
Jefferson Co.	96.29	2.60
Jefferson Davis Co.	59.44	10.24
Jones Co.	38.25	29.45
Kemper Co.	71.28	11.91
Kosciusko Sep.	74.64	21.16
Lafayette Co.	37.79	8.12
Lamar Co.	52.82	43.22
Lauderdale Co.	62.34	34.28
Laurel Sep.	79.63	36.33
Lawrence Co.	57.01	23.14
Leake Co.	48.85	17.37
Lee Co.	21.67	7.67
Leflore Co.	175.38	9.52
Leland	113.02	24.99
Lincoln Co.	68.51	26.06
Long Beach Sep.	138.38	-
Louisville-Winston	47.82	7.64
Lowndes Co.	64.03	8.53
Lumberton Cons.	85.47	16.09
Madison Co.	171.24	4.35
Marion Co.	42.91	19.10
Marshall Co.	69.56	8.91
McComb Sep.	61.51	18.85
Meridian Sep.	116.58	63.11
Monroe Co.	44.11	6.20
Montgomery Co.	48.73	6.71
Moss Point Sep.	86.63	43.30
Natchez-Adams	131.84	49.38
Neshoba Co.	21.16	7.12
Nettleton Line	26.81	1.58
New Albany	55.93	13.42
Newton Co.	67.42	17.98

District	White	Negro
Newton Sep.	81.23	19.83
North Panola Cons.	104.28	1.76
North Pike	30.89	.76
North Tippah Co.	35.14	.00
Noxubee Co.	113.29	1.21
Oakland Cons.	104.03	6.15
Ocean Springs Sep.	78.26	84.08
Okolona Sep.	72.39	14.54
Oktibbeha Co.	103.87	8.91
Oxford Sep.	69.42	30.67
Pascagoula Sep.	102.88	45.64
Pass Christian Sep.	127.98	78.50
Pearl River Co.	61.70	-
Perry Co.	98.98	38.51
Philadelphia Sep.	85.05	30.33
Picayune Sep.	74.54	26.48
Pontotoc Co.	34.75	13.59
Pontotoc Sep.	78.91	-
Poplarville Sep.	57.96	18.69
Prentiss Co.	33.88	19.88
Quitman Cons.	60.70	13.48
Quitman Co.	90.28	8.41
Rankin Co.	72.71	14.78
Richton Sep.	52.09	14.41
Scott Co.	31.55	10.95
Senatobia Sep.	65.08	10.74
Sharkey-Issaquena	18.75	25.74
Simpson Co.	41.42	8.97
Smith Co.	54.34	20.43
South Panola	59.55	1.35
South Pike	101.92	10.55
South Tippah	32.40	-
Starkville Sept.	78.00	19.11
Stone Co.	60.27	13.03
Sunflower Co.	127.36	11.49
Tate Co.	67.08	5.84
Tishomingo Co.	41.06	2.70
Tunica Co.	172.80	5.99
Tupelo Sep.	96.87	31.41
Union Co.	26.68	7.86
Union Sep.	47.62	7.24
Vicksburg Sep.	124.33	24.17
Walthall Co.	48.08	10.55
Warren Co.	101.66	10.62
Water Valley	53.44	2.75
Wayne Co.	62.76	8.69
Webster Co.	34.62	11.56
Western Line	198.74	52.27
West Jasper	55.71	9.87
West Point Sept.	51.26	11.91
West Tallahatchie	141.95	13.47
Wilkinson Co.	80.76	1.28
Winona Sep.	70.95	12.92
Yazoo Co.	245.55	2.92
Yazoo City Sep.	98.43	35.64

5. Every school district in Mississippi in 1954-1955 spent more money for the education of white children than for the education of Negro children. 25/

County and Separate District	White Per Pupil Cost	Negro Per Pupil Cost
Adams	$ 235	$ 84
Natchez	194	138
Alcorn	109	77
Corinth	146	117
Holly	77	
Rienzi	121	
Amite	180	88
Attala	151	82
Kosciusko	167	96
Benton	188	79
Bolivar	206	73
Calhoun	131	111
Carroll	189	84
Chickasaw	187	84
Houston	156	91
Okolona	181	111
Choctaw	165	108
Claiborne	396	97
Port Gibson	186	87
Clarke	167	92
Clay	202	81
West Point	164	101
Coahoma	226	84
Clarksdale	226	91
Copiah	168	76
Hazlehurst	168	85
Covington	154	122
DeSoto	219	51
Forrest	156	130
Hattiesburg	165	110
Franklin	175	110
Knoxville		111
White Apple		209
George	159	107
Greene	168	98
Grenada	207	87
Grenada	159	95
Hancock	156	61
Bay St. Louis	187	138
Waveland	189	
Harrison	141	84
Biloxi	191	141
Pernwood	163	
Gulfport	187	124
Long Beach	227	103
Mississippi City	158	100
Pass Christian	186	105

25/ E-O-39 A Report to the People of Mississippi on the White House Conference on Education, Bulletin No. 140 (1955), State of Mississippi Department of Education, pp. 53-56.

County and Separate District	White Per Pupil Cost	Negro Per Pupil Cost
Hinds	$ 163	$ 93
Jackson	217	157
Holmes	222	70
Durant	185	98
Lexington	231	97
Humphreys	190	91
Issaquena		153
Itawamba	113	94
Jackson	142	138
Lyon	172	146
Moss Point	175	125
Ocean Springs	155	111
Pascagoula	182	148
Jasper	171	92
Jefferson	206	67
Jefferson Davis	185	96
Jones	144	136
Ellisville	137	93
Laurel	156	85
Ovett	125	122
Kemper	175	75
Scooba	222	72
Lafayette	155	93
Oxford	171	112
Lamar	142	72
Lauderdale	155	102
Meridian	211	125
Lawrence	164	104
Leake	169	104
Lee	127	87
Baldwyn	129	72
Tupelo	169	114
Leflore	202	76
Greenwood	187	125
Lincoln	198	115
Brookhaven	151	108
Lowndes	149	82
Columbus	178	111
Crawford	197	51
Prairie	440	45
Madison	324	88
Canton	160	78
Flora	210	
Madison-Ridgeland	264	55
Marion	140	111
Columbia	144	110
Marshall	180	79
Holly Springs	167	
Monroe	136	97
Aberdeen	147	85
Amory	148	116
Prairie	312	69
Montgomery	155	101
Winona	161	99
Neshoba	137	
Philadelphia	175	114

County and Separate District	White Per Pupil Cost	Negro Per Pupil Cost
Newton	$ 158	$ 74
Newton	191	136
Union	158	82
Noxubee	191	64
Macon	199	78
Oktibbeha	176	83
Starkville	175	100
Panola	162	75
Como	236	76
Sardis	213	99
Pearl River	151	79
Picayune	174	96
Poplarville	151	110
Perry	163	114
Richton	151	75
Pike	166	79
Fernwood	158	98
Magnolia	183	81
McComb	148	104
Osyka	171	63
Summit	174	69
Universal	273	93
Pontotoc	134	108
Pontotoc	159	
Prentiss	124	92
Quitman	183	79
Marks	142	101
Rankin	159	69
Scott	177	109
Forest	163	123
Sharkey	238	106
Simpson	156	106
Braxton	179	
D'Lo	200	
Smith	133	122
Stone	156	111
Sunflower	195	81
Drew	178	90
Indianaola	180	90
Ruleville	210	85
Tallahatchie	196	94
Glendora	600	53
Sumner	205	80
Tutwiler	237	58
Tate	187	76
Coldwater	207	52
Senatobia	167	45
Tippah	134	74
Ripley	129	97
Tishomingo	112	98
Iuka	119	87
Tunica	267	67
Union	120	90
New Albany	170	116
Walthall	158	82
Tylertown	161	86

County Separate District	White Per Pupil Cost	Negro Per Pupil Cost
Warren	$ 179	$ 87
Vicksburg	172	92
Washington	231	109
Greenville	209	87
Wayne	157	76
Webster	142	103
Wilkinson	201	56
Winston	155	82
Louisville	162	99
Yalobusha	155	83
Yazoo	217	91
Yazoo City	178	106
County Average	$ 161	$ 87
Separate District Average. .	181	106

6. White school children have longer school terms than Negro school children.

1930-31 26/

Length of Term in Days

White	165
Negro	119

1961-62 27/

Number of Schools

	8 Month Terms	9 Month Terms
White	2	637
Negro	103	399

26/ E-0-8 Twenty Years of Progress 1910-30 and a Biennial Survey Scholastic Years 1929-30 and 1930-31 of Public Education in Mississippi, p. 136.

27/ E-0-75 Statistical Data School Session 1961-62, Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance, p. 16.

7. In 1910 the State of Mississippi decided that consolidation of small rural schools would provide better education for children. 28/

(a) Between 1910 and 1930 white schools were consolidated and Negro schools were not.

1930-31 29/

	No. Consolidated Schools	No. Unconsolidated Schools
White	959	789
Negro	16	3,484

(b) In 1930-31 Negro children in Mississippi still went to schools where one or two teachers taught all grades.

1930-31 30/

	One-Teacher Schools	Two-Teacher Schools
White	515	202
Negro	2,411	832

28/ The biennial report of the State Superintendent of Public Education in Mississippi for 1909-11 cited a number of advantages for consolidation including:

(1) If the teacher is only responsible for one or at the most two grades, it is easier to secure a good teacher with professional training than in a one-room country school.
(2) The economy of the consolidated school makes a longer school term possible.
(3) Pupils are more interested in school and therefore attend more frequently and remain in school and go on to high school.
(4) The entire curriculum can be enriched.
(5) The school building will be much superior.
(6) "Consolidation offers the bases for the solution of more of the rural school problems than anything that has yet been offered. It is the only way of securing really good country schools. It is the only school that proposes to educate the country boy throughout high school without disturbing his home relations or taking him out of it".

E-9-5 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1909-10 and 1910-11, pp. 25-28.

29/ E-0-8 Twenty Years of Progress 1910-30 and A Biennial Survey for the Scholastic Years 1929-30 and 1930-31 of Public Education in Mississippi, pp. 51, 53.

30/ E-0-8 Twenty Years of Progress 1910-30 and A Biennial Survey for the Scholastic Years 1929-30 and 1930-31 of Public Education in Mississippi, p. 51.

(c) Real consolidation of Negro schools did not begin until after the United States Supreme Court's decision in Brown v. Board of Education - 40 years after the consolidation of white schools.

Number of One-Teacher Schools [31]

1952-53	
White	42
Negro	1,077
1953-54	
White	48
Negro	1,040
1956-57	
White	20
Negro	504
1958-59	
White	1
Negro	295
1961-62	
White	1
Negro	47

8. At all times in Mississippi, secondary education has been made available to more white children than Negro children. [32]

	Number of Secondary Schools	Enrollment
1930-31		
White	706 [33]	49,742 [33]
Negro	46 [34]	5,012 [33]
1952-53 [35]		
White	474	61,323
Negro	285	26,667
1961-62 [35]		
White	354	77,694
Negro	198	48,798

31/ E-0-75 Statistical Data School Session 1961-62, Division of Administration and Finance, Mississippi State Department of Education, p. 32.

32/ through 35 - see following page.

32/ Yet there have always been more Negro than white children of school age. See paragraph B.

33/ E-0-8 Twenty Years of Progress 1910-30 and A Biennial Survey for the Scholastic Years 1929-30 and 1930-31 of Public Education in Mississippi, pp. 17, 124, 129.

34/ E-0-37 A Report of the Committee of Investigation of the Teacher Training Facilities for Negroes in Mississippi, Bulletin No. 61, State of Mississippi Department of Education (1930), p. 26.

35/ E-0-75 Statistical Data School Session 1961-62, Division of Administration and Finance, State of Mississippi Department of Education, pp. 6, 32.

9. At all times more white high schools than Negro high schools are accredited by the State of Mississippi and regional accrediting associations.

	State Accredited		Regional Accreditation	
	Number	% of high schools	Number	% of high schools
1943-44				
White	315 [36/]	56.5%	87 [36/]	15.6%
Negro	20 [37/]	(figure not available)	(figures not available)	
1947-48 [38/]				
White	292	50.7%	91	16.6%
Negro	37	29.6%	8	6.4%
1949-50 [39/]				
White	303	63.1%	91	18.9%
Negro	55	37.2%	7	4.7%
1954-55 [40/]				
White	(figures not available)		93	19.9%
Negro			7	4.2%
1959-60 [41/]				
White	404	(figures not	96	(figures not
Negro	176	available)	7	available)
1960-61 [42/]				

Accredited Status of All Schools

	Number of Schools	
	White	Negro
Elementary	562	642
Jr. High	48	29
High	322	190

State Accreditation

	Number		Percent	
	White	Negro	White	Negro
Elementary	545	285	96.9%	44.3%
Jr. High	48	26	100.0%	89.7%
High	322	145	100.0%	76.3%

Regional Accreditation

	Number		Percent	
	White	Negro	White	Negro
Elementary	150	66	26.7%	10.3%
Jr. High	2	0	3.4%	0 %
High	89	7	27.6%	3.7%

36/ through 42 - see following page.

36/ E-0-15 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1943-44 and 1944-45, p. 26.

37/ E-0-29 Mississippi Blue Book: Biennial Report of the Secretary of State to the Governor and Legislature of Mississippi (1943-45), p. 49.

38/ E-0-30 Mississippi Blue Book: Statistical Register of the State of Mississippi (1945-49), p. 80.

39/ E-0-31 Mississippi Official and Statistical Register (1949-51), p. 117.

40/ E-0-32 Mississippi Official and Statistical Register (1956-60), p. 183.

41/ E-0-33 Mississippi Official and Statistical Register (1960-64), p. 202.

42/ E-0-23 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1959-60 and 1960-61, p. 137.

D. THE PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDED FOR NEGROES IS INFERIOR TO THAT PROVIDED FOR WHITES IN MISSISSIPPI.

1. At all times more junior colleges have been provided for white students than for Negro students.

	Number	Enrollment
	1936-37 [43]	
White	11	3,012
Negro	0	0
	1949-50 [44]	
White	14	4,971
Negro	1	26
	1954-55 [45]	
White	14	6,233
Negro	1	217
	1960-61 [46]	
White	14	9,269
Negro	3	843

2. At all times more senior colleges have been provided for white students than for Negro students.

	Number	Enrollment
	1935-45 [47]	
	Average Annual Enrollment	
White	5	5,145
Negro	2	466
	1953-54 [48]	
White	5	12,061
Negro	3	1,872
	1960-61 [49]	
White	5	14,435
Negro	3	2,990

43/ E-0-11 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1935-36 and 1936-37, p. 50.

44/ E-0-18 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1949-50 and 1950-51, p. 48.

45/ through 49 - see following page.

45/ E-0-20 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1953-54 and 1954-55, p. 31.

46/ E-0-23 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1959-60 and 1960-61, p. 144.

47/ E-0-43 Mississippi Study of Higher Education 1945, Board of Trustees, Institutions of Higher Learning of Mississippi, Joseph E. Gibson, Director, pp. 72-74.

48/ E-0-20 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1953-54 and 1954-55, pp. 102, 106.

49/ E-0-51 Public Education in Mississippi: Reports of Advisory Study Groups (Volume II) Institutions of Higher Learning to the Legislature Education Study Committee, 1961, p. 26.

3. A much wider variety of courses and degrees are offered to the white than to the Negro college students of Mississippi in 1960-61. 50/

White	Negro
University of Mississippi	Jackson State College
College of Liberal Arts Offers: a. Bachelor of Arts degree in 24 fields b. Bachelor of Science in 5 fields c. Bachelor of Music d. Bachelor of Fine Arts	Offers the Bachelor of Science and the Bachelor of Arts degrees in 11 fields and provides pre-professional preparation in 5 fields.
School of Engineering Offers: Bachelor's degree in 5 fields	Alcorn A.&M. College
School of Education Offers: a. Bachelor's degree in 3 fields b. Special programs of study in 5 areas	Offers the Bachelor of Science degree in about 20 fields.
School of Commerce and Business Administration Offers: a. Bachelor of Business Administration b. Bachelor of Public Administration c. Bachelor of Science in Journalism d. Bachelor of Science in Commerce	Mississippi Vocational College
Mississippi State University	Offers the Bachelor of Science degree in 12 fields.
School of Arts and Sciences offers training in about 16 fields School of Agriculture composed of 9 departments School of Education composed of 5 departments	
Mississippi Southern College	
School of Education School of Arts and Sciences School of Commerce and Business Administration Division of Fine Arts Division of Home Economics	

50/ E-O-51 Public Education in Mississippi: Reports of Advisory Study Groups (Vol. II) Institutions of Higher Learning 1961, pp. 71-75.

White

Mississippi State College for Women

Offers 5 Bachelor degrees in 19 fields

Delta State College

Offers Bachelor degrees in 10 fields

Negro

4. Until September 1962 white students in Mississippi had graduate and professional schools and Negro students did not. 51/

White

University of Mississippi

School of Law
School of Medicine
School of Pharmacy
School of Nursing
Graduate School Offers:

a. Master's degree in more than 30 fields
b. Doctor of Philosophy degree in 7 fields

Mississippi State University

5 Professional Schools
Graduate School offers:

a. Master's degree in about 30 fields
b. Doctor of Philosophy degree in 5 fields

Mississippi Southern College

Graduate School offers:

a. Master's degree in 12 fields
b. Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Education degrees in about 7 fields

Negro

Jackson State College

The Division of Graduate Studies offers a Master of Science in Education degree for principals and supervisors only.

51/ E-0-51 Public Education in Mississippi: Reports of Advisory Study Groups (Volume II) Institutions of Higher Learning 1961, pp. 71-74.

5. Mississippi's public institutions of higher learning granted more degrees and in a greater variety of fields in 1959-61 to white students than to Negro students. 52/

	Bachelors	Masters	Doctors	Fields of Learning
White	5,584	1,480	16	43
Negro	1,420	10	0	12

E. THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI HAS ALWAYS RECOGNIZED THAT THE PUBLIC EDUCATION PROVIDED FOR NEGROES HAS BEEN INFERIOR TO THAT PROVIDED FOR WHITES.

1. Officers of the State Government have recognized that the public educational facilities provided for Negroes were inferior to those provided for whites.

a. Governor Vardaman (1907).

Here is what I promised to do. I said if you elect me Governor and elect a legislature in sympathy with me that I would submit to the people of Mississippi an amendment to the State Constitution which would control the distribution of a public school fund so as to stop the useless expenditure in the black counties.

Let's see whether I kept my promise. In my inaugural address, I devoted the greater part of it to that. The only time I ever got a chance to urge against Negro education as I wanted to without impairing the white schools was when a legislature passed a bill providing money to that Negro school in Holly Springs which was sent to me signed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. Did I sign it? No. I killed the bill and I killed the school. . . 53/

b. Governor Wright (1950).

We face a serious problem in the matter of providing comparable educational opportunities for the two races in our State. As a matter of fact, this problem is composed of several phases. One of them deals with salary adjustments. A plan was proposed and submitted to the teachers this past summer. They voted it down. It is now necessary

---

52/ E-0-50 Biennial Report of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning from 1959 to 1961 to the State Legislature, State of Mississippi, p. 18.

53/ E-0- 78 Speech of Governor Vardaman of Mississippi quoted in the Jackson Mississippi Daily Clarion-Ledger, July 11, 1907.

to prepare another plan, and I understand that a great amount of study has been given to this by the members of the Mississippi Education Association, the Association of County Superintendents, and the State Department of Education. Proposals will be submitted to the Legislature in due time embracing the principles subscribed to by these groups.

Another phase of this problem deals with transportation, and another with building facilities. In fact, in order to accomplish some of the objectives to which our attention and efforts must be directed, we may have to reshape our plans and reform our thinking in order that all of the children of all of the people may have the opportunity to develop their abilities to the maximum.

I recommend that legislation be enacted providing for the equalization of teachers' salaries based upon qualifications, and removing any discrimination as between the races.

Second, I urge that a program be enacted providing for equal facilities between the races recognizing that children of both races are entitled to equal opportunities, but I will insist, as I believe the thinking people of both races in the State would insist, that this program provide for segregated educational facilities. 54/

c. Governor White (1953).

It is true that there is a wide variation in educational opportunities between the races. 55/

2. Every two years the State Superintendent of Public Education in Mississippi reports to the Mississippi legislature. Every such report transmitted to the legislature has shown that the public education provided for Negroes has been inferior to that provided for whites.

Following are excerpts from some of these biennial reports:

> In many counties, particularly in rural areas, negro children are forced to attend school in mere shacks or in church houses... 56/

54/ E-0-79 Message by Governor Fielding L. Wright to the Joint Session Mississippi Legislature, January 3, 1950.

55/ E-0-80 Message from Governor White to the Senate of Mississippi - 1953 Extraordinary Session Senate Journal, p. 970.

56/ see following page.

> Consolidation has done away with practically all of the one and two-teacher schools. In fact, this year there are less than ten percent of the white children of the rural districts attending these old type schools. The other ninety percent have the advantage of modern high schools, in many of which, not only the college preparatory course is given but also work in vocational agriculture, home economics and business training. . . .
> E-0-7 Biennial Report 1929-31, p. 11.

> 83 percent of all colored children enrolled in school were in open country rural schools, the great majority of which were of the one and two teacher type so common in Mississippi in both races prior to 1910. 57/

> 98.3 percent of all children in schools for the colored race were in grades one to eight inclusive, and 1.7 percent in grades nine to twelve. The great majority of colored children never get beyond the sixth grade.
> E-0-8 Twenty Years Progress, p. 130.

It was reported that a factor in the disbursement of the state per capita fund which creates and magnifies inequality in financial support is:

> The fact that we spend less money in Mississippi per child in the schools for the negro race than in the schools for the white race. The ratio between the amount per child for the white race and for the negro race among the counties ranges from two to one in some counties to more than ten to one in other counties. In counties with large negro population and small white population the state per capita fund provides a larger part of the actual school expenditures than in counties with large white population and small negro population. . . Consequently, inequalities from state sources are magnified by the per capita school census basis for disbursement.
> E-0-8 Twenty Years Progress, p. 107

56/ The full title of this document is Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1929-30 and 1930-31, p. 45 - E-0-7. Hereafter, all such reports will be referred to as Biennial Report for the particular years covered therein.

57/ see following page.

> In spite of the fact that about fifty-four percent of the total educable population of the state is negroes, there is only one higher institution of learning maintained by state support. This is Alcorn College at Alcorn, Mississippi. Some of the best trained teachers in colored schools come from this institution, but obviously it is far and away from meeting the needs of the state in the business of training an adequate supply of teachers. E-0-8 Twenty Years' Progress, p. 24.

> The quality of work done in the school room by the majority of negro teachers would not rank very high when measured by any acceptable minimum known to the leaders in educational thought. There is a growing sentiment among the white people and the negroes in Mississippi favorable to improvement in school plants, in the training of negro teachers which will guarantee a better quality of work in the schoolrooms for the negro race. E-0-8 Twenty Years' Progress, p. 90.

> The [Negro] teaching force, numbering 5,863 teachers has an average of 50 enrolled pupils each. This average situation is rarely ever found, for teachers in the lower grades frequently have in their charge from seventy-five to one hundred and fifty pupils. In a great many cases these teachers are forced to teach double sessions each day - one group in the forenoon and a totally different group in the afternoon. . . . Of the 3,753 Negro schoolhouses in Mississippi, 2,313 are owned by public school authorities. The other 1,440 schools are conducted in churches, lodges, old stores, tenant houses, or whatever building is available. Last winter, with the aid of the CWA, a considerable number of the best buildings were repaired. Up to the present time there has been only one PWA Negro school project. It is a farm shop building at the Hopewell School in Covington County. One of the great difficulties in getting Federal aid for these buildings is the lack of local funds for meeting the requirements of the government. The Negroes themselves, in some cases, are building and repairing their schoolhouses out of their own meager savings and with their own labor.

57/ The full title of this document is Twenty Years of Progress 1910-1930 and A Biennial Survey Scholastic Years 1929-30 and 1930-31 of Public Education in Mississippi, issued by W.F. Bond, State Superintendent of Education, p. 121 - E-0-8. Hereafter, all such reports will be referred to as Twenty Years' Progress.

School buildings need to be erected to displace the many little shanties and churches now being used. . . .
E-0-10 Biennial Report 1933-35, p. 41.

There is also dire need for school furniture and teaching materials - comfortable seating facilities, stoves, blackboards, erasers, crayon, supplementary reading materials, maps, flash cards, and charts.

In many of the 3,763 colored schools of the State there is not a decent specimen of anyone of the above mentioned items. In hundreds of rural schools there are just four blank, unpainted walls, a few old rickety benches, an old stove propped up on brickbats, and two or three boards nailed together and painted black for a blackboard. In many cases, this constitutes the sum total of the furniture and teaching equipment.
E-0-10 Biennial Report 1933-35, p. 41.

High school advantages for Negroes in Mississippi are very meager. Ninty-four percent of the educable Negro population of high school age is not in school. . . . There are twenty-eight counties in Mississippi which do not have any recognized high school facilities for Negroes. Fifteen counties make absolutely no provision whatever for high school training of Negro children. Of the fifty-four recognized four-year high schools for Negroes, fifteen are privately owned and supported. . . . Only eighteen Negro high schools in Mississippi have been given any recognition by the State High School Accrediting Association. Three Negro high schools are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. . . .
E-0-11 Biennial Report 1935-37, p. 13.

Of course, everyone knows that there is a long distance to go yet before an adequate system for the training of the colored youth of the state can be provided; yet it should be said that there is more interest in this question and that definite progress is now being made. . . .

The most urgent need in the field of Negro education is for trained teachers. Without trained teachers, any worthwhile educational program is impossible. The facilities for training teachers, both public and private, now available are wholly inadequate. . . .
E-0-11 Biennial Report 1935-37, p. 15.

Of course, everyone knows that there is a long distance to go yet before an adequate system for the training of the colored youth of the state can be provided; yet, it should be said that there is more interest in this question and that definite progress is now being made.
E-0-12 Biennial Report 1937-39, p. 18.

Negro Salaries At the beginning of the biennium, the State Board of Education set up a salary schedule of $28 per month for a six months term, or a total of $170.00 per year per teacher. In some counties, however, the salaries have averaged less than this amount. It is obvious that the salary problem is one of our real problems in the colored schools in Mississippi. Teachers cannot live on this small salary and maintain any sort of decent standard of living. Many teachers have dependants, and the small salaries and short terms make it compulsory that they earn a part of their living by engaging in some other type of work, usually farming or domestic service. As a consequence, many of our best teachers have gone into other sections of the country or into other lines of work where remuneration is more liberal.
E-0-12 Biennial Report 1937-39, p. 16.

... 99.7% of the white children had the opportunity to attend eight months the past session. . . .

During the past biennium improvement was made in the length of school terms for [Negro] rural schools. In most of the counties the term ran for six months, but in a few counties the term was four or five months. The term in separate districts was eight or nine months. In an effort to maintain longer school terms in rural areas, colored patrons frequently provide funds from their own meager resources for this purpose.
E-0-12 Biennial Report 1937-39, pp. 9, 16.

It is felt very definitely that the Negro schools in Mississippi are now on the upgrade. Of course, everyone knows there is a long distance to go yet before an adequate system for the training of the Negro youth of the state can be provided; yet, it should be said that there is more interest in this question and that definite progress is now being made.
E-0-13 Biennial Report 1939-41, p. 18.

There are 3,737 Negro schools in Mississippi. Of this number approximately 1,500 are housed in churches, tenant houses, or any other type of building available. One of the most pressing needs in Mississippi today is provision either by the state, by the county, or by both, of funds to revamp Negro schoolhouses. A few counties have put on county levies for this purpose; but this has been a very slow process. Schoolhouses need not be elaborate, but they should at least be sanitary, comfortable and adequate.
E-0-15 Biennial Report 1943-45, pp. 21-22.

There are 3,345 Negro public schools in Mississippi. Nearly half of these schools are housed in churches, tenant houses, or any other type of building available. In such schools the equipment is nil. . . .
E-0-16 Biennial Report 1945-47, p. 41.

In view of the present sociological conditions, race relations are extremely good in Mississippi. This is true largely because of mutual cooperation and understanding between the races in their attempt to equalize educational facilities. The building program is progressing very well in most counties; however, classroom needs in many cases have been underestimated. Consequently space that has been provided for libraries and auditoriums is being used for classrooms. In many districts, the necessary amount of teaching materials and equipment is not being placed in the new buildings. Therefore, many of the new schools will not be able to meet the standards of the Mississippi Accrediting Commission. In order for good relationships to continue between the races, the people of Mississippi, both white and Negro, must work toward getting all communities to meet the responsibility of truely equalizing facilities. . . The fact that public schools for Negroes have been poor in the past also has a direct bearing on the quality of instruction being done. . . .
E-0-21 Biennial Report 1955-57, pp. 40, 41.

Recommendations

The most important immediate needs in regard to Negro education are as follows:

Continued work toward equal facilities. In view of the present sociological conditions, race relations are extremely good in Mississippi. This is true largely because of mutual cooperation and understanding between the races in their attempt to equalize educational facilities. The building program is progressing very well in most counties; however, classroom needs, in many cases, have been underestimated. Consequently, space that has been provided for libraries and auditoriums is being used for classrooms. In many districts, the necessary amount of teaching materials and equipment is not being placed in the new buildings; therefore, many of the new schools will not be able to meet the standards of the Mississippi Accrediting Commission. In order for good relationships to continue between the races, the people of Mississippi, both white and Negro, must work toward getting all communities to meet the responsibility of truly equalizing facilities.

Graduate training for teachers. The principals' training program at Jackson State College is the only graduate work available to Negro school people in Mississippi, and this program is limited to a small number of principals and supervisors. In order for

Negro teachers to further their education beyond the bachelor's degree, it is necessary for them to leave the State.

Since there is such a great demand on the part of Negro teachers for advanced college work, it seems particularly desirable that graduate training for principals, elementary and high school teachers be provided by Mississippi Negro institutions. Considering the large number of Negro teachers desiring graduate training and the wholesome influence of such training on the schools of Mississippi, it is highly probable that this training could be provided on a more economical basis than adequate out-of-state tuition. Certainly, the quality and type of training provided by our own state institutions would more nearly meet the needs of Mississippi schools. Of course, out-of-state tuition will continue to be necessary for those students desiring to study in fields other than the teaching profession.

Negro person to work with Negro elementary schools. Since the Southern Education Foundation is no longer financially able to contribute to the support of a special consultant in Negro elementary education, a Negro person who is well qualified in elementary education and who has demonstrated his ability to work with both white and Negro people should be employed by the State as an assistant to the co-ordinator of Negro education. Such a person is needed because: (1) There is a great need for additional state leadership in Negro elementary education, (2) Many elementary teachers are not fully qualified and need guidance and direction, (3) Better interpretation of Negro elementary school needs can be effected through the work and advice of a well-qualified Negro person, (4) The employment of such a person will do much to instill confidence between the races, (5) A good Negro person can work effectively with Negro elementary teachers because of mutual understandings.

Local supervision of classroom teaching. For approximately 50 years the Southern Education Foundation has contributed financially to the support of supervision in the Negro schools of the South. Through the years the Foundation has gradually withdrawn its support from this program. At present, the various counties receive very little assistance. If this important service is to be continued, it will be necessary for the State to assume a greater financial responsibility for its support. The need for supervision in instruction is obvious when it is realized that only sixty-three per cent of the Negro teachers in Mississippi hold an "A" class teachers' certificate. The fact that public schools for Negroes have been poor in the past also has a direct bearing on the quality of instruction being done. If the state of Mississippi is to receive just value in return for money expended for teachers' salaries, supervision of instruction is a necessity.
E-0-22 Biennial Report 1957-59, pp. 40, 41.

I strongly recommend that sufficient funds be budgeted during the next biennium to allow equal amounts to be allocated according to the density formulas for Negro and white transportation. Our best estimates indicate that approximately $1,200,000 annually would be needed to close the gap that now exists between white and Negro allocations.
E-0-23 Biennial Report 1959-61, p. 23.

There was also a serious shortage of textbooks in some of the Negro schools.
E-0-23 Biennial Report 1959-61, p. 138.

There is also a critical need for a State Supervisor of Elementary Education for Negro Schools.
E-0-23 Biennial Report 1959-61, p. 155.

3. Special studies of education in Mississippi have been authorized at various times by the Mississippi Legislature, by the State Superintendent of Public Schools and by other public educational authorities in Mississippi. These studies have shown that the education provided for Negroes is inferior to that provided for whites in Mississippi.

Following are excerpts from some of these studies:

The buildings are usually poorly planned. Often churches are used for school purposes and are not adapted to instructional needs. In many instances the buildings are not well kept. . . .

In most of the rural schools, the desks are poor, not adjusted to the children, often double and perhaps in one-half the cases no desks at all. Usually in churches the benches are used for seats. . . .

The blackboards are entirely inadequate, often painted boards and in many cases oil cloth stretched along the walls are the makeshifts for blackboards. Most frequently, the amount of blackboard space is entirely inadequate. Usually, there are no erasers. It is hard to imagine how any work at all can be done under such conditions.
E-0-37 A Report of the Committee of Investigation of the Teacher Training Facilities for Negroes in Mississippi, Bulletin No. 61 (1930) State of Mississippi Department of Education, p. 12.

In view of the fact that only approximately thirty-two four-year high schools for Negroes, half of which number are privately maintained, are to be found in the entire state of Mississippi, it naturally follows that the actual need for college buildings is not extensive. . .
E-0-37 A Report of the Committee of Investigation of the Teacher Training Facilities for Negroes in Mississippi, Bulletin No. 61 (1930) State of Mississippi Department of Education, p. 29.

Although the State has made noticeable strides during the past decade in the education of its Negro citizens on all levels, the goal of equality is still very distant. Action is already under way to hasten progress . . .

The quantity and quality of higher education is so inextricably bound to that on the lower level, particularly the secondary level, that it is not possible to consider inequalities in higher education at the exclusion of others. Opportunities for the Negro youth to get the basic secondary school training necessary for college admission have been considerably less than for the white youth of the State.
E-0-46 Higher Education in Mississippi: A Survey Report to the Board of Trustees, Institutions of Higher Learning (1954), John E. Brewton, Director, p. 146.

Even greater inequalities exist in the area of higher education. . . . The State provides, through the University of Mississippi and other state colleges, ample opportunities for white students to pursue graduate and professional study; but the Negro student has been compelled to go outside the State for this service. . . . These inequalities in opportunities contribute to the scarcity of Negroes in the professions.
E-0-46 Higher Education in Mississippi: A Survey Report to the Board of Trustees, Institutions of Higher Learning (1954), John E. Brewton, Director, pp. 148,149.

Curricular offerings in areas considered to be urgent for national defense have not kept pace with such demands in the Mississippi high schools for Negroes. Less than five per cent of the high schools offered courses in modern foreign languages. Areas of critical shortage in the teaching personnel were modern languages, speech, physics, and chemistry. The situation is more acute due to the fact that opportunities for training teachers in such fields are limited at the undergraduate level and totally unavailable to the teaching force within the state at the graduate level.
E-0-41 Public Education in Mississippi: Report of Mississippi Legislative Education Study Committee December, 1961, p. 118.

Findings in this study indicate that higher education for Negroes in Mississippi is handicapped by restricted budgets and curricular offerings. Major emphasis in the past has been concerned with serving the needs of rural Mississippi. The schools now face the problems of expanding their programs to include more course offerings for pre-professional and professional students. . . .
E-0-41 Public Education in Mississippi: Report of Mississippi Legislative Education Study Committee December, 1961, p. 121.

Enrollments in both [Negro] junior and senior colleges have grown steadily over the past ten year period. Although budgets for higher education are still inadequate, they, too, have shown steadily increases; however, the increases have not been sufficient to cope with the increasing enrollment and expanding curricular offerings, and higher cost of living.
E-0-41 Public Education in Mississippi: Report of Mississippi Legislative Education Study Committee December, 1961, p. 122.

The Legislature and the Board should give considerable emphasis to providing Jackson, Alcorn, and Mississippi Vocational College with the funds and assistance needed to qualify them for full membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Colleges presently admitting Negro students are in a difficult position, since the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has discontinued the separate accrediting of colleges admitting only Negro students, and is applying its regular standards to such colleges.
E-0-41 Public Education in Mississippi: Report of Mississippi Legislative Education Study Committee December, 1961, p. 102.

. . . With the exception of the work toward a Master's degree for principals and supervisors at Jackson State College, no graduate work is at present available to Negro students within the state. This is a severe unmet need, which cannot be satisfied even by building another institution. The costs would be overwhelming, and the difficulties of gathering a satisfactory faculty almost insuperable.
E-0-51 Public Education in Mississippi: Report of Advisory Study Groups (Volume II) Institutions of Higher Learning, 1961, pp. 78, 79.

SPECIAL SCHOOL SURVEYS

In 1949 a study was made of the educational provisions for Negro children in Sunflower County. In the same year a study was made of education in both the white and Negro schools of the Holly Springs Separate School District, Holly Springs, Mississippi. Following are excerpts from these studies.

THE EDUCATION OF NEGROES IN SUNFLOWER COUNTY

Introduction

In February 1949, an inter-racial Citizens Committee was formed in Sunflower County to investigate the education of Negro children in that county. The Citizens Committee selected the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University ot Mississippi, to conduct the study. The results of the study were published by that Bureau in March 1950 under the title, The Report of a Study of the Education for Negroes in Sunflower County, Mississippi (Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi: March 1950).

This report began by discussing a similar study conducted in Sunflower County in 1936-37, which had recommended, among other things, that 81 out of 105 Negro schools in the county be abandoned and had stated:

> This recommendation is made in the light of the following facts: the colored schools of Sunflower County as they now exist, are in deplorable condition; the schools that are now being used are not owned by the County Board of Education; many of the schools that the Committee recommends to be retained are in need of repairs; there is a decided lack of equipment in the schools; and finally this program will enable the County to give to its colored population the needed facilities for carrying on a worthwhile educational program. Ray L. Hamon and Ullin W. Leavell, Sunflower County Survey 1936-37. (A typewritten report), p. 62, quoted in the 1950 Report at pp. 8-9.

This was 1936-37. In 1950, the Bureau of Educational Research said:

> It is evident as far as the educational facilities for Negroes is concerned, that practically none of the recommendations made in the 1936-37 survey have been followed.
> 1950 Report, p. 9.

The Bureau studied all phases of Negro education in Sunflower County and made recommendations for its improvement.

The Instructional Program

Elementary Schools. With such a large proportion of the schools being one and two teacher schools, being inadequately housed and poorly equipped, running short terms with poor attendance during a large part of the time, having a large pupil-per-teacher ratio, and having inadequately trained and poorly paid teachers - the instructional program would naturally be inadequate. . . 1950 Report, p. 10.

High Schools. High school education is, at present, available only to a rather small proportion of Negro boys and girls of Sunflower County. . . . In the high schools, as in the elementary schools, progress is handicapped by inadequate housing, insufficient instructional materials, supplies, and equipment, large classes, poor attendance, and other factors mentioned earlier in this report. Furthermore, good high school education is built on the foundation of good elementary education. 1950 Report, p. 22.

Pupils in the Schools

Of the 7709 Negro children enrolled [in December 1949], the following facts seem of real significance: 32 per cent in grade 1; 70 per cent in grades 1-4; 86 per cent in grades 1-6; 2 per cent in grades 10-12. Obviously with a grade distribution indicated above . . . most Negro boys and girls in Sunflower County are not securing a very extensive education. 1950 Report, p. 39.

The Bureau gave a sampling of Sunflower Negro children the Metropolitan Achievement Test. This test was chosen because nationwide norms had been established for both white and Negro pupils.

The Bureau stated that the children tested were "under severe handicaps".

> . . . In very few instances were there enough desks. Most of the children were obliged to sit on benches and work closely together at a table. Thus, it was impossible to prevent copying. In some instances, pupils sat on the floor and did their work...
> 1950 Report, p. 44.

According to the Bureau, the tests showed:

> . . . On the average, the Negro children tested in grades 3-8 were two whole grades behind the white norms. This statement seems even more dismal when it is known that these Negro children who were two grades behind also are two years, three months older than the children on whom the norms were established. . . . It will be noted that compared with the Negro norms the pupils tested scored only one grade two months below the Negro norms. Still they were one year seven months older than the Negroes on whom the norm was based. This is a pretty bad picture. 1950 Report, pp. 50, 53.

The Bureau points out that the Negro norm was established on the basis of other Negro children in the south (p. 42) and that each successively higher grade tended to show a greater gap between the educational attainments of the Negro children, of Sunflower County, tested and the norms. (p. 56)

Negro Teachers in Sunflower County

Unprepared teachers tend to teach as they were taught. If half of the teachers in Sunflower County who had completed the twelfth grade or less, attended schools as inadequate as are the Sunflower County Schools for Negroes, then we have a vicious cycle. In this cycle children are taught in poor schools by poorly prepared teachers; these children in turn become teachers, unprepared as they are, for other children.

It is the opinion of this study staff that, by and large the schools for Negroes in Sunflower County are not good schools. Under the conditions described above the schools for Negroes will never be good schools. 1950 Report, pp. 58, 60.

The kind of teachers a school system may secure depends to a large extent on the amount of salaries they receive. . . . Salaries for Negro teachers in Sunflower County and in the State of Mississippi generally, are miserably low. . . .
1950 Report, p. 66.

Negro School Plant and Plan for Improvement

The Bureau pointed out that Negro children in Sunflower County are attending school in 94 different places. They recommend that these small school units be abandoned and that "a good modern school program should be started

for the Negroes of Sunflower County". (p. 79 They recommend the establishment of eight elementary centers and two high school centers. (p. 79)

The Bureau points out that this could be done without financial loss.

From the point of view that the school plant is an educational tool, the present holdings of Sunflower schools present a dreary spectacle. Over-crowded classrooms are a definite handicap to instruction in the finest and best equipped schools. When the buildings are below acceptable standards and equipment is inferior in quality and in quantity, every phase of a sound educational program fails to function.

In one respect, at least, Sunflower County may be fortunate. Since with the exception of three situations in the separate school districts, there is little capital investment and since, in these three, there is only a limited amount, the county is in the position to develop a school plant which is not tied to present structures. Most of the present school plants may be abandoned or sold without undue financial loss. . .
1950 Report, p. 89.

Financing Negro Schools

In the past, expenditures for schools for Negroes in Sunflower County have been woefully low. This has been true also for most of the counties and separate school districts in Mississippi. There are several reasons for the low expenditures for Negro education. Most of these reasons have their origin in the period when many white people thought that a Negro should not be educated. Today, the white people in Mississippi who see the immediate need for the education of Negroes find themselves tied down by laws and traditions to such an extent that progress can be made only by unceasing and tremendous effort.
1950 Report, p. 101.

As was stated before, half of the state disbursements for school purposes are made on a per capita basis. Nothing in the law states that this money must be spent for the schools of either race according to the number of educable children. However, since the state pays the money on a per child basis, it at least may be inferred that the state money should be spent on the child who was responsible for the payment.

In Sunflower County schools, as well as many other school districts in Mississippi, this is not the case. The amount of money received by the county from the state because of the Negroes exceeds the amount spent for "instruction" of the Negroes. . .
1950 Report, p. 126-127.

. . . in 1939-40 the county received from the state $6.96 per enrolled Negro pupil but spent only $4.26. The per capita amount received in each of the following ten years was, in every year, more than the per capita expenditure.
1950 Report, p. 134-135.

. . . Sunflower County in 1939-40 received $73,626 per capita fund. Since 79 per cent of the educables at that time were Negro, $58.165 was the amount received on the basis of the Negro children. However, only $35,564 was spent for "instruction" for the Negro children. Evidently $22,601 of this amount was expended elsewhere - probably on the schools for the whites. In the last two years the difference in the amount received and the amount [not spent for Negro children] is more than twice the $22,601 figure.
1950 Report, pp. 126-127.

(E-12-1 Survey published in March 1950 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay)

INTRODUCTION

In 1949 a study of the Holly Springs Separate School District was made at the request of the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools of that district. This study was made by the School Study Staff of the School of Education, University of Mississippi under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.

Negro Elementary School

It is difficult to write anything about the curriculum of this school. The program is so limited, the physical conditions are so inadequate, the pupils per teacher load is so heavy, the materials of instruction are so meager, being limited to a few almost worn-out textbooks and a few materials that the teachers have gathered together, that any attempt to describe the program becomes lost in the mass of needs of this large group of boys and girls. (p. 17)

Negro High School

The high school provides classes through the tenth grade only. The principal carries on classes in arithmetic, english, social studies, general science, and perhaps some other subjects. The conditions under which he and the boys and girls work are abominable. He teaches his classes in one corner of an assembly hall while the rest of the room is full of very small children. There are practically no materials and supplies with which to work except a few almost worn-out textbooks. (p. 19)

Teachers' Salaries

The present salaries in Holly Springs white schools range from $1760 to $1980 for classroom teachers with the average being $1823. (p. 49)

The current salary scale for the Negro teachers in, the Holly Springs School District has a range from $420 for one . . . teacher. . . to $880 which is paid to six teachers . . . The average salary paid Negro teachers, exclusive of the salary of the principal in the Holly Springs District is $ 550. (p. 60)

Negro School Buildings

Except for the Rosenwald school, all Negro schools are housed in one room frame buildings. Except for a rather questionable shelter from the weather, they interfere with, rather than aid, the teaching and the learning process. Water supply is usually far removed from the building and the unsanitary water bucket is always evident. Toilets are either wooden shacks, or the adjacent woods. Natural

lighting is usually poor, no artificial light is available. Equipment is not worthy of the name. . . (p. 68)

Per Capita Cost

. . . In 1948-49. . . there was budgeted $107.37 for each white boy and girl. This compares with $45.00 spent per child in 1940-41. . . The per capita cost for the education of Negro boys and girls in Holly Springs is exceedingly low. . . the cost in 1940-41 was $5.95 per enrolled pupil. The cost increased each year until the budgeted amount for 1948-49 was $17.96 each. . . (p. 87)

(E-18-1 The Report of a Study of The Holly Springs Separate School District by Dr. John E. Phay, Director of School Study Staff, School of Education University of Mississippi 1949.)

4. The surveys of schools in Mississippi required by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi and the State Educational Finance Commission conducted in the mid-1950's show that the education provided for Negroes has been inferior to that provided for whites.

The special session of the Mississippi legislature convened in 1953 passed a law requiring each county and separate school district to have a survey of the educational facilities in that county made for the purpose of equalizing all schools in the district. All presently existing districts were abolished and each district was required to have a plan prepared for its reorganization prior to July 1, 1957. At this session of the legislature, the State Educational Finance Commission was also created as an organization to insure and provide substantial equality of educational opportunities through the maintenance of a uniform system of free public schools. The Commission was also charged with the responsibility of bringing about desirable consolidation or reconsolidation of school districts in Mississippi.

The Commission established criteria for school district reorganization as guides to county boards of education and to school district trustees in carrying out the purpose of the legislative acts of this session. One of the requirements was that a survey of each county and school district had to be prepared by one of the institutions of higher learning of the State of Mississippi, the State Department of Mississippi, or a survey agency approved by the Finance Commission.

Among the agencies approved by the State Educational Finance Commission for making school surveys in the State of Mississippi for this purpose were the following:

Dr. John E. Phay, Director
Bureau of Educational Research
University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi

Dr. Ralph S. Owings
Head and Professor of Educational
Administration
Mississippi Southern College
Hattiesburg, Mississippi. 58/

The following are excerpts from the survey reports prepared by the above two agencies for submission to the Educational Finance Commission:

58/ E-0-47 Report of the State Educational Finance Commission June 1, 1954-June 30, 1955, Department Reports State of Mississippi, Vol. I, 1953-1955
NOTE: All direct quotes from reports are single spaced or in quotation marks.

ADAMS COUNTY AND CITY OF NATCHEZ

School Plant

Adams County has 30 schools for negroes outside the city of Natchez. Of the 30, 9 are housed in churches, 11 in school buildings, 8 in society halls and the remainder in combinations of buildings. The site is publicly owned in only three instances. . . . The condition of the buildings that house the negro children in the county outside Natchez is one that needs immediate attention. There are only two buildings that are considered adequate for future use as schools. . . . (p. 77)

Enrollment and Average Daily Attendance

In 1954-55 the Adams County school enrollment was 844 for white schools and 1,368 for Negro schools. The average attendance was 807 for white students and 1,227 for Negro students. There were 129 white high school students and no Negro high school students.

School enrollment figures for the city of Natchez show that the total enrollment was 2,774 for whites and 2,014 for Negroes. The average attendance was 2,599 in the white schools and 1,814 in the Negro schools. There were 661 white and 451 Negro high school students in the city of Natchez in 1954-55. (pp. 15,17,19,21,33,35, and 36)

Two of the three white schools in Adams County outside Natchez are consolidated schools. The condition of one building is rated "good"; the other two, "poor". (p. 70) Of the six white school buildings in Natchez Separate District, two are rated "excellent"; three, "fair"; and one, "good".

One of the three Negro school buildings is rated "fair"; one, "good"; and one, "excellent". (p. 113) About the building rated "good", the report said: "The lights in the basement are totally inadequate. . . . Adequate bulletin boards are lacking in this building.

Chalk boards are in bad condition and require attention . . ." (p. 114)

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

The pupils per teacher ratio in white schools in Adams County is 25-1 (p. 132); in Negro schools, 34-1 (p. 136). The ratio in white schools in Natchez is 26-1 (p. 138), in Negro schools, 29-1 (p. 140).

Expenditures

The per capita amount spent for each white child in average daily attendance in Adams County was $340.26 per pupil for a nine-month term (p. 135); for each Negro child for an eight-month term, $110.92. "When this figure is contrasted with the cost of the program for whites, it shows that more than twice as much is being spent for whites". (p. 137)

Instructional Program

. . . [In the Negro elementary schools in Adams County] you find the conventional program offered. In grades 7 and 8 the program is very weak and inadequate, all the children spending a major portion of their time just sitting because the teacher has to spread her time over so many grades. These boys and girls are not getting a program of education that appears to be of too much consequence. The program offered to the Negroes is very mediocre. The listing of the offerings would not reveal anything that would prove valuable. Only the dearth of the program would be obvious. (p. 137)

The Natchez city schools are to be commended on the fact that they provide kindergartens for their negroes as well as whites. It is one of the few school systems in the state of Mississippi that provide this type of education for negro boys and girls. . . . (p. 140)

Expenditures

In Natchez, the per capita spent for each white child in average daily attendance is $176.94; for each Negro child, $134.57. "This indicates that Natchez is making an effort to equalize the program of negroes and whites". (p. 141)

(E-38-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings and Dr. Raymond M. Ainsley).

AMITE COUNTY

Enrollment and Average Attendance

In 1955-56 the total enrollment for white schools was 1,940. During the same year there were 3,978 children enrolled in the Negro schools of Amite County. The average attendance was 1,794 for white schools and 2,594 for Negro schools. (pp. 11-32)

School Plant

The school buildings in Amite County range from excellent to unsatisfactory. Some should no longer be utilized for school purposes. The buildings for Negroes are most inadequate and in a deplorable condition. . . . (p. 41)

There are 7 white school buildings - all publicly owned. Two are rated "poor"; one, "excellent to poor"; one, "good to satisfactory"; one, "poor to unsatisfactory". (p. 43)

There are 32 schools for Negroes in Amite County. Without exception they are in extremely poor condition... These schools are in such deplorable condition that it seems a waste of time to discuss each school plant in detail. . .. (p. 54)

Only 3 of the 32 Negro schools are publicly owned. (p. 54)

It is recommended that 13 be abandoned. (p. 55)

School Busses

. . . Amite County maintains 34 busses for white pupils and 21 for Negro pupils. . . All but 4 of the white busses are either 1954 or 1955 models. Only 4 of the Negro busses range from 1952 to 1954 models, while the balance range from 1951 models, down to 1946 models. Older model busses (1946-1949) make it difficult to maintain safe and economic operation. . . The largest percentage of the busses serving white pupils make only one trip daily. Table 19 shows most of the Negro busses making two trips, with one Negro bus making 3 trips. (p. 69)

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

Eighty-nine white teachers are employed with a pupil-teacher ratio of 21.9. "This ratio is much below the state average of 30 plus". (p. 82) Eighty Negro teachers are employed with a pupil teacher ratio of 37.2.

"This ratio is much higher than that of the white schools. Compared with the State of Mississippi which has a 30 plus ratio it is also high". (p. 91)

Expenditures

There is a dearth of teaching materials and equipment in all the Negro schools. There is a shortage of chalk boards, bulletin boards, reading material, charts, maps, and library books. (p. 91)

The budget for 1954-55 was made on the basis of average daily attendance of 1,991 white children at $182.36 per child for 8 months. The budget for 2,423 Negro children was made at the rate of $85.68 per child in average daily attendance for 8 months. This shows that approximately twice as much is spent for each white child as for each Negro child in Amite County. This fact should be given careful consideration. (p. 97)

(E-46-1 Survey published in 1956 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings, Head of the Department of Educational Administration.)

BENTON COUNTY

Enrollment and Average Daily Attendance

In January 1956, there were 1,018 white and 1,054 Negro students enrolled. Nine hundred and fifty-nine white and 710 Negro students were in average daily attendance. (pp. 23, 32)

Elementary Schools

. . . It should be noted that in the quality and quantity of housing, in the availability of instructional materials, and in general environment, the Negro elementary schools are far below those of the white schools. (p. 37)

School Plant

The report indicated that 12 of the 13 Negro attendance centers are obsolete. The high school portion of the thirteenth is obsolete. (p. 46)

Expenditures

The per pupil cost for white schools was $162 for Hickory Flat and $184 for Ashland. The per pupil cost for the Negro schools was $98. (pp. 50-51)

(E-14-1 Survey published in June 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay)

CLAIBORNE COUNTY AND CITY OF PORT GIBSON

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

The pupil teacher ratio for the white children of Claiborne County is 21 per teacher and for the Port Gibson schools 26 per teacher; whereas, the ratio of Negro pupils per teacher for the county is 33 and for Port Gibson, 40.

Expenditures

The county operates white schools for nine months and the negro schools for eight months. The budget for white children in the county is $436.40 per child in average daily attendance; whereas, the budget for the negroes is only $100.39, and is for eight months, showing that four times as much is being spent for each white child as for each negro child in average daily attendance, and in addition, he is given an extra month. . . .

Port Gibson operates both the white and negro schools for nine months. No school should be run for less than nine months. Port Gibson budgeted on a basis of $160.02 per white child in average daily attendance, and $82.25 per negro child in average daily attendance or approximately 50 per cent less for the Negroes . . . . (p. 102)

(B-39-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings and Dr. Raymond M. Ainsley.)

CLAY COUNTY AND CITY OF WEST POINT

Average Daily Attendance

In 1954-55 the average daily attendance in the schools of Clay County was 1,810 for white students and 2,297 for Negro students. (pp. 20, 30)

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

The total number of teachers for the city of West Point and Clay County was 72 for the white schools and 82 for the Negro schools. (pp. 22, 31)

Elementary Schools

. . . It should be noted that both in the quality and quantity of housing, in the availability of instructional materials and in general environment, the Negro elementary schools are below those of the white schools in their neighborhood. (p. 43)

School Plant

Two of the twenty-five Negro school buildings are rated "fair", the other twenty-three "obsolete". (pp. 56-60) Four of the seven white school buiiiings are rated "good", the other three "fair". (p. 52)

Expenditures

The per capita expenditure at different white schools in the county and West Point ranges from $218 to $145. The County expenditure per Negro pupil is $91; West Point spends $105. (p. 64)

(E-29-1 Survey published in May 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.)

COVINGTON COUNTY

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

The white pupil-teacher ratio is 25.3-1; the Negro, 35.1-1. (pp. 70,78)

Expenditures

The budget for the year 1954-55 reveals that Covington County budgeted for an average daily attendance of 2,383 white children at a cost of $154.53 per child. Compared to this figure is the budget for the average daily attendance of 1,219 Negro children at a cost of $122.46 per child. This budget is prepared for eight months for both white and Negro. This means that about 25 per cent more is being spent per white child than per Negro child. (p. 82)

(E-67-1 Survey published in 1956 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.)

FORREST COUNTY AND CITY OF HATTIESBURG

Expenditures and General Description

According to the budget for 2,948 white children and 1,809 negro children in average daily attendance for the 1954-55 year, Hattiesburg has been attempting to equalize the expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance. The budget calls for an expenditure of $165.00 per white child and $110.00 per negro child. Hattiesburg operates both the negro and white schools for nine months, which indicates that effort is being made toward bringing the negro schools to the same level as to kind and type of schools as the white. However, the negro schools are overcrowded to an extent greater than the white schools. Also, the facilities in the negro schools are not comparable to the whites.

In 1954-55, Forrest County budgeted $159.91 per child for 2,727 white children in average daily attendance and $130.00 per child for 1,036 negro children. Here again is evidence that there is an attempt to improve the situation of the negro child and bring it in line with the white. Unfortunately, however, the negro schools in the county do not run for nine months. All of them run for eight months only. Some of the white schools run for only eight months, but others run for nine. All schools should run a minimum of nine months, both white and negro. (pp. 167-168)

(E-68-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings and Dr. Raymond M. Ainsley)

FRANKLIN COUNTY

Expenditures

The proposed budget for 1954-55 indicates that Franklin County budgeted for 1,392 white children in average daily attendance for eight months at a cost of $175.62 per child. It also budgeted for 898 Negroes in average daily attendance for eight months at a cost of $110.28 per child. Franklin County is spending a little better than 50 per cent more on its white children than it is on its Negroes. (p. 74)

(E-48-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.)

GEORGE COUNTY

School Plant

The school buildings in the county cover a wide range from poor to excellent. Some of the buildings are poorly adapted to educational needs. The Negro buildings are most inadequate and in a deplorable condition. . . (p. 39) It is quite evident from examination of the pictures of the schools that the Negro situation is pathetic. . . (p. 55)

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

The white pupils per teacher ratio is 30.5-1; the Negro, 36.9-1. (pp. 68,76)

Expenditures

The budget for 1954-55 was made on the basis of average daily attendance of 2,472 white children at $158.78 per child for eight months. The budget for 353 Negro children was made at the rate of $106.75 per child in average daily attendance for eight months. This shows that approximately 50 per cent more is being spent on each white child than on each Negro child in George County. This fact should be given careful consideration. (p. 78)

(E-77-1 Survey published in 1956 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.)

GREENE COUNTY

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

The white pupils per teacher ratio is 26.1-1; the Negro, 32.4-1. (pp. 70, 76)

Expenditures

The budget for the year 1954 reveals that Greene County budgeted for an average daily attendance of 1,980 white children at a cost of $166.86 per child for 8 months. Compared to this figure is the budget for the average daily attendance of 583 Negroes at a cost of $97.51 per child. This means that the county is spending approximately twice as much on the white child as on the Negro. (p. 80)

(E-69-1 Survey published in 1956 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.)

GRENADA COUNTY AND CITY OF GRENADA

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

1,840 white children in average daily attendance in 1955-56 were taught by 78 teachers; 2,076 Negro children in average daily attendance were taught by 74 teachers. (pp. 20,28)

$146.00 was spent for each white child in average daily attendance in Grenada City schools; $174 in one county white school and $249 in the other. The expenditure per child for county Negroes was $103, for city Negroes $90. (p. 56)

(E-16-1 Survey published in July 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay)

HOLMES COUNTY AND CITIES OF DURANT & LEXINGTON

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

There were 1780 white children in average daily attendance in the entire county. The white pupil-teacher ratio was 17-1 in Holmes County, 18-1 in Lexington, and 20-1 in Durant. (p. 19,23) There were 5396 Negro pupils in average daily attendance. The Negro pupil-teacher ratio was 30-1. (pp. 37 and 39)

School Plant and Instructional Program

. . . no sound educational program for elementary Negro children can be established until extensive replacements and additions are made to the present school plants. (p. 66) In most instances the Negro high schools have too many oversized classes. This seriously interferes with a sound instructional program. As in the Negro elementary school curriculum, the school plant is a major factor in limiting the school program. Library facilities, laboratory equipment, and other teaching devices also are limited. (p. 69)

. . . except for the Mileston plant and the one at West the County must provide new plants for Negro education. [The survey recommends that over 60 other Negro schools be abandoned. (p. 78)] Although it is unfortunate better school buildings have not been provided in the past, it is fortunate that new buildings can now be built at the most desirable locations. Little capital loss will be sustained by abandoning the school plant as recommended in this study. (p. 81)

Expenditures

In 1954-55, Durant spent $191 for each white child in average daily attendance; Lexington spent $265; the county expense for white pupils ranged from $306 to $152, depending on the school attended. Holmes County, at the same time, spent $78 on each Negro child; Lexington, $72; and Durant, $63. (pp. 86-89)

(E-50-1 Survey published in June 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John B. Phay.)

JACKSON COUNTY

General Description

Jackson County has 7 white schools. Grades 1-12 are taught in three of these: St. Martin, Vancleave, and Wade. Grades 1-8 are taught in the other schools.

All the schools operate for eight months. Table 60 shows that enrollment for the current year is 2,132 pupils with 71 teachers employed or a teacher-pupil ratio of 31.4. This ratio is above the state average of 30 plus. . . . (p. 119)

Jackson County has three Negro schools. Grades 1-8 are taught in 2 of these. The other, Davis Chapel, includes grades 1-6.

All of these schools operate for eight months. . . the enrollment for this year is 196 and . . . 6 teachers are employed. The pupil-teacher ratio is 32.7 which is higher than the average in the State of Mississippi.

Since none of these schools have a high school, no course of study will be given. Generally speaking, the program of these schools needs improvement in every respect. (pp. 123-124)

(E-80-1 Survey published in 1956 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.)

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Average Daily Attendance

In the school year 1954-55 there were 551 white children in average daily attendance. There were 1717 Negro children in average daily attendance. (pp. 15, 30)

While the buildings are not the most important thing concerning the school, they are of significance. The kind and type of housing for children affect the program and also have an affect on the teachers. (p. 47)

In each of the school surveys discussed in this appendix all the school buildings in the county are described. The following are descriptions of the three white schools in Jefferson County and some of the 28 Negro schools:

It is reported that Fayette is a school for whites. It is a two-story brick building, located on 10 acres and owned by the public. The value of the plant is approximately $150,000. (pp. 48, 49)

Union Church is a school for white children. This was partially burned during the time of survey. The survey reported that the elementary (which was not burned) is a wooden frame building with a metal roof in poor condition. However, inside toilets are available. The shop and vocational building is in very good shape. (pp. 50, 51)

According to the survey United Vocational is a school for white children. The value of the plant is $60,000. The condition of this school, in general, is poor.

Ashland [a one-teacher school for Negroes, teaching grades 1-8] The windows are inadequate. It is heated by a wood stove. It has no lights and the furniture consists of chairs and benches. There is no water supply. There are open-type toilets in very poor condition. Teaching aids, such as chalk boards and bulletin boards are desired. (p. 55)

Contentment [a one-teacher school for Negro children teaching grades from 1-8] It has a metal roof that leaks. The windows are inadequate and half the panes are missing in some instances. The floor is wood and in good condition but unpainted. The building is heated by a wood heater in fair condition. There are no lights and the furniture is home-made benches. There is no water supply at all. The children bring their water from home. Chalk boards are inadequate and in poor condition. The toilets are open type in poor condition, totally inadequate for school use. (p. 57)

Hard Times [a one-teacher school for Negroes, teaching grades 1-8.] The windows are not very good. The floor is wood in fair condition. It has a tongue and groove ceiling in fair condition. The building is heated by a wood heater in fair condition. There are no lights. The furniture is all home-made benches. . . The water supply comes from a church. . . The teaching aids are most inadequate. The entire facilities are not suitable for school. (p. 59)

Montgomery [a one-teacher school for Negroes, teaching grades 1-8] The windows are not adequate. The floors are wood in good condition. The building is heated by a wood stove. The lights are inadequate and the furniture is likewise inadequate. There are no toilets available, except for girls. The water is obtained from a cistern. This building was built in 1950. (p. 64)

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

The ratio of white pupils per teacher is 19-1 (p. 87) The ratio of Negro pupils is 30-1. "This is about 60 per cent higher than the figures shown for white children." (p. 91)

While there were 64 negro teachers employed for the year 1953-54, for the year 1954-55 this number has been cut to 59. On the basis of enrollment for 1954-55, the ratio of teachers will be 40 for the negro schools. (p. 91)

Expenditures

The survey showed that the 1954-55 school year budget for Jefferson County allotted $202.35 for each of the 574 white students in average daily attendance. The budget allotted $66.79 for each of the 2007 Negro students in average daily attendance. (p. 91)

(E-41-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings and Dr. Raymond M. Ainsley)

JEFFERSON DAVIS COUNTY

School Plant

There are 15 schools for Negroes in Jefferson Davis County. The Negro schools with the exception of Carver at Bassfield and Oakley, are in extremely poor condition. . . . There is little use in discussing each of these schools in detail since their facilities are inadequate and not fit for further use as schools. Many of the buildings are all but falling apart. (p. 54)

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

. . . The enrollment for the past year [in white schools] was 1,763 with 78 teachers employed or a pupil-teacher ratio of 22.6. This ratio is very desirable, however, it is expensive. It is doubtful that Jefferson Davis County can afford this luxury. . . . (p. 82)

. . . The enrollment for last year [in Negro schools] was 2,764 with 62 teachers employed which makes a pupil-teacher ratio of 42.9 which is extremely high. . . Good work cannot be accomplished when a teacher has such a larger number of pupils. In certain instances the ratio is as high as 47 per teacher and in no instances is it lower than 31.3 except at Haw Pond where it is 27.5. . . . (p. 87)

Expenditures

The budget for 1954-55 for Jefferson Davis County reveals that for 1,557 white students, $183.59 was budgeted for each pupil in average daily attendance for eight months. Contrasted to this is the budget for 2,238 Negro pupils in average daily attendance at a cost of $96.19 per pupil for eight months. In other words, Jefferson Davis County is spending approximately twice as much on its white children as it is on its Negro children. This should be given some attention at an early date. (p. 92)

(E-70-1 Survey published in 1956 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.)

JONES COUNTY
AND LAUREL AND ELLISVILLE
SEPARATE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Elementary Schools

. . . The limitation of the program of studies also is dependent upon many factors which must be altered before any sizeable improvement can occur. Only one school plant, the new building at Shady Oak, provides a satisfactory setting for a good elementary program in the county schools for Negroes. Delapidated buildings, poor equipment and the almost complete absence of teaching supplies, are factors which contribute to the deficiencies. (p. 40-41)

Instructional Program

In all county schools for Negroes, several grades are being taught by one teacher, a factor which limits the extent and quality of the program of studies. There is only so much time available for teaching during each day. When this time either is divided consecutively among several grades or used simultaneously for teaching at several levels of instruction, the quality of teaching and the program of studies both suffer. (p. 41)

The Ellisville Municipal Separate School District elementary school follows the pattern of the county elementary schools, although the building is better than any except the Shady Oak School building. (p. 41)

In the Laurel Municipal Separate School District, the schools show evidence of a general administrative policy enrichment. The new buildings, better equipment, and the use of teaching supplies, promote this policy. However, many classrooms are overcrowded. . . (pp. 41-42)

High Schools

Concerning the Negro high schools, the survey comments that the Laurel Municipal Separate School District High School offers only 19 courses per year, which "provides a limited program of studies". However, the survey felt that this high school was better than the Negro county high schools which are all small schools. Concerning the county high schools, the survey remarked: "Probably the greatest handicap in providing an adequate program of studies is the poor school plants. Although agriculture and home economics are listed as courses in

each school except Friendship, it is obvious from the lack of equipment and the poor housing available that only limited value can be obtained. A similar situation exists in the laboratory sciences. Library holdings and facilities are practically nonexistent." (pp. 55-58)

Expenditures

The expenditure per white pupil in the Jones County High School ranges from $181 to $110; in Ellisville Municipal Separate District the cost per white pupil was $117; and, in the Laurel Separate School District the cost per white pupil was $148. "Per pupil cost for Negroes was relatively much lower than for the white pupils in the separate school districts and in most of the county schools. These costs were: Jones County, $123, Laurel, $75, and Ellisville, $72." (p. 92)

(E-71-1 Survey published in November 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.)

LAWRENCE COUNTY

Enrollment

The enrollment of white children in 1955-56 was 1,890 pupils. (p. 10)

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

The white pupil-teacher ratio was 25.9 to 1. There were 1,393 Negro pupils enrolled. The Negro pupil-teacher ratio was 35.7 to 1. (pp. 64, 69)

Expenditures

The budget for the year 1954-55 reveals that the county budgeted for 1,800 white children in average daily attendance at a cost of $160.41 per child for a term of 8 months. It budgeted for 1,187 Negroes at a cost of $103.83 per child for 8 months. Thus, approximately 50 per cent more is being spent for each white child than for each Negro child in Lawrence County. This fact should be given careful consideration. (p. 72)

(E-73-1 Survey published in 1956 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings)

MARION COUNTY AND THE CITY OF COLUMBIA

Enrollment

In 1954-55 there were 1,795 white and 2,344 Negro students enrolled in Marion County schools. (pp. 12,22)

The Columbia City school enrollment for the same year was 1,626 for white schools and 508 for the Negro school. (pp. 32, 37)

School Plant

Marion County is now providing eight schools for its white children. Half of these schools are high schools which have grades 1-12. . . .(pp. 48-49)

Marion County provides 6 schools for its Negro children. . . All buildings are publicly owned and grades 1-12 are taught at all except Expose, where only grades 1-8 are taught. A study of the pictures will indicate the condition of most of these buildings. Some few are very good, but most of them are totally unfit for school use. . . .(p. 61)

The Columbia public schools are housed in three buildings for whites and one for Negroes. (p. 70)

(E-74-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings)

PANOLA COUNTY AND COMO AND SARDIS SEPARATE DISTRICTS

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

Ninety-seven white teachers instruct 2,250 white children; 101 Negro teachers instruct 3,400 Negro children. ". . . The difference between the number of instructional staff is readily seen. A difference is also apparent in the Como schools with 11 white teachers and 178 white pupils compared with 8 Negro teachers and 303 Negro children; likewise, in Sardis with 17 white teachers and 349 white pupils compared with 10 Negro teachers and 327 Negro children". (p. 29)

Instructional Program

As is generally true in the state of Mississippi, the curriculum in the Negro schools is limited in scope and in sequence. Most of this is due to the lack of money available for teachers, for supplies and for buildings. Panola County and its separate districts find themselves in the situation of other Mississippi communities. The Negro secondary schools are even more retarded in cirriculum offerings than the elementary schools. This is due in part to the fact that few of the total number of Negroes enrolled in the first grade enter the high school. Thus, the limited enrollment plus other factors deters the development of a sound curriculum. Special attention is called to the fact that in grades seven and eight one of the weakest sections of the curriculum occurs, which may have a decided effect upon the elimination of many boys and girls from the schools at this particular point. It may be said that throughout the entire county no high school for Negroes exists which presents a curriculum attractive enough to hold boys and girls in school. The needs of these youngsters are not being met. They undoubtedly know this, and withdraw from school at an early age. . . .(pp. 41-42)

School Plant

As a whole, the white schools are far better than the Negro schools. With the possible exception of Blackjack and Union most of the white children in Panola County attend schools which are housed in acceptable buildings. In some instances, such as the Batesville High School and the elementary schools at Pope and Batesville, unusually good facilities exist. Among the Negro schools, however, the situation is reversed. Few buildings of any quality exist for Negroes. The better ones are located at Batesville and Como with

one small building at Crenshaw. The remainder of the Negro children are too often housed in private buildings, poorly adapted to the needs of the school. It is perhaps fortunate that no great investment now exists in the rural sections in the county for Negroes. The abandonment of any attendance centers now will not mean any great capital loss to the county and will make much easier the establishment of attendance centers at the proper places. (p. 45)

Expenditures

The per capita expenditure on white pupils in all of the school districts in Panola County varies from a low of $140 to a high of $280. The expenditure per capita on Negro children in the county was $70; in Como, $78, and in Sardis, $86. (pp. 58-59)

(E-4-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay)

PEARL RIVER COUNTY AND POPLARVILLE AND PICAYUNE SEPARATE DISTRICTS

School Plant

The buildings in this county range from good to poor. Some are not suitable for schools. It might be said that the housing of the Negro children in the county is substandard in every instance. . . .(p. 61)

Expenditures

For a term of 8 months in 1954-55, $158.18 was budgeted for each of the 2,237 white children in Pearl River County. For the same time, $79.02 was budgeted for each of the 184 Negro children. This shows that Pearl River County is spending two dollars for each white child where they spend one for each Negro. This situation should be corrected at the earliest possible date. . . . (p. 116)

Poplarville budgeted for 440 white children in average daily attendance in 1954-55 for a period of nine months at a cost of $151.85. They also budgeted for 186 Negro pupils for a nine months' program at a cost of $108.61. For every two dollars spent on Negroes, three dollars are spent on whites. There is a decided need for improving the Negro education at the Poplarville Schools. (p. 123)

[In 1960-61, Poplarville District spent $57.96 for the instruction of each white child and $18.69 for the instruction of each Negro child.]

In 1954-55, $170.29 per child was budgeted for 1,082 white children for a term of nine months. At the same time, $96.00 per child was budgeted for 606 Negro children for a term of nine months which shows that almost twice as much is spent for each white child as for each Negro child. (p. 127)

[In 1960-61, Picayune spent $74.54 instructing each white child and $26.48 instructing each Negro child.]

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

Picayune is also attempting to give its Negroes a good program of education. However, examination of the table which follows shows that the ratio of pupils to teachers is entirely too high. It is 41 1/2 which is 33.5 percent greater than the average for the State of Mississippi which is the highest in the nation. (p. 125)

(B-81-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings)

PERRY COUNTY AND THE CITY OF RICHTON

Enrollment

In 1954-55 the Perry County white school enrollment was 1,295 and 536 for Negro schools. (pp. 12, 24)

Enrollment for the city of Richton was 510 for whites and 187 for Negroes in 1954-55. (pp. 34, 39)

School Plant

There are seven white schools in Perry County and three Negro schools. "The housing for Negroes has been neglected and the facilities are very inadequate and in a very bad state of repair". All of the Negro schools were rated "poor" by the survey staff. (pp. 52, 65)

Richton schools are housed in five buildings for whites and two for Negroes. One of these is a church. (p. 68)

The Richton negro schools are in a deplorable condition so far as housing is concerned. One of the schools, which is called Happy Lilly or McSwain, is housed in a church. This building is not suitable for school activities. (p. 71)

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

In Perry County the ratio of pupils per teacher was 21.5-1 for white schools and 33.5-1 for Negro schools in 1954-55. (pp. 93, 99)

In the Richton white school the pupil-teacher ratio was reported as 32-1 and in the Negro schools it was reported as 37-1. (pp. 103, 105)

Expenditures

[In Perry County] the 1954-55 budget shows that for 1,300 children in average daily attendance the budget was $166.86 per child in average daily attendance. The schools are operated for a term of eight months. Perry County spends about 25 per cent more for its white children than it does for its Negroes, based on a budget of 538 negro children at a cost of $114.23 per child in average daily attendance for a period of eight months. (p. 99)

For 1954-55 the budget calls for an expenditure of $146.42 per pupil for 415 white children in average daily attendance for eight months school, whereas, for the 157 Negroes in average daily attendance, the expenditure was only $75.13 per pupil. Richton is spending twice as much on its white children as it is on its Negroes, and both schools are operating for eight months only. (p. 103)

(E-75-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings)

PIKE COUNTY AND SUMMIT, McCOMB, FERNWOOD, AND MAGNOLIA SEPARATE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

General Description

This chapter points out that many schools in this county, both white and Negro, are operating for less than 9 months. It shows that the pupil-teacher ratio has a wide range in the various schools. In the Negro schools the ratio, in most cases, is unfavorable. . . .

Expenditures

The budget for the year 1954 reveals that Pike County budgeted for an average daily attendance of 1,186 [white] children at a cost of $174.45 per child for 8 months. Compared to this figure is the budget for the average daily attendance of 1,670 Negroes at a cost of $83.60 per child. This means that the county is spending approximately twice as much on the white child as on the Negro child.

The budget for the year 1954-55 reveals that Fernwood budgeted for an average daily attendance of 201 white children at a cost of $151.86 for 9 months. In comparison is the budget for the average daily attendance of 345 Negro children at a cost of $97.70 for 9 months. This means that Fernwood spent 50% more for each white child than it did for each Negro child.

The budget for the year 1954 reveals that Magnolia budgeted for an average daily attendance of 508 [white] pupils at a cost of $167.19 for 9 months for each child. Compared to this figure is the budget for an average daily attendance of 502 Negro children at a cost of $78.18 per child for 8 months. This means that Magnolia is spending twice as much on each white child as it is on each Negro child. Furthermore this does not take into consideration the high school Negroes.

The budget for 1954 reveals that McComb budgeted for an average daily attendance of 1,369 white children at a cost [of] $145.19 for each child for 9 months. Compared to this is the budget for the average daily attendance of 583 Negro children at a cost of $104.35 for 9 months. This means that McComb is spending approximately 50% more on each white child than on each Negro child.

The budget for 1954 reveals that Osyka budgeted for an average daily attendance of 133 white pupils at a cost of $154.66 per child for 8 months. In comparison $63.08 per child was budgeted for 68 Negro children in average daily attendance for 8 months. This means that Osyka is spending more than twice as much on each white child as it is on each Negro child.

. . . The budget for 1954-55 reveals that Summit budgeted for the average daily attendance of 271 white children at a cost of $169.15 for 9 months. Compared to this is the budget for the average daily attendance of 343 Negro children at a cost of $64.81 for a period of 9 months. This means that Summit is spending approximately 3 times as much on each white child as on each Negro. Attention is called to the fact that the Negro schools run for 8 months and the white schools run for 9 months, and that the high school students of Summit attend the Pike County A.H.S.

The budget for the year 1954-55 reveals that Universal budgeted for an average daily attendance of 246 Negroes at a cost of $93.22 for the term of 9 months. The white children in this district attend McComb on a tuition basis. According to the budget $273.11 per child for 9 months is spent for the 41 children in average daily attendance. In other words, for each white child Universal receives 3 times as much as for each Negro. (pp. 187-189)

(E-54-1 Survey published in 1956 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.)

PRENTISS COUNTY AND BALDWYN SEPARATE SCHOOL DISTRICT

School Plant

[White schools] At the time of this survey Prentiss County operated 13 schools. In addition, schools were operated by the Baldwyn Separate School District at Baldwyn and Pratt. . . Of the 13 white schools in Prentiss County, seven enrolled pupils in grades one through 12, and six enrolled pupils in grades one through eight. . . (p. 19)

Prentiss County had only three schools for Negroes in 1955-56. None of these centers presents a good condition. The schools at Baldwyn, Lincoln, and Carver should be abandoned. At Booneville, if sufficient care is taken and considerable money spent, some of the new building might be salvaged. However, the remainder of the plant should be abandoned. . . in the long run a completely new plant may be more economical. (pp. 27, 47-54)

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

In 1955-56 there were 132 teachers instrucing the white boys and girls in the Prentiss County schools and 23 in the Baldwyn Separate School District schools, a total of 155 teachers. . . (p. 24)

There were 15 1/2 teachers instructing the Negro boys and girls in the Prentiss County schools and nine teachers in the Baldwyn Separate School District school. This provides approximately the number of teachers both in the Baldwyn and Prentiss County schools that would be allowed on the basis of one teacher for each 30 pupils in average daily attendance. (p. 28)

(E-35-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Prentiss County and Baldwyn Separate School District)

QUITMAN COUNTY AND MARKS SEPARATE DISTRICT

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

One hundred and six white teachers instructed the 2,482 white children in average daily attendance in 1954-55. Ninety-six Negro teachers instructed the 3,025 Negro children in average daily attendance in that school year. (pp. 16-17, 25-26)

School Plant

Most of the schools for Negroes in Quitman County are located in churches. In these churches one or more teachers conduct classes in all grades from one through eight, as needed..In only Lambert in the county schools and in Marks in the separate school district are there enough teachers so that a teacher may have only one grade to teach. (p. 27)

Expenditures

In the county, expenditure per white pupil ranges from $231 to $131. The expenditure per Negro pupil is $82. In Marks Separate District, $186 is spent on the white, $96 on the Negro child. (p. 51)

(E-5-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay)

STONE COUNTY

School Plant

. . . It might be said that the housing of the negro children is substandard in every instance, however it must be said that a good negro school is under construction at the Stone County Training School. . . . (p. 39)

Expenditures

In 1954, this county budgeted $157.71 per white child and $111.47 per Negro child in average daily attendance. (pp. 70, 72)

(E-32-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings and Dr. Raymond M. Ainsley)

TALLAHATCHIE COUNTY

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

. . . In comparing 108 white teachers instructing some 2,200 white children, with 128 Negro teachers instructing 4,000 Negro children, the difference between the number of instructional staff is readily seen. (pp. 32-33)

School Plant

Most of the schools for Negroes in Tallahatchie County are located in churches. In these churches one or more teachers conduct classes in all grades from one through eight, as needed. . . . It is the rare instance where a teacher has only one grade to teach. (p. 33)

The Negro elementary schools housed as they are, in most instances, in buildings completely inadequate for a modern instructional program, obviously could present only the most meager curricular offerings. . . .

The limited offerings in the seventh, eighth and ninth grades in the Negro schools is too often merely duplication of work offered in lower grades. . . (pp. 38-39)

The report recommends that 53 of the 59 schools used to house Negro children this school year (1955) be abandoned. (p. 74)

Expenditures

. . . It may be seen from the table that the per pupil cost for white schools ranges from $53.93 in the Charleston school to $694.70 in the Glendora school. The range for the Negro school per pupil cost is listed as $19.80 for the Glendora pupils to $52.50 for the Sumner pupils. . . . (p.58)

(E-6-1 Survey published in 1955 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John B. Phay)

UNION COUNTY AND NEW ALBANY SEPARATE DISTRICT

School Plant

Most of the county schools for Negroes in Union County are located in churches or non-public buildings. The Negro school in the New Albany Separate School District has an attractive brick classroom building and several less desirable frame buildings. In the county schools, one, two or three teachers conduct classes in all grades from one through eight, as needed. The number of classes assigned to each teacher varies with the school location and the number of children. One teacher may teach grades one through eight, or three teachers might divide the grades. In none of the county schools for Negroes does a teacher have only one grade to teach. (p. 30)

Elementary Schools

The program of studies in the Negro elementary schools follows that of the white elementary schools. The exception is that there is little deviation from the program of studies outlined by the state of Mississippi in the state adopted textbook program. This, again, is the condition which is found in most of the Negro elementary schools in Mississippi and again Union County follows the rule and is not an exception. It may be noted, however, that in the Negro elementary schools, the quality of education and the materials available for teaching seem to be far below that in the white schools. This is due in part to the poor physical surroundings. . . . (pp. 36-37)

High School

The only Negro high school in the county is the Union County Training School in New Albany. This high school offers 20 subjects consisting of the traditional college entrance requirements plus work in home economics and agriculture. This is a limited program of studies for Negro boys and girls. Only a limited amount of materials of instruction and laboratory equipment are available. (p. 45)

Expenditures

In the New Albany Separate School District, $171 is budgeted for each white child and $123 for each Negro child. In Union County itself less money was budgeted for both white and Negro children but almost without exception far more was budgeted for the white child than for the Negro child. (pp. 55-58)

(E-22-1 Survey published in 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay)

WAYNE COUNTY

School Plant

Nine schools for Negroes are provided - four are privately owned including one church; three are rated "abandon", two, "unsatisfactory" or partially so. Six schools for whites are provided - all are publicly owned; none of them receive ratings as low as the Negro schools. (pp. 43, 53)

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

... The teacher-pupil ratio is favorable as far as the white children are concerned since in general it is beneath that of the State. For the Negroes the ratio is above the state average. (p. 80)

Expenditures

The budget for the year 1954-55 reveals that the county budgeted for 2,363 white children in average daily attendance at a cost of $159.27 per child per term of 8 months. The budget for the 1,671 Negroes in average daily attendance was $75.99 each for a term of 8 months. Wayne County is spending twice as much for the education of each white child as it is for each Negro. This condition should be corrected. (pp. 80-81)

(E-66-1 Survey published in 1956 by the Department of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings)

YALOBUSHA COUNTY

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

Seventy-three white teachers instructed 1,688 white children in average daily attendance in 1955-56. Fifty-two Negro teachers instructed 1,543 Negro children in average daily attendance during the same school year. (pp. 20-24)

School Plant

... It should be noted that both in the quality and quantity of housing, in the availability of instructional materials, and in the general environment, the Negro elementary schools are below those of the white schools in their neighborhood. These are factors which influence and control the program of studies. (p. 29)

Four new school houses were constructed for Negroes between 1952-1955. (p. 40)

(E-24-1 Survey published in 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay)

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NUMBER 11(b) AS TO THE NAME AND ADDRESS OF EACH WITNESS THE UNITED STATES INTENDS TO CALL OR OTHERWISE USE AT THE TRIAL OF THIS CAUSE TO SHOW THAT PUBLIC EDUCATION FACILITIES PROVIDED FOR NEGROES IN MISSISSIPPI WERE AND ARE INFERIOR TO THOSE PROVIDED FOR WHITE PERSONS.

The United States intends to rely principally on the documents listed in answer to Question 11(c) in proving that public educational facilities provided for Negroes in Mississippi were and are inferior to those provided for white persons. Such persons as are necessary to establish the authenticity of these documents will be called. The identity of those persons has not yet been determined. No decision has at this time been made as to whether any other witnesses will be called specifically to testify about this issue. All witnesses, white and Negro, who testify may be asked about their educational experience in Mississippi and their personal knowledge of the educational system.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NUMBER 11(c) AS TO THE SPECIFIC DOCUMENTS THE UNITED STATES INTENDS TO USE TO PROVE THAT THE PUBLIC EDUCATION FACILITIES PROVIDED FOR NEGROES IN MISSISSIPPI WERE AND ARE INFERIOR TO THOSE PROVIDED FOR WHITE PERSONS.

The United States intends to rely on the following documents to prove that public education facilities provided for Negroes in Mississippi were and are inferior to those provided for white persons:

E-O-1 Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Education of the State of Mississippi for the Year Ending Dec. 31, 1872, transmitted to the Legislature, March 1873.

E-O-2 Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1889-1890 and 1890-1891.

E-O-3 Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for Scholastic Years 1891-1892 and 1892-1893.

E-O-4 Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for Scholastic Years 1899-1900 and 1900-1901.

E-O-5 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1909-1910 and 1910-1911.

E-O-6 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1927-1928 and 1928-1929.

E-O-7 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1929-1930 and 1930-1931.

E-O-8 Twenty Years of Progress 1910-1930 and A Biennial Survey, Scholastic Years 1929-1930 and 1930-1931 of Public Education in Mississippi, Issued by W. F. Bond, State Superintendent of Education.

E-O-9 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi, for the Scholastic Years 1931-1932 and 1932-1933.

E-O-10 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1933-1934 and 1934-1935.

E-O-11 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1935-1936 and 1936-1937.

E-O-12 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1937-1938 and 1938-1939.

E-O-13 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1939-1940 and 1940-1941.

E-O-14 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1941-1942 and 1942-1943.

E-O-15 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1943-1944 and 1944-1945.

E-O-16 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1945-1946 and 1946-1947.

E-O-17 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1947-1948 and 1948-1949.

E-O-18 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1949-1950 and 1950-1951.

E-O-19 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1951-1952 and 1952-1953.

E-O-20 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1953-1954 and 1954-1955.

E-O-21 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1955-1956 and 1956-1957.

E-O-22 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1957-1958 and 1958-1959.

E-O-23 Biennial Report and Recommendations of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Scholastic Years 1959-1960 and 1960-1961.

E-O-24 Biennial Report of the Secretary of State to the Legislature of Mississippi, Oct. 1, 1921, to Oct. 1, 1923.

E-O-25 Biennial Report of the Secretary of State to the Legislature of Mississippi, Oct. 1, 1923, to Oct. 1, 1925.

E-O-26 Biennial Report of the Secretary of State to the Legislature of Mississippi, Oct. 1, 1927, to Oct. 1, 1929.

E-O-27 Mississippi Blue Book: Biennial Report of the Secretary of State to the Legislature of Mississippi, July 1, 1929, to July 1, 1931.

E-O-28 Mississippi Blue Book: Biennial Report of the Secretary of State to the Legislature of Mississippi, July 1, 1933, to July 1, 1935.

E-O-29 Mississippi Blue Book: Biennial Report of the Secretary of State to the Legislature of Mississippi (1943-1945).

E-O-30 Mississippi Blue Book: Statistical Register of the State of Mississippi, issued by the Secretary of State for 1945-1949.

E-O-31 Mississippi Official and Statistical Register, issued by the Secretary of State for 1949-1951.

E-O-32 Mississippi Official and Statistical Register (1956-1960), issued by the Secretary of State of Mississippi.

E-O-33 Mississippi Official and Statistical Register (1960-1964), issued by the Secretary of State of Mississippi.

E-O-34 High Schools, Bulletin #23 (1921), State of Mississippi Department of Education.

E-O-35 Seventh Biennial Report and Brief Fourteen-Year Survey of Vocational Education in Mississippi to the Legislature of Mississippi for the Biennial Period Ending June 30, 1931.

E-O-36 Twenty-First Biennial Report on Vocational Education in Mississippi for Biennial Period Ending June 30, 1959.

E-O-37 A Report of the Committee of Investigation of the Teacher Training Facilities for Negroes in Mississippi, Bulletin #61 (1930), State of Mississippi, Department of Education.

E-O-38 Let Us Pay for the Kind of Education We Need: Report of a Study of State and Local Support of Mississippi's Schools, William P. McLure, Director, Bureau of Educational Research, and Associate Professor of Education, School of Education, University of Mississippi.

E-O-39 A Report to the People of Mississippi on the White House Conference on Education, Bulletin No. 140 (Dec. 1955), State Department of Education.

E-O-40 Public Education in Mississippi; Reports of Advisory Study Groups to the Legislative Education Study Committee (Dec. 1961), vol. 1.

E-O-41 Public Education in Mississippi: Report of Mississippi Legislative Education Study Committee, Dec. 1961.

E-O-42 Biennial Report of the Board of Trustees of Mississippi State Institutions of Higher Learning, 1934-1935.

E-O-43 Higher Education in Mississippi: A Report to the Board of Trustees, Institutions of Higher Learning (1945), Joseph F. Gibson, Director.

E-O-44 Biennial Report of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning, July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1949, to the State Legislature.

E-O-45 Biennial Report of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning from July 1, 1949, to June 30,1951, to the State Legislature.

E-O-46 Higher Education in Mississippi: A Survey Report to the Board of Trustees, Institutions of Higher Learning (1954), John E. Brewton, Director.

E-O-47 Report of the State Educational Finance Commission, June 1, 1954-June 30, 1955, Department Reports, State of Mississippi, Vol. 1, 1953-1955.

E-O-48 Biennial Report of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning from July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1955, to the State Legislature, Department Reports, State of Mississippi, Vol. 1, 1953-1955.

E-O-49 Report of the State Educational Finance Commission, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1961. Department Reports, State of Mississippi, Vol. 1, 1959-1961.

E-O-50 Biennial Report of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1961, to the State Legislature, State of Mississippi. Department Reports, State of Mississippi, 1959-1961.

E-O-51 Public Education in Mississippi: Reports of Advisory Study Groups (Vol. II), Institutions of Higher Learning, 1961.

E-O-52 Libraries in Mississippi: A Report of a Survey of Library Facilities, 1946-1947. Augusta B. Richardson, Chairman, State Survey Committee.

E-O-53 Twelfth Biennial Report of the Mississippi State Library Commission of the State of Mississippi, 1947-1949.

E-O-54 People Without Books: An Analysis of Library Services in Mississippi. Bureau of Public Administration, University of Mississippi (1950).

E-O-55 Fifteenth Biennial Report of the Mississippi Library Commission, July 1, 1953-June 30, 1955.

E-O-56 A Survey of the Plant Facilities of the Public Schools of Mississippi: General Summary by the Mississippi State Department of Education (1934).

E-O-57 Public Schools for White Children, School Session 1954-1955. State of Mississippi Department of Education.

E-O-58 Public Schools for Negro Children, 1954-1955 School Session. State of Mississippi Department of Education.

E-O-59 Public Schools in Mississippi, School Session 1958-1959. Division of Administration and Finance, State Department of Education.

E-O-60 Public Schools in Mississippi, Session 1959-1960. Division of Administration and Finance, State Department of Education.

E-O-61 Public Schools in Mississippi, Session 1961-1962. Division of Administration and Finance, State Department of Education.

E-O-62 Mississippi Public Secondary Schools Enrollment and Staff, 1961-1962. Division of Administration and Finance, State Department of Education.

E-O-63 Special Salary Tabulations, Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance (May, 1958).

E-O-64 Special Salary Tabulations, Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance (March, 1963).

E-O-65 Statistical Data on School Session 1949-1950. Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

E-O-66 Statistical Data, School Session 1951-1952. Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

E-O-67 Statistical Data, 1952-1953. Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

E-O-68 Statistical Data, 1953-1954. Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

E-O-69 Statistical Data, 1954-1955. Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

E-O-70 Statistical Data, 1955-1956. Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

E-O-71 Statistical Data, 1957-1958. Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

E-O-72 Statistical Data, 1958-1959. Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

E-O-73 Statistical Data, 1959-1960. Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

E-O-74 Statistical Data, 1960-1961. Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

E-0-75 Statistical Date, 1961-62. Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

E-0-76 A Report to the Mississippi State Legislature by the Recess Education Committee, March 1953.

E-0-77 Southern School News, February 1962. (p. 6)

E-38-1 School Survey - The City of Natchez and Adams County.

Survey published in 1955 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings and Dr. Raymond M. Ainsley.

E-46-1 School Survey - Amite County.

Survey published in 1956 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-14-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Benton County.

Survey published in June 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.

E-39-1 School Survey - The City of Port Gibson and Claiborne County.

Survey published in 1955 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings and Dr. Raymond M. Ainsley.

E-29-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Clay County and West Point Separate School District.

Survey published in May 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.

E-67-1 School Survey - Covington County.

Survey published in 1956 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-68-1 School Survey - The City of Hattiesburg and Forrest County.

Survey published in 1955 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings and Dr. R. A. Ainsley.

E-69-1 School Survey - Greene County.

Survey published in 1956 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-48-1 School Survey - Franklin County.

Survey published in 1955 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-77-1 School Survey - George County.

Survey published in 1956 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-16-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Grenada County and Grenada Separate School District.

Survey published in July 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.

E-50-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Holmes County, Durant Separate School District and Lexington Separate School District.

Survey published in June 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.

E-80-1 Separate School Districts of Lyon, Long Point, Ocean Springs, and Pascagoula and Jackson County.

Survey published in 1956 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-41-1 School Survey - Jefferson County.

Survey published in 1955 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings and Dr. Raymond M. Ainsley.

E-70-1 School Survey - Jefferson Davis County.

Survey published in 1956 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-71-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Jones County and the Laurel and Ellisville Separate School Districts.

Survey published in November 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.

E-73-1 School Survey - Lawrence County.

Survey published in 1956 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-74-1 School Survey - City of Columbia and Marion County.

Survey published in 1955 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-18-1 The Report of a Study of the Holly Springs Separate School District.

Survey published in August 1949 by the School of Education, University of Mississippi.

E-4-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Panola County and Como and Sardis Separate School Districts.

Survey published in December 1955 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.

E-81-1 School Survey - The Cities of Picayune and Poplarville and Pearl River County.

Survey published in 1955 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-54-1 School Survey - The Separate School Districts of Fernwood, Magnolia, McComb, Osyka, and Summit and Pike County.

Survey published in 1956 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-35-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Prentiss County and Baldwyn Separate School District.

E-75-1 School Survey - City of Richton and Perry County.

Survey published in 1955 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-5-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Quitman County and Marks Separate School District.

Survey published in December 1955 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.

E-32-1 School Survey - Stone County.

Survey published in 1955 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings and Dr. Raymond M. Ainsley.

E-12-1 The Report of a Study of the Education for Negroes in Sunflower County.

Survey published in March 1950 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.

E-6-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Tallahatchie County.

Survey published in April 1955 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.

E-22-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Union County and New Albany Separate District.

Survey published in January 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John E. Phay.

E-66-1 School Survey - Wayne County.

Survey published in 1956 by the Dept. of Educational Administration, Mississippi Southern College, under the direction of Dr. Ralph S. Owings.

E-24-1 The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Yalobusha County.

Survey published in June 1956 by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, under the direction of Dr. John B. Phay.

E-0-78 Speech of Governor Vardaman of Mississippi quoted in the Jackson, Mississippi Daily Clarion-Ledger. July 11, 1907

E-0-79 Message by Governor Fielding L. Wright to the Joint Session Mississippi Legislature, January 3, 1950.

E-0-80 Message from Governor White to the Senate of Mississippi, 1953
Extraordinary Session Senate Journal, p. 970.

Analysis of Educational Facilities Afforded to Negroes and Whites in the State of Louisiana

[The following material is an extract from the brief of the United States filed in United States v. Board of Registration of Louisiana, (C.A. No. 2866, E.D. La.)]

From at least 1900 to the present time, the State of Louisiana has consistently and deliberately provided Negroes with an educational system both segregated from and inferior to that provided for white persons. It is only since 1955 that the two systems have been remotely comparable. In any case, whatever changes have been made since 1955 affect very few of the vast number of Negroes who are of voting age today in Louisiana and are not registered to vote. The Negroes who today are eligible by age to vote were of school age during earlier periods, and for that reason an analysis of the constitutional validity of voter registration tests must look to the educational opportunities afforded Negroes during the critical school age periods.

Facts derived exclusively from the annual reports of the Louisiana State Superintendent of Schools show that the adult Negro of today who has grown up in Louisiana was given little opportunity to develop intellectual tools to meet stringent voter registration educational requirements on the same basis as the typical adult white person. In every particular, Negro schools have been inferior to white schools.

A. The Value of Public Schools

Prior to 1955, the typical Negro school was worth almost nothing compared to the typical white school. For example, in 1910 the average white school was worth more than 10 times that of the average Negro school.[1/] In the same year the total value of all white schools

---

1/ Table I, Appendix A.

was 23 times that of the value of all Negro schools,[2] although Negroes constituted 44% of the school-age population.[3] This disparity persisted so that in 1950, when Negroes constituted 39% of the school-age population,[4] the total value of all white schools was seven times that of the total value of all Negro schools, and the average white school was worth eleven times that of the average Negro school.[5]

B. Expenditure Per Student

Another important distinction is in annual expenditures per student. In 1920 Louisiana spent an average of $33.71 for each white pupil enrolled in school, but only $7.81 for each Negro pupil enrolled.[6] In 1940 it spent $69.37 for each white student and $16.88 for each Negro student.[7]

C. Enrollment and Attendance

Lack of funds inevitably resulted in a lower percentage of enrollment and of daily attendance of Negro school-age children compared to the enrollment and daily

---

2/ Ibid.

3/ Table II, Appendix A.

4/ Ibid.

5/ Table I, Appendix A.

6/ Table III, Appendix A.

7/ Ibid.

attendance of white school-age children. For example, in 1910 75.9% of the white "educables" were enrolled in schools compared to only 46.3% of the Negro "educables."[8/] The percentage in average daily attendance was 46% of the white pupils but only 24% of the Negro pupils.[9/] By 1940 the difference had been reduced to 78% of the white children enrolled compared to 73.9% of the Negro children enrolled.[10/]

D. Length of School Terms

In 1910 the school term for white students was 153 days, for Negro students only 90 days.[11/] The better enrollment figures for 1940 (see Section C above) are less impressive in light of the continued disparity in length of school terms, which in that year was 180 days for white students and 147 days for Negro students.[12/]

E. Salaries of Teachers

Prior to 1945 Negro teachers received less than one-half of the salaries received by white teachers. In 1920 the average annual salary was $1198.98 for white teachers (male) and $374.37 for Negro teachers

---

8/ Table IV, Appendix A.

9/ Ibid.

10/ Ibid.

11/ Table V, Appendix A.

12/ Ibid.

(male).[13] In 1940 the average salaries were $1,044.89 for white teachers and $377.06 for Negro teachers.[14] By 1955 the two pay scales were brought into substantial equality.[15]

F. Pupil-Teacher Ratio

In 1920 the ratio was 33 white pupils per teacher and 64 Negro pupils per teacher.[16] By 1940 the white ratio had dropped to 28:1 for the white students and 42:1 for the Negro students.[17]

G. The Education and Qualifications of Teachers

The scarcity of opportunities for secondary education for Negroes posed a serious educational disadvantage, and made it impossible for the Negro school system to produce a sufficient supply of qualified teachers. In 1925 there were 318 accredited white high schools but not a single accredited Negro high school.[18] Ten years later there were only six accredited Negro high schools.[19] As late as 1950, there were 362 accredited white high schools but 98 accredited Negro high schools.[20]

13/ Table VI, Appendix A.

14/ Ibid.

15/ Ibid.

16/ Table VII, Appendix A.

17/ Ibid.

18/ Table VIII, Appendix A.

19/ Ibid.

20/ Ibid.

As a result, most Negro students were taught by teachers who were not college trained. In 1930, only 17% of the Negro teachers held Bachelor's degrees, compared to 41% of the white teachers.[21] By 1940, only 38% of the Negro teachers compared to 78% of the white teachers had such degrees.[22] Between 1930 and 1945 the number of white teachers with Master's degrees was more than ten times the number of Negro teachers with such degrees.[23]

H. One-Room Schools Versus Consolidation

School consolidation in the Negro system in Louisiana lagged far behind that in the white school system. In 1920 State Superintendent of Schools L. H. Harris said that "as an educational institution the one-room school is sadly and fatally weak when compared with the larger type school."[24] But in 1925 Superintendent Harris felt constrained to state why consolidation was not taking place within the Negro school system:

> The reasons accounting for the retention of the one room negro school are quite obvious: first, the negro school is required to meet public demands in a particular community, and, second, public sentiment in Louisiana would not endorse the proposition of providing transportation for negro children at public expense. 25/

21/ Table IX, Appendix A.

22/ Ibid.

23/ Ibid.

24/ Annual Report of State Superintendent of Schools, 1920, p. 86.

25/ Annual Report, 1925, p. 45.

In 1915 there were 1,251 single-teacher schools for white students and 1,011 for Negro students.[26] In the next fifteen years, the process of consolidation reduced the number of one-teacher white schools to 339. In the same period, however, the number of one-teacher Negro schools actually increased to 1,042.[27] By 1950 the one-teacher white school was practically extinct (there were 36 remaining), while 500 one-teacher Negro schools were still operating.[28]

I. State Policy Fostered Inferior Education for Negroes

Discrimination against Negroes in education was the product of a conscious state policy, a policy explained and justified in 1915 by the State Superintendent of Schools in the following terms:

> ....we have taken the position that our first duty was to provide good schools for the white race, attacking the problem of negro education after the performance of that first duty. 29/
>
> * * * * *
>
> I think our first duty was to provide good schools for the white children before undertaking seriously the education of the negro children. 30/

and again in 1925:

> If we should use the foregoing table [Showing Data on Wealth, Expenditures and Population] as a basis of comparison

---

26/ Table XI, Appendix A.

27/ Ibid.

28/ Ibid.

29/ 1915 Report, p. 26.

30/ Id. at p. 62.

> with any of the progressive states having white populations, we should probably not make the most favorable showing, for the negroes are included with the whites in this discussion. If we should exclude the negroes and confine the figures to the white population, white school children and expenditures on white schools, the evidences of progress would be much more apparent, and in that case we should, I think, take our place in the same class with the half-dozen most progressive states in the country. 31/

* * * * *

> In 1900 the public schools reached only 32% of the negro school population, in 1910 only 36%, in 1920 51%, while last year the public schools enrolled 56% of the Negro educables. The advancement in the development of negro schools has been as rapid perhaps as it should have been, for it has been in keeping with the public sentiment.... 32/

In 1930 Superintendent Harris made a candid admission in discussing Louisiana's high rate of illiteracy:

> This heavy percentage of illiteracy was due to the fact that until recently little or nothing was done in negro education, with the result that practically all of the negroes were classed as illiterates 33/

And in 1935 the Superintendent posed a series of "Questions for School Officials" as a technique for evaluating parish school systems. The questions included the following indication of an acceptable capital investment standard:

31/ 1925 Report, p. 17.

32/ Id. at p. 39.

33/ 1930 Report, p. 14.

> 10. Have you invested as much as $140 per pupil in buildings for whites and as much as $25 per pupil in buildings for negro schools? If not, you might consider additional expenditures for capital outlay. 34/

By 1945, the Superintendent felt it necessary to make a plea for the upgrading of Negro schools:

> ....More and better educational facilities for Negroes constitute one of our most serious educational and civic problems. Teachers and children cannot live, teach, and learn in schoolrooms that are overcrowded, uncomfortable, unhealthful, and that are three or more miles from the child's home. Too many Negro children are out of school, or attend schools that fail to meet their educational needs, because a school of suitable grade is not accessible. Our Negro schools need to be recognized so as to provide a school of suitable grade for every Negro child. 35/
>
> * * * * *
>
> Our Negro schools generally need more administrative and supervisory attention and assistance. Short school terms, limited school facilities, and poorly trained teachers contribute to the need for the best of school supervision. 36/

In 1942 the operations of Negro schools in Louisiana were intensively observed and analyzed by a special staff assembled by the Louisiana Educational Survey Commission. The report of this team of experts, entitled "The Negro Public Schools," was published in Volume IV of the

---

34/ 1935 Report, p. 84.

35/ 1945 Report, p. 46.

36/ Id. at 49.

Louisiana Educational Survey.[37] The report, compiled on the basis of personal observations and interviews conducted by staff members, provides an insight into what actually took place within the typical Negro school in Louisiana twenty years ago. The report tells the story of a grossly inadequate school system, a story which fills in the details suggested by the statistics reviewed above. Appendix A contains selected excerpts from the report. They demonstrate that as of 1942, and as a result of the State's policy of discrimination in education, Louisiana's Negroes were offered no educational opportunities of any significant value.[38]

After 1945 some small improvement came to the Negro school system in Louisiana, and as the tables in the Appendix show, substantial gains have been made since the

---

37/ The Louisiana Educational Survey was an exhaustive, ten-volume study of the state's public school system prepared by groups of experts under the direction of the Louisiana Educational Survey Commission, a body established for that purpose by the state legislature. Washburne, Louisiana Educational Survey: A Summary (Baton Rouge, 1942).

38/ The techniques of personal observation and interviews employed by the survey staff were not designed to yield statistically conclusive findings. The purpose instead was to gain a sufficiently comprehensive first-hand view of the Negro public schools to permit the making of sensible, useful, and detailed recommendations for the improvement of the Negro school system. The survey staff concentrated on Negro schools in the following twenty parishes: Claiborne, East Feliciana, Ouachita, St. Landry, Vernon, Washington, Webster, Avoyelles, Caddo, Concordia, East Carroll, Natchitoches, Richland, Ascension, Iberia, LaFourche, St. Martin, Calcasieu, Jefferson Davis, and St. Charles.

Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education, 357 U.S. 483 (1954). Nonetheless, 78.6% of Louisiana's non-white voting age population in 1960[39/] had entered or completed school by 1940, and no persons presently of voting age began their educations as late as 1954. Assuming, as we must, that inadequate training in the early years of one's education is a permanent handicap, it becomes clear that no native Louisiana Negro now of voting age has been free from the gross discrimination in education practiced as a matter of state policy prior to 1954.

The Fifteenth Amendment in these circumstances forbids the use of any voter registration test which bears a relationship to education achievement and which denies the right to vote to those who have been the victims of State-enforced inferior educational opportunities.

39/ Computed from 1960 U. S. Census, Louisiana, Vol. I, part 20, pp. 20-29.

APPENDIX A

MATERIALS ON EDUCATION

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TABLE I — COMPARISON OF THE TOTAL VALUE OF SCHOOL PROPERTY AND THE AVERAGE VALUE PER SCHOOL BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

TABLE II — COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF "EDUCABLES" (CHILDREN AGED 6 TO 18 YEARS) BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

TABLE III — COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURES FOR INSTRUCTION PER CHILD ENROLLED BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

TABLE IV — COMPARISON OF PER CENT OF "EDUCABLES" ENROLLED IN AND ATTENDING PUBLIC SCHOOL, BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962 (Beginning in 1945, figures in parentheses show the per cent of children enrolled in both public and private schools.)

TABLE V — COMPARISON OF AVERAGE LENGTH OF SCHOOL TERM BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS, 1900 TO 1962

TABLE VI — COMPARISON OF AVERAGE TEACHER'S SALARIES, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

TABLE VII — COMPARISON OF PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO BY ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

TABLE VIII — COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOLS, NUMBER ACCREDITED BY STATE AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS ABOVE SEVENTH GRADE BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

TABLE IX — COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF TEACHERS BY RACE AND YEAR, SHOWING NUMBER OF BACHELOR'S AND MASTER'S AND HIGHER DEGREES HELD AND PERCENT OF TEACHERS HOLDING BACHELOR'S DEGREES OR HIGHER, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

TABLE X — TOTAL ENROLLMENT IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS BY RACE AND YEAR (Beginning in 1945, figures in parentheses show total number of students enrolled in public and private schools)

TABLE XI — COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF SINGLE-TEACHER SCHOOLS IN THE STATE BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

TABLE XII — COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS PROVIDED FOR EACH RACE, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

TABLE XIII — COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF TEACHERS EMPLOYED BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

EXCERPTS FROM "THE NEGRO PUBLIC SCHOOLS," VOL. IV, SECTION 8 OF THE LOUISIANA EDUCATIONAL SURVEY (Baton Rouge 1942)

APPENDIX A

Bibliography For Education Materials

(Footnotes in the Tables in this Appendix cite to the Sources listed below by the indicated abbreviations)

Abbr.	Title
1900 Report	Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the General Assembly. 1900-1901. Baton Rouge: The Advocate, Official Journal of the State of Louisiana, 1902.
1905 Report	Same title. 1904-1905 Baton Rouge: The Times, Official Journal of Louisiana. 1905.
1910 Report	Biennial Report of the State Supt. of Public Educ. to the Governor & to the General Assembly. School Sessions of 1909/10 & 1910/11. Baton Rouge: Ramires-Jones Printing Co., 1912.
1915 Report	Biennial Report of the State Supt. of Public Education to the Governor & General Assembly of Louisiana. School Sessions 1911-12 - 1914-15. Baton Rouge: Ramires-Jones Printing Co., 1915.
1920 Report	Public School Situation in La. Session of 1919-1920. (Vol. I of Biennial Report, Sessions of 1919-20 & 1920-21) L.H. Harris, State Supt. of Public Educ., Baton Rouge.
1930 Report	State Dept. of Educ. of La. Eighty-First Annual Report for the Session 1929-30. Prepared by Jno. M. Foote, Div. of Reference & Service. Issued by L.H. Harris, State Supt. of Public Educ. Baton Rouge: Ramires-Jones Printing Co. 1930.
1940 Report	State Dept. of Educ. of La. 1941. Ninety-First Annual Report for the Session 1939-40. Prepared by Div. of Administration & Finance. Issued by John E. Coxe, State Supt. of Public Educ.
1950 Report	State Dept. of Educ. of La. 1951. One Hundred First Annual Report for the Session 1949-1950. Prepared by John A. Hunter, Supervisor of Statistics & Research. Issued by Shelby M. Jackson, State Supt. of Educ.

1960 Report — State Dept. of Educ. of La. 1960 *One Hundred Eleventh Annual Report for the Session 1959-60.* Issued by Shelby M. Jackson, State Supt. of Public Educ.

1961 Report — *112th Annual Report for the Session 1960-61.*

1945 Report — *96th Annual Report for the Session 1944-45* Prepared by M. S. Robertson, Research & Special Services. Issued by Joh.. E. Coxe, State Supt. of Public Educ. December 1945.

1955 Report — *106th Annual Report for the Session 1954-1955* Issued by Shelby M. Jackson, State Supt. of Educ.

1962 Report — *113th Annual Report for the Session 1961-62* Part II, Financial & Statistical Report.

Negro Educ. — Washburne, Carleiou, Director, Louisiana Educational Survey; *Survey of Elementary Education* Section 8: *The Negro Public Schools* by Charles S. Johnson & Staff Baton Rouge: Louisiana Educational Survey Commission, 1942.

U.S. Census — *18th Decennial Census of the United States Census of Population: 1960* Volume I: *Characteristics of the Population.* Part 20: Louisiana U.S. Dept. of Commerce: Bureau of the Census, 1963.

APPENDIX A

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF THE TOTAL VALUE OF SCHOOL PROPERTY AND THE AVERAGE VALUE PER SCHOOL BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

	TOTAL VALUE		AVG. VALUE PER SCHOOL	
	WHITE	NEGRO	WHITE	NEGRO
1900	No data		No data	
1905	No data by race		No data by race	
1910	$6,503,019.57 1/	273,147.50 1/	2,764,88 2/	261.89 2/
1915	12,718,766.60 3/	579,414.13 4/	5,575.96 5/	503.86 6/
1920	22,498,303.00 7/	1,656,250.00 8/	10,612.40 9/	1,223.23 10/
1925	40,833,291.42 11/	2,151,224.47 12/	22,301.08 13/	1,504.35 14/
1930	No data		No data	
1935	46,294,002.86 15/	3,767,241.92 16/	No data for no. of schools	
1940	66,757,162.95 17/	5,857,433.54 17/	No data for no. of schools	
1945	78,681,499.03 18/	8,559,485.72 18/	89,512.51 19/	5,094.93 19/
1950	108,112,234.24 20/	15,752,339.88 20/	134,971.50 21/	12,098.57 21/
1955	207,118,656.03 22/	63,603,192.92 23/	254,445.50 24/	82,494.41 25/
1960	379,735,255.32 26/	150,529,009.27 27/	432,500.20 28/	296,901.30 29/
1961	400,958,168.19 30/	163,605,876.61 31/	445,509.08 32/	325,908.81 33/
1962	430,301,032.62 34/	174,031,716.47 35/	448,737.50 36/	345,987.50 37/

1/ 1910 Report, part II, p. 6.

2/ Computed from figures for total value of school property & no. of schools, 1910 Report, part II, p. 6.

3/ 1915 Report, part II, p. 11.

4/ Id. at p. 15.

5/ Computed from figures for total value of school property & no. of schools, Id. at pp. 15, 21.

6/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 15, 16.

7/ 1920 Report, Vol. I, p. 33.

8/ Id. at p. 45

9/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 33, 39.

10/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 45 & Volume II, part I, p. 5.

11/ 1925 Report. pp. 116-7.

12/ Id. at pp. 118-9.

13/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 116-7, 128-9.

14/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 118-9 128-9.

15/ 1935 Report, pp. 136-7.

16/ Id. at pp. 138-9.

17/ 1940 Report, p. 108.

18/ 1945 Report, p. 86.

19/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 86, 180.

20/ 1950 Report, pp. 206-7.

21/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 206-7, 268.

22/ 1955 Report, pp. 256-7.

23/ Id. at pp. 258-9.

24/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 256-7, 392-3.

25/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 258-9, 396-7.

26/ 1960 Report, pp. 304-5.

27/ Id. at pp. 306-7.

28/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 304-5, 538-49.

29/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 306-7, 552-63.

30/ 1961 Report, pp. 510-1.

31/ Id. at pp. 512-3.

32/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 502, 510-1.

33/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 502, 512-3.

34/ 1962 Report, pp. 336-7.

35/ Id. at pp. 338-9

36/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 332, 336-7.

37/ Computed from figures for total value, etc., Id. at pp. 332, 338-9.

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF "EDUCABLES" (CHILDREN AGED 6 TO 18 YEARS) BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

	WHITE	NEGRO	PERCENT OF TOTAL NUMBER OF EDUCABLES WHO WERE NEGRO
1900	204,827 1/	199,930 1/	49.4%
1905	241,906 2/	217,690 2/	47.4%
1910	275,087 3/	221,714 3/	44.6%
1915	310,562 4/	227,557 4/	42.2%
1920	335,854 5/	228,939 5/	40.5%
1925	358,930 6/	242,706 6/	40.3%
1930	394,456 7/	255,740 7/	39.3%
1935	382,711 8/	236,764 8/	38.2%
1940	382,711 9/	236,764 9/	38.2%
1945	387,829 10/	229,877 10/	37.2%
1950	426,556 11/	269,593 11/	38.7%
1955	484,118 12/	288,193 12/	37.3%
1960	596,737 13/	337,506 14/	36.1%
1961	613,403 15/	346,947 15/	36.1%
1962	629,153 16/	355,499 16/	36.1%

1/ 1900-01 Report, p. 40.

2/ 1905 Report, pp. 212-3.

3/ 1910 Report, p. 27.

4/ 1915 Report, part II, p. 18.

5/ 1920 Report, p. 31.

6/ 1925 Report, pp. 138-9.

7/ 1945 Report, p. 77 ("Trends" chart showing figures for past years).

8/ 1935 Report, p. 62.

9/ 1940 Report, "Trends" chart (no page number).

10/ 1945 Report, pp. 77-8.

11/ 1950 Report, pp. 132-3.

12/ 1955 Report, p. 176

13/ 1960 Report, pp. 112-3.

14/ Id. at pp. 114-5.

15/ 1961 Report, p. 23.

16/ 1962 Report, p. 37.

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURES FOR INSTRUCTION PER CHILD ENROLLED BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

	WHITE	NEGRO
1900	No data	
1905	No data	
1910	$ 13.00 1/	$ 2.56 1/
1915	2.58/month 2/	.87/month 3/
1920	33.71/year 4/	7.81/year 5/
1925	45.37 6/	8.33 6/
1930	52.75 7/	11.72 7/
1935	44.23 8/	7.87 8/
1940	69.37 9/	16.88 9/
1945	113.30 10/	34.06 10/
1950	127.33 11/	75.06 11/
1955	159.94 12/	116.25 12/
1960	222.03 13/	171.23 13/
1961	236.50 14/	182.10 14/
1962	237.60 15/	184.76 16/

1/ Computed by dividing "disbursements for teacher salaries" by enrollment, 1910 Report, part II, p. 6.

2/ 1915 Report, part II, p. 10.

3/ Id. at p. 16

4/ 1920 Report, p. 33.

5/ Id. at p. 36.

6/ 1925 Report, pp. 140-1.

7/ 1930 Report, p. 29.

8/ 1935 Report, p. 89.

9/ 1940 Report, "Trends" chart (no page number).

10/ 1945 Report, p. 78

11/ Computed by dividing figures for "cost of instructional service" by enrollment, 1950 Report, pp. 132-3, 186-7, 188-9.

12/ Computed by dividing figures for "cost of instructional service", etc., 1955 Report, pp. 176, 184.

13/ Computed by dividing figures for "cost of instructional service", etc., 1960 Report, pp. 120, 216-7.

14/ Computed by dividing figures for "cost of instructional service", etc., 1961 Report, pp. 134, 216-7.

15/ Computed by dividing figures for "cost of instructional service", etc., 1962 Report, pp. 38, 90-1.

16/ Computed by dividing figures for "cost of instructional service", etc., 1962 Report, pp. 38, 96-7.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF PER CENT OF "EDUCABLES" ENROLLED IN AND ATTENDING PUBLIC SCHOOL, BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 to 1962 (Beginning in 1945, figures in parentheses show the per cent of children enrolled in both public and private schools.)

	PER CENT ENROLLED		PER CENT IN AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE	
	WHITE	NEGRO	WHITE	NEGRO
1900	59 1/	32 2/	44 3/	24 3/
1905	59 4/	37 4/	41 5/	21 5/
1910	75.9 6/	46.3 6/	46 7/	24 7/
1915	79.4 8/	45.3 9/	57.5 8/	34 9/
1920	70 10/	51.4 11/	51 12/	35 13/
1925	73.8 14/	56.5 14/	60 15/	41 15/
1930	70.4 16/	60.1 17/	58 18/	49.7 19/
1935	77.3 20/	72.9 20/	64 21/	58 22/
1940	78 23/	73.8 23/	66 24/	60 24/
1945	67.9 25/ (81.3)	71.1 25/ (79.4)	58 26/	60 26/
1950	68.8 27/ (84.3)	67.6 27/ (75.4)	61 28/	58 28/
1955	73.4 29/ (91.3)	76.2 29/ (84.8)	65 30/	65 30/
1960	69.9 31/ (87.7)	79.2 32/ (86.6)	62.91 33/	68.9 33/
1961	69.9 34/ (88.5)	80.6 34/ (87.8)	64 35/	70.5 35/
1962	70 36/ (88.7)	81.7 36/ (88.6)	63.4 37/	70.9 37/

1/ 1900-01 Report, p. 44.

2/ Id. at p. 46

3/ Compiled from figures for average attendance & total number of educables, Id. at p. 24.

4/ 1905 Report, pp. 212-3. The figures given for % of Negroes enrolled is 37%; my computation from figures for enrollment & total educables gives 31%.

5/ Computed from figures for average attendance, etc., Ibid.

6/ 1910 Report, p. 27. The figures given for % of enrollment are 75.9% and 46.3% for whites and Negroes respectively; my computations from the figures for enrollment & total number of educables give 67.2% and 35.6% respectively.

7/ Computed from figures for average attendance, etc , Ibid.

8/ 1915 Report, part II, p. 46. Figures given for % of white enrollment is 79.4%. My computation from figures given for enrollment & no. of educables gives 68.7%.

9/ Id. at p. 16, Figure given for % of Negro enrollment is 45.3%. My computation from figures given for enrollment & no. of educables gives 40.1%.

10/ Computed from figures for enrollment & no. of educables, 1920 Report, Vol. I, pp. 31, 34.

11/ Computed from figures for enrollment, etc., Id. at pp. 31, 36.

12/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Id. at p. 34.

13/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Id. at p. 36.

14/ 1925 Report, pp. 138-9.

15/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Id. at

16/ Computed from figures for enrollment, etc., 1930 Report, pp. 66-7, 1945 Report, p. 77.

17/ Computed from figures for enrollment, etc., 1930 Report, pp. 70-1, 1945 Report, p. 77.

18/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Id. at pp. 66-7.

19/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Id. at pp. 70-1.

20/ Computed from figures for enrollment, etc., 1935 Report, pp. 62, 88.

21/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Id. at pp. 88, 148-9.

22/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Id. at pp. 88, 152-3.

23/ 1940 Report, "Trends" chart (no page number).

24/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Ibid, "Trends" chart, p. 108.

25/ 1945 Report, pp. 77-8. Private school figures, pp. 156-7.

26/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Ibid.

27/ From 1950 Report, pp. 132-3. Private school figures, pp. 222-5.

28/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Ibid.

29/ 1955 Report, p. 176. Private school figures, pp. 326-7, 346-7.

30/ Computed from figures for enrollment, etc., Ibid, p. 176. Private school figures, pp. 418-9.

31/ Computed from figures for enrollment, etc., 1960 Report, pp. 112-3, 120. Private school figures pp. 450-1.

32/ Computed from figures for enrollment, etc., Ibid, pp. 114-5, 120

33/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Ibid, p. 126. Private school figures pp. 388-9, 408-9.

34/ Computed from figures for enrollment, etc., 1961 Report, pp. 23, 134

35/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Ibid,, Private school figures, pp. 254-5.

36/ Computed from figures for enrollment, etc., 1962 Report, pp. 37, 38

37/ Computed from figures for attendance, etc., Ibid.

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE LENGTH OF SCHOOL TERM BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS, 1900 TO 1962.

	WHITE	NEGRO
1900	6 months 1/ (120 days)*	5 months 1/ (100 days)*
1905	7 months 2/ (140 days)*	4.5 months 2/ (90 days)*
1910	7.64 months 3/ (153 days)*	4.6 months 3/ (92 days)*
1915	7.67 months 4/ (153 days)*	4.33 months 4/ (87 days)*
1920	165 days 5/	114 days 6/
1925	170 days 7/	111 days 7/
1930	175 days 8/	106 days 9/
1935	177 days 10/	120 days 11/
1940	180 days 12/	147 days 12/
1945	180 days 13/	151 days 13/
1950	180 days 14/	171 days 15/
1955	178.3 days 16/	178 days 16/
1960	179.6 days 17/	179.7 days 18/
1961	179.4 days 19/	179.2 days 20/
1962	179.1 days 21/	179.3 days 22/

*Figures for days are calculated by using the State of Louisiana's conversion figure: 1 month = 20 days of instruction.

1/ P. 19, 1900-1901 Report

2/ P. 222, 1905 Report

3/ P. 28, 1910 Report

4/ P. 16, part II, 1915 Report

5/ P. 34, 1920 Report

6/ P. 36, 1920 Report.

7/ PP. 136-7, 1925 Report.

8/ PP. 66-7, 1930 Report.

9/ PP. 70-1, 1930 Report.

10/ PP. 146-7, 1935 Report.

11/ PP. 150-1, 1935 Report.

12/ "Trends" chart, 1940 Report (no page number).

13/ P. 77, 1945 Report.

14/ PP. 132-3, 1950 Report.

15/ PP. 236-7, 1950 Report.

16/ P. 176, 1955 Report.

17/ P. 474, 1960 Report.

18/ P. 476, 1960 Report.

19/ Computed by dividing figures for aggregate days attended by figures for average attendance, pp. 348-9, 1961 Report.

20/ Computed by dividing figures for aggregate days attended by figures for average attendance, pp. 368-9, 1961 Report.

21/ Computed by dividing figures for aggregate days attended by figures for average attendance, pp. 210-11, 1962 Report.

22/ Computed by dividing figures for aggregate days attended by figures for average attendance, pp. 228-9, 1962 Report.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE TEACHER'S SALARIES, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

	WHITE	NEGRO
1900	$ 37.11/month 1/	$ 24.31/month 2/
1905	men 61.67/mo. 3/ women 41.00/mo.	men 29.55/mo. 4/ women 26.77/mo.
1910	men 75.29/mo. 5/ women 50.80/mo.	men 34.25/mo. 6/ women 28.67/mo.
1915	59.75/mo. 7/	31.71/mo. 8/
1920	men 1198.98/yr. 9/ women 793.75/yr.	men 374.37/yr. 10/ women 369.00/yr.
1925	1052.81/yr. 11/	453.34/yr. 12/
1930	1101.88/yr. 13/	450.67/yr. 14/
1935	850.45/yr. 15/	274.25/yr 16/
1940	1044.89/yr. 17/	377.06/yr. 18/
1945	1639.70/yr. 19/	866.61/yr. 20/
1950	2993.81/yr. 21/	2434.71/yr. 22/
1955	3896.66/yr. 23/	3638.85/yr. 24/
1960	4792.95/yr. 25/	4619.85/yr. 26/
1961	5112.87/yr. 27	4918.45/yr. 28/
1962	5133.23/yr. 29/	4948.85/yr. 30/

1/ 1900-01 Report, p. 19.

2/ Ibid.

3/ 1905 Report, p. 122

4/ Ibid.

5/ 1910 Report, Part I, p. 28.

6/ Ibid.

7/ 1915 Report, Part II, p. 9.

8/ Id. at 15.

9/ 1920 Report, p. 33

10/ Id. at 36.

11/ 1925 Report, pp. 140-1.

12/ Ibid.

13/ 1930 Report, pp. 98-9.

14/ Id. at 100-1.

15/ 1935 Report. pp, 160-1.

16/ Id. at 162-3.

17/ 1940 Report, "Trends" Chart.

18/ Ibid.

19/ 1945 Report, pp. 174-5.

20/ Id. at 178-9.

21/ 1950 Report, pp. 250-1.

22/ Id. at 252-3.

23/ 1955 Report, 364-5.

24/ Id. at 380-1.

25/ 1960 Report, p. 107.

26/ Ibid.

27/ 1961 Report, p. 129.

28/ Ibid.

29/ 1962 Report, p. 35.

30/ Ibid.

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO BY ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

	WHITE	NEGRO
1900	39:1/29:1 1/	63:1/46:1 2/
1905	40:1/28:1 3/	58:1/39:1 4/
1910	37:1/26:1 5/	61:1/42:1 6/
1915	37:1/26:1 7/	70:1/49:1 8/
1920	33:1/24:1 9/	64:1/44:1 10/
1925	31:1/25:1 11/	56:1/42:1 12/
1930	30:1/25:1 13/	51:1/42:1 14/
1935	31:1/26:1 15/	53:1/42:1 16/
1940	28:1/23:1 17/	42:1/35:1 18/
1945	26:1/23:1 19/	38:1/32:1 20/
1950	26:1/23:1 21/	35:1/30:1 22/
1955	26:1/23:1 23/	33:1/28:1 24/
1960	23:1/21:1 25/	31:1/27:1 26/
1961	25:1/23:1 27/	30:1/27:1 28/
1962	25:1/23:1 29/	30:1/26:1 30/

1/ Computed from figures for attendance and enrollment monthly records of teachers,1900-01 Report, p. 19.

2/ Ibid.

3/ Computed from figures for attendance and enrollment monthly records of teachers, 1905 Report, pp. 212-13.

4/ Ibid.

5/ 1910 Report, Part II, p. 20.

6/ Ibid.

7/ Computed from figures for attendance and enrollment monthly records of teachers, 1915 Report, Part II, p. 10.

8/ Id. at 16.

9/ Computed from figures for attendance and enrollment monthly records of teachers, 1920 Report, pp. 33-34.

10/ Id. at 36.

11/ Computed from figures for attendance and enrollment monthly records of teachers, 1925 Report, pp. 132-3, 124-5, 136-7.

12/ Id. at 136-7, 134-5, 126-7

13/ Computed from figures for attendance and enrollment monthly records of teachers, 1930 Report. p. 28.

14/ Ibid.

15/ 1935 Report, p. 28.

16/ Ibid.

17/ 1940 Report, "Trends" Chart.

18/ Ibid.

19/ 1945 Report, p. 78

20/ Ibid.

21/ 1950 Report, pp. 132-3.

22/ Ibid.

23/ 1955 Report, p. 176.

24/ Ibid.

25/ Computed from figures for attendance and enrollment monthly records of teachers, 1960 Report, pp. 344-5, 500-1.

26/ Id. at 376-7, 510-1.

27/ Computed from figures for attendance and enrollment monthly records of teachers, 1961 Report, pp. 348-9, 446-7.

28/ Id. at 368-9, 458-9.

29/ Computed from figures for attendance and enrollment monthly records of teachers, 1962 Report, pp. 300-1, 218-9.

30/ Id. at 314-5, 236-7.

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOLS, NUMBER ACCREDITED BY STATE AND PER CENT OF STUDENTS ABOVE SEVENTH GRADE BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS FROM 1900 TO 1962

	NO. HIGH SCHOOLS		NO. ACCRED. BY STATE		PERCENT STUDENTS ABOVE 7TH GRADE	
	W	N	W	N	W	N
1900	No data		No data		No data	
1905	No data		47 1/	0 1/	1 2/	0 2/
1910	No data		87 3/	0 3/	4 4/	0 4/
1915	No data		142 5/	0 5/	8 6/	No data
1920	204 7/	7 7a/	No data		6 8/	1 9/
1925	No data		318 10/	0 10/	15 11/	2 12/
1930	No data		353 13/	4 13/	14 14/	4 15/
1935	No data		367 16/	6 16/	22 17/	6 18/
1940	---	62 19/	383 20/	39 20/	27 21/	10 21/
1945	No data		380 22/	80 22/	25 23/	9 23/
1950	363 24/	108 24/	362 25/	98 26/	21 27/	9 28/
1955	358 29/	135 30/	No data		23 31/	16 31/
1960	348 32/	158 33/	No data		24 34/	21 34/
1961	353 35/	159 36/	No data		24 37/	19 38/
1962	359 39/	164 39/	No data		25 40/	20 41/

1/ PP. 228-9, 1904-05 Report.

2/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 228-9, 1904-1905 Report.

3/ P. 29, 1909-10 Report.

4/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, p. 27, 1909-10 Report.

5/ PP. 45, part II, 1915 Report.

6/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, p. 43, part II, 1915 Report.

7/ P. 34, 1920 Report.

7a/ P. 36, 1920 Report.

8/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, p. 34, 1920 Report.

9/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, p. 36, 1920 Report.

10/ P. 41, 1925 Report.

11/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp.132-3, 1925 Report.

12/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 134-5, 1925 Report.

13/ P. 29, 1930 Report.

14/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 66-7, 1930 Report.

15/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 70-1, 1930 Report.

16/ P. 89, 1935 Report.

17/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 146-7, 1935 Report.

18/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 150-1, 1935 Report.

19/ Computed from pp. 186-7 & 198, 1940 Report.

20/ PP. 186-7, 1940 Report.

21/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, "Trends" chart, 1940 Report.

22/ P. 87, 1945 Report.

23/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 86-7, 1945 Report.

24/ P. 268, 1950 Report.

25/ PP. 274-5, 1950 Report.

26/ PP. 284-5, 1950 Report.

27/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 216-7, 1950 Report.

28/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 218-9, 1950 Report.

29/ PP. 392-3, 1955 Report.

30/ PP. 396-7, 1955 Report.

31/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 354-5, 1955 Report.

32/ PP. 544-49, 1960 Report.

33/ PP. 558-63, 1960 Report.

34/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, p. 120, 1960 Report.

35/ PP. 504-5, 1961 Report.

36/ PP. 506-7, 1961 Report.

37/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 336-39, 1961 Report.

38/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp, 356-59, 1961 Report.

39/ P. 333, 1962 Report.

40/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 178-9, 1962 Report.

41/ Computed from figures for enrollment by grade, pp. 184-5, 1962 Report.

TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF TEACHERS BY RACE AND YEAR, SHOWING NUMBER OF BACHELOR'S AND MASTER'S AND HIGHER DEGREES HELD AND PERCENT OF TEACHERS HOLDING BACHELOR'S DEGREES OR HIGHER, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

	COLLEGE OR NORMAL SCHOOL GRADUATES		NUMBER OF MASTER'S DEGREES HELD		% OF TEACHERS WITH BACHELOR'S OR HIGHER DEGREES	
	WHITE	NEGRO	WHITE	NEGRO	WHITE	NEGRO
1900	No data		No data		No data	
1905	No data by race		No data by race		No data by race	
1910	1,698 1/	No data	No data		No data	
1915	2,111 2/	173 3/	No data		35 4/	13 5/
1920	3,976 6/	No data	No data		No data	
1925	5,981 8/	470 9/	No data		69 10/	19 11/
1930	3,484 12/	486 13/	284 12/	22 13/	41 14/	17 15/
1935	4,307 16/	768 17/	499 16/	16 17/	51 18/	24 19/
1940	7,572 20/	1,530 21/	804 20/	34 21/	78 22/	38 23/
1945	6,986 24/	2,295 25/	938 24/	77 25/	79 26/	55 27/
1950	8,390 28/	3,837 29/	1,227 28/	155 29/	84 30/	76 31/
1955	8,733 32/	4,947 33/	2,001 32/	416 33/	78 34/	79 35/
1960	11,312 36/	7,552 37/	4,237 36/	1,317 37/	89.2 38/	96.2 39/
1961	11,675 40/	7,888 41/	4,559 40/	1,492 41/	95 42/	96.8 43/
1962	12.065 44/	8,308 45/	4,800 44/	1,572 45/	90.8 45/	97.4 47/

1/ 1910 Report, part II, pp. 12-13.

2/ 1915 Report, part II, p. 9.

3/ Id. at p. 16

4/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at p. 9.

5/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at p. 16.

6/ 1900 Report, p. 34.

8/ 1925 Report, pp. 124-5.

9/ Id. at pp. 126-7.

10/Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 124-5.

11/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 126-7.

12/ 1930 Report, pp. 94-5.

13/ Id. at pp. 96-7.

14/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 28, 94-5.

15/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 28, 96-7.

16/ 1935 Report, pp. 156-7.

17/ Id. at pp. 158-9.

18/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 156-7.

19/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 158-9.

20/ 1940 Report, pp. 174-5

21/ Id. at pp. 178-9.

22/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 174-5 & "Trends" Chart.

23/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 178-9 & "Trends" Chart.

24/ 1945 Report, pp. 172-3

25/ Id. at pp. 176-7.

26/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 77, 172-3.

27/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 77, 176-7.

28/ 1950 Report, pp. 254-5.

29/ Id. at pp. 260-1.

30/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 132-3, 254-5.

31/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 132-3, 260-1.

32/ 1955 Report, pp. 370-1.

33/ Id. at pp. 386-7

34/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 176, 370-1.

35/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 176, 386-7.

36/ 1960 Report, pp. 504-5.

37/ Id. at pp. 514-5.

38/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 504-5.

39/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 514-5.

40/ 1961 Report, pp. 450-1.

41/ Id. at pp. 462-3.

42/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 450-1.

43/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 462-3.

44/ 1962 Report, pp. 304-5.

45/ Id. at pp. 318-9.

46/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 304-5.

47/ Computed from figures for number of teachers holding degrees and total number of teachers, Id. at pp. 318-9.

TABLE X

TOTAL ENROLLMENT IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS BY RACE AND YEAR
(Beginning in 1945, figures in parentheses show total number of students enrolled in public and private schools)

YEAR	WHITE	NEGRO
1900	120,178[1/]	64,803[1/]
1905	142,729[2/]	67,387[2/]
1910	184,755[3/]	78,862[3/]
1915	213,210[4/]	91,272[5/]
1920	236,301[6/]	117,778[7/]
1925	264,863[8/]	136,997[9/]
1930	277,707[10/]	156,850[11/]
1935	296,029[12/]	172,621[13/]
1940	298,455[13/]	174,649[13/]
1945	263,291[14/] (315,598)[15/]	163,553[14/] (182,522)[15/]
1950	293,509[16/] (359,473)[17/]	182,215[16/] (203,294)[18/]
1955	355,259[19/] (441,779)[20/]	219,707[19/] (244,506)[21/]
1960	417,313[22/] (523,400)[23/]	267,331[22/] (292,328)[24/]
1961	429,078[25/] (542,619)[26/]	279,899[25/] (304,727)[27/]
1962	442,112[28/] (558,558)[29/]	290,533[28/] (315,190)[30/]

1/ p.24, 1900-1901 report

2/ pp.212-213, 1904-1905 report

3/ p.27, 1909-10 report

4/ p.10, pt. II, 1914-1915 report

5/ p.16, pt. II, 1914-1915 report.
6/ p.34, 1919-1920 report.
7/ p.36, 1919-1920 report.
8/ pp.132-133, 1925 report.
9/ pp.134-135, 1925 report.
10/ pp.66-67, 1930 report.
11/ pp. 70-71, 1930 report.
12/ p.88, 1935 report.
13/ "Trends" chart, 1940 report (no page number)
14/ pp.77-78, 1945 report.
15/ Figures for private school enrollment, pp.156-157, 1945 report.
16/ pp. 132-133, 1950 report
17/ Figures for private school enrollment, pp.222-223, 1950 report.
18/ Figures for private school enrollment, pp. 244-245, 1950 report.
19/ p. 176, 1955 report
20/ Figures for private school enrollment, pp. 326-327, 1955 report.
21/ Figures for private school enrollment pp. 346-347, 1955 report.
22/ p. 120, 1960 report
23/ Figures for private school enrollment, pp. 418-419, 1960 report.
24/ Figures for private school enrollment, pp. 450-451, 1960 report.
25/ p. 134, 1961 report
26/ Figures for private school enrollment, pp. 388-389, 1961 report.
27/ Figures for private school enrollment, pp. 408-409, 1961 report.
28/ p. 38, 1962 report
29/ Figures for private school enrollment, pp. 254-255, 1962 report.
30/ Figures for private school enrollment, pp. 270-271, 1962 report.

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF SINGLE-TEACHER SCHOOLS IN THE STATE BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS, 1900 TO 1962

	WHITE	NEGRO
1900	No data	
1905	No data	
1910	1,559 1/	1,005 1/
1915	1,251 2/	1,011 3/
1920	860 4/	994 4a/
1925	593 5/	1,036 5/
1930	339 6/	1,042 7/
1935	No data	
1940	No data	
1945	69 8/	867 8/
1950	36 9/	500 9/
1955	10 10/	129 11/
1960	21 12/*	19 13/*
1961	21 14/*	20 14/*
1962	20 15/*	21 15/*

* Number of schools enrolling 49 pupils or less. The official report gives totals of 13, 13 and 14 respectively for 1960, 1961, and 1962 for one-teacher schools for both races; there is no indication of how these are distributed by race.

1/ 1910 Report, part II, p. 20

2/ 1915 Report, part II, p. 12

3/ 1915 Report, part II, p. 16

4/ 1920 Report, p. 39

4a/ 1920 Report, vol. II, part I, p.5

5/ 1925 Report, pp. 128-9

6/ 1930 Report, pp. 88-9

7/ 1930 Report, pp. 90-1

8/ 1945 Report, p. 180

9/ 1950 Report, p. 268

10/ 1955 Report, pp. 390-1

11/ 1955 Report, pp. 394-5

12/ 1960 Report, pp. 538-49

13/ 1960 Report, pp. 552-63

14/ 1961 Report, p. 502

15/ 1962 Report, p. 332

TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS PROVIDED FOR EACH RACE, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

	WHITE	NEGRO
1900	2,303[1/]	918[1/]
1905	2,404[2/]	1,106[2/]
1910	2,352[3/]	1,043[3/]
1915	2,281[4/]	1,152[5/]
1920	2,120[6/]	1,354[7/]
1925	1,831[8/]	1,430[8/]
1930	1,409[9/]	1,578[10/]
1935	No	data
1940	No	data
1945	879[11/]	1,680[11/]
1950	801[12/]	1,302[12/]
1955	814[13/]	771[14/]
1960	878[15/]	507[16/]
1961	900[17/]	502[17/]
1962	918[18/]	503[18/]

1/ 1900-01 Report, p. 24.

2/ 1905 Report, pp. 224 - 5.

3/ 1910 Report, p. 27.

4/ 1915 Report, part II, p. 21.

5/ Id. at p. 16.

6/ 1920 Report, Vol. I, p. 39.

7/ 1920 Report, Vol. II, part I, p.5.

8/ 1925 Report, pp. 128-9.

9/ 1930 Report, pp. 84-5.

10/ Id. at pp. 86-7.

11/ 1945 Report, p. 480.

12/ 1950 Report, p. 268.

13/ 1955 Report, pp. 392-3.

14/ Id. at pp. 396-7.

15/ 1960 Report, pp. 538-49.

16/ Id. at pp. 552-63.

17/ 1961 Report, p. 502.

18/ 1962 Report, p. 332.

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF TEACHERS EMPLOYED BY RACE AND YEAR, SELECTED YEARS 1900 TO 1962

	WHITE	NEGRO
1900	3,102 1/	1,034 1/
1905	3,515 2/	1,165 2/
1910	5,001 3/	1,287 3/
1915	5,981 4/	1,291 5/
1920	7,129 6/	1,837 7/
1925	8,577 8/	2,429 9/
1930	9,145 10/	3,028 10/
1935	9,488 11/	3,282 12/
1940	10,711 13/	4,119 13/
1945	10,003 14/	4,309 14/
1950	11,420 15/	5,255 15/
1955	13,693 16/	6,750 16/
1960	17,427 17/	9,217 18/
1961	18,036 19/	9,690 20/
1962	18,580 21/	10,140 22/

1/ 1900-01 Report, p. 19
2/ 1905 Report, pp. 220-1
3/ 1910 Report, p. 28
4/ 1915 Report, part II, p. 9
5/ Id. at p. 16
6/ 1920 Report, p. 33
7/ Id. at p. 36
8/ 1925 Report, pp. 124-5
9/ Id. at pp. 126-7
10/ 1930 Report, p. 28
11/ 1935 Report, pp. 156-7
12/ Id. at pp. 158-9
13/ 1940 Report, "Trends" chart (no page number)
14/ 1945 Report, p. 77
15/ 1950 Report, pp. 132-3
16/ 1955 Report, p. 176
17/ 1960 Report, pp. 504-5
18/ Id. at pp. 514-5
19/ 1961 Report, pp. 450-1
20/ Id. at pp. 462-3
21/ 1962 Report, pp. 304-5
22/ Id. at pp. 318-9

EXCERPTS FROM "THE NEGRO PUBLIC SCHOOLS"

The following pages consist of excerpts taken from Volume IV, Section 8, of the Louisiana Educational Survey, entitled "The Negro Public Schools." The Louisiana Educational Survey is a ten-volume study of elementary and secondary education published in 1942 by the Louisiana Educational Survey Commission. The Commission was created by the legislature of Louisiana for the purpose of supervising the preparation of a complete study of public education in Louisiana with the emphasis on existing deficiencies and recommendations for improvement. Washburne, Louisiana Educational Survey: A Summary (Baton Rouge 1942).

1.

One superintendent stated that he could not urge improvement of Negro schools and retain his position as superintendent because sentiment of the school board members was strongly opposed to it. An assistant superintendent, responsible for supervising the Negro schools in the parish, said:

> The members of the school board don't want a nickel spent on Negro schools. We have a hard time getting supplies for them -- or anything else for that matter.
>
> You know we've got to live here with these people, and we have to get along with them even if we can't convince them about the right thing to do with regard to colored schools. But the fellows in Baton Rouge could take over buildings and force better buildings for colored children. I can't do it here. After all, I want my job -- just like everybody else.

Still another superintendent said,

> I've always been able to carry my board with me in whatever I recommend. But I have to do plenty of spade work before I put the question before the whole group. Right now they are opposed to further improvements in colored schools. We've had a little trouble here, and that's the way they feel. But I have improved colored schools a great deal since I've been superintendent. I had to do it very carefully, though. When I took over this office over fifteen years ago, less than half a dozen Negro schools were held in school buildings, and Negro schools had only a two-month summer term. Gradually we increased the term until three years ago we increased all rural Negro schools to a seven-month term. But we might as well be frank about it -- all these years we have taken money from the colored children to educate the white. There's no use talking about <u>how</u> we did it or <u>why</u> we did it. We did it and we might just as well start there. I think it's mighty important to let the State and the Federal government see this picture

> as it really is, and if they want to do something about it, all right. But parish school boards spend money on white children first.

A delta cotton plantation parish superintendent said:

> The money allocated to the colored children is spent on the education of white children. That's unfair, and I know it, but that's the only way we can have decent white schools here. Why we have twice as many colored children of school age as we have white, and we use their money. Colored children are mighty profitable to us here in this parish.

A superintendent in a rice parish frankly stated that:

> We don't do much for Negro schools here in this parish. We've got some pretty good schools for white children. Look up there on the wall and see what nice schools we have for white children. But these people in this parish -- they just let the Negro schools go the best way they can, and that's not much, you know. (pp. 36-37)

2.

...[W]hile the white rural schools of the state are in large measure consolidated, the Negro rural schools are widely scattered over the parishes within Negro population concentrations of from one to five or six miles from these. Many of them are in Negro churches and lodge halls, some are in small cabins on plantations, and others are on parish owned property. Some of these schools are located in such remote or difficult areas that they are inaccessible to visitors and even, in bad weather, to the pupils.... (page 42)

3.

The one- and two-teacher schools of Louisiana are of three types: they are either miniature frame structures; they are small wooden churches; or they are wooden lodge

halls. Objective measurements of the buildings and of the qualification of the teachers provide an inadequate picture of the schools. The buildings are, for the most part, small, dilapidated, and untidy, the equipment meager, and the teachers in many instances poorly equipped. (p. 43)

[T]he majority of these buildings are in serious need of repair, whether they are five years old or fifty. (p. 45)

Water is supplied to these schools either by wells or cistern tanks. In the main the wells are quite shallow and too close to the privy. In no instance was the water made sterile before use. Frequently there is no water supply on the school grounds, as in the case of the Levee schools. (p. 46)

The one-and two-teacher schools are heated almost without exception by a single, iron stove. As has been noted, fuel is supplied generally by the patrons, and is wood. In some instances the boys cut the wood from the forest; in a few other instances, the school board furnishes it. (p. 46)

The toilets are all of the out-door type, if there are any at all. (p. 46)

4.

[describing an average one-teacher school]

The school site is a narrow, rectangular plot of land, about 12 by 36 feet. It is enclosed by a wire fence on all four sides. On three sides there is barely walking space between the fence and the school building. The fourth side, the front, serves as a play space for the children -- about 5 by 10 feet. The pupils have covered this space with small pebbles, as a precaution against the muck and mud of rainy weather. The teacher stated that frequently after rains, water rises above the level of the front porch.

The school building itself is a rectangular unpainted frame building. It is the lodge hall of the Benevolent Association of the community, and is built so close to the ground that it gives the appearance of crouching behind the levee. The inner walls are of weather boarding and are also unpainted. Four windows are on either side of the school room and admit light and ventilation. All of these have wooden shutters; several panes of glass are broken.

There are no toilet facilities on the place. Girls are allowed to use the sanitary privy built by the association, in the rear of a private home behind the school; boys go over the levee.

Within the room are four rows of double seats -- 29 in all -- of uniform size. They are nailed to the floor and much scarred by time and abuse. Along the walls are a few maps, charts and pictures - chosen, evidently, at random, and with no reference to classroom procedure. Two long wooden tables at the rear of the classroom serve as lunch tables (for the free lunch provided). In the right hand corner of the front of the room is a closet, filled to overflowing with an untidy assortment of materials. In the extreme left-hand corner of the rear of the room is a water cooler filled with ice water. This is the only source of water on the grounds. A single small stove at the front of the room furnishes heat. (pp. 46-47)

* * *

Each child has his own textbooks, furnished by the state. They are those that had already been used by the whites. The teacher exhibited three badly torn textbooks that had just been received. Supplementary books are brought by a traveling library. She has about 20 such books -- mainly story books. She had no criticisms to offer of the books now used. (p. 48)

* * *

The class procedure was about as follows: The teacher gave the smaller children pages from a Sears Roebuck catalogue, and passed a pair of scissors around for cutting out pictures. The larger children were, she announced, to have language. She went from seat to seat, whispering instructions. Finally she read aloud groups of words, some of which were sentences, and some of which were not sentences. At the end of each group read, the class chorused either

'S' for sentence, or 'NS' for not a sentence. At the end of this procedure (about 10 minutes in all) she stated: 'Now I gonna make the assignment for tomorrow: It's gonna be a test and you better know all of this that we been over or else you'll flunk.'

To a group of smaller children: 'You gonna have a test too, so you better learn the names of the New England states. Now we gonna have health.' She moved over to the health chart at the side of the room and stated: 'We gonna say the chart for health.' She read each statement, and at the end asked: 'Do we do that?' Pupils all chorused 'Yes' in response to each question. For example, 'We should take a bath at least twice a week. Do we do that?' Answer, 'Yes.' As a matter of fact, the children without exception were dirty, untidy and acrid with the odor of unwashed bodies. Few, if any of them, made any connection between the lesson and an actual bath. (p. 49)

5.

[Describing a two-teacher school]

This school is set in the muddy clearing of a pine forest, and is about 15 miles from the small town that serves as the parish seat. To the left of the school, about ten feet removed, stands a fifteen foot well, completely covered by a wooden box. To the right are the sanitary pit privies -- one for boys, the other for girls. Upon entering the school building one sees first an unused room to the left. In it is an accumulation of litter and odd objects -- agricultural implements, an old and rusty stove covered with peanut shells, a pile of stove wood, a jar with a coiled, live snake.

This room leads to the classroom of the wife of the principal. The atmosphere here, as throughout the building, was dark and unimviting. The floor was caked with mud, and strewn with caps and paper. Childish obscenities were scrawled on the walls. Four rows of single, immovable desks, two dusty blackboards, an empty bulletin board, a table piled untidily with primary readers, a stove turned backwards in a far front corner, a teacher's desk -- these constituted the room's furnishings. (p. 50)

* * *

The physical elevation of the teacher (on the dais) was only the beginning of a schism between himself and his class, which grew wider as the recitation proceeded. 'Today we gonna discuss the relationship that exists between the school and the community. If you have read pages 8 to 13, you oughts to know your lesson.' (This to a group of larger pupils. The remainder of the class studied spelling, audibly). 'What did we say a community was?' A child read an answer from a grimy sheet of paper. The answer was unsatisfactory to the teacher. 'Will anybody help her out?' No response. 'Well, a community is being interest in the same thing. If a community is what I say, then we are all citizens in a community. What is a citizen?' Another pupil read an answer from an equally grimy sheet of paper. 'Do the class agree?' No response. He then gave the answer (at variance with that of the pupil), that he would have the class accept - 'A person living in a community is a citizen. Take our shoes -- coming from foreign places -- but they help us, so they are members of our community.' (Pupils were slow to respond and timid in manner. They, like the teacher, showed no evidence of being able to think critically. The teacher moved on (alone) - 'Now, in a community we have organizations; some we join, and some we belong to without joining. Name some.' He finally elicited some response to his question. The home and neighborhood were mentioned as organizations to which one belongs without joining; Boy Scouts and baseball teams as the other type. The pupils expressed themselves in muffled monosyllables.

'Awright, what relationship exists between a school and a citizen?' No response. The teacher read aloud at length from a textbook to answer this question. (pp. 50-51)

6.

The above schools are two dreary examples of a vicious circle in which the child leaves a home setting of cultural backwardness to attend a school that is only another facet of this setting. He receives instruction from a teacher who comes from the same level of incompetence and returns home without having glimpsed very far beyond the folk pattern which conditions his behavior and his thinking. The one- and two-teacher rural schools, as they

exist in the main, appear to mitigate only slightly the cultural retardation of the rural youth. (p. 51)

7.

One of the most acute problems confronting the teacher in the one and two-teacher school is that of irregular attendance, and it is closely related to inadequate clothing, bad weather, and pupils being kept at home to work. In the autumn months, too, at the beginning of the school year, attendance is poor because pupils must assist in the harvesting of the crops. Sometimes the child attends school in the morning but is kept at home in the afternoon.

In one parish pupils failed to attend regularly because it was necessary to cross a river in an old and leaky boat. The teacher explained, 'We have to bale water out all the way across. The superintendent has promised to send the lumber out here so the people can build a new boat, but he hasn't done it yet.'

There seems little that the teacher can do to solve the problem of irregular attendance, since she cannot change the weather, or build roads, or buy clothes for the children. (p. 56)

8.

The principal criticisms offered by the teachers of the functioning of the textbook system were the inadequacy of the numbers of textbooks and the impractical (for Negro children) nature of the content. In only a few schools was there a text for each child. One teacher stated, 'They are not enough and are too <u>differcult</u>.' Several teachers lamented the fact that the texts gave no attention to the achievements of the Negro. A few observed that the white pupils used the books first, and then passed them on to the Negroes. Others, that the white pupils had a sufficient number of books, but that the Negroes did not." (p. 57)

9.

"Inside the school the first impression was of the great pupil density (children were packed closely together in seats), and the confusion. T ere was constant shifting about among the pupils in an effort to have all pupils receive some of the warmth from the small iron stove at the rear. There was much talking and giggling, some fighting. The teacher, a tall, portly woman, was nervous, tense, and harassed. Her greeting to the visitors was: "You'll have some pages to write up from this mess."

Sixty pupils were huddled uncomfortably on a number of long hard benches that would normally accomodate about thirty. There was no ventilation except for the gusty draughts of air that came through the open cracks in the walls and floors." (p. 57)

10.

"The teacher passed out two half-sheets of paper to each pupil, with the admonition, 'It's got to do you all day, so be careful with it.' To the visitor, 'We don't have no pencils; we don't have no books; we don't have anything.' " (p.58)

11.

"The reading lessons -- grades 1-4 -- were conducted in this fashion: The teacher read a single line and then, after her, the children chorused the line. Thence to the next, and so on until the lesson was completed. She taught with a long switch in her hand, which she used lightly at intervals to prompt her pupils. The presence of the switch seemed to incite no fear to the pupils. Like the majority of other teachers in one and two-teacher schools she had no conception of enlightened classroom procedures, or of progressive methods and made no pretense of using them. She had no time for taking into account individual differences, or inclusion of students in the planning or evaluation of the work; or trying any experiments in classroom teaching. In this respect she was like the majority.

The teaching of reading in these schools generally in confined simply to the reading of words from textbook. Little or nothing is done to broaden the vocabularies of the youth, or to stimulate the pupils' interest

in reading. Most of the teachers did not understand the use of the term 'mechanics' of reading, nor of the terms 'formal school exercise,' or 'functional skill.' One teacher explained that she provided for reading readiness in the first grade 'by giving the children a wealth of reading materials.'

As in reading, so in social studies. No attempt was made by most of the teachers to correlate this area with the solution of actual life problems. Instruction here was usually limited to the discussion of a few historical events. There is little time for extra-curricular activities, confronted as they are with the problems of handling many grades and many subjects, of preparing or supervising the preparation of the free lunches and, in many instances, of securing heat for their buildings." (pp. 58-59)

12.

"The dilapidated condition of the schools is mute evidence of the fact that few repairs are made on them by the school board. In one hundred schools the only repairs made were as follows:

1. A screen door (Paid for by the P.T.A.)
2. A covering (Paid for by the church members)
3. Toilets and steps (Paid for by the church members)
4. A kitchenette (Paid for by the school board)
5. Windows (Paid for by the school board)
6. A stove pipe and a well (Paid for by the P.T.A.)
7. A new faucet (Paid for by the P.T.A.)

A new school was erected in one district, and the seven items of repair occurred in seven schools." (p. 60)

13.

"The Training schools are in one respect consolidated schools insofar as they are expected to draw their pupils from over a fairly wide area. It seems impossible to locate these schools in such a manner that a considerable number of pupils may reach them without traveling long distances, sometimes as much as thirty miles. This is

directly in conflict with the present practice of restricting free transportation for Negro schools. In only one of the parishes covered in this study was any free transportation provided in the Parish for Negro pupils. The exception was the free bus transportation provided in Washington Parish for the training school in Franklinton and to the city school in Bogalusa. In all the others the story of hardships or inability to attend schools because of distance was repeated. Occasionally students were able to hitch-hike for parts of the distance, but in the main, difficulties in getting to schools from rural sections were enormous. A few students used private automobiles. Accidents were reported involving injury to pupils on the highways. Parents have been more seriously concerned about this problem of the inability of their children to get to schools because of distance than about any other." (p. 65)

14.

"In all cases the buildings of the training school were standard types. That many of them were old and run down was quite evident. Some had two stories while others had one. A few of them were constructed of brick, but most of them were frame structures. In most schools there was more then one building. Schools tended, on the whole, to be so small in proportion to the number of pupils to be accommodated that their inadequacy in space seriously restricted the work expected of both teachers and students.

In one school, with an enrollment of 1,111 pupils, the students were so crowded it was necessary to conduct classes in the auditorium every period in the day. Students were seated in the balcony and on the main floor. On this floor a part of the auditorium was partitioned off, thus adding another classroom. The library of this school was located in the lavatory. This was not an abandoned toilet, but one in use every day by the men teachers. Although it is somewhat large, it has been used for years as the teachers' lavatory. While the over-crowded conditions in other schools are not quite as acute, they are sufficiently serious to point strongly to the necessity for additional space to relieve the severely cramped conditions of the teachers and students." (p. 67)

15.

"The financing of Negro school construction often runs counter to local white sentiment and those superintendents who would like to improve the Negro schools find themselves seriously handicapped in their efforts to secure appropriations. It is easier to abandon the effort, or restrain the desire, than to arouse the opposition of the parish school board, which in the end might result in the superintendent's losing his position." (p. 69)

16.

"A great variety of subjects is taught, counting all Negro Training and high schools together: but in any one school the variety is very small....In fact a bare minimum of subjects if the rule. For example, only a few high schools in the state offer chemistry, because of the lack of laboratory equipment. The subjects offered are, in fact so limited that in most schools there are few or no electives." (p. 75)

17.

"Free textbooks are provided by the state as in the elementary schools. The superintendent of schools, acting on the authority of the local school board, in the parish, is responsible for their distribution. No uniform policy in the distribution of these books could be discerned in the Negro schools. One principal said:

> Five or six years after new textbooks are introduced in the white schools they get to the colored schools.

...From observation and the reports of teachers the Negro schools more often got the old or re-conditioned books from white schools, than they got new ones." (p. 76)

18.

"The secondary school teachers have full schedules and large classes. Only 8.7 per cent of them had classes of less than 35 students, and 57 per cent had classes of 55 students or more. This congestion of schedule and students undoubtedly influences unfavorably the quality of teaching. Such large classes limit individualized instruction.

The conventional teaching methods were employed generally in all of the secondary schools, with occasional exceptions in the case of individual teachers. Many of the teachers used terms from the context of progressive education, but little of the actual method was used. The equipment deficiencies, size of classes and crowded schedules made good teaching by old or new methods very difficult. Many of the teachers did not comprehend the problem-solving method of teaching and did not like it or in fact, any innovation." (p. 88)

19.

"The excessively low salary scale for Negro teachers helps to explain the quality of a large number of the teachers and their work. The rural schools in particular are unattractive to teachers of superior qualifications. In neither urban nor rural areas is it possible to maintain a reasonable level of living without supplementing the teaching salary with others resources. This helps to explain the large number of married Negro teachers. In four of the small schools visited the teachers were absent on maternity leave. Many of the regular teachers find it necessary to carry other employment such as farming, hair dressing, domestic or personal service, canvassing preaching, and other means of bringing their earnings up to a living level. This situation favors the older teachers with less adequate educational qualifications but who are willing to adjust themselves to the circumstances. The result is an unusually low quality of instruction. The superior graduates of the colleges, and particularly the men, move on to better paying jobs in or out of the state." (pp. 97-98)

20.

"The inadequacy of teaching is not due entirely to the teacher. Lack of equipment, insufficient textbooks, and little or no library facilities contribute largely to the result of schooling which misleads rather than educates." (p. 110)

21.

"Few teachers who are professionally prepared to teach according to accepted modern standards can be employed at the low salaries afforded by the state of Louisiana. It is a viscious circle. Teachers with a fair foundation already employed cannot afford on their meager salaries to keep abreast of current trends and newer methods, as they could if they were able to attend summer school.

Overwhelmed as they are with overcrowded classes, and no facilities or equipment, they have no time for experimenting nor for employing any techniques save the old ones by which they themselves were taught.

They have little supervision. Some of the superintendents are indifferent, most lack the staff necessary to proper supervision, and some definitely discourage the kind of learning pupils need....In spite of oversized classes; over-loaded teaching schedules; lack of equipment, unattractive buildings, grounds, and classrooms; lack of sufficient money to maintain decent living standards, many teachers are struggling to improve learning conditions." (pp. 113-114)

Analysis of Educational Facilities Afforded to Negroes and Whites In Sumter County, Alabama.

[The following material is an extract from the brief of the United States filed in United States v. Hines, (C.A. 63-609, N.D. Ala.)]

SUMTER COUNTY, ALABAMA
EDUCATIONAL DATA
1900-1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Explanatory Note

Tables

Table I: Summary of Selected Educational Data, 1900-1960

A. Number of School Age Children
B. Number of Pupils Enrolled
C. Pupil-Teacher Ratio
D. Average Teacher's Salary
E. Expenditure per Pupil

Table II: Enrollment, 1900-1960

A. Number of School Age Children
B. Number of Pupils Enrolled
C. Percent of School Age Children Enrolled
D. Percent of Total Enrollment in Elementary and High Schools

Table III: Instruction, 1900-1960

A. Pupil-Teacher Ratio
B. Average Annual Salary
C. Days in School Term
D. Qualifications of Teachers

Table IV: Facilities, 1910-1945

A. Total Enrollment
B. Number and Size (by teaching staff) of Schoolhouses
C. Estimated Value of Schoolhouses

Table V: Expenditures, 1925-1960

A. Total Enrollment
B. Teachers' Salaries
C. Transportation
D. Capital Improvements
E. Operation and Maintenance
F. Total Expenditure
G. Expenditures per Pupil

Appendices

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The data contained in the accompanying Tables illustrate the comparative quality of white and Negro public education in Sumter County, Alabama, from 1900 through 1960. Sources of all data are the Annual Reports of the Alabama Department of Education.

The Tables present information by five-year intervals. Wherever appropriate, data pertaining to elementary and high schools are listed in separate columns. As to Annual Reports which did not so differentiate, the aggregate (or average) figure is centered in a column between the elementary and high school columns. Certain categories of data were not reported in some of the Annual Reports; these omissions are indicated by two dashes (--). An asterisk (*) indicates that data for the particular category and year were not differentiated by race. All data are presented as they appear in the Annual Reports, except computations which are based on reported data. Such computations are indicated by a "(c)" in the Appendices.

Page references for all data are given in the Appendices.

TABLE I

SUMTER COUNTY, ALABAMA
SUMMARY OF SELECTED
EDUCATIONAL DATA
1900-1960

Year		A Number Of School Age Children	B Number Of Pupils Enrolled		C Pupil-Teacher Ratio [a]		D Average Teacher's Salary [c]		E Expenditures Per Pupil
			Elem	HS	Elem	HS	Elem	HS	
1900	W	2052	880	415	28:1	29:1	--	--	--
	N	8820	2040	100	37:1	33:1	--	--	--
1905	W	2006	1405		31:1		--	--	--
	N	10,292	1152		44:1		--	--	--
1910	W	1825	1563		29:1		--	--	$ 18
	N	10,934	2897		55:1		--	--	2
1915	W	1932	1214	196	24:1		$507		--
	N	10,649	3152	10	81:1		114		--
1920	W	2162	1298	361	27:1 [b]		743		--
	N	9397	5426	9	116:1 [b]		201		--
1925	W	2067	833	579	28:1	20:1	$729	$1367	72
	N	10,901	6245	109	79:1	36:1	152	1253	4
1930	W	1806	925	649	30:1	16:1	855	1293	97
	N	9049	4935	255	57:1	16:1	149	466	5
1935	W	1722	751	580	19:1	21:1	561	986	75
	N	8999	5328	338	54:1	18:1	128	307	4
1940	W	1499	643	576	21:1	18:1	494	784	87
	N	9414	5400	557	43:1	23:1	247	341	8
1945	W	1362	536	467	19:1	18:1	1080	1309	114
	N	7415	4371	1002	34:1	32:1	507	577	18
1950	W	1324	596	438	23:1	21:1	2100	2511	198
	N	6419	3913	1529	31:1	30:1	1432	1910	63
1955	W	--	534	434	22:1	19:1	2734	2763	*
	N	--	3298	1796	27:1	32:1	2312	2585	
1960	W	--	516	457	23:1 [b]	20:1 [b]	3859	4051	*
	N	--	3168	1926	29:1 [b]	27:1 [b]	3549	3738	

a - Based on enrollment and number of teachers.
b - Based on positions; actual number of teachers not reported.
c - Separate averages are reported for vocational teachers for the years 1940-50 and 1960; they are not included herein.

TABLE II

SUMTER COUNTY, ALABAMA - ENROLLMENT
1900-1960

Year		A Number Of School Age Children	B Number Of Pupils Enrolled Elem	HS	C % Of School Age Children Enrolled	D % Of Total Enrollment In Elem	HS
1900	W	2052	880	415	63	68	32
	N	8820	2040	100	24	95	5
1905	W	2006	1405		70	--	--
	N	10,292	1152		11	--	--
1910	W	1825	1563		86	--	--
	N	10,934	2897		26	--	--
1915	W	1932	1214	196	73	86	14
	N	10,649	3152	10	30	99.7	.3
1920	W	2162	1298	361	76	78	22
	N	9397	5426	9	58	99.8	.2
1925	W	2067	833	579	68	59	41
	N	10,901	6245	109	58	98	2
1930	W	1806	925	649	87	59	41
	N	9049	4935	255	57	95	5
1935	W	1722	751	580	81	56	44
	N	8999	5328	338	63	94	6
1940	W	1499	643	576	88	53	47
	N	9414	5400	557	63	90	10
1945	W	1362	536	467	74	53	47
	N	7415	4371	1002	73	81	19
1950	W	1324	596	438	78	58	42
	N	6419	3913	1529	88	72	28
1955	W	--	534	434	--	55	45
	N	--	3298	1796	--	66	34
1960	W	--	516	457	--	53	47
	N	--	3168	1926	--	62	38

TABLE III

SUMTER COUNTY, ALABAMA - INSTRUCTION
1900-1960

Year		A Pupil-Teacher Ratio [a]		B Average Annual Salary [d]		C Days In School Term		D Qualifications Of Teachers [c]			
		Elem	HS	Elem	HS	Elem	HS	A	B	C	D
1900	W	28:1	29:1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	N	37:1	33:1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
1905	W	31:1		--	--	137		3	15	19	12
	N	44:1		--	--	117		0	0	7	19
1910	W	29:1		--	--	170		5	19	22	8
	N	55:1		--	--	100		0	0	6	47
1915	W	24:1		$507		152		3	26	23	6
	N	81:1		114		86		1	0	4	34
1920	W	27:1[b]		743		174	175	8	31	16	8
	N	116:1[b]		201		94	110	1	3	4	39
1925	W	28:1	20:1	$729	$1367	175	176	--	--	--	--
	N	79:1	36:1	152	1253	74	152	--	--	--	--
1930	W	30:1	16:1	855	1293	173	175	--	--	--	--
	N	57:1	16:1	149	466	84	138	--	--	--	--
1935	W	19:1	21:1	561	986	175	175	25	12	16	3
	N	54:1	18:1	128	307	87	138	--	--	--	--
1940	W	21:1	18:1	494	784	143	165	40	10	14	0
	N	43:1	23:1	247	341	117	127	11	13	57	69
1945	W	19:1	18:1	1080	1309	175	175	38	9	11	2
	N	34:1	32:1	507	577	160	160	15	6	44	95
1950	W	23:1	21:1	2100	2511	176	176	36	9	4	0
	N	31:1	30:1	1432	1910	176	176	40	34	29	77
1955	W	22:1	19:1	2734	2763	175	175	45	1	1	0
	N	27:1	32:1	2312	2585	175	175	106	37	20	13
1960	W	23:1[b]	20:1[b]	3859	4051	175	175	45.5	0	1	0
	N	29:1[b]	27:1[b]	3549	3738	175	175	167	10	3	1

a - Based on enrollment and number of teachers.
b - Based on positions; actual number of teachers not reported.
c - 1900-1920: Classified by certificates held. 1935-1960: Classified by college training.
d - Separate averages are reported for vocational teachers for the years 1940-50 and 1960; they are not included herein.

ADDENDUM TO TABLE III

SUMTER COUNTY, ALABAMA - INSTRUCTION
1900-1960

The column entitled "Qualifications Of Teachers" is divided into four categories denoting differences in levels of teacher training. For purposes of brevity, these columns are designated "A", "B", "C", "D". These symbols represent the following levels of teacher training.

Years *	Teachers' Qualifications	
	Symbol in Table III D	Explanation
1900-1920	A	Life Certificate
	B	First Certificate
	C	Second Certificate
	D	Third Certificate
1935-1960	A	College Graduates
	B	Three Years College
	C	Two Years College
	D	Less Than Two Years

* Data not similarly reported for the years 1925 and 1930.

TABLE IV

SUMTER COUNTY, ALABAMA - FACILITIES
1910-1945

Year		A	B						C
			Number and Size (by teaching staff) of Schoolhouses						
		Total Enrollment	One Tch.	Two Tchs.	Three Tchs.	Four Tchs.	Five Or More	Total	Est. Value Of Schoolhouses
1910	W	1563	--	--	--	--	--	--	$ 19,500
	N	2897	--	--	--	--	--	--	1,000
1915	W	1410	--	--	--	--	--	--	59,700
	N	3162	--	--	--	--	--	--	500
1920	W	1659	14	12	3	1	2	31	81,200
	N	5435	45	1	0	0	0	46	27,385
1925	W	1412	7	1	5	1	4	18	187,700
	N	6354	60	8	0	0	1	69	21,300
1930	W	1574	3	2	3	2	6	16	517,000
	N	5190	58	10	3	1	1	73	75,000
1935	W	1331	4	2	4	1	6	17	--
	N	5666	53	12	7	2	1	75	--
1940	W	1219	5	1	1	1	5	13	261,900
	N	5957	51	19	6	3	4	83	30,558
1945	W	1003	5	2	0	0	5	12	--
	N	5073	43	20	9	4	4	80	--

TABLE V

SUMTER COUNTY, ALABAMA - EXPENDITURES
1925-1960

Year		A Total Enrollment	B Teachers' Salaries	C Trans-portation	D Capital Improvements	E Operation & Maintenance	F Total Expend.	G Expend. Per Pupil
1925	W	1412	$60,259	$12,990	$1609	$5581	$101,539	$ 72
	N	6354	15,768	--	3000	1263	22,184	4
1930	W	1574	70,576	19,145	26,422	5626	152,578	97
	N	5190	20,312	0	490	265	25,194	5
1935	W	1331	50,032	18,261	2665	3367	99,185	75
	N	5666	18,529	0	303	0	22,108	4
1940	W	1219	45,948	19,430	8563	8452	105,546	87
	N	5957	41,529	0	222	0	50,072	8
1945	W	1003	71,370	23,990	--	--	114,511	114
	N	5073	86,212	0	--	--	98,767	18
1950	W	1034	109,073	36,346	18,072	22,117	204,249	198
	N	5442	283,958	14,559	13,826	9965	343,752	63
1955	W	968	129,161	31,944	24,035	*	*	*
	N	5094	422,212	31,809	125,863	*	*	*
1960	W	973	180,405	27,414	2562 [a]	*	*	*
	N	5094	657,353	38,423	2073 [a]	*	*	*

a - Not differentiated by race as to $337.

APPENDIX

TABLE I

The data contained in Table I is reported on (or based on data reported on [a]) the following pages of the Annual Reports of the Alabama Department of Education for the years indicated.

Year		A	B	C	D	E
1900	W	259	266	(c)266	--	--
	N	259	266	(c)266	--	--
1905	W	117	137	(c)137;133	--	--
	N	117	137	(c)137;133	--	--
1910	W	135	135	(c)135;143	--	(c)171;135
	N	135	135	(c)135;143	--	(c)171;135
1915	W	96	108	(c)108;109	(c)117	--
	N	96	108	(c)108;109	(c)117	--
1920	W	(c)124;126	(c)49;57	(c)49;57;97	99	--
	N	(c)128;130	(c)61;65	(c)61;65;107	109	--
1925	W	204	205	(c)205;204	(c)204;212-13	(c)216;225
	N	218	219	(c)219;218	(c)218;223	(c)225;219
1930	W	172	203	(c)203;202	(c)202;235	(c)250;203
	N	173	259	(c)259;258	(c)258;275	(c)287;259
1935	W	28	37	361	(c)89;353	(c)225;37
	N	28	53	365	(c)89;357	(c)259;53
1940	W	39	71	147	303	(c)233;71
	N	39	75	147	307	(c)241;75
1945	W	39	41	117	227	(c)181;235;41
	N	39	45	117	231	(c)189;235;45
1950	W	47	77	129	231	(c)179;77
	N	47	81	129	235	(c)179;81
1955	W	--	37	(c)37;91;93	(c)91;93;151	--
	N	--	41	(c)41;103;105	(c)103;105;155	--
1960	W	--	35	(c)35;81	167	--
	N	--	39	(c)39;85	169	--

a The letter (c) preceding a page number(s) indicates a computation based on data reported.

A P P E N D I X

TABLE II

The data contained in Table II is reported on (or based on data reported on [a]) the following pages of the Annual Reports of the Alabama Department of Education for the years indicated.

Year		A	B	C	D
1900	W	See Appendix to Table I A	See Appendix to Table I B	(c)Column A divided by Column B	(c)See Appendix to Table I B
	N				
1905	W	"	"	"	--
	N				--
1910	W	"	"	"	--
	N				--
1915	W	"	"	"	(c)See Appendix to Table I B
	N				
1920	W	"	"	"	"
	N				
1925	W	"	"	"	"
	N				
1930	W	"	"	"	"
	N				
1935	W	"	"	71	"
	N			71	
1940	W	"	"	(c)Column A divided by Column B	"
	N				
1945	W	"	"	65	"
	N			65	
1950	W	"	"	(c)Column A divided by Column B	"
	N				
1955	W	"	"	"	"
	N				
1960	W	"	"	"	"
	N				

a The letter (c) preceding a page number(s) indicates a computation based on data reported.

APPENDIX

TABLE III

The data contained in Table III is reported on (or based on data reported on [a]) the following pages of the Annual Reports of the Alabama Department of Education for the years indicated.

Year		A	B	C	D
1900	W	See Appendix	--	--	--
	N	to Table I C	--	--	--
1905	W	"	--	145	133
	N		--	145	133
1910	W	"	--	135	143
	N		--	135	143
1915	W	"	See Appendix	108	109
	N		to Table I D	108	109
1920	W	"	"	57	97
	N			65	107
1925	W	"	"	205	--
	N			219	--
1930	W	"	"	203	--
	N			259	--
1935	W	"	"	63	103
	N			(c)67	--
1940	W	"	"	103	151
	N			107	163
1945	W	"	"	57	121
	N			61	133
1950	W	"	"	93	133
	N			97	145
1955	W	"	"	55	89
	N			57	101
1960	W	"	"	51	89
	N			55	101

a The letter (c) preceding a page number(s) indicates a computation based on data reported.

APPENDIX

TABLE IV

The data contained in Table IV is reported on (or based on data reported on [a]) the following pages of the Annual Reports of the Alabama Department of Education for the years indicated.

Year		A	B	C
1910	W	See Appendix	--	155
	N	to Table I B	--	155
1915	W	"	--	116
	N		--	117
1920	W	"	95	101
	N		105	111
1925	W	"	230	(c)217
	N		233	217
1930	W	"	185	(c)251
	N		187	251
1935	W	"	139	--
	N		143	--
1940	W	"	175	335
	N		175	335
1945	W	"	91	--
	N		91	--

a The letter (c) preceding a page number(s) indicates a computation based on data reported.

APPENDIX

TABLE V

The data contained in Table V is reported on (or based on data reported on [a]) the following pages of the Annual Reports of the Alabama Department of Education for the years indicated.

Year		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1925	W	See Appendix	(c)213	(c)215	(c)215	(c)214	(c)216	See Appendix
	N	to Table I B	223	--	(c)225	(c)224	225	to Table I F
1930	W	"	(c)235	(c)243	(c)250	(c)242	(c)250	"
	N		275	283	287	282	287	
1935	W	"	(c)353	(c)285	223	(c)213	225	"
	N		(c)357	317	257	247;249	259	
1940	W	"	231	311	233	(c)249	233	"
	N		239	313	241	265	241	
1945	W	"	179	87	--	--	181	"
	N		187	89	--	--	189	
1950	W	"	191	113	179	175;177	179	"
	N		195	115	179	175;177	179	
1955	W	"	151	73	(c)137	--	--	"
	N		155	75	(c)137	--	--	
1960	W	"	151	73	137	--	--	"
	N		155	75	137	--	--	

a The letter (c) preceding a page number(s) indicates a computation based on data reported.

1964 STATUS REPORT

[Prepared by Attorneys in
the Civil Rights Division,
Department of Justice, for
Intra-Department Use]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

Page

1971(a) Cases.....1-126

1971(b) Cases.....127-161

1971(a), Matters Under Active Investigation

Alabama.....162-181

Georgia.....182-194

Mississippi.....195-204

South Carolina.....205-206

1971(b), Matters Under Active Investigation

Georgia.....207

Louisiana.....208-211

Mississippi.....212-216

PART II

Records Inspections

Mississippi.....1-62

Alabama.....63-94

Louisiana.....95-151

INDEX TO CASES

1971(a)	PAGE
U.S. v. Allen et.al. (Chickasaw Co., Miss.)	121-122
U.S. v. Ashford, Jr. (Hinds Co. Miss.)	81-82
U.S. v. Assoc.of Citizens Councils (Bienville Parish, La.)	11-12
U.S. v. Atkins (Dallas Co., Ala.)	17-19
U.S. v. Bibb Co. Demo. Exec. Comm. et.al. (Bibb Co., Ga.)	62
U.S. v. Bellsnyder, et.al (Jefferson Co., Ala.)	88-89
U.S. v. Board of Registration of the State of Louisiana (Louisiana)	90-93
U.S. v. Campbell, C.C (Sunflower Co., Miss.)	73-75
U.S. v. Campbell, R.F (Madison Co., Miss.)	109-110
U.S. v. Cartwright (ex.rel.Strong) (Elmore Co., Ala.)	85-87
U.S. v. Clayton (Marshall Co., Miss.)	116-118
U.S. v. Clement and State of Louisiana (Webster Parish, La.)	76-77
U.S. v. Coleman (Lauderdale Co., Miss.)	107-108
U.S. v. Cox et.al. (ex.rel.Harris) (Tallahatchie Co., Miss.)	52-53
U.S. v. Cox (Harold J.) (Writ of Prohibition)	Addendum
U.S. v. Crawford and the State of Louisiana (Red River Parish, La.)	78-79

U.S. v. Crouch..... 94-95
(St. Helena, Parish, La.)

U.S. v. Daniel..... 32-34
(Jefferson Davis Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Dogan..... 50-51
(Tallahatchie Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Duke..... 44-46
(Panola Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Fayette Co.Dem.Exec.Comm..... 10
(Fayette Co., Tenn.)

U.S. v. Ford..... 63-64
(Choctaw Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. Fox..... 42-43
(Plaquemine Parish, La.)

U.S. v. Harvey..... 96-97
(West Feliciana Parish, La.)

U.S. v. Henry..... 101-102
(Oktibbeha Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Hines..... 99-100
(Sumter Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. Hosey, et.al..... 119-120
(Jasper Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Jones Demo.Exec.Comm.et.al..... 80
(Jones Co., Ga.)

U. S. v. Lucky..... 29-31
(Ouachita Parish, La.)

U.S. v. Lynd..... 26-28
(Forrest Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Manning..... 20-22
(East Carroll Parish, La.)

U.S. v. Mathis..... 123-125
(Benton Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Mayton, et.al..... 65-68
(Perry Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. McClellan.....114-115
(Holmes Co. Miss.)

U.S. v. McElveen..... 8-9
(Washington Parish, La.)

U.S. v. Mikell..... 126
(Marion Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Palmer.....111-113
(East Feliciana Parish, La.)

U.S. v. Parker..... 35-37
(Montgomery Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. Ramsey..... 23-25
(Clarke Co., Miss.)

U.S. Raines..... 1-3
Terrell Co., Ga.)

U.S. v. Simpson et.al.(ex.rel.Griffin)..103-104
(Chickasaw Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. State of Alabama..... 13-16
(Bullock Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. State of Alabama..... 4-7
(Macon Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. State of Louisiana.....54-57
(Baton Rouge, La.)

U.S. v. State of Mississippi.....69-72
(Jackson Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Tutwiler..... 98
(Hale Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. Wall (ex.rel.Logue)..... 83-84
(Wilcox Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. Ward (ex.rel.Green)..... 60-61
(George Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Ward..... 47-49
(Madison Parish, La.)

U.S. v. Wilder..... 58-59
(Jackson Parish, La.)

U.S. v. Weeks.....105-106
(Copiah Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Wood..... 38-41
(Walthal Co., Miss.)

INDEX TO CASES

1971(b) PAGE

U.S. v. Atkeison.....130-131
(Fayette Co., Tenn.)

U.S. v. Barcroft.....127-129
(Haywood Co., Tenn.)

U.S. v. Beaty.....127-129
(Haywood Co., Tenn.)

U.S. v. Board of Education, et. al.....136-137
(Greene Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Bruce et. al.....156
(Wilcox Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. Clark.....160-161
(Dallas Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. Dallas Co.....147-148
(Dallas Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. Dallas Co. Citizens Council, et. al.....154-155
(Dallas Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. Deal 132-133
(East Carroll Parish, La.)

U.S. v. Edwards, et. al.....143-144
(Rankin Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Greenwood.....140-142
(Leflore Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Holmes, et. al.....145-146
(Holmes Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Leflore,Co., et. al.....149-150
(Leflore Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Mathews, et. al.....138-139
(Terrell Co., Ga.)

U.S. v. McLeod, et. al.....151-153
(Dallas Co., Ala.)

U.S. v. Warner.....157-159
(Clarke Co., Miss.)

U.S. v. Wood.....134-135
(Walthall Co., Miss.)

GREEN TACKS: 1971(a) ACTIONS FILED UNDER 1957 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

Status Date, December 31, 1964

1. U.S. v. Raines
(Terrell County, Ga.)

Discrimination in registration (Nixon)

M.D. Georgia: Bootle
Date Filed: 9/4/58
Date Tried: 6/27-7/1/60
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 9/13/60
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
4/16/58	White	3,233	2,810	86%
	Negro	5,000	48	1.0%
9/13/60	White	3,038	2,900	95%
	Negro	4,057	53	1.3%
12/1/63	White	3,038	3,146	100%+
	Negro	4,057	188	4.6%
12/11/64	White	3,038	3,385	100%+
	Negro	4,057	333	8%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
2/24/61- 12/1/63	White	217	215	2
	Negro	146	131	12
12/63- 12/64	White	240	239	1
	Negro	154	145	9

This case was filed in September, 1958. The district court dismissed the action (April 16, 1959) on the grounds that Congress had exceeded its scope of authority by providing for civil rights actions in the 1957 Act against "private" individuals. The decision of the district court was appealed directly to the United States Supreme Court where it was reversed. The Court held that it was erroneous to dismiss the complaint on the grounds that the Act might apply to private individuals because that question was not before the court. The complaint was against state officials acting in their official capacity, and as such, was clearly pursuant to a constitutional exercise of Congressional power under the 15th Amendment.

A hearing on the merits was held June 27-July 1, 1960. The government proved a strong case of discrimination including the rejection of 2 Negroes with master's degrees, 5 with bachelor degrees, 1 Negro with a year of college, 5 school teachers, and a county agent.

On September 13, 1960, findings and decree were entered. Both were favorable to the government. Although the court declined to make a finding of a pattern and practice of discrimination, the court enjoined the defendants "...from engaging in any acts or practices which involve or result in distinction on the basis of race or color...", including (a) the use of differently colored registration forms for white and Negro voters, (b) the keeping of separate registration records by race, (c) the delaying action upon applications by Negroes while not delaying for whites, (d) requiring more difficult sections from the state or federal constitutions for Negroes to read and copy then whites, (e) requiring Negroes to read aloud and write from dictation while not so requiring of whites, (f) administering literacy tests to Negro applicants singly and apart from white applicants while administering such tests to white applicants in

groups, (g) and requiring a higher standard of literacy of Negroes than of white applicants in passing upon the results of the literacy tests.

More broadly, the court enjoined the administration of qualifying examinations to Negroes in any way different from the manner in which those tests are administered to other applicants, and granted freezing relief.

The court also ordered 4 Negroes put on the rolls, and retained jurisdiction for the purpose of making any and all additional orders as might become necessary.

SNCC has worked in Terrell County since December, 1961. Up until the end of the summer, 1962, registration proceeded very slowly and workers were restricted by intimidation. Following the filing of a 1971(b) case, U.S. v. Mathews in August, 1962, registration increased.

In 1963, registration workers' home was shot into. Investigation followed, but produced no subject.

Consent judgment entered in U.S. v. Mathews on January 27, 1964, against 15 of the 16 defendants; remaining defendants dismissed. Board of Registrars has applied standards fairly and equally since January, 1964.

12/31/64

2. U.S. v. Alabama
(Macon County, Ala.)
166-2-10 1-087-6

Discrimination and slow-down in registration (Marlin)

M.D. Alabama: Johnson
Date Filed: 2/5/59
Date Tried: 2/20-22/61
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 3/17/61
Appeal: By Alabama
Appeal Decided: 6/11/62

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
2/5/59	White	2,818	2,800	98%
	Negro	8,493*	1,110	13%
3/17/61	White	2,818	2,800	98%
	Negro	8,493*	1,133	13%
12/31/63	White	2,818	2,800	98%
	Negro	8,493*	4,040**	47.4%
10/31/64	White	2,818	2,946***	100.0%
	Negro	8,493*	4,188****	49.3%

*This figure excludes 3,393 non-resident Negroes

**This figure is an estimate

***This figure does not take into account deaths and transfers from the county.

****According to Tuskegee Civic Association

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
3/17/61-	White	16	16	0
10/1/61-	Negro	448	138* 287	165
10/1/61-	White	446	427	19
2/17/64	Negro	2,707	2,109	598
2/17/64-	White	69	67	2
9/1/64	Negro	149	79	70
9/1/64-	White	21	16	5
10/19/64	Negro	58	19	38

*Registered by order of Court.

This case was first filed in February, 1959. It was dismissed by Judge Johnson in March 1959 on the grounds that there was no functioning board of registrars, that registrars have the right to resign and we could not then hold them as defendants. This decision was remanded by the Supreme Court. In the interim, the 1960 Civil Rights Act was passed, which provided for including the state as a defendant.

The case was tried in February, 1961 and a decree was entered in March of that year. The decree required the board to place 64 previously-rejected Negroes on the rolls, to issue priority numbers to Negro applicants, and to have a systematized procedure for processing the applications. Furthermore, the practice of limiting the number of applicants for whom a supporting witness may vouch was enjoined and a detailed system of reports by the board to the court was

required. The court permitted the board to require applicants to read and write "a portion of the Constitution not to exceed 50 words."

The decree's requirement that the board register the specific Negroes was appealed by the defendants. The Court of Appeals upheld the lower court's order in ruling that the broad language of the 1960 Act indicated that Congress meant to grant effective tools to furnish the Court with the means for the effective enforcement of the protection of the franchise.

On September 13, 1961, a supplemental decree was issued. This order enjoined the board from rejecting, for technical errors, Negroes who would qualify under standards applied to white applicants since 1957, and from using a different or more stringent application form than was used prior to March 17, 1961.

Costs in the amount of $1,533.36 taxed and collected July 10, 1962. Parties by stipulation entered into July 25, 1963 agreed to suspend the reporting provisions. Phototraphing put on a quarterly rather than on a monthly basis.

In August 1963 the Sheriff of Macon County hired a Negro deputy.

On January 7, 1965 contempt proceedings against the board will be heard in Montgomery. The Department is contending: (a) that the board has continued to reject qualified Negroes for technical errors and has not followed standards previously applied to whites; and (b) has adopted a different and more difficult application form by utilizing the forms promulgated by the Alabama Supreme Court in 1964. The Government's brief is due January 25, 1965; the defendants' on January 30, 1965.

In September 1963 the school board, pursuant to an order of the District Court, accepted 13 applications of Negro

students to the white Tuskegee High School. The whites organized a complete boycott of the school and it was forced to close down in February 1964. In September 1964 it was reopened with 148 students, including 14 Negroes. Since then more white students have returned and as of December 7, 1964, the school has 198 white pupils.

The 1964 election saw two Negroes elected to the five member Tuskegee City Council, two Negroes elected as County Justices of the Peace, and one Negro elected to serve on the Macon County Board of Revenue.

12/31/64

3. U.S. v. McElveen
(Washington Parish, La.)
166-32-20 17-117-1
Purge of Negro Electors
(Kauder)

E.D.La.: Wright
Date Filed: 6/29/59
Date Tried: 11/18/59
Type: Preliminary Injunction
Date of Decree: 1/11/60
Appeal: McElveen; Government
Appeal Decided: 2/29/60

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
6/29/59	White	16,804	12,228	73.00%
	Negro	6,821	236	4.60%
2/29/60	White	16,804	15,156	84.00%
	Negro	6,821	1,698	25.00%
11/7/63	White	16,804	16,216	96.00%
	Negro	6,821	1,633	23.90%
10/3/64	White	16,804	15,795	94.00%
	Negro	6,821	1,634	23.90%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Between February and June 1959 the Citizens Council of Washington Parish challenged the registration status of 1,377 Negro voters (or about 85% of the 1,517 Negroes registered before the purge) and only 10 white voters (or about 0.07% of the 12,228 white persons then registered). At least 50% of the unchallenged applications of white persons had the same deficiencies upon which the challenges were based. Preliminary injunction granted January 11, 1960, ordering the registrar to restore to the registration rolls the names of the 1,377 Negroes purged therefrom. Since that time the registration of Negroes has proceeded very slowly with the result that total Negro registration has decreased slightly.

The Department has not followed up on this county. Attorneys for the Department did make a gross inspection of the records when the registrar's deposition was taken in U.S. v. Board (1/28/64) and reported that registrar was using application card as a test for Negroes only but that standards were not impossibly high. Records will have to be rechecked carefully and interviews conducted to determine reasons for lack of Negro effort and extent of discrimination.

4. U.S. v. Fayette Democratic Executive Committee
(Fayette County, Tenn.)
166-72-1 41-047-1

White Primary (Hubbard)

W.D. Tenn: Boyd
Date Filed: 11/16/59
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Consent 4/25/60
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
11/16/59	White	6,500	6,500	100.00%
	Negro	7,921	58	.73%
10/1/63	White	6,500	6,500	100.00%
	Negro	7,921	3,500*	44.20%
8/1/64	White	6,500	6,500	100.00%
	Negro	7,921	3,500*	44.20%

*This figure represents an estimation.

During a primary election to select candidates for local offices in August of 1959, the County Democratic Executive Committee excluded Negroes from voting by placing notices in each ballot box to the effect that the election was for white Democrats only. Registered Negroes who attempted to vote in the election were so advised.

Because the primary was neither required nor governed explicitely by state law, the party could abandon the primary and choose candidates by convention or simple appointment by the Executive Committee. Therefore, the consent decree, entered on April 25, 1960, provides that Negroes shall not be excluded from any election or selection process. Registered Negroes voted freely in the August 1963 primary election.

The registration figures are based on estimates. It may be that only about 2,000 Negroes are actually registered. A careful count should be made.

12/31/64

5. U.S. v. Assoc. of Citizens Council
(Bienville Parish, La.)
166-33-10 17-013-1
Purge of Negro electors and discrimination in registration (Ross)

W.D. La.: Dawkins
Date Filed: 6/7/60
Date Tried: 11/16/60
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 11/3/61
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
6/7/60	White	5,617	5,153	96.00%
	Negro	4,077	26	.64%
2/1/62	White	5,617	4,828	86.00%
	Negro	4,077	464	11.04%
12/11/63	White	5,617	5,055	90.00%
	Negro	4,077	551	13.05%
10/3/64	White	5,617	5,007	89.00%
	Negro	4,077	584	14.04%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
11/3/61-	White	749	708	41
12/31/63	Negro	215	111	104
1/64-	White	164	159	5
11/30/64	Negro	91	48	43

The Court ordered the registrar to restore five hundred and seventy Negroes to rolls and to cease discrimination in future. Court found a pattern and practice of discrimination. Costs taxed $3,370. No success at collection to date. Around four hundred and twenty Negroes restored to rolls. Remainder have moved, died or not responded. Registrar has been difficult on proof of residence, reading and writing from dictation and oral interpretation of Louisiana Bill of Rights. Under new procedures instituted in August 1962, the interpretation test was discontinued and the multiple choice citizenship test added. Local Negro voter registration group has not been very successful in trying to get people to register. No applications to Court have yet been filed under 1971(e). Parish included under decree of U.S. v. Louisiana forbidding use of any new test, including multiple choice citizenship test.

Records filed in U.S. v. Louisiana for the period September 1 through October 3, 1964, reflected that 1) high percentage of Negro applicants rejected 2) Negroes with good handwriting rejected. The Attorney General of Louisiana had instructed registrars to have applicants complete a form themselves as a means of complying with the court's order as to reporting registration progress on a monthly basis. On the basis of this, interview in November 1964. Interview reflected that Negroes with high school educations were rejected.

Thereafter in December 1964, records were inspected and photographed. These showed that some of the persons interviewed had been rejected for technical errors on their application cards. Inspection also showed that white cards contained very few errors. Statistical record shows 50% of the Negroes, and 5% of whites have been rejected since the trial. Affidavits of Negroes are being obtained and a white investigation is in preparation.

Facts collected to date seem to justify filing of a contempt action without further investigation. In 1954 the registrar had checked on the cards of rejected Negro applicants technical errors such as "My color is Negro," "My occupation is Welfare" and slight spelling errors. Inspection of the white accepted cards shows changes and corrections which in other parishes have been indicative of assistance by the registrar.

6. U.S. v. Alabama
(Bullock County, Ala.)
166-2-4 1-011-2

Voucher requirement. Registrars require identification by registered voter. Person can only vouch twice a year. Only four Negroes registered; three Negroes refused to vouch because of fear of economic reprisal. (Marlin)

M.D. Ala.: Johnson
Date Filed: 1/19/61
Date Tried: 3/28-3/30/61
Date of Decree: 9/13/61
Type: Permanent Injunction
Post Decree Orders:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age*	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
	White	2,387	2,291	96.0%
1/19/61	Negro	4,450	5	0.1%
	White	2,387	2,291	96.0%
4/1/61	Negro	4,450	4	0.1%
	White	2,387	2,380	100.0%
11/1/63	Negro	4,450	1,230	27.6%
	White	2,387	2,631	110.0%
11/1/64	Negro	4,450	1,386	31.0%

*1960 Census

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——23

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
4/1/61- 11/1/63	White	380	354	26
	Negro	2417	1225	1189
11/1/63- 11/1/64	White	249	244	5
	Negro	228	156	72

On March 30, 1961 the day trial ended, four Negroes were registered. The Court deferred decision to test the good faith of the Board. The Board continued to discriminate and further hearings were held in September, 1961, at the government's request. On September 13, 1961 the Court made a finding of a pattern and practice and granted permanent injunction.

The decree enjoined the Board from discriminating against Negroes; from enforcing any limitation on the number of times a person may serve as supporting witness; from applying different standards for Negro applicants than those applied to other applicants from 1954 to 1961, from rejecting Negro applicants for formal or inconsequential errors or from using a form of application or questionnaire different from or more stringent than that used for persons prior to March 30, 1961. Procedures were prescribed for maintaining an orderly form of priority lists. The United States was given authority to inspect the records at reasonable times and was ordered to assist the court in determining whether the decree was being complied with. Costs were assessed and collected in the amount of $986.53.

On July 26, 1962, following another hearing at the request of the Department of Justice, the court issued a supplemental order setting up specific standards which the registrar must use in administering registration in Bullock County. The registrar was ordered to register everyone who met the residence requirements; was not disqualified by reason of conviction of a crime; was willing to sign the oath and could read and write.

The Court stated that it was the Board's duty to ascertain from the applicant whether he met these requirements and directed them to resolve any questions, if questions arose, of an applicant's qualifications. Furthermore, it was the Board's duty to affirmatively administer the oath, and to judge literacy on the basis of the applicant's responsiveness to the questions on the application form.

Following this decree registration continued to pick up and in 1963 four Negroes were hired by the Highway Commission as truck drivers.

In February 1964 the State Supreme Court ordered the registrars to use a different type of registration form which included a relatively easy test and a requirement that the applicant write from dictation an excerpt from the Constitution. The Division decided not to challenge this as a violation of the court order, at least until there was some experience based on its use.

In September the Supreme Court adopted a new very difficult test which included an objective test on citizenship and an understanding test based on reading carefully. On November 13, the Government filed an order to show cause seeking to hold the registrar in contempt for using a different and more stringent application form than had been used during the period of discrimination prior to the Court's initial order. This hearing is set for January 5, 1965. Trial preparation reflects that the Board is not using the new insert in the way contemplated by the State but rather is giving the test and using the result as an aid in making a subjective judgement on literacy. All whites have been registered. One third of Negroes have failed.

The defendants will urge that the injunction has been in effect long enough to have given Negroes in Bullock County a fair opportunity to register under the lower standards and that the freeze should be lifted.

The rate of registration efforts has fallen off considerably in the last year. This is probably due to the low literacy level of the Negro community.

On the whole, progress in the County has been good. The Negro leaders have a great amount of self-respect and the 12th grade of the High School was desegregated by three pupils in September, 1964, without incident. One of the Negro students rode the white school bus from her home 10 miles in the country from the first day without difficulty.

12/31/64

7. U.S. v. Atkins
(Dallas County, Ala.)
166-3-6 1-047-3
Discrimination in registration (landsberg)

S.D. Ala.:Thomas
Date Filed: 4/13/61
Date Tried: 5/2-4/62; 10/5-8/64, 11/12/64
Type: Permanent Injunction
Appeal: Government 1/9/63
Appeal Decided: 9/30/63

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
4/13/61	White	14,400	9,195	64.0%
	Negro	15,115	156	1.03%
4/1/62	White	14,400	8,597	59.7%
	Negro	15,115	242	1.6%
11/18/63	White	14,400	9,162	63.6%
	Negro	15,115	298	1.9%
8/17/64	White	14,400	9,542	66.0%
	Negro	15,115	335	2.2%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
6/61-	White	480	443	37
5/62	Negro	115	71	43
5/62-	White	725	546	178
11/1/63	Negro	469	50	419
11/2/63-	White	507	399	108
8/17/64	Negro	326	43	283

Between 1952 and 1960 the Board of Registrars registered 4,420 white persons while registering only 88 Negroes. Seventy-four of these 88 Negroes were registered prior to May 18, 1954. Case tried on Merits May 2-4, 1962. Between the filing of the complaint and the date of the trial 70 Negroes were accepted and 45 were rejected.

The Government called about 40 witnesses -- 125 under subpoena and proved a pattern and practice of racial discrimination by prior Boards between 1952 and 1961. Contested issue was conduct of present Board activated after suit filed and whether the present Board bound by standard applied by former Boards in registering whites.

November 10, 1962, Judge Thomas held (210 F. Supp. 441) that the Government proved discrimination against the old Board and denied the Government's request to enjoin the new Board from future discrimination, our request for a finding of a pattern and practice of discrimination, and our request for an order requiring the Board to register specific Negroes. Notice of appeal filed on January 9, 1963. Oral argument held before Judge Rives, Judge Cameron (Fifth Cir.) and Judge Hays (Second Circuit) on June 4, 1963. On September 30, 1963, Court of Appeals (323 F. 2d 733) reversed the decision of the lower court and instructed District Court to issue a specific injunction.

On November 1, 1963, the District Court issued a permanent injunction against the Board of Registrars of Dallas County. Injunction directed Board to cease discriminating and specifically to cease rejecting applicants for errors or omissions in the questionnaire when other answers or information reveals that the applicant is qualified; to cease using the questionnaire as a test unless the registrars present to the court and propose to use a definite set of standards for the grading of questionnaire which standards are acceptable to the court as complying with federal law. The Board was also forbidden to ask oral questions unless the questions complied with state and federal law and unless records were kept. The Board was also directed to cease rejecting applicants for lack of good character without notice and opportunity for hearing. Finally the Board was ordered to keep records of the exact reasons for the rejections and to advise the applicant as to the specific reason for his rejection. The district court refused to tax costs against the defendants or to order the defendants to report to the court monthly on registration progress. The opinion was disappointing in that the court declined to apply the freezing principle to this particular Board of Registrars and indicated that the Governement could better purge the whites. Opinion is not helpful in counties where Boards of Registrars are determined to frustrate federal law. On October 29, 1963, the Government filed an order to show cause why the registrars of Dallas County should not be required to speed up the registration process. The Court declined to sign the order.

The Board's records since the May 1962 trial were photographed on November 27 and 29, 1963. These records revealed that, between May 1962 and November 18, 1963, 89% of the 500 Negroes who applied for registration were rejected; 24% of the 752 whites were rejected. The Board's pre-May 1962 rejection rate had doubled. On March 6, 1964, the government filed a notice of motion and motion for an order requiring the defendants to observe specific requirements, to register certain applicants, and for a finding of a pattern and practice of discrimination. The motion was set to be heard on March 30, 1964, but, on March 23, 1964, was continued at the government's request. On September 2, 1964, the case was set for hearing beginning October 5, 1964.

The government, under Rule 34, photographed the Board's records on March 19-20, 1964 and on September 23, 1964. The parties, at the commencement of the hearing on October 5, 1964, agreed that the hearing not only covered the government's motion but was also a contempt proceeding. The hearing was held on October 5 through 8, 1964 and on November 12, 1964. The government subpoenaed 78 witnesses, of whom 56 testified. The evidence showed that the Board had violated the court's injunction by using the form as a test without court-approved standards, by failing to notify applicants of the exact reasons for their rejection, by requiring applicants to answer difficult and unreasonable questions (e.g. requiring them to interpret the Ninth Amendment to the Constitution) that violate state and federal law, and by discriminating against Negroes. The discrimination consisted of denying registration to qualified Negroes, discrimination in the selection and grading of questions, aiding white but not Negro applicants, slowing down the receipt of applications for registration, and freezing registration by the adoption of unreasonably high standards. The evidence also showed violations of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 -- the use of standards, practices, and procedures not previously applied to white persons, the use of questions unrelated to the applicant's qualifications, and the use of literacy tests not wholly in writing. The evidence also showed the Board to have increased the difficulty of the state registration test used between February 1964 and September 1964 by requiring the applicants to spell difficult words from the Constitution and by requiring them to explain an excerpt from the Constitution.

The case included the government's first attack on the new set of 100 inserts to the application form. The government's brief was submitted on November 20, 1964. The defendant's reply December 3, 1964. Case submitted for decision.

12/31/64

8. U.S. v. Manning
(East Carroll Parish, La.)
166-33-20 17-035-1
Voucher requirement. Registrar requires identification by registered voter. No Negroes registered. (Ross)

W.D. La.: Dawkins
Date Filed: 4/8/61
Date Tried: 11/27/61
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 5/30/62
Appeal: State
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
4/8/61	White	2,990	379	13.00%
	Negro	4,183	0	0.00%
5/30/62	White	2,990	1,115	37.00%
	Negro	4,183	0	0.00%
11/11/63	White	2,990	1,833	61.00%
	Negro	4,183	159*	4.00%
10/3/64	White	2,990	1,939	64.00%
	Negro	4,183	179*	4.50%

New registration period began 1/1/61. Parish now on permanent registration.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
9/1/62- 12/31/63	White	884	728	156
	Negro	274	113	161
7/62**	Negro	79	43	36
1/64- 10/3/64	White	93	81	12
	Negro	73	25	48

*Includes 43 Negroes registered by the Court under 1971(e).

**Applications made to U.S. District Court under the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1971(e).

Court made strong findings of fact; enjoined registrar from discriminating against Negroes in connection with proving their identity when they go to register. Court also enjoined registrar from engaging in any other acts or practices which result in racial discrimination and found a pattern or practice. The court also required the registrar to report monthly on registration progress. Costs of U.S. v. Manning were assessed against the registrar but not the State and nothing has been collected.

On June 13, 1962, the Department received reports that Negroes who tried to register could not locate the registrar and he was doging them. On June 14, the registrar resigned on the stated ground that he could not understand the decree.

A congressional primary election was scheduled for July 28. On June 19, 1962, 44 Negroes applied by letter to the court to be registered under the provisions of the 1960 Civil Rights Act. On June 20, the State of Louisiana filed notice of appeal and the court granted stay of the injunction. The ground for the stay was that the court could not find a referee; that it was physically impossible for him to process the applicants because he was tied up in court and was assigned to sit in Jacksonville in July. On June 22, the Government applied to the Circuit Court of Appeals to dissolve the stay. Hearing held June 25. Stay lifted July 3, 1962. Shortly thereafter 34 additional Negroes applied to be registered by the court. On the 12th day of July the court found 26 of the 53 Negroes who appeared qualified and directed that defendants show cause on the 23rd day of July why these 26 should not be registered. On July 19 a state court issued a Temporary Restraining Order against district judge forbidding him to issue the registration certificates to any of the 26 Negroes. July 23 the action was removed by the federal court and the Temporary Restraining Order dissolved. July 24 the state's plea of unconstitutionality of the 1960 Civil Rights Act was heard and denied. Government also obtained preliminary injunction against state officials from interfering with the federal court in the case of U.S. v. Manning. After hearing by the court it was determined that 26 of the Negroes were qualified, 25 of whom affiliated with the Democratic Party and voted on July 28.

Since the election, 17 of 26 additional applicants have been found qualified by the court and issued certificates. Although those holding certificates have been allowed to vote, they are not counted as registered voters in the statistics of the State Board of Registration. The Court cited Manning for contempt, but prior to the hearing on the citation for contempt (August 22, 1962) and at the suggestion of Judge Dawkins, Manning

agreed to accept reappointment as registrar. Judge Dawkins then held the question of contempt to be moot and Manning resumed office.

In February 1963 the three-judge court which upheld the constitutionality of the referee provisions of the 1960 Act issued a comprehensive opinion. In it the court stated, "Discrimination by a registrar is especially harmful because it is the most effective method of denying the right to vote; it denies the right to vote before an individual has the chance to exercise it and it bars not only the individual concerned from all elections but inhibits other qualified voters from running the gauntlet of discrimination and humiliating practices by a registrar."

Negro registration is moving very slowly. Although June 1964 interviews show that some Negroes with eighth and ninth grade educations are being rejected, the general quality of the Negro rejects is not particularly high. This determination was made by an inspection of the records through 6/23/64. This parish suffers from low literacy of Negroes with the result that they do make errors in the application form. The solution to this is the elimination of the application form as a test (now challenged in U.S. v. Board) and an increased registration effort by Negroes. Thirty-three applications were filed by Negroes (14 accepted, 19 rejected) in the month before the books closed for the Presidential election.

Interviews with Negroes in November and December 1964 indicate that without the impetus provided by an election of great interest, few Negroes will attempt to register. The registrar has been enjoined from using the citizenship test by the decree in U.S. v. Louisiana. There is some evidence that he has been giving it to applicants but not grading it.

9. U.S. v. Ramsey
(Clarke County, Miss.)
166-41-37 23-023-1

Discrimination in registration (Schwelb)

S.D. Miss.: Cox
Date Filed: 7/6/61
Date Tried: 12/26-28/62
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 2/5/63-12/1/64
Appeal: Government - 4/1/63
Appeal Decided: 2/20/64
Rehearing: 4/23/64

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
7/6/61	White	6,072	4,611	76%
	Negro	2,998	0	0%
12/26/62	White	6,072	4,611	76%
	Negro	2,998	3	0.1%
11/3/63	White	6,072	4,785	79%
	Negro	2,998	45	1.5%
9/4/64	White	6,072	4,829	80%
	Negro	2,998	64	2.2%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
4/1/63-11/3/63	White	183	174	9
	Negro	63	42	21
11/3/63-9/5/64*	White	44	44	0
	Negro	19	19	0

*In addition to the above, 17 Negroes and 17 white persons had pending applications on 9/5/64 but had not returned to sign the registration book. All the rejected Negro and white applicants were rejected by former registrar Ramsey. Mrs. Harris, the new registrar, has accepted all applicants during her incumbency.

After hearings on preliminary motions Government inspected records in July 1962 and defendants answered. Originally set for trial December 17, 1962. Postponed until December 26, 1962, in Meridian, Mississippi. Case very strong; government called several highly qualified Negroes, including school principal, and remarkable group of illiterate and semi-literate white registrants. Proof strong that Negro applicants were sent home to "think" it over and not allowed to apply, while white persons registered by "signing the book" for themselves and spouses without any test. On February 5, 1963, District Court decided case for Government and found massive irregularities in the registration of whites and discrimination against Negroes, but found that there was no pattern or practice of discrimination. Injunction entered against the registrar restraining him from discrimination against Negroes. Court also indicated that local officials should purge the books of illegally registered whites. Court refused to order registrar to "violate the law" by registering Negro citizens in the same manner that whites had been registered in the past. Costs taxed in the amount of $1,377 but have not been paid.

Government filed notice of appeal on April 1, 1963, because of the refusal to find a pattern and practice of discrimination which would trigger the 1960 Civil Rights Act and because of the Court's denial of freezing relief.

The appeal was heard on December 4, 1963. An affidavit was filed by the defendants with the Court of Appeals on December 4, 1963, which stated that from January 1, 1963, to November 3, 1963, there were 183 white applicants and 63 Negro applicants of which 174 whites were registered and 42 of the Negroes were registered. An affidavit was also filed by the Board of Election Commissioners which stated that they had removed from the registration rolls 21 witnesses who testified at the trial whose testimony indicated they were improperly registered. This included 16 white witnesses and 5 Negroes. The proof showed that the 5 Negroes were placed on the registration rolls for jury service purposes only.

On February 20, 1964, the United States Court of Appeals modified the District Court's ruling to require the Registrar to make periodic reports and, as modified, affirmed Judge Cox's order, specifically approving the denial of freezing relief. Judge Rives dissenting. The United States moved for a rehearing en banc, and on April 23, 1964, the panel which had heard the appeal (minus Judge Cameron, who had died) held, on rehearing, that Judge Cox's finding that there was no pattern or practice of discrimination was "clearly erroneous" and remanded the case to Judge Cox in the light of that finding.

On September 4, 1964, the Government moved to implement the mandate and to grant freezing relief. After oral argument was had and briefs were filed, Judge Cox, on December 1, 1964, withdrew his finding of no pattern and practice and substituted therefore a finding that justice would best be served by making no finding whether or not there was a pattern or practice of discrimination. He again denied "freezing" relief but amended his order to provide for limited monthly reports by the registrar, for specific facts with respect to rejected Negroes. No comparable requirement was made for accepted Negroes or white persons, accepted or rejected.

Appeal, on an expedited basis, has been recommended 12/28/64 from Judge Cox's failure to find a pattern or practice and from his second denial of freezing relief.

10. U. S. v. Lynd
(Forrest County, Miss.)
166-41-40 #23-035-1 #68

Discrimination in registration (McIntyre)

S. D. Miss.: Cox
C.C.A.: Brown, Wisdom, Bell
Date Filed: 7/6/61
Date Tried: 3/5/-3/7/62;
9/17- 9/22/62
4/14-15-17/64
Type: Preliminary Injunction;
Contempt; Permanent Injunctio
Date of Decree: 4/10/62
Appeal: Government
Appeal Decided: 7/15/63

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
7/6/61	White	22,431	12,500	56%
	Negro	7,495	12	.2%
8/12/62	White	22,431	12,500	56%
	Negro	7,495	21	.3%
12/18/63	White	22,431	13,000*	58%
	Negro	7,495	94	1.2%
6/16/64	White	22,431	13,253	59%
	Negro	7,495	236	3.14%

*This figure is estimated.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
4/10/62 - 12/10/63	White	967	441	536
	Negro	398	82**	355
12/11/63- 6/16/64	White	342	253	89
	Negro	956	142	814

** 43 by Court order

Prior to April, 1962 only 14 Negroes registered in the County; all became registered prior to the adoption of the Constitutional interpretation test in 1954 (One Negro, mistaken for a white person, registered in 1955 and two Negroes transferred their registration from another Mississippi County early in 1962) After Court refused to rule on preliminary injunction

in March 1962 the Court of Appeals issued an injunction pending appeal. On May 1, 1962 the Court of Appeals cited the registrar for contempt of that injunction. The contempt action was tried in Hattiesburg beginning September 17, 1962 before three Court of Appeals judges. Contempt matter submitted on January 25, 1963. On July 15, 1963 the Court of Appeals found Lynd in civil contempt and ordered him to register 43 Negroes immediately; also directed Lynd to agree not to use examination form as an obstacle course and to use only 13 sections of the Mississippi Constitution to determine an applicant's qualifications under the interpretation test. Criminal contempt proceedings stayed until Supreme Court decides Barnett case. Stay of the civil contempt order granted until August 25 to enable Lynd to apply for stay from the Supreme Court.

By first primary on August 6 some of the 43 Negroes had been registered by Lynd but names had not been placed on poll books and those who had two poll tax receipts were refused the right to vote. The stay applied for in the Supreme Court was denied on September 20, 1963. The Government has taxed costs in the amount of $5,856.00 in the contempt case. On January 6, 1964 Supreme Court denied the defendant's petition for certiorari.

Records had been rephotographed September 24, and 25, 1963 and preliminary analysis showed that Lynd had continued to reject applicants for inconsequential omissions from the time of the trial of the contempt case until the Court of Appeals Order on July 15, 1963. Since July 15, 1963 preliminary analysis indicated strict standards both on the interpretation test and the duties and obligations test. Records rephotographed again on January 11, 1964, and thereafter in the month of January attorneys for the Government had several conferences with the defendants about registering 23 previously rejected Negroes. Lynd agreed to register ten of the 23 previously rejected Negroes. He also agreed to let five of the 23 return to the courthouse to correct the basis for his earlier rejection on their original forms. At least two of these five persons were required to complete a new form when they returned to do so. Lynd refused to register the remaining eight Negroes.

Hearing on merits of 1971(a) case held in Hattiesburg on April 14, 15 and 17, 1964. Records brought down almost to the date of trial for introduction into evidence. At the same time on April 15, the Government filed with the Court of Appeals a petition for further orders to compel compliance.

In the petition we specified the means of continued discrimination and the names of 154 Negroes who we thought should be registered. Government's brief and findings of fact filed May 28, 1964. Defendants brief filed in June. Oral argument held before Judge Cox on July 31, 1964. Post trial records inspected and photographed July 20, 1964. These records reflected a continued course of rejection of qualified Negroes through mid-June. By August 28, 1964 the Court of Appeals had not acted on our April 15, 1964 petition. On that day we sent a supplemental petition attaching the names of 275 Negroes who we thought should be registered. On September 12, 1964 the defendant responded to this petition contending that the Court of Appeals should let Judge Cox decide the case. On October 7, 1964 we wrote the Court of Appeals asking for a hearing on our petition. To date there has been no action taken on these petitions.

Costs of $4,523.84 paid on August 17, 1964. Newspaper publication lists indicate Negroes still applying as of November. On November 6 Judge Cox wrote Government stating that application forms not legible and requested substitutes. On November 26 these substitute application forms were furnished to the Court.

Case currently pending in the District Court. Decision expected early in 1965.

11. U.S. v. Lucky
(Ouachita Parish, La.)
166-33-30 17-073-1
Purge of Negro electors and discrimination in registration. (Ross)

W.D.La.: Dawkins
Date Filed: 7/11/61
Date Tried: 2/10-2/24/64
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
7/11/61	White	40,185	24,049	59.80%
	Negro	16,377	781	4.80%
12/11/63	White	40,185	28,691	71.00%
	Negro	16,377	1,285	9.00%
10/3/64	White	40,185	29,575	73.00%
	Negro	16,377	1,746	11.00%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/56-	White	13,720	13,076	644
12/11/64	Negro	2,937	1,503	1,434
6/1/64-	White	1,305	1,269	36
11/30/64*	Negro	415	271	144

* These figures are derived from the registrar's reports in U.S. v. Louisiana and do not reflect registration activity between 1/1/64 and 5/31/64, during which time approximately 200 Negroes registered, according to the figures of the State Board of Registration.

The depositions of the Attorney General, the Assistant Attorney General, and Frank Dunbaugh were taken November 1962 in Washington by attorney for the Citizens Council. Motion for summary judgment as to the Citizens Council was denied. The

motion of one of the individual defendants for summary judgment was granted. The case against a number of individual defendants was dismissed on the motion of the United States. We obtained a Rule 34 order from the Court to copy additional records in the Parish. The order was granted and the Government commenced photographing on March 29, 1963. Records analyzed. Records show a continuing pattern of discrimination. Defendant Lucky filed motion for summary judgment May 29, 1963. Hearing held and denied November 13, 1963. Records rephotographed December 12, 1963. In preparation for trial, the following control cards were typed: 28,000 accepted whites; 650 rejected whites; 8,000 whites removed from the registration rolls; 1,200 accepted Negroes; 1,200 rejected Negroes; 4,600 Negroes removed from the rolls; 900 affidavits of retention of Negroes; about 700 names of Negroes appearing on list in the registrar's files; and 900 returned envelopes.

While analyzing the records concerning the purge of thousands of Negroes from the rolls in 1956 by the Registrar and the Citizens Council, it was discovered the Registrar had also purged Negroes from the rolls between 1957 and 1961 for age computation errors on their application cards and for having allegedly incorrect addresses on their application cards. Many Negroes were on and off the rolls from three to five times during this period. In order to reconstruct a history of registration in Ouachita Parish from 1949 to the time of trial, two master alphabetical files of control cards were made, one for Negroes and one for whites. A control card for each registration experience for each person was placed in the file. These included accepted, rejected and purged cards; letters of challenge; affidavits of retention; returned envelopes; newspaper lists and registrar's scratch lists. From the completed file, it was possible to determine, for example, that an individual registered in 1949, was purged by the Citizens Council in 1956, retained on the rolls, purged again by the registrar in 1957, rejected when re-applying, accepted, purged a third time by the registrar in 1958, accepted, purged again in 1959, and accepted again. The control card file was used both as a means of relating witnesses for the trial and to construct a table appended to the Trial Brief showing the 185 worst experiences of Negro applicants. In addition, telephone directories and city directories for the years 1956 through 1961 were checked to determine that when the registrar had purged some Negroes for allegedly incorrect addresses, they had in fact listed their correct addresses.

- 30 -

Since white persons had also been purged from the rolls in 1956, it was necessary to analyze all the cards of persons who were not purged, as well as the cards of those that were, in order to determine that the registrar had used more stringent standards in purging Negroes than he had in purging whites. From this analysis, it was determined that over 4,000 white persons had remained on the rolls although their cards contained "errors" for which Negroes were purged. It was also necessary to check the age computations on 25,000 white accepted cards in order to show that when the registrar purged 20% of the Negro voters in 1959 for age computation errors, he ignored the cards of over 5,000 white persons who had made the same errors. This case was made even more complicated at the trial when the defendants tried to add 3,000 white persons who were removed from the rolls in 1955 for not voting to the number of white persons who were purged in 1956 and 1957 for errors on their cards. To support their contention the defendants introduced an exhibit compiled by a former deputy registrar. This exhibit contained the names of all the persons the defendants asserted had been removed from the rolls in 1956 and 1957 and the reasons for which they had been removed. In writing the trial brief, it was necessary to compare this exhibit to our control card files and newspaper lists in order to extablish that 5,000 white persons had been removed from the rolls in 1956 for errors on their cards, rather than 10,000 as claimed by the defendants. The trial was held from February 10 through February 24, 1964. The Government called 83 Negro and white applicant witnesses. Among the Negro witnesses was a college professor, who has a Doctorate, was a Fulbright Scholar and who was rejected for an inconsequential error on her application card. Among the white witnesses were several who testified that they received help from the registrar in filling out their applications in October 1963. Negro applicants who were turned down for "errors" during the same month or later also testified. The trial judge refused to admit into evidence the deposition of the registrar and when it was reoffered under Rule 43(c), the court ordered Government counsel to physically remove the original deposition transcript from the court record. Trial transcript was filed June 16, 1964. The Government's brief was filed September 28, 1964. The defendants' brief was filed December 11, 1964. The Government's Reply Brief is due January 11, 1965.

Ouachita is one of the 21 parishes enjoined from using the citizenship test by the U.S. v. Louisiana decree. Negro registration increased from 1,285 to 1,746 between 1/1/64 and 10/3/64. The large number of Negro applicants is due mainly to an intense CORE drive carried on there this year.

12. U.S. v. Daniel
(Jefferson Davis County, Miss.)
166-41-52 23-065-1 #41
Discrimination in registration. (McIntyre)

S.D. Miss.: Cox
Date Filed: 8/3/61
Date Tried: 10/23-24/62
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: Interlocutory Order
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
8/3/61	White	3,629	3,085	85.00%
	Negro	3,222	63	2.00%
10/23/62	White	3,629	3,600	99.00%
	Negro	3,222	76	2.36%
10/15/63	White	3,629	3,200	88.00%
	Negro	3,222	115	3.60%
12/10/64	White	3,629	3,236 1/	89.00%
	Negro	3,222	126 1/	3.91%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/4/63-	White	80	77 2/	3
10/15/63	Negro	26	4 3/	22 3/
10/16/63-	White	41 4/	36 1/	5
12/10/64	Negro	70	11 1/	59 5/

1/ Also 65 accepted race unknown.
2/ Does not include 109 whites re-registered after the interlocutory order.
3/ Also 146 accepted race unknown. Does not include 48 Negroes re-registered after the interlocutory order or 112 Negroes rejected.
4/ Does not include applicants for re-registration who were rejected, if any.
5/ Includes 40 applicants rejected on oral re-registration test and 19 rejected on written test.

Records inspected in July 1962. All applications destroyed prior to May 1962. Tried October 23 and 24, 1962 in Hattiesburg. On January 4, 1963 District Judge entered an interlocutory order in which the court deferred entry of final judgment and instructed the registrar as to his duty. Registrar instructed he should permit all Negroes who had registered prior to 1954 to re-register by merely demonstrating an ability to read and as to new applicants he should select for interpretation one of 50 sections of the Mississippi Constitution having some reasonable interest to citizens who are not lawyers. Court also directed registrar to report to him each month as to individuals who have been rejected. Decision made not to appeal in view of the interlocutory nature of the order and our desire to work matter out through district court if possible. Reporting provisions have been complied with and are helpful to us on rejections. In June 1963 we gave to the State Attorney General's office a list of Negroes who we thought we thought were improperly denied registration and the Assistant Attorney General agreed to look into the matter. No response. In late July 1963 the Government advised Court that if we got no satisfaction, we were going to move for permanent injunction. Application for order to show cause why a permanent injunction should not be issued and for an order permitting the Government to inspect and photograph records filed on September 27, 1963. Government photographed records on October 15, 1963.

Negroes who were rejected by Daniel interviewed throughout year. Interviews indicate that Daniel's still applying high literacy standards to Negroes, whether they are re-registrants or initial registrations. August FBI investigation of white standards netted very little, white persons very uncooperative.

One hundred ninety-seven reports setting out bases of rejecting Negro applicants filed with Clerk of Court as of late November 1964. Forty-four of these rejected Negroes completed forms, approximately 13 of which are persons who were registered prior to January 1, 1954, and who under state law and the terms of the Interlocutory Order should not have been required to do so.

Records photographed in Prentiss on November 26 and December 10, 1964. Race identification request sent out December 18, 1964. White standards FBI request being prepared. Trial date on permanent relief set for February 8, 1965. Latest records now being analyzed in preparation for trial. Preliminary analysis indicates some section selection and grading discrimination. White standards of course substantially higher now than in 1956 through 1962 period when nearly all whites in county re-registered or registered. Classic freeze case.

13. U.S. v. Parker
(Montgomery County, Ala.)
166-2-11 1-101-1

Discrimination in registration (Norman)

M.D. Ala.: Johnson
Date Filed: 8/4/61
Date Tried: 1/3 - 10/62
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 11/20/62
Post Decree Orders: 12/17/64

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
8/4/61	White	62,911	33,846	54%
	Negro	33,056	3,766	11.3%
11/1/61	White	62,911	33,846	54%
	Negro	33,056	3,766	11.3%
11/1/64	White	62,911	40,234*	64%
	Negro	33,056	7,250**	21.9%

*This figure includes an estimate of 1000 registered between November 1, 1961 and November 20, 1962.
**Includes 800 of 1,140 Court ordered registered. Does not include persons registered between November 1, 1961 and November 20, 1962.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
11/20/62 - 12/1/63	White	1,771	1,586	185
	Negro	2,279	1,559	720
12/1/63 - 11/1/64	White	4,033	3,802	231
	Negro	1,550	1,125	425

Case tried January 3 - 10, 1962. Case submitted on briefs May 7, 1962. On November 20, 1962 judge ordered Board of Registrars to place 1,140 Negroes on the rolls within 20 days. The Court enjoined Board from further discrimination and established the standards on which Negroes would be registered in the future. The Board was ordered to report periodically to the Court on the progress of the registration under the provisions of the injunction. Costs paid in the amount of $1,604. However, Court disallowed over $5,000 in costs for photocopies of registration records introduced in evidence. The Board continued to reject qualified Negro applicants for technical errors or omissions on their forms while assisting white applicants. On June 13, 1963 the Government filed a motion requesting the Court to order the defendants to register specific rejected Negro applicants and to issue an order appointing voting referees. A hearing on this motion was held on August 12, 1963 and continued. At the end of the August hearing the Court suggested that the Board change certain of it standards and procedures. The hearing was concluded on September 27, 1963 and briefs were submitted. On July 2, 1964 the Government filed a motion for an order amending the Decree to enjoin the use of the Insert Part III of a new application form which was promulgated by the Alabama Supreme Court on January 14, 1964. The Government contended that this new Insert was different and more stringent than the former application and questionnaire and its use to reject applicants was therefore in violation of the Court's Decree. The Government also requested the Court to order the defendants to register specific rejected Negro applicants. The hearing on this motion was held August 12. 1964. Briefs submitted.

On December 17, 1964 the District Court entered a supplemental order directing the registrars to register 229 Negroes and prohibiting the registrars from rejecting any applicant on the ground that he failed to complete satisfactorily any part of the Part III Insert in the application used in Montgomery County. The Part III Insert is the Insert that was used generally in Alabama between February and September 1964 and is much less difficult than the Insert now being used.

In its opinion the Court said that the Part III test as prescribed by the Supreme Court of Alabama and as used by the Montgomery County Board of Registrars since March 16, 1964 consists of qualifications different from and more stringent than those used in registering white persons between 1956 and January 1962. Such testing, by the use of questions on government, provides a new and different subject of examination and provides questions of different type not before used. The Board also used a reading test requiring the applicants to pronounce correctly words that were not on the old applications. Thus applicants were required to read and pronounce correctly such words as "delegated", "prohibited", "respectively", construed", apportioned", "enumeration", "ordain", and "affirmation". After July 2, 1964 the Board has required

applicants to write by copying excerpts on the Part III form. The court held that the practice followed by the board up until July 2, 1964, of requiring applicants to write from dictation, had the inevitable effect of subjecting these applicants to technical * standards to which white applicants in the past had not been subjected. One court said that the statistical evidence standing alone proves that the new test is more difficult than any of the tests previously used by the Montgomery County Board.

With respect to the time that the injunction had been in effect the court said that the injunction issued in November 1962 had not corrected the effects of the past discriminatory use because of rejection of Negroes for inconsequential errors and omissions and because the new application form not only has been used as a means for continuing the rejection of qualified Negro applicants for technical and inconsequential errors and omissions, but had constituted a different and more stringent test than that used by the Board during the period when the standards were determined by this Court in its original opinion. Therefore the injunction as originally issued would remain in force and effect. In addition, the court held that Part III is a test more stringent than any of the white applicants of Montgomery County were subjected to during the initial period under consideration by the court. The court did say that part of the injunction prohibiting the use of different and more stringent standards might be eliminated after the pattern and practice of discrimination ceases and after a reasonable opportunity to register to vote is afforded all citizens without regard to race or color. The court held that the one year "suggested" period does not apply where, as here, the discrimination has continued to exist since the original finding of discrimination and the issuance of the original decree. In order to eliminate the effect of past discrimination against Negro applicants to register in Montgomery County, Alabama, there can be set no time limit until an adequate opportunity has been afforded those desiring to register.

Finally, this opinion seems to suggest that the registrars may use the Insert but may not grade it. Our position has been to the contrary. It has not been upheld to date.

*Emphasis added.

12/31/64

14. U.S. v. Wood
(Walthall County, Miss.)
166-41-65 23-147-1
Discrimination in registration. No Negroes registered. (McCabe)

S.D. Miss: Cox
Date Filed: 8/5/61
Date Tried: 4/8-9/63
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 10/25/63
Appeal: Government; argued 11/9/64
Appeal Decided: 12/28/64

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
8/5/61	White	4,736	3,903	82.00%
	Negro	2,490	0	0.00%
4/10/62	White	4,736	4,736	100.00%
	Negro	2,490	3	0.1204%
11/1/63	White	4,736	4,736	100.00%
	Negro	2,490	4	0.1204%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/1/63- 9/1/63	White	177	177	0
	Negro	1	0	1

After disposal of preliminary motions, records inspected on July 9, 1962. Case ready for trial in October 1962 but defendant obtained a continuance because of broken jaw. Case came on for trial April 8, 1963. The Government presented illiterate white applicants who had been registered and literate Negroes who had been denied the right to vote, including a graduate student at Harvard University. The registrar admitted he helped white applicants fill out forms but said that the Negroes never asked for help. The Harvard student was registered during the trial and became the third Negro to register to vote in the

last thirty years. Government's trial brief filed April 26, 1963. Negro graduate student at Harvard voted at first primary without difficulty and night before election one local candidate solicited her vote. Since trial, Court on its own motion has written defendant and told him to remove 15 of the white witnesses from the books as they were not qualified to register. Records rephotographed September 1963 to bring evidence up to the date of trial. Court required Government to amend complaint to introduce records into evidence. Final argument on the case held September 27. On October 25, 1963 Court found that defendant Wood had discriminated against Negro citizens in his administration of the registration processes. It enjoined Wood and his successors from further acts of discrimination, ordered him to register the one Negro who had unsuccessfully applied for registration since the trial, and directed a limitation of the sections of the Mississippi Constitution to be used in the interpretation test to approximately 40 specified in the order. The Court declined to make a finding as to whether a pattern and practice of discrimination existed and dismissed the complaint against the State of Mississippi. The Court also awarded costs to the plaintiff. On November 16, 1963 defendant Wood died. Appeal was argued November 9, 1964;on December 28, 1964, the Court of Appeals reversed the order of the District Court. It stated that the history of this litigation parallels a similar suit brought in Panola County. At least until the date of the filing of the suit, voting was for white persons in Walthall County, Mississippi, a simple corollary of citizenship. White persons who applied were permitted to register without complying with the current and increasingly difficult provisions of the voters' registration statutes enacted by the State of Mississippi on a time schedule that coincided with the indications that more Negroes would make the effort to register. The registrar permitted illiterate white persons to register and gave assistance to white registrants in the filling out of their registration forms, so that it turned out the application was treated largely as an information form when submitted by a white person. It was a test of skill for the Negro. Aid was available to the white applicant when construing a section of the Constitution of the State of Mississippi and the sections given to such applicants were much simpler and shorter sections than those given to the Negroes to write and construe.

In discussing the refusal of the trial court to find the existence of a pattern or practice and in justifying the reversal of that decision by the trial court, the court

referred to the John Hardy case. The district court had refused to find the existence of a pattern or practice on the assumption that the relatively small number of Negro applicants was occasioned solely by reason of the fact that Negroes had not been interested in registering to vote and that no probative value could be ascribed to the statistics because the imbalance was not due to discrimination between the races. In refuting this the Court reviewed the Hardy case and made an implicit finding that Hardy's version of the facts was correct. The basis for this was the district court's implicit credibility finding that John Q. Wood falsely deposed with respect to the reinstatement of an illiterate voter amounting to what the district court called "his audacity to the court." During the course of the trial the district court wrote a letter to the registrar directing that 13 illiterates be removed from the voter rolls. One was reregistered and permitted to vote. Thereafter his name was removed by erasure and Wood filed an affidavit that he had never been reregistered. The district court stated that Wood even reregistered an illiterate whom the Court had stricken from the rolls and let him remain registered during August primaries in the county; that he was stricken from the rolls only after the Justice Department had discovered and revealed his audacity to the court.

The Court held that a finding of a pattern or practice is either warranted or not according to the facts, not what they were called, and that where the Court found a continual course of conduct constituting the policy of the registrar which is discriminatory, this was tantamount to a finding of pattern or practice within the meaning of the statute.

The order dismissing the state was reversed because the registrar is an official of the state and since the freeze order contemplates the temporary suspension of the state statutes regulating registration unless the state should see fit to cause reregistration of all the voters, the state's presence as a defendant is essential to the granting of complete relief.

The Court then ordered that, provided reasonable opportunities are given to the Negro citizens in Walthall County, there should be a limitation upon the time during which they may take advantage of the special registration standards.

The district court was directed to order the registrar to register all Negroes who met the following qualifications: age; residence; oath; nonconviction of certain crimes; a reasonable ability to read and to write by completing questions 1 through 18 of the form with or without assistance as needed. The registrar was ordered to process applicants when he or his deputy was present and to proceed as fast as the physical facilities of the office would reasonably permit; applicants were to be told the results then and there, and if favorable to be registered forthwith. Full and complete monthly reports were to be filed, the first report to be from April 10, 1963.

Two days after the decision Judge Cox wrote the attorney for the registrar, suggesting a complete reregistration. The defendant was given thirty days to make its decision.

15. U.S. v. Fox
(Plaquemines Parish, La.)
166-32-23 17-075-1
Discrimination in registration. (Kauder)

E.D. La.: Ainsworth
Date Filed: 10/16/61
Date Tried: 5/1-3/62
Type: Preliminary Injunction
Date of Decree: 11/2/62
Appeal: Government
Appeal Decided: 7/21/64

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
10/16/61	White	8,633	6,730	78.00%
	Negro	2,897	43	1.50%
11/30/62	White	8,633	6,731	78.00%
	Negro	2,897	57	2.00%
12/11/63	White	8,633	7,533	87.00%
	Negro	2,897	97	3.30%
10/3/64	White	8,633	7,627	88.00%
	Negro	2,897	96	3.30%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/64-6/30/64	White	62	44	18
	Negro	1	0	1

Hearing on motion for preliminary injunction held before Judge Ainsworth on May 1-3, 1962. Briefs submitted May 26, 1962. Government asked Court to make a finding of pattern and practice; to register 40 Negroes; and to lay down specific rules for registrar to follow so that Negroes can register on same basis as whites have been registered in past. Opinion of judge entered November 2, 1962, finding that the registrar had discriminated against Negroes but refused to make a finding

of pattern and practice, refused to register the 40 Negroes or to require the registrar to permit Negroes to register on the same basis as whites were allowed in the past. The registrar now uses the new procedure for registration adopted by the State Board of Registration (citizenship). Appeal heard November 18, 1963 before Judges Jones, Rives and Bootle. On July 21, 1964 the judgment below was affirmed. The court held that since the case had been tried on a motion for Preliminary Injunction, the trial court was not in error in refusing to find a pattern or practice of discrimination nor in refusing to apply a freezing theory to enjoin the registrar from raising her standards. The registrar was enjoined from using the citizenship test under the decree in U.S. v. Louisiana. Her reports to the court pursuant to the U.S. v. Fox decree showed that she continued to use this test. In addition, she failed to report registration progress to the U.S. v. Louisiana court. On June 1, 1964, the Government sought to have the registrar held in civil contempt of the U.S. v. Louisiana decree. A hearing was set on June 29, 1964 and was held on July 7, 1964. Both sides were given ten days to file briefs. On November 30, 1964 the Court issued an order requiring the district attorney of Plaquemines Parish to file with the court a declaration of intent to the effect that the registrar would cease to use the citizenship test and would file reports to the court. Thus far, the declaration has not been filed. The registrar's reports in the Fox case show that less than 15 Negroes have applied since the decree in that case.

16. U.S. v. Duke
(Panola County, Miss.)
166-40-49 23-107-1 #4
Discrimination in registration (Flannery)

N.D. Miss.: Clayton
Date Filed: 10/26/61
Date Tried: 3/19 - 21/63
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 6/25/63
Appeal: Government
Appeal Decided: 5/22/64

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
10/22/61	White	7,639	4,755	62.000%
	Negro	7,250	1	.014%
3/21/63	White	7,639	5,343	70.000%
	Negro	7,250	2	.028%
12/31/63	White	7,639	5,505	72.000%
	Negro	7,250	22	.030%
11/30/64	White	7,639	5,922	77.000%
	Negro	7,250	878	12.000%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
3/21/63-	White	180	162	18
12/31/63	Negro	56	22	34
1/1/64-	White	430	417	13
11/30/64	Negro	1,037	854	183

Answer filed January 4, 1963. Trial held March 19, 1963. Government called 17 Negroes and twenty-three white witnesses and proved that whites were registered in Panola County without any literacy test and that prior to the suit, no Negroes in the county had been registered since 1892. Brief filed April 22, 1963. On the 25th of June 1963, Court made findings and conclusions contrary to the United States on every issue. On the 24th of July 1963, the Government filed notice of appeal. December 5, 1963, Circuit Court advised record in final form. Government's brief filed January 8, 1964.

The appeal was argued on March 5 and May 22 the Court of Appeals reversed the District Court in its most significant voting case opinion to that time. The Court adopted the Government's contention that, absent a reregistration, the local officials are obliged by Federal law to register Negroes by standards and procedures approaching those applied to white persons during the years of discrimination. For the guidance of the District Court it set out in detail what those standards of procedures were to be.

On May 29, 1964, the District Court entered an order pursuant to the Court of Appeals opinion. It provides that Negro applicants who demonstrate a reasonable ability to read and write by filling out the first eighteen questions on the application form including copying a section of the Mississippi Constitution not longer than four lines - with help as needed -- shall be registered at the time they apply. The decree's provisions are to operate for a year and, also pursuant to the Court of Appeals opinion, the District Court found that the original defendant - registrar had engaged in a pattern and practice of discrimination against Negro applicants for registration.

When the case was tried, in March of 1963, two Negroes were registered. By November 30, 1964, that number had climbed to 878.

The defendant has complied with the Court's order with one qualification: on the stated ground that he does not have a formally appointed deputy and that he does not wish to subject to a possible contempt action the women who help him, he has ceased processing applicants at one of the two county courthouses and handles all registration matters himself at the other one. This inconveniences applicants who live in the Northern part of the county, but its adverse effects have not been serious because registration leaders have been able to provide transportation to applicants and minimize delays by arranging for a steady flow of small numbers of persons at the office. On September 28, a Negro voter registration worker was indicted for making a false statement on his registration form. He subsequently pleaded guilty and he was sentenced to eighteen months in the state penitentiary. This matter is being investigated. Other incidents of arrests of COFO workers have occurred and the rate of registration has fallen. Whether there is a possible connection between these events is the subject of our investigation.

17. U.S. v. Ward
(Madison Parish, La.)
166-33-27 17-065-2
Voucher requirement. Registrar requires identification by registered voter. No Negroes registered. (Ross)

W.D.La.: Dawkins
Date Filed: 10/26/61
Date Tried: 12/5/62
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 10/22/63
Appeal: Government
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
10/26/61	White	3,334	820	24.50%
	Negro	5,181	0	0.00%
11/30/62	White	3,334	1,859	56.00%
	Negro	5,181	0	0.00%
12/11/63	White	3,334	2,539	76.00%
	Negro	5,181	260	5.00%
10/3/64	White	3,334	2,467	74.00%
	Negro	5,181	294	6.00%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
12/62-12/63	White	763	717	46
	Negro	374	259	115

Government's brief filed on April 9, 1963. Defendants did not file their brief. The registrar is now using the new registration procedure adopted by the State Board of Registration. On October 22, 1963 the court found that the registrar had engaged in discriminatory practices with respect to the identification requirement. Although court found that no tests of literacy or intelligence were used during the period when Negroes were prohibited from applying and that a majority of

the white persons of voting age were registered during this period, court did not enjoin the use of the new citizenship test or the application form test which came into use at about the time that Negroes were first allowed to apply. Government applied for costs in the amount of $1,468.77.

Notice of appeal filed December 20, 1963. Government's appellate brief filed April 18, 1964. A delay in the hearing of the appeal resulted from the defendants being over four months late with their brief. In May 1964, the Fifth Circuit Clerk wrote a letter to the defendants informing them that if they did not submit their brief, the case would be submitted on the Government's brief alone. However, this was not done. The defendants filed their brief on 10/6/64. The appeal will be heard on 1/6/65. The Government's appeal is based on the trial court's refusal to grant freezing relief from the use of any tests that were not applied to white persons who became registered before Negroes were permitted to apply. The court found that no test had been applied to whites before September 1962, but refused to enjoin the registrar from rejecting applicants for technical errors on the card or from using the citizenship test. Also on appeal is the court's refusal to assess costs against the state as well as the registrar. (Nothing has been collected from the registrar.)

In our reply brief we argued that Title I of the 1964 Act prohibits the new citizenship test from being used. In Louisiana the Constitution requires that an applicant must understand the duties and obligations of citizenship under a Republican form of Government. In 1962 the Louisiana legislature and subsequently the people by a constitutional amendment provided for an objective citizenship test to measure an applicant's understanding. We claim this new method of testing a qualification violates Title I. On the other hand, we also concede that if a wholly new qualification law should be enacted prescribing a novel qualification for registration, Title I would not prevent the application of such a new standard to future applicants.

The Madison Parish records were last photographed on June 23, 1964. These records show that after the trial the registrar began to use the application card as a strict test and that she has rejected a much higher proportion of Negroes

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——25

than white persons. The application card test is now under attack in U.S. v. Board. The registrar's deposition, taken March 17, 1964, is in the U.S. v. Board file.

There was a great deal of registration activity by Negroes in the first few months following the trial. However, from that time on Negro registration has increased quite slowly, with the exception of an increase of 31 in the month before the books closed for the Presidential election.

18. U.S. v. Dogan
(Tallahatchie County, Mississippi)
166-40-53 23-135-1 #6

Refusal by sheriff to accept poll tax payments from Negroes and discrimination by registrar. No Negroes registered. (McCabe)

N.D. Miss.:Clayton
Date Filed: 11/17/61
Date Tried: 12/13-15/61
Type: Preliminary injunction
Date of Decree: 1/19/62
Appeal: Government 2/15/62
Appeal Decided: 1/28/63

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
11/17/61	White	5,099	4,334	85.00%
	Negro	6,481	0	00%
11/22/63	White	5,099	4,400	86.00%
	Negro	6,481	5	.08%
11/2/64	White	5,099	4,464	87.50%
	Negro	6,481	17	.26%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
11/22/63- 6/24/64	White	12	12	0
	Negro	0	0	0
6/24/64- 11/2/64	White	52	52	0
	Negro	65	12	53

In January 1962 court denied Government's application for a preliminary injunction against sheriff who refused to permit Negroes to pay poll taxes. On February 15, 1962, the government filed Notice of Appeal and on January 28, 1963 Court of Appeals reversed and directed district court to enter injunction against sheriff. Case scheduled to come on for trial during March term of court at Clarksdale, but on day before call of the calendar defendants made a motion for severence. May 7, 1963 court granted motion for severance as to defendant Harris who was registrar of voters in Tallahatchie County. Harris case heard on November 21-22, 1963. The preliminary injunction is still in force against the sheriff. Hearing to make the injunction permanent not yet set. Since the Court of Appeals decision, sheriff has permitted Negroes to pay poll tax, but present investigation underway to determine if sheriff's office fully complying with decree.

19. U.S. v. Cox, et al. (X-Harris)
(Tallahatchie County, Miss.)
166-40-53 23-135-1 #6
Refusal by sheriff to accept poll tax payments from Negroes and discrimination by registrar. No Negroes registered. (McCabe)

N.D. Miss.: Clayton
Date Filed: 11/27/61
Date Tried: 11/21-22/63
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 6/24/64
Appeal: Defendant
Appeal Decided: Dismissal of appeal sought by defendant and granted by District Court on 12/2/64

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
11/17/61	White	5,099	4,334	85.00%
	Negro	6,481	0	0.00%
11/22/63	White	5,099	4,400	86.00%
	Negro	6,481	5	0.08%
11/2/64	White	5,099	4,464	87.50%
	Negro	6,481	17	00.26%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
11/22/63 - 6/24/64	White	12	12	0
	Negro	0	0	0
6/24/64 - 11/2/64	White	52	52	0
	Negro	65	12	53

This case was originally filed together with part of the poll tax case of U.S. v. Dogan, on 11/17/61. On May 7, 1963 the court severed the registration case. Trial held November 21 and 22, 1963 in Clarksdale, Mississippi.

The evidence showed that 5 Negroes and approximately 4,400 whites were registered to vote in Tallahatchie County as of the date of the trial; no Negroes were registered prior to the filing of the suit. Testimony showed white illiterates were registered despite their inability to complete the application form; other white persons were given assistance by the defendant registrar to the extent of permitting applicants to copy their interpretation from a completed application form. Proof was that the application form was used as a test for Negroes but not for whites.

On June 24, 1964, Judge Clayton in his order substituted the new registrar, Cox, and established specific registration procedures he had to follow. The court found that there had been a pattern and practice of discrimination and enjoined defendant Cox from applying to Negroes more stringent standards and procedures than had been applied to white applicants in the past. Specifically Judge Clayton ordered defendant to : 1) afford applicants the opportunity to complete the application during regular business hours; 2) permit at least four applicants to apply simultaneously; 3) register all persons who (a) are 21 years of age or older, (b) meet state residence requirements, (c) " . . . embrace the duties and obligations of citizenship as demonstrated by their willingness to sign the oath . . ." , (d) is not disqualified for crime, insanity, or idiocy, (e) demonstrate literacy by completion of questions 1-17 of the form "with or without assistance as needed".

Compliance reports and further inspection of records by departmental attorneys indicate systematic rejection of Negroes for technical errors and omissions on the application form. To remedy this, the government on October 26, 1964, filed a petition for other orders to secure compliance and for order to show cause why defendant Cox should not be held in civil contempt for his failure to comply with the order of the District Court. The order to show cause was signed by Judge Clayton 10-26-64. No date has been set for hearing.

20. U.S. v. State of La.
(Baton Rouge, La.)
166-32-11 17-033-5
Constitutional challenge of Louisiana statute providing for constitutional interpretation test.
(Ross, Kauder)

E.D.La.: Widsom, Christenberry, West
Date Filed: 12/28/61
Date Tried: 3/9/63
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 1/31/64
Appeal: State
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS - 21 Affected Parishes*

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/17/56	White	212,273	161,069	76.00%
	Negro	107,446	25,361	24.00%
12/31/60	White	212,273	162,427	77.00%
	Negro	107,446	10,256	9.50%
12/11/63	White	212,273	166,879	79.00%
	Negro	107,446	12,520	11.50%
10/3/64	White	212,273	167,815	79.00%
	Negro	107,446	15,156	14.00%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS - 21 Affected Parishes*

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/64-11/64**	White	6,629	6,377	252
	Negro	3,338	2,010	1,328

*Bienville, Claiborne, DeSoto, East Carroll, East Feliciana, Franklin, Jackson, LaSalle, Lincoln, Morehouse, Ouachita, Plaquemines, Rapides, Red River, Richland, St. Helena, Union, Webster, West Carroll, West Feliciana, Winn

** Four of the reports for November have not been received thus far. Figures do not include all parishes for January 1964.

Three-judge case. Defendants' motion to dismiss overruled. Depositions of registrars throughout the state taken. Trial date initially set for December 20, 1962 continued. Case tried March 9, 1963. All evidence submitted March 4, 1963 by stipulation. Government's proposed findings, conclusions and decree filed March 18, 1963. State's brief originally due April 4, 1963 but State never did file its brief. State's primary defense was that the constitutional interpretation test had been abandoned. However, after trial the Government discovered that registrar in Webster Parish had begun to use the test again. On motion of Government court ordered case reopened for further evidence on this issue. Deposition of Registrar of Webster Parish taken and filed and case submitted.

On November 27, 1963, decision rendered in which the court found the Louisiana interpretation test unconstitutional. The opinion referred to the test as a "wall between registered voters and unregistered, eligible Negro voters." The court found that the test had been discriminatorily applied in 21 parishes and held that the new citizenship test required a higher standard than was applied to white persons who registered under the interpretation test and therefore its use in the 21 parishes would freeze into the registration rolls the prior discrimination under the interpretation test. The court enjoined the use of the new citizenship test in these 21 parishes with respect to applicants who met the age and residence requirements at the time the new test was adopted until such time as there has been a general re-registration of voters in the parish or it is shown to the court that the effects of prior discrimination have worn off.

Included in the decree is a reporting provision requiring the registrars of the 21 parishes to submit a report to the court each month, showing the number of applicants of each race, each applicant's age and length of residence, and what action was taken on each application. For all rejected applicants, the reason for rejection was to be given. The first few months' reports were not very useful; one registrar sent the reports to the wrong place, another did not send any. Two other registrars (in East Feliciana and West Feliciana Parishes) refused to register anyone. The rest of the registrars sent in ad hoc reports that varied greatly in completeness of the required information.

One registrar, in Plaquemines Parish, continued to use the citizenship test. On June 1, 1964, the Government filed motions seeking an order to show cause why this registrar should not be

held in contempt for using the citizenship test and for failing to report to the court. A hearing was held on 7/7/64 and on 11/30/64 the registrar was ordered to file within 10 days a declaration of intent to comply with the original decree. This declaration has not yet been filed.

Also on June 1, 1964, the Government filed a motion asking the court to issue further orders requiring a uniform reporting system. On August 28, 1964 the state agreed to the use of the Government's proposed uniform reporting system. The Government subsequently supplied the state with mimeographed forms which the state in turn sent to the 21 registrars. The reports for November 1964 show that the registrars are now using these forms. The main difficulty with the reporting system had been the registrars' requirement that all applicants, including those accepted for registration, fill out a reporting form propounded by the state. As a result, there was a slow-down of registration in some offices. Some of the registrars still require rejected applicants to fill out the State's form. As long as this practice is not a burden on the registration system, the Government will take no steps to prevent it because it allows an assessment of the applicant's literacy, through his handwriting.

Under the inspection provisions of the decree, a schedule has been set up by which the records in the 21 parishes will be photographed by the FBI approximately every six months. The records have been photographed at least once in 1964 in all of the 21 parishes except Ouachita. There, the District Attorney objected because the records had been photographed three times before (in connection with U.S. v. Lucky). Apparently his objection was also based on the fact that the registrar was busy preparing for the Presidential election. It is expected that this problem will be worked out and the records photographed without the necessity of obtaining an order from the court.

All of the microfilm of records received by the Department through July 1964 has been reviewed. Memoranda describing the quality of the accepted and rejected cards, the registrars' standards and containing a chronological count of the application cards by race are in the U.S. v. Louisiana enforcement file in Room 1132.

Between January 1, 1964 and October 3, 1964 Negro registration has shown a net increase of 2,636 in the 21 parishes affected by the U.S. v. Louisiana decree. (Approximately 500 of these are Negroes who were purged from the rolls in Jackson Parish in 1956 and restored to the rolls by the Court's decree in U.S. v. Wilder.) This figure is almost exactly the same as the net increase in Negro registration in the entire state, which was 2,633. Thus, in the other 43 parishes, gains and losses in Negro registration cancelled out each other. The 1964 increase in Negro registration in the 21 affected parishes was approximately the same as it had been for the period 1/61 through 12/63.

Figures derived from the registrars' reports show that about 60% of all Negro applicants in these 21 parishes were accepted, whereas over 95% of all white applicants were accepted. The registrars' reports also give the reason for rejection. These reports and a detailed analysis of the rejected cards in Bienville, DeSoto, East Carroll, East Feliciana, Red River, Webster and West Feliciana show that over 95% of the rejections have been for errors on the application card test. This test is currently under attack in U.S. v. Board. In connection with that case, the Government took the depositions of registrars in 14 of the 21 parishes affected by U.S. v. Louisiana.

21. U.S. v. Wilder
(Jackson Parish, La.)
166-33-25 17-049-1
Purge of Negro electors and discrimination in registration. (Ross)

W.D.La.: Dawkins
Date FiledL 2/21/62
Date Tried: 12/3-4/62
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 10/23/63
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
2/21/62	White	6,607	5,532	84.00%
	Negro	2,535	470	19.00%
9/30/63	White	6,607	5,759	87.00%
	Negro	2,535	509	20.00%
12/11/63	White	6,607	6,207	94.00%
	Negro	2,535	659	26.00%
10/3/64	White	6,607	6,082	91.00%
	Negro	2,535	1,244	49.00%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
10/56-	White	2,525	2,391	134
10/31/63	Negro	1,440	522	918
11/1/63-	White	449	433	16
11/30/64	Negro	281	244	37

Trial held December 3 and 4, 1962. Government's brief filed March 22, 1963. Defendants did not file their brief. Default judgment entered against Citizens Council and its members. Government proved strong case of discrimination and freezing; produced some excellent (low education, low literacy)

whites. The registrar started using the new registration procedure adopted by the State Board of Registration. Case decided on October 23, 1963. Court found that the registrar had engaged in discriminatory practices; particularly with respect to the application card. Court ordered the 953 Negroes who were purged from the rolls by the Citizens Council in 1956 be restored. The court enjoined the registrar from rejecting applicants on the grounds that their application cards were incomplete unless the applicant refused to provide the information. He instructed the registrar to inquire of the applicant as to the truth of any disqualifying statement made on the form. The court refused to enjoin the use of the new citizenship test. However, this parish included under the decree in U.S. v. Louisiana forbidding use of any new test, including multiple-choice citizenship test. Costs of $1,437.29 taxed against registrar but not against the state.

The records were last photographed on June 3, 1964. These records, the registrar's reports and interviews, show that since the decree in U.S. v. Wilder, the registrar has not rejected applicants for technical errors on the card. Nine of the 37 rejections were on the citizenship test before its use was enjoined. The other rejected applicants are apparently illiterate. The increased number of Negro applicants in this period is due to the work of CORE, which has set up an office in Jackson Parish. These applicants have been successful because the registrar is obeying the U.S. v. Wilder and U.S. v. Louisiana decrees. To date, more than 49% of the adult Negroes are registered.

22. U. S. v. Wilbur G. Ward
(George County, Miss.)
166-41-41 23-039-1

Discrimination in registration (Schwelb)

S.D. Miss: Cox
Date Filed: 4/13/62
Date Tried: 1/27-28/64
Type: Injunction
Date of Decree: 2/19/64
Appeal: Government 4/17/64
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
4/13/62	White	5,276	3,678	70%
	Negro	580	7	1.2%
4/8/63	White	5,276	3,850	73%
	Negro	580	12	2%
4/22/64	White	5,276	4,200	79%
	Negro	580	14	2.4%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
4/24/62 - 1/27/64	White	644	632	12
	Negro	41	9	32
1/27/64 - 4/23/64	White	57	50	7
	Negro	3	1	2
4/23/64 - 12/17/64	White	84	80	4
	Negro	1	1	0

Government applied for a Temporary Restraining Order restraining registrar from testing Negroes about names of county officials and committees. After notice and hearing, court granted Temporary Restraining Order on April 24, 1962. The court ordered a more

definite statement and the amended complaint was filed on September 28, 1962. Records were photographed July 28 and November 27, 1962. Defendants answered December 13, 1962. Pre-trial conference held April 5, 1963, at which time the court almost asked Government to cite registrar for contempt for failing to register certain Negroes. The court had application forms before it at the time. Court later deferred action to give registrar and Election Board an opportunity to reconsider the applications. In addition, at the request of the court, the Government submitted an amended order to tighten the existing injunction. No action has been taken by the court on the amended order. On September 27, 1963, Government attorneys orally requested Judge Cox to set a trial date as soon as possible, and the judge indicated the court could not hear the case before December, 1963. Case set for trial January 27, 1964. The title of the action was changed to United States v. Ward, on January 27, 1964. The case was tried on January 27 and 28, 1964. The new Registrar, Ward, received his commission a few days before the trial, and defendants moved to dismiss the case against him on the grounds of mootness. Judge Cox denied the motion. During the trial, Judge Cox expressed shock at the registration of white illiterates but said he would not grant freezing relief. He also expressed the opinion that white witnesses should be warned before they testify that their testimony may cause them to be purged from the rolls. On February 19, 1964, Judge Cox delivered an opinion and decree wherein Registrar Ward was enjoined from discriminating, from assisting applicants, and from registering illiterates. The Court also gave the plaintiff the right to inspect the records every four months and held that a final decree would be held in abeyance for one year, to determine Ward's performance over that time. On April 17, 1964, the United States filed an appeal from Judge Cox's decision, and plaintiff's brief has been filed. The date for oral argument has not been set yet.

23. U.S. v. Bibb County Democratic Executive Committee, et al. (Bibb County, Georgia) 166-19M-6 10-021-1

M.D. Ga.:
Date Filed: 5/16/62
Date Tried: 5/23/ - 24/62
Type: Preliminary Injunction
Date of Decree: 6/1/62
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

Segregation in voting facilities and in counting ballots (J. Nixon)

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
5/16/62	White	60,429	26,827	44%
	Negro	26,812	5,042	19%
	White			
	Negro			

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

Hearing on Government's application for a preliminary injunction prohibiting segregated voting facilities and ballot counting was held May 23 and 24, 1962. Injunction granted and made permanent on February 5, 1963. Segregated facilities eliminated.

12/31/64

24. U.S. v. Ford
(Choctaw County, Ala.)
166-3-3 #1-023-1

Discrimination in registration (Norman)

S.D. Ala.: Thomas
Date Filed: 6/15/62
Date Tried: 2/20/63
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
6/15/62	White	5,192	3,600	69%
	Negro	3,982	163	4%
2/5/63	White	5,192	3,697	71%
	Negro	3,982	176	4%
	White			
	Negro			

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
11/9/59-2/5/63	White	784	782	2
	Negro	302	42	260

On June 15, 1962, the complaint was filed. On July 2, 1962, the defendants filed a motion to dismiss which was subsequently set for hearing on October 10. On November 13, 1962, the motion to dismiss was denied. Answers were filed on November 20, and a request for trial at the first available

date was made on November 27, 1962. The trial was set for February 20, and on that date the case was taken under submission after hearing. At trial Government proved that between November 9, 1959, and February 5, 1963, the registrars accepted 99.8% of the applications filed by white persons and 14.0% of the applications filed by Negroes; that during that period, of the 302 applications filed by Negroes, 260 were rejected, while of the 784 applications filed by white persons, 2 were rejected. Government also proved that application form used as a tricky examination for Negroes and a simple application for whites; that the registrars used the signing of the oath as a device to discriminate against Negroes; and that registrars made registration procedures easy for whites and difficult for Negroes. Following the trial plaintiff filed a detailed and comprehensive brief on March 19, 1963.

On October 29, 1963, and again on March 30, 1964, the Government requested a judgement, based on the facts of elections scheduled in 1963 and 1964. On April 7, 1964, a motion for preliminary injunction was made and on April 13, permanent injunction was granted.

The court found that from November 1959 to February 20, 1963, the defendants engaged in racially discriminatory practices, and the defendants were enjoined from such practices in the future. Freezing relief was not granted, nor was the Board required to place on the rolls qualified Negroes who had been rejected. No Board reports were required, the government was not given the right of inspection of records and was not awarded costs. Finally, the State was dismissed as a party defendant. A notice of appeal was filed on June 11, 1964.

On November 16, 1964, a contempt action was filed which seeks to prohibit use of the Insert in the application form and to register qualified but rejected Negro applicants. A hearing date has not yet been set. Records have not been photographed since the trial and this will be done early in 1965.

12/31/64

25. U.S. v. Mayton, et al.
(Perry County, Ala.)
166-3-11 1-105-1

Discrimination in registration (Landsberg)

S.D. Ala: Thomas
Date Filed: 8/27/62
Date Tried: 10/26/62
Type: Preliminary Injunction
Date of Decree: 11/15/62
Appeal: Government
Appeal Decided: 7/23/64

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
8/27/62	White	3,441	3,100	90%
	Negro	5,200	257	5%
10/26/62	White	3,441	3,100	90%
	Negro	5,200	257	5%
10/1/63	White	3,441	3,100	90%
	Negro	5,200	300	6%
8/17/64	White	3,441	3,260	94%
	Negro	5,200	364	7%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
10/1/63 - 8/17/64	White	200	160	40
	Negro	341	64	277

No Negroes registered since 1954 until suit filed. Motion on preliminary injunction heard on October 26, 1962. Injunction was issued by Judge Thomas on November 15, 1962. Court found that Board since at least 1959 had engaged in acts and practices which have had the purpose and effect of depriving Negroes of their right to register without distinction of race. The injunction prohibited the Board from engaging in any act or practice

which results in discrimination, failing to meet, receive and process Negro applications, failing to notify the applicant of the Board's action with respect to his application, refusing to allow Negroes to reapply after 60 days waiting period, rejecting Negroes for inconsequential errors or omissions on the application form.

Between November 15 and December 31, 1962 the Board met on 3 days. On these three days approximately 330 Negroes attempted to apply; 17 were processed. As to those who applied, 1 accepted, 8 rejected, 8 pending. On January 9, 1963 Government filed a petition for an order to show cause in civil contempt and on the same day Negroes filed 173 applications to be registered under 1971(e). Court declined to set order to show cause and did nothing toward processing the Negro applications. On January 14 Government filed notice of appeal to protect itself in the event trial court refused to act on the grounds that he had not found a pattern or practice within the meaning of 1971(e). Judge Thomas took no action on Negro applications within ten days and on the 28th day of February Government filed a petition for writ of mandamus in the Court of Appeals. On April 5, 1963 the Court of Appeals dismissed the petition for want of jurisdiction because of the appeal. Government decided to take its licking, dismiss the appeal and go back to the district court and start over, renewing its application for an order to show cause. This was done on April 26, 1963.

On May 17, 1963 district judge issued an order specifying in detail what the registrars must do to facilitate Negro registration. The registrars were directed to meet at least 2 full days each month for a full working day and to adopt and use fair and speedy procedures. The court also ordered the registrars to meet specially to act on the 173 letters filed with the court and to act on them within 45 days. A written monthly report as to regular registration was to be filed and a semi-monthly report as to the 173 special applications was to be filed. On July 16, 1963 the Government filed a motion for inspection of the records under Rule 34.

In August 1963 Negroes filed an additional 142 letters with the court and in September 1963 an additional 33 were filed. All the additional letters of application filed with the court were dismissed. On September 18, 1963 Judge Thomas granted Government's Rule 34 motion. Hearing on order to show cause set for October 3 postponed; not reset. Government filed notice of appeal on October 18, 1963. The Government filed

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——26

notice of appeal from the order of the district court with respect to the 142 letters and the 33 letters. Government also supplied for and received a preferential setting of appeal (Tuttle and Rives). Gewin dissented: "The judiciary should not allow the zealous, demanding and over-enthusiastic request of one litigant to prevail over others whose cases are also vital and deserve the early attention of the Court."

On November 7, district court entered an order to the effect that the registrars claimed $918.87 at $10.00 per day for their work on the first batch of letters and that court was ordering the costs split betwden the State of Alabama and the United States Government -- this done without a hearing and without the dGovernment's ever having an opportunity to review and object to the work of the registrars. Because of an understanding between Assistant Attorney General and the State Attorney 'General's office as to the payment of costs if registrars worked extra time to effectively register people. Government will pay its share of costs, making clear that this establishes no precedent.

At oral argument before the court on November 18, 1963 court decided preferential setting not justified and ordered case to be reargued in regular course. Case set for argument February 5, 1964.

"Two new members of the Board of Registrars took office on September 30, 1963. As of December 31, 1963, more than 100 Negroes had applied for registration with the new Board. Many did not receive notice of disposition as long as six weeks after their qualifications for registration had dbeen rejected. No Negroes were known to have been registered by the new Board during this period."

On March 6, 1964, the Department filed an Order to Show Cause why the Board of Registrars should not be held in civil contempt. This cause was tried on April 23 and 24, 1964 before Judge Thomas but he has not ruled on this case yet.

On July 23, 1964 the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals through Judge Brown held for the 'Government on the appeal argued February 5, 1964 and said that the letters filed with the District Court were "applications" and therefore sufficient to trigger the machinery envisioned in 42 U.S.C. 1971(e).

Subsequent to the Court of Appeals decision, Judge Thomas appointed a voting referee, Mr. O. S. Burke of Greensboro, Alabama, thus initiating for the first time this procedure of the 1960 Civil Rights Act. Mr. Burke proceeded to send out questionnaires to each of the Negroes who had written the Court and for those who filled in and returned the questionnaire he held hearings for "Application to Vote" on September 23 and October 16, 1964 at the Marion County Courthouse in Perry County. On these dates he had those applicants who appeared complete a "registration application", answer four questions on "citizenship", write from dictation a provision of the U.S. Constitution and take a test on "literacy" which was comprised of four questions based on the constitutional provision dictated to them. Thereafter Mr. Burke submitted his "Finding(s) of Referee" as to the applicants to the Court. In this report the Referee determined that 24 should be accepted, 13 dismissed for failure to appear after receiving two notices, and 110 he rejected as not qualified. The Referee also filed reports on 60 applicants who subsequent to their letters to the Court had been registered by the Board.

On October 30, 1964 the United States filed a general statement of exception to 82 of the rejection reports of the voter referee with an attached analysis of each applicant who we thought should be qualified and a memorandum in support of these exceptions. These exceptions were overruled and denied by Judge Thomas on November 2, 1964. At present the Government is perfecting its appeal on the substantive issues of the case which basically deal with the standards used by the Referee. Pending the outcome of this appeal, however, steps are being taken to clarify and streamline certain procedural matters which arose in the Referee proceeding.

Also pending at this time is an application for an Order to Show Cause why the Board should not be held in Contempt filed by the Government on November 16, 1964. This deals primarily with the use of the Board of the new Insert Part III promulgated by the Alabama Supreme Court in August, 1964.

As the statistics show, there has been very little progress in Negro voter registration in Perry County. It is doubted that appreciable gains will be made until we either are successful in our appeal on the exceptions to the Referee report or Judge Thomas rules favorably on the Contempt Action against the Board which has been pending since April, 1964.

26. U.S. v. State of Miss., State Board of Registrars and Registrars of Amite, Claiborne, Coahoma, LeFlore, Lowndes and Pike Counties
(Jackson, Mississippi)
166-0-2 23-000-2
Constitutional challenge of two constitutional amendments and five statutes dealing with registration requirements and procedures. Government also requests finding of pattern and practice of discrimination against six registrars. (Doar)

Date Filed: 8/28/62
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
6/1/55**	White	710,639	423,456*	59.6%
	Negro	495,183	31,502	4.3%
6/1/62/	White	295,648	231,666	78%
	Negro	230,770	10,445	4.5%
1/1/64//	White	282,580	227,504	80.5%
	Negro	201,849	12,975	6.4%

* This figure is an estimate

** Statewide figures. See Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, STATISTICS (CENSUS - REGISTRATION - VOTING 1890 - 1962.)

/ These are figures for 34 of 82 counties. See Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, STATISTICS (CENSUS - REGISTRATION - VOTING 1890 - 1962.)

// These are figures for 29 of 82 counties. Date listed is approximate median date for tabulations covering 1963 and 1964.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS[1]

Amite	1955	1960	1962	Net Gain
White over 21	5,162	4,449	4,449	(-713)
White registered	3,977	3,600	3,532	(-445)
Negro over 21	4,598	3,560	3,560	(-1038)
Negro registered	2	1	1	(-1)

Claiborne	1955	1960	1962	1963	Net Gain
White over 21	1,929	1,688	1,688	1,688	(-241)
White registered	1,450	1,440	1,440	1,528	78
Negro over 21	4,728	3,969	3,969	3,969	(-759)
Negro registered	140	15	15	26	(-114)

Coahoma	1955	1960	1962	Net Gain
White over 21	8,409	8,708	8,708	299
White registered	3,929	5,033	6,380	2451
Negro over 21	19,136	14,004	14,004	5132
Negro registered	867	980	1,061	194

Leflore	1955	1960	1962	1963	Net Gain
White over 21	10,331	10,274	10,274	10,274	57
White registered	5,563	6,925	7,168	7,348	1785
Negro over 21	17,893	13,567	13,567	13,567	(-4326)
Negro registered	400	269	268	281	(-119)

1/ Listed figures represent the latest tabulation for those 6 counties, the registrars of which are involved in this suit. The 1955 figure is prior to implementation of the constitutional interpretation test.

Lowndes	1955	1960	1962	1963	Net Gain
White over 21	11,667	16,460	16,460	16,460	4793
White registered	5,133	7,181	8,312	8,687	3554
Negro over 21	9,177	8,362	8,362	8,362	(-815)
Negro registered	151	67	95	99	(-52)

Pike	1955	1960	1962	Net Gain
White over 21	12,147	12,163	12,163	16
White registered	6,683	-	7,864	1181
Negro over 21	7,608	6,936	6,936	(-672)
Negro registered	100	-	150	(50)

The complaint was filed on August 28, 1962. It attacks the validity of the Mississippi constitutional and statutory provision governing registration for voting. The complaint describes the background and setting of the adoption of the constitutional provisions and statutes under attack and alleges that since 1890 the State by its laws and customs have promoted white political supremacy by discriminatory use of the voter qualification laws. The complaint also alleges that the adoption and use of the invalid registration laws constitute a pattern and practice of discrimination.

On March 8, 1963, a three-judge court (Brown, Wisdom and Cox) heard numerous motions filed by the defendants and directed that discovery should proceed as rapidly as possible. The defendants served interrogatories on the Government which were answered on September 1, 1963 (and supplemented thereafter) setting out voluminously the registration statistics in the State, the methods of discriminatory use of the registration laws, the history of the purpose of the registration laws, and a detailed analysis of the inferior educational opportunities afforded Negroes in the State of Mississippi. After an initial stay by Judge Cox and a pre-trial conference, depositions were taken of several registrars, white witnesses and James Franklin Barnes who had made a State-wide statistical analysis of Negro voter registration in 1955 immediately prior to the adoption of the constitutional interpretation

test. Depositions taken on December 12, 17, 18, and 19. Previously the reconstituted panel, Brown, Cox and Cameron, heard further oral arguments on the defendants' motions on October 30, 1963. The Court, Judge Brown dissenting, entered its Order March 6, 1964 granting the motions to dismiss. Various grounds were given for dismissing the complaint, but in substance the Court held that no proper parties were joined and that the United States had no standing to attack the constitutionality of the Mississippi statute. An appeal was taken from this decision directly to the Supreme Court, briefs have been filed and oral arguments are scheduled for January 27, and 28, 1965. The similar case of United States v. Louisiana, which the Government won in the District Court, has also been appealed and that appeal has been consolidated with this case and will be argued at the same time.

27. U.S. v. Campbell

(Sunflower County, Miss.)
166-40-5 23-133-1 #2
Discrimination in registration (Flannery)

N.D. Miss.: Clayton
Date Filed: 1/22/63
Date Tried: Oct. 12-14, 1964
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
8/9/62	White	8,785	6,618	75%
	Negro	13,524	118	.9%
9/19/64	White	8,785	7,082	80.1%
	Negro	13,524	155	1.1%
10/29/64	White	8,785	7,082	80.1%
	Negro	13,524	185	1.4%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/22/63-	White	461	406	55
9/19/64	Negro	512	32	480
9/19/64-	White			
10/29/64	Negro		30*/	

*/ Registered by court order on motion of the government in time to vote in November 1964 elections.

Defendants filed motion for more definite statement on the 11th of February 1963. On August 20, Government asked court to overrule this motion in view of the Circuit Court's decision in U.S. v. Lynd and on September 11th also made application for inspection of records under Rule 34. In addition, Government wrote Judge Clayton requesting disposition of pending motions and a trial setting during October (1963) term of court. Court considered motions on briefs. Defendants given 15 days to support motion for more definite statement, and plaintiff given 15 days thereafter to file opposing brief. On October 21 and 22, 1963, Government filed memoranda in opposition to motion for more definite statement and memorandum in support of Rule 34 motion, respectively. Defendants filed opposition to Rule 34 November 1, 1963. All motions submitted on memoranda. On January 7, 1964, court denied defendants' motion for more definite statement and granted Government's motion for inspection of registration records.

After the records were photographed on January 20, 1964, the defendants filed Interrogatories on March 12. Answers were filed on April 17, and Supplemental Answers on September 30.

Trial on October 12 to 14, 1964. The Government called 49 witnesses, 22 Negroes and 27 white persons, and introduced 26 voluminous documentary exhibits. The proof showed that Negroes had been discriminated against in their efforts to register as far back as 1932 and in the mid-forties. No Negroes were permitted to register between August of 1955 and April of 1962, and of those who tried, 7 were not permitted to apply and 5 were told that they were not qualified. As late as December of 1962, the defendants' deputies were refusing to process Negro applicants in his absence. The testimony and exhibits also showed that many qualified Negroes who were permitted to apply in 1963, 1964, and earlier were rejected because they failed to meet very high standards which were not applied to white persons. During the period from 1955 to August 9, 1962, the date of the first application form preserved by the defendant, 11 white persons registered for themselves and 4 others without taking any test, 11 others were illiterate or semi-literate, and 2 others received substantial help to fill out their forms. Three white persons who registered between August 9, 1962, and the time of the trial testified that they received significant help to fill out the application form which they did not fully understand. Overall during the period for which there are application forms, 520 white persons and 558 Negroes applied. Of these, 89% of the white persons but only 7% of the Negroes were accepted.

The defendants called 13 witnesses, all Negroes, who testified that they registered without difficulty and ithout taking any test from 1952 to 1954. However, most had not voted since Negroes were excluded from the Democratic primary election in 1955, and several testified that it was understood in the Negro community after 1955 that Negroes were fearful of trying to register or vote. The Government's last witness, a 72 year old Negro woman, testified that she had applied unsuccessfully five times. At the conclusion of her testimony Judge Clayton directed that she be registered immediately - which she was. After the defendants rested the Government moved that rejected Negroes be ordered registered in time to vote in the November, 1964, election on the ground that they had demonstrated their ability to read and write by filling out questions 1-17 on the application and had thereby met or exceeded the qualification standards applied to white persons. The motion was granted as to 29 Negroes on October 29, 1964, and they voted in the election.

The case is presently awaiting decision on the Government's motion for a permanent injunction and for "freezing relief" of the kind granted in United States v. Shankle and United States v. Cox, the Panola and Tallahatchie County' cases. This would provide for the registration of Negroes by the same standards as had been applied to whites during the period when a pattern and practice of discrimination existed. The Government brief is due January, 1965, defendant's brief due February, 1965.

28. U.S. v. Clement and State of Louisiana
(Webster Parish, La.)
166-33-40 17-119-1
Discrimination in registration. (Ross)

W.D.La.: Dawkins
Date Filed: 2/18/63
Date Tried: 7/22/63
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 7/14/64
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
2/18/63	White	15,713	8,636	55.00%
	Negro	7,045	151	2.14%
6/30/63	White	15,713	8,914	57.00%
	Negro	7,045	229	3.20%
12/11/63	White	15,713	11,142	71.00%
	Negro	7,045	430	6.10%
10/3/64	White	15,713	12,002	77.00%
	Negro	7,045	803	11.00%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
9/13/62-	White	2,432	2,163	269
7/31/64	Negro	654	428	226
8/1/64-	White	397	392	5
10/3/64	Negro	274	187	87

The registrar used the oral interpretation test to deny registration to Negroes until September 1962, when this test was replaced by the citizenship test. At this time the registrar began to use the application card as a test for Negroes. Case tried 7/22/63. Government's motion for preliminary injunction

against the use of the application form as a test denied 7/24/63.

Case decided July 14, 1964. Court found a pattern and practice of discrimination, held that the registrar had used the interpretation test and the application card to discriminate, but refused to enjoin use of citizenship test or to invoke freezing theory on the use of the application card as a test. However, the registrar has been enjoined from using the citizenship test by the decree in U.S. v. Louisiana.

The refusal to grant freezing relief was based on the Court's unwillingness to force the registrar to violate state law by not testing new applicants as she had done previously in the case of white applicants. This ruling was not appealed because the application card test is currently under attack in U.S. v. Board. However, appeal is now under consideration in the light of recent developments: On 12/1/64, Judge Dawkins denied the Government's motion to amend the judgment so as to have costs taxed against the State as well as the registrar. (The time for appeal of the original decree runs from 12/1/64.) In the original opinion, Judge Dawkins found that the registrar had required Negroes to come into her office one at a time, but had allowed white persons to enter in groups. However, he failed to enjoin the registrar from engaging in this "slowdown" practice. Investigation and analysis of the records shows that since the decree the registrar has not only rejected qualified Negroes for errors on their cards (while registering whites with errors), but also enforced her one-at-a-time rule as to all applicants, causing them to wait in line all day despite the fact that there were less than 20 persons in line ahead of them.

29. U.S. v. Crawford and State of Louisiana
(Red River Parish, La.)
166-33-31 17-081-1
Discrimination in registration. (Ross)

W.D.La.: Dawkins
Date Filed: 2/18/63
Date Tried: 7/24-26/63
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 5/25/64
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
2/18/63	White	3,294	3,076	93.00%
	Negro	2,181	33	1.50%
6/30/63	White	3,294	3,132	95.00%
	Negro	2,181	36	1.60%
12/11/63	White	3,294	3,522	100.00%
	Negro	2,181	77	3.50%
10/3/64	White	3,294	3,530	100.00%
	Negro	2,181	96	4.30%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/63-11/64	White	520	508	12
	Negro	210	66	144

Case tried July 24, 1963. Case decided May 25, 1964. Court found a pattern and practice of discrimination, found that the registrar had used the interpretation test and the application card test as device to discriminate against Negroes. Registrar enjoined from discriminating, but no freezing relief on citizenship test or standards on the application card given. Registrar enjoined from using citizenship test under U.S. v. Louisiana decree. The denial of relief on the use of the application card test as a freezing device was not appealed because the application card test is now under attack in U.S. v. Board.

Records analysis show Negroes rejected since decree to be of low literacy level. Although white illiterates were registered before the trial, none have been registered since decree. Government's motion to amend the decree in U.S. v. Crawford to include taxation of costs against the State as well as the registrar denied by Judge Dawkins 12/1/64. Appeal on this issue and on failure to grant freezing relief are under consideration in view of decision of court of appeals in U.S. v. Wood.

30. U.S. v. Jones County Democratic Executive Committee, et al.
(Jones County, Ga.)
166-197-19 10-169-1

Segregation in voting facilities and in counting ballots (Quaintance)

M.D. Ga: Bootle
Date Filed:
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
6/18/63	White	2,655	2,570	97.0%
	Negro	2,185	923	42.0%
	White			
	Negro			

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

On June 26, 1963, defendants and their attorneys stipulated that basic allegations of the complaint were true. The defendants agreed that a permanent injunction be entered outlawing racial voting discrimination, except that the list of qualified voters prepared for the special commissioners election would be used for that election. The permanent injunction was issued.

12/31/64

31. U. S. v. Ashford, Jr.
(Hinds County, Miss.)
166-41-47 23-049-4 #49

Discrimination in registration. (Rosenberg)

S. D. Miss: Mize
Date Filed: 7/13/63
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
6/1/62	White	67,836	56,363	83.0%
	Negro	36,183	4,756	13.2%
7/13/63	White	67,836	58,976*	87.0%
	Negro	36,183	5,104*	14.0%
10/21/64	White	67,836	62,410*	92.1%
	Negro	36,183	5,616*	15.5%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
7/13/63 - 3/18/64	White	1608	1600	8
	Negro	457	214	243
3/18/64 - 10/21/64	White	1837	1834	3
	Negro	379	298	81
	Unknown	479	10	469**

* This figure does not take into account deaths and transfers from the state since June, 1962.

** Rejected probably mostly Negro.

Complaint and application for temporary restraining order were filed July 13, 1963, after the registrar had obtained an ex parte state court order to close registration in the midst of a Negro voter registration drive following death of Medgar Evers. Registrar claimed an inability to handle large groups of applicants with courts in session and the preparation required of him for the August primary election.

On July 26, 1963, the Court denied the application for the restraining order, holding that the closing of the registration books was not an act by the registrar for the purpose, and with the intention of discriminating against Negroes. The court did direct that applicants should be accommodated on first-come first-served basis, following testimony that whites were waited on preferentially.

August 1, 1963, the Government filed an amended complaint claiming discrimination by the registrar in processing and grading applicants. On August 21, 1963, defendants filed a motion for a more definite statement. This motion was overruled by Judge Cox on March 6, 1964.

The Government has photographed and analyzed approximately 14,000 application forms dating from June 7, 1960, the date of the first form in the registrar's possession to the date of the most recent photographing October 21, 1964.

Case will be tried before Judge Sidney Mize in February, 1965. Judge Harold Cox has heard all prior testimony and ruled on all motions to date, but turned the case over to Judge Mize for hearing on the merits.

32. U.S. v. Wall (x-Logue)
(Wilcox County, Ala.)
166-3-14 1-131-1,-2

Discrimination in registration (Cabel)

S.D. Alabama: Thomas
Date Filed: 7/19/63
Date Tried: 12/17/63
Type: Preliminary Injunction
Date of Decree: 3/31/64
Appeal: 4/22/64
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

DATE	Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
	White 2,647	2,959	100% +
7/19/63	Negro 6,085	0	0%
	White 2,647	2,974*	100% +
5/3/64	Negro 6,085	0	0%

*This figure is from the Birmingham News.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

Registrars used the white voucher rule. The defendants filed motions to dismiss and to strike allegation with respect to unequal educational facilities and its effect on use of tests to determine registration qualifications. The hearing on these motions held October 29, 1963. Motion to dismiss was overruled and the motion to strike was granted. Hearing on motion for preliminary injunction heard on December 17, 1963. On March 31, 1964, the district court denied defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint, denied plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction and held that the plaintiff failed in its proof of discrimination, holding that all applicants, irrespective of race or color, were duly required to have a registered voter vouch for him. The court found that the requirement had been uniformly applied and that the Negro applicants, in not producing registered voters to vouch for them, had failed to comply with the law. Accordingly, the defendants were not guilty of discrimination or discriminatory acts which were pursuant to a pattern or practice. The court made a point of the fact that the government had not shown that supporting witnesses had been sought but not found.

The Government's contention in this regard, was that the voucher requirement as applied to whites was meaningless. As proof, the Government offered that of the 376 whites to register to vote between January 1, 1959 and October 17, 1963, 342 were vouched for by a county official or employee. In this period of nearly four years, only 34 whites took the trouble to bring in another registered voter to the courthouse to vouch for them. Therefore, as to whites, the voucher requirement had not been used as a means of ascertaining the true identity of white applicants or of establishing their character or reputation. The Government also offered proof of assistance.

Finally, the Court found that none of the Negroes were intimidated, harassed, or otherwise abused, but had been treated the same as white applicants.

Notice of Appeal filed by United States on April 22, 1964. Brief of United States submitted in September, 1964. No oral argument as yet. Few Negroes have applied for registration since the hearing in December 1963. There has been no voter registration activity. Negroes afraid -- awaiting decision on appeal.

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——27

33. U. S. v. Cartwright (x-Strong)
(Elmore County, Alabama)
166-2-1 1-051-1

Discrimination in registration (Marlin)

M. D. Ala.: Johnson
Date Filed: 7/19/63
Date Tried: 3/6/64
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 6/17/64
Appeal: None

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
7/19/63	White	12,510	10,368	82.8
	Negro	4,808	279	5.8
12/3/63	White	12,510	11,134[1/]	89.0
	Negro	4,808	363[1/]	7.5
11/16/64	White	12,510	12,022[2/]	96.0
	Negro	4,808	592	12.3

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
12/59 - 12/31/63	White	1,928	1,832	96
	Negro	215	9	206
12/31/63 - 11/16/64	White	868	845	23
	Negro	279	229[3/]	50

[1/] Obtained from List of Registered Voters maintained by Elmore County Judge of Probate.

[2/] Accepted applications added to previous total. The Negro total includes the 102 persons ordered on the rolls by the Decree. Neither total excludes those purged since December 3, 1963.

[3/] Included in this figure are 82 Negroes ordered on the

Judge Johnson handed down a strong decree on June 17, 1964 in which the Court found a pattern and practice of racial discrimination from December 1, 1959 to the date of trial and ordered relief from the freezing effects of ;this discrimination. The decree contains the qualifications needed to become a voter at this time. They are: (1) that the applicant be 21 years of age and a citizen of the United States; (2) that the applicant meet the residence requirements (1 year in the State, 6 months in the county and 3 months in the precinct); (3) that he not have been convicted of any of the disqualifying offenses under Alabama law, or be of bad character; (4) that the applicant be able to demonstrate his ability to read and write; and (5) that the applicant take the oath.

The Court also enjoined the Board from rejecting any applicant because of an unsatisfactory performance on one or more of the tests provided for the Insert, Part III, of the new application form or for inconsequential errors or omissions The Court furthermore established specific procedures and standards for the Board to use in determining such qualifications as residence, loyalty, and the determination which errors or omissions are technical and inconsequential. In particular, the Court prohibited the rejection of anyone for lack of residency if, in fact, they possessed the residency, and it was made the affirmative duty of the Board to determine residency orally in the same manner as had been determined for whites since 1959. The Board was also prohibited from rejecting anyone for not signing the oath or the supplemental oath, and the Board had the duty to administer the oath, and to

---

3/ (cont. from previous page) rolls by the June 17, 1964 decree. A total of 102 Negroes were ordered on the rolls by that decree (cf. Footnote 2), but 20 had already successfully registered between the time of the trial and the time of the decree.

orally instruct the applicant to sign if the applicant is willing. With regard to technical or inconsequential errors, the Court instructed that an error or omission is inconsequential if (a) the information sought appears elsewhere on the form; (b) if the information sought is readily available to the Board or if it is information which has no real value; or (c) if it is merely a matter of inconsistent answers.

The Court ordered 102 Negroes to be put on the rolls, required the Board to submit monthly reports to the Court, gave the Government the right to inspect the records at any and all reasonable times, and requested further assistance by the government in enforcing the decree.

Twenty of the 102 Negroes who were ordered on the rolls had already been registered and the remaining 82 were put on. Of 92 Negro applicants since the decree, 84 have been registered. The eight rejected Negroes are either illiterate or marginal. However, the Board has continued to require the applicant to complete the Insert and tests his literacy by his performance on it. On November 13th, a contempt action was filed against the Board to enjoin the use of the Insert. The facts were stipulated to at a hearing on January 7, 1965 and briefs ordered of the plaintiff by January 20th and of the defendant by January 25th.

12/31/64

34. U.S. v. Ballsnyder, et al. (Jefferson County, Ala.)
166-1-7 1-073-1

Discrimination in registration (Norman)

N.D. Ala.:Lynn
Date Filed: 7/13/63
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of voting age	Persons Registered	Per cent registered
7/1/62	White	256,319	118,000*	46.0%
	Negro	116,160	11,000*	9.5%
7/31/62	White	256,319	120,000*	47.0%
	Negro	116,160	14,000*	12.0%
12/20/63	White	256,319	125,000*	49.0%
	Negro	116,160	17,000*	15.0%
10/1/64	White	256,319	134,939**	52.6%
	Negro	116,160	27,013**	23.2%

* These figures are estimates.
** Birmingham News, 10/18/64.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/1/61-	White	6470	6430*	40
12/31/61	Negro	1657	1078*	579
1/1/62-	White	6337	6266*	71
12/31/62	Negro	3242	2313*	929
1/1/63-	White	16,216	16,137*	79
12/31/63	Negro	10,755	8,833*	1922
1/1/64-	White	8,651	8,626**	25
12/31/64	Negro	3,238	2,302**	936

* Count of Registration Books
** Birmingham News 10/18/64

Records first photographed in June 1962 and negotiation with the Board began soon thereafter. Defendants filed answer along with motions to dismiss and to strike. Paragraph 25 claims that unequal educational opportunities in the past prevents Jefferson County from using application form as a test. Motions heard on September 6th. Motion to dismiss denied but motion to strike was granted September 10, 1963. Government moved to consolidate this case with private suit brought against these defendants by Negroes. On October 10, 1963 Court granted Government's motion to consolidate. A new Board of Registrars appointed October 1, 1963 and the new Board had been accepting a vast majority of Negro applicants. Trial date set for December 6, 1963, but because of the apparent good faith action of the Board the plaintiff sought and was granted a continuance. Late in December Board started to again apply stricter standards to Negroes. Records photographed January and August 1964. Since the beginning of 1964 the Board has accepted over 99% of white applicants and has rejected 29% of Negro applicants. In February the Board started using an application form containing an insert with questions on government, writing from dictation, and excerpts from the federal Constitution. This was again changed in September 1964 with a more difficult insert requiring answers to questions on government. Supplemental complaint filed in November 1964 to enjoin the use of these inserts. No trial date has been set.

12/31/64

35. U.S. v. Board of Registration of the State of Louisiana
166-0-1 17-000-4

Constitutional challenge of Louisiana statute providing that the application form is a strict test (Ross, Kauder)

E.D. La.: Wisdom, Christenberry, West
Date Filed: 10/8/63
Date Tried: 11/30/64
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
7/30/63	White	1,284,634	971,959	75.7%
	Negro	510,252	153,655	30.1%
10/3/64	White	1,284,634	1,037,339	80.4%
	Negro	510,252	164,252	32.2%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

Defendants' motion to strike historical paragraph on unequal educational opportunity and attachments consisting of Citizens Council pamphlet and applications (rejected and purged) deferred to hearing on the merits. At the request of the Court, this case was tried largely on the documentary evidence described below.

In preparation for this case the Government photographed the rejected application cards in fifty-seven of the sixty-four Louisiana Parishes. Of the remaining seven parishes, there were three in which there were no rejects: Cameron, Livingston and Tensas. In the other four, Catahoula, Sabine, Vernon and Washington, we inspected the records, but did not photograph them. Some or all of the accepted applications were photographed in twenty-five parishes. Some of these parishes were ones in which the Government had photographed before in connection with 1971(a) investigations and suits. The photographing was done in late 1963 or early 1964, with the exception of Iberville and Pointe Coupee, in which the last photographing was in May 1963; and the 21 parishes covered by the U.S. v. Louisiana decree, in which the photographing is brought up to date approximately every six months. 348 rolls of microfilm were entered in evidence. The records analysis done in connection with other 1971(a) suits against individual parish registrars was used as a starting point in this case. In nineteen parishes, there were enough rejected cards to arrive at meaningful accepted rates (by race and by reason for rejection). Tables were constructed showing the number of whites and Negroes accepted and rejected (and the reason they were rejected) in each of these parishes for each month from the date of the first rejected card through December 1963. The figures for Orleans Parish were broken down by deputy registrar in order to show the extreme variations in rejection among the 22 deputies there. In addition to these counts, the records were analyzed to show differences in standards on the application card test from parish to parish, to select examples of arbitrary rejections of Negro applicants and to show that Negroes' cards were graded with different standards than were the cards of white persons. The total number of rejected cards analyzed was approximately 49,000. The breakdown is as follows:

	W	N	Race Unknown
Rejected on the application card test	10,100	24,000	1,800
Rejected on the citizenship test or the interpretation test	3,700	5,200	4,200

In the case of both whites and Negroes, two-thirds of the rejections on the cards occurred in Orleans Parish.

Between January 27 and June 3, 1964, the Government took the depositions of the registrars of 54 parishes, nine deputy registrars and two assistants in Orleans Parish and three members of the staff of the State Board of Registration. These depositions were indexed according to the registrar's testimony about a particular blank on the card. This was done in order to facilitate discussion in the Brief of varying and arbitrary standards in grading the card. These depositions, as well as registrars' testimony in other 1971(a) cases, and the testimony of other witnesses in those cases, were summarized for the Court in an Appendix to the Brief.

Other preparations for the submission of this case included the selection of newspaper articles concerning the 1898 Louisiana Constitutional Conventions for introduction into evidence to show the discriminatory origin and purpose of the application card test; the compilation of statutes and historical commentary relating to the inferior education provided to Negroes by the State of Louisiana; and the construction of notebooks containing Xerox copies of 143 rejected Negroes' applications, demonstrating the arbitrariness of the registrars' rejections of obviously qualified Negro applicants.

Pre-trial conferences were held on July 7 and August 28, 1964. The Government submitted its documentary evidence, summaries, and the defendants filed their Brief on November 23, 1964. On November 30, 1964, oral arguments and a hearing on the merits were heard. After the hearing, the Court ordered both sides to file supplemental Briefs within 30 days and gave both sides leave to take additional testimony on depositions. During the week of 12/14/64 the Government took the depositions of fourteen white voters in Orleans, East Baton Rouge and Caddo Parishes. The defendants took the depositions of five white voters in these parishes. In addition the Government deposed two Negroes from West Feliciana Parish who had been indicted by a local Grand Jury for making allegedly false statements on their application cards. On 12/28/64 the defendants deposed a statistician with the intent of discrediting the Government's statutes; a thirteen year-old boy, with the intent of demonstrating how easy the application card test is (he failed it); and a Political Science Professor from Tulane, to testify that the State needs the information elicited by the card in order to determine an applicant's qualifications. The Government's Supplemental Brief was filed 12/31/64 and the case is now under submission.

In its reply brief the Government maintained that Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 invalidated many of the specific immaterial errors for which applicants in Louisiana have been rejected. However, the Government claimed that it was not sufficient for the Court to

enjoin the board from rejecting applicants for missing a series of specified immaterial errors, but rather the Court had to invalidate the use of this particular form itself because of the fact that Louisiana had written this application form into its statutory law. Our theory is that the entire form conflicts with Title I and that where state law and an act of Congress are in direct conflict, the Supremacy Clause requires that the state statute be declared invalid.

The Government also urged the Court to declare the application test invalid under the 15th Amendment. Our theory is that the application form test was arbitrary, based upon an analysis of its content, the structure of the form and the traps embodied in it, and the requirement that it be completed absolutely perfectly with no leeway for the slightest error or omission. Since the test was arbitrary, we maintained it violated the 15th Amendment for the reason that in a state where there exists a massive disparity in the percentage of Negro adults registered to vote compared to the percentage of white persons registered to vote, and a record exists which demonstrates that the state has long maintained a policy of racial discrimination in voting, any arbitrary test violates the 15th Amendment.

36. U.S. v. Crouch
(St. Helena Parish, La.)
166-32-17 17-091-1
Discrimination in registration. (Ross)

E.D. La.: West
Date Filed: 10/22/63
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
10/22/63	White	2,363	1,832	77.00%
	Negro	2,082	351	17.00%
11/7/63	White	2,363	1,965	83.00%
	Negro	2,082	417	20.00%
10/3/64	White	2,363	2,059	86.00%
	Negro	2,082	560	27.00%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/61-	White	2,387	2,038	349
12/63	Negro	1,504	347	1,157
1/64-	White	116	73	43
8/31/64	Negro	441	110	331

Complaint filed October 22, 1963. On same day Government applied for preliminary and permanent injunction. On November 12, 1963, defendants applied for extension of time in which to answer. Answer filed 1/23/64. Government filed Interrogatories 7/24/64. These have not yet been answered and no steps have been taken to compel defendants to answer.

The registrar is enjoined by the decree in U.S. v. Louisiana from using the citizenship test. Records photographed 7/2/64 and registrar's reports filed under that decree show that the registrar continues to reject a high proportion of Negroes (75% this year) and has started to reject a relatively high proportion of whites (35% this year), mostly for technical errors on the application card. All the records through December 11, 1963 have been typed on control cards and analyzed. These records show that about half the Negroes and 60% of the white persons who were rejected became registered on a subsequent attempt, but that it took Negroes more times. The registrar's standards on the application card are very strict and several examples of rejection from St. Helena are found in the U.S. v. Board brief.

This case was filed on the basis of discriminatory use of the constitutional interpretation test, which has been discontinued as well as the citizenship test. Undoubtedly the registrar is now discriminating in the use of the application card, as a freezing device if not by assisting some whites in filling it out. Twenty-seven per cent of the adult Negroes in St. Helena Parish are now registered. CORE has been very active here in the last two years, teaching Negroes how to fill out the form and encouraging them to try to register. It is considered that relief to these applicants from the burden of the application card test can be obtained sooner from U.S. v. Board, than from U.S. v. Crouch.

37. U.S. v. Harvey
(West Feliciana Parish, La.)
166-32-22 17-125-1
Unfair use of voucher system and proof of residence. (Kauder)

E.D.La.: West
Date Filed: 10/29/63
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
10/29/63	White	1,632*	1,207	74.00%
	Negro	2,235*	8**	0.36%
11/7/63	White	1,632*	1,341	82.00%
	Negro	2,235*	13	0.60%
10/3/64	White	1,632*	1,345	82.00%
	Negro	2,235*	85	3.00%

* These figures include the inmate population of Louisiana State Penitentiary at Angola, Louisiana.

** The Negroes who became registered in October 1963 were the first Negroes to be registered in this parish since 1900.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
8/1/63-	White	273	261	12
11/30/64	Negro	281	85	196

Answer filed 1/23/64. On 4/2/64 Judge West denied Government's motion for a Temporary Restraining Order requiring defendant Harvey to receive and process applications for registration. Harvey had refused to process any applications since the issuance on 1/28/64 of the decree in U.S. v. Louisiana,

which enjoined Harvey from using the citizenship test. Hearing held 4/27/64 on Government's motion for a Preliminary Injunction. Both sides given 10 days within which to file briefs. Government's Brief filed 5/7/64. Government renewed motion on 6/12/64; Judge West denied it 6/18/64. On 6/22/64 Fifth Circuit entered an order requiring Judge West to enter a temporary injunction pending appeal. Books were open for 2 days before they closed for an election. Government's Motion for Summary Reversal filed with Fifth Circuit and denied 11/17/64.

The records have been photographed under the U.S. v. Louisiana decree. The registrar is not using the citizenship test, but he is rejecting Negroes for technical errors on the card and the Preamble. Since the books opened: 44 white accepted, 0 whites rejected; 68 Negroes accepted, 142 Negroes rejected. This is the only parish left in the State on periodic registration. The books will be wiped clean with a new period beginning 1/1/65. On November 2, 1964, two Negroes and a white person were indicted by a local grand jury for alleged "false statements" on their application cards (which were rejected by the registrar). The Government took the depositions of these three persons in connection with U.S. v. Board, in which the use of the application card as a test is challenged. The Negro defendants filed a petition to have their cases removed to the federal court, and the Government has under consideration participation in the removal proceedings.

38, U.S. v. Tutwiler
(Hale County, Ala.)
166-3-7 1-065-1

Discrimination in registration (Sutin)

S.D. Ala.: Thomas
Date Filed: 12/16/63
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
12/16/63	White	3,600	3,674	100.0%
	Negro	6,000	200	3.3%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
	White			
	Negro			

Records will be photographed early in 1965. The case should be ready for trial early in 1965. Lack of progress due to back up of cases in Southern District of Alabama, Northern Division.

12/31/64

39. U.S. v. Hines
(Sumter County, Ala.)
166-1-17 1-119-1

Discrimination in registration (Marlin)

N.D. Ala.:Grooms
Date Filed: 12/16/63
Date Tried: 5/6-7/64
Type: Preliminary injunction
Date of Decree: 9/17/64
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRAION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
4/1/64	White	3,061	3,238	105.0%
	Negro	6,814	315	4.4%
11/1/64	White	3,061	3,297	107.0%
	Negro	6,814	358	5.2%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
4/1/64 - 9/17/64	White	41	32	9
	Negro	67	16	51
9/17/64- 11/1/64	White	28	27	1
	Negro	28	27	1

On December 27, 1963 defendants filed a motion to strike paragraph 9 from the complaint which alleged the use of the application as a test or examination is discriminatory in that Negroes in Sumter County had not been afforded an equal opportunity to education through the public system. Defendant's motion was granted over the Government's objection on February 26, 1964.

Trial was held on the merits of the Case in May, 1964 and Judge Grooms issued his decree on September 17,1964. Judge Grooms' decree is one of the most far-reaching we have obtained in Alabama. In it the Judge enjoined the board from using standards, requirements, etc. which are more stringent than those applied to white applicants since January, 1954, using the application as a test, rejecting any applicant for failure to satisfactorily complete Insert Part III or delaying, hindering, or discouraging Negroes from registration. The Judge also enjoined the Board from employing the supporting witness requirement.

Subsequent to this decree we filed an Order to Show Cause why the Board should not be held in contempt of this decree and a hearing was held on this matter on December 2, 1964. Basically our argument to the court was that the use of the new Insert Part III, promulgated by the Supreme Court of Alabama in August 1964, by the Board was a violation of the injunction. We also attempted to show the delay and discouragement aspects of the Insert. The Court, however, ruled that the Board was not in contempt of its order. The Judge in his order discharging the show cause order (December 3, 1964) stated that although the Board was submitting Insert Part III to applicants, it had acted on the applications independent of and without consideration of the Insert. He further emphasized that his order of September 17, 1964 was not broad enough to prohibit the ". . . use of Part III unless its use is for the purpose of rejecting applicants for registration." (Emphasis by the Court)

At present Sumter County seems to suffer from a lack of Negro leadership or an organization that would stimulate voter registration. Until this problem is solved it is doubted that Negro voter registration will be materially increased.

12/31/64

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——28

40. U.S. v. Henry
(Oktibbeha County, Miss.)
166-40-47 23-105-1 #34

Discrimination in registration (Danziger)

N.D. Miss: Clayton
Date Filed: 12/16/63
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
12/16/63	White	8,423	8,000*	95%
	Negro	4,952	128	2.6%
	White			
	Negro			
	White			
	Negro			

*Estimate

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

*
Records photographed again on this date. No analysis nor count made yet. Records were photographed on August 20 and September 15 and 16, 1964 as a result of prior litigation under Title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

Detailed analysis of these records is now in progress. Race identification biggest problem. FBI request in preparation.

Relatively few Negroes are known to have attempted to register after 1955 and prior to the filing of the suit. Those that did were subjected to delay and obstruction. There appears to have been a slight improvement since our investigations began but registration efforts by Negroes remain nominal.

Investigations were conducted in the county in the spring and fall of 1964 but little or no new material was developed.

No trial date has been set. The next term of court is in April of 1965 and the case may be heard at that time.

41. U.S. v. Simpson, et al (x-Griffin) N.D.Miss.: Clayton
(Chickasaw County, Miss.) Date Filed: 12/16/63
166-40-33 23-017-1 #27 Date Tried:
Discrimination in accepting Type:
Payment of poll taxes (Flannery) Date of Decree:
Appeal:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
12/16/63	White	6,388	4,522	71.0%
	Negro	3,054	0	0.0%
8/11/64	White	6,388	4,607	72.1%
	Negro	3,054	1	0.03%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

1/1/64	White	88	85	3
8/11/64	Negro	7	2 *	5

* Although two Negroes' forms were accepted, only one signed the registration book; the other believed that he did not have to do so.

Departmental attorneys' interviews with Negroes disclosed that between 1947 or 1948 and 1963 Negroes had been denied their right to pay poll taxes on about nine occasions. One successfully did so by mail in January, 1963. In most instances the incumbent sheriff or his deputies refused to accept payments or issue receipts.

In late 1963 negotiations were conducted with the outgoing sheriff's attorney who agreed to permit Negroes to pay back taxes, but he also insisted that Negroes who had not personally been refused the right to pay should have to pay a penalty amount before being permitted to pay back taxes.

This was not satisfactory and suit was filed on December 16, 1963. A new sheriff, Arnold Simpson, assumed office in January, 1964.

The defendants' Motion For a More Definite Statement was filed on January 2, 1964, denied on January 27, and their answers were filed on February 14. On February 25 the defendants filed interrogatories which were answered on March 16. The defendants moved to dismiss the action on March 26. In a Memorandum Opinion and Order on July 21 the motions to dismiss the action were denied and the new sheriff, Arnold Simpson, was ordered to be substituted as defendant. His answer to the complaint was filed on August 11, 1964, and the case is awaiting trial.

Investigation conducted in February, 1964, disclosed that, during the preceding month, approximately twenty Negroes paid their 1963 poll taxes without difficulty, but one man was illegally delayed and there was no information indicating that any Negroes attempted to pay poll taxes for previous years.

42. U.S. v. Weeks
(Copiah County, Miss.)
166-41-39 23-029-1 #47
Discrimination in Registration
(Moore)

S. D. Miss: Cox
Date Filed: 12/17/63
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
1/3/63	White	8,153	7,533	92%
	Negro	6,407	25	.4%
1/3/63-	White	8,153	7,824*	95.9%
12/17/63	Negro	6,407	26	.4%
10/22/64	White	8,153	8,047	98.6%
	Negro	6,407	34	.5%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
12/17/63-	White	249	223	26
10/ 22/64	Negro	11	8	3

*This is, necessarily, an estimate. Of the 291 white applicants during this period, only 30 have been verified thus far as accepted. The official disposition of the remaining 261 has not been determined by records analysts, though it is expected that most, if not all, were accepted. Only one Negro, Mrs. Odessa Crisler, was accepted during this period. The figures for this period also do not reflect any alleged purge of white illiterates--as this purge has not been verified.

The government first inspected records in this County in January, 1963, pursuant to court order obtained December 10, 1962. The records showed massive discrimination in the assignment of Sections of the Constitution of Mississippi to be interpreted and in the furnishing of assistance at least through the end of 1962. We filed our complaint on December 17, 1963. The records were photographed twice in 1964, on March 10 and October 22, Analysis of these photographings is in progress.

Following the photographing of the records in 1963, the registrar's attorneys took a greater interest in the operation of his office and those attorneys have advised government lawyers of the following steps taken to prevent discrimination in processing and grading of forms of Negro applicants. They have persuaded the Board to employ a full time deputy who alone is responsible for handling registration of applicants and who initially grades those applications. The attorneys then review some or all of the deputy's work and can overrule him. In addition, the attorneys have interviewed most of the whites and Negroes whom we list in our interrogatories as being discriminated either for or against. They are themselves administering a test to white applicants we allege were not qualified and have purged a large number of them.

After the answers to interrogatories were filed in this case (7/8/64), several conferences were held between the attorneys for the government and the attorneys representing the registrar. These attorneys have agreed to stipulate to the major part of the testimony of white witnesses that the government had proposed to call; they have purged most of these whites from the registration books, and then have traveled around the county inquiring of Negroes who had attempted to register whether they had been intimidated. They have informed all Negroes that they have interviewed that they have the right to register and have allegedly told the Negroes interviewed that if necessary, because of reluctance to reapply, to contact them and they will accompany the Negroes to the registrar's office.

The trial, originally set for November 18, 1964, was re-set for February 8, 1965. At request of government, the trial was continued in order that the assigned date could be used for trial of the Jeff Davis case, U.S. v. Daniel.

43. U.S. v. Coleman
(Lauderdale County, Miss.)
166-1-9 1-077-1 #62

S.D. Miss.:Mize
Date Filed: 12/17/63
Date Tried: 6/25/64
Preliminary injunction records only
Type: Preliminary (20 Negroes ordered registered)
Date of Decree:
(1) 7/7/64
(2) 10/28/64
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

Discrimination in registration (Schwelb)

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
12/17/63	White	27,200	20,000*	74.0%
	Negro	11,924	1,600*	13.4%
9/25/64	White	27,200	20,000*	74.0%
	Negro	11,924	1,700*	14.3%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
2/60-	White	2,883	2,851	32
6/30/64**	Negro	460	285	175

* Estimates, since books have not been adequately purged of names of persons who have moved or died.

** Forms from February 1960 to June 30, 1964 but only a few forms were preserved prior to 1962.

Records reflect massive discrimination in selection of sections, and massive assistance to white applicants in completing forms. Since the suit was filed, the Registrar and his assistants have somewhat mitigated their discrimination in section assignment but continue to discriminate in assistance and grading. The case is before Judge Mize, who set a trial date for June 22, 1964. However, a few weeks before trial Registrar Coleman suffered a heart attack and the trial was postponed. Plaintiff applied for a preliminary injunction 6/17/64 and, after reading briefs, hearing oral argument, and examining the Lauderdale County registration records, Judge Mize ordered 15 rejected Negroes registered. Several of these had already been registered on subsequent attempts; however, shortly before the general election, the Government made a further application and Judge Mize ordered five more Negroes registered. A trial date is set for March 1, 1965. Defendant's attorneys oppose date because registrar still not recovered from heart attack.

44. U.S. v. Campbell
(Madison County, Miss.)
166-41-58 23-009-1 #53
Discrimination in registration. (Schwelb)

S.D. Miss.: Cox
Date Filed: 3/5/64
Date Tried: 8/24-26/64
Type: Permanent Injunctions
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	5,606	4,302	69%
	Negro	11,586	476	3.8%
1/1/60	White	5,622	4,568	81%
	Negro	10,366	120	1.1%
6/21/63	White	5,622	5,458	97%
	Negro	10,366	152	1.1%
7/13/64	White	5,622	6,256	100%+*
	Negro	10,366	218	2%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
7/5/60-9/4/64	White	640	518	122
	Negro	637	65	572

* The Registration Books have not been fully purged of deceased and transferred persons.

This case was filed on March 5, 1964. At the same time an application for an order to show cause and a temporary restraining order was filed for the purpose of preventing the registrar from continuing his "slow down" in receiving and processing voter registration applications on a one at a time basis in the face of a Negro registration drive being conducted by CORE. This application for a temporary restraining order was heard on March 13, 1964 by Judge Cox. On March 16, 1964, Judge Cox issued a TRO requiring the registrar to process four persons at a time so that as many as fifty applicants per day could be handled. The case was tried on its merits on August 24-26, 1964, at which trial the government contended and attempted to prove that Negroes who had been registered prior to a 1957 registration had been required to fill out application forms in order to reregister, that whites making initial application subsequent to 1957 were aided in completing the application forms while Negroes were not, that prior to our intervention Negroes were given harder sections to interpret, and that illiterate whites were allowed to register. On November 3, 1964, simultaneous briefs and proposed conclusions of law and findings of facts were filed by both parties. A date for oral argument is set in January 1965.

45. U.S. v. Palmer
(East Feliciana Parish, La.)
166-32-12 17-037-1
Discrimination in registration. (Kauder)

E.D. La.: West
Date Filed: 3/26/64
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
1/1/61	White	4,200*	2,448	58.00%
	Negro	4,102*	82	2.00%
12/11/63	White	4,200	2,720	65.00%
	Negro	4,102	126	3,00%
10/3/64	White	4,200	2,728	65.00%
	Negro	4,102	180	4.40%

* East Louisiana State (Mental) Hospital, Jackson, Louisiana, is located in this parish. There are 4,852 persons there, 1,979 Negroes; 2,843 whites. These persons are not included in the above statistics.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/58-12/63	White	3,207	2,560	647
	Negro	778	126	652
1/64-6/22/64		(Books closed)		
6/23/64-11/30/64	White	128	109	19
	Negro	253	49	204

On April 2, 1964 Judge West denied Government's motion for a Temporary Restraining Order requiring Defendant Palmer to receive and process applications for registration. Palmer had refused to process any applications since the decree in U.S. v. Louisiana was issued on 1/28/64, enjoining Palmer from using the citizenship test. A hearing was held on 4/27/64 on the Government's motion for a Preliminary Injunction. The Government called Negro witnesses who testified that they had attempted to register but had been told that applications were not being processed. Both sides were given ten days to file briefs. Government's Brief filed 5/7/64. These proceedings were held contemporaneously with those in U.S. v. Harvey, since both cases involved similar facts and identical issues. The Government renewed its motion on 6/12/64 because the registration office was scheduled to be rightfully closed on 6/25/64 in preparation for an election. On 6/18/64 Judge West denied the Government's motion. On 6/22/64 the Fifth Circuit entered an order requiring Judge West to enter a Temporary Injunction pending appeal. The registration books were open for two days before they closed for the election. During those two days, 11 Negroes applied and 4 were accepted. The Government's Motion for Summary Reversal of Judge West's original ruling was filed with the Fifth Circuit and denied 11/17/64. The records were photographed under the U.S. v. Louisiana decree on 9/9/64. These records have not yet been analyzed. Analysis of the records filed through December 1963 show that the registrar has rejected a high percentage of Negroes for technical errors on the application card, and while whites have also been rejected for errors, a much lower percentage have been turned down.

There was a purge of the rolls based on alleged "errors" on the application card in September 1958: August 31, 1958 there were 2,443 whites and 1,027 Negroes registered; October 4, 1958 there were 2,449 white persons and 450 Negroes registered to vote. Following this purge the registrar also purged whites (and more Negroes). By June 30, 1959 there were 1,634 white persons and only 50 Negroes registered to vote. Since then, white registration has more than recovered, but Negro registration has been held down, by the use of the constitutional interpretation test until it was discontinued in August 1962 and by the application card test. Discrimination in the use of this test is apparent from the records. For example, they show a discriminatory distribution of the five "scrambled" application cards [the same blanks, but in different order -- some cards are more of a trap than others], whereby Negroes are generally given the more difficult cards and whites are given the easier ones. CORE has been very active in this parish and is largely responsible for the high number of Negro applicants during the past year and a half.

46. U.S. v. McClellan
(Holmes County, Miss)
166-41-9 23-051-4 #50
(Danziger)

S.D. Miss: Mize, Clayton, Jones
Date Filed: 7/24/64
Date Tried: 11/4-6/64
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	5,569	3,616	64.90%
	Negro	11,468	8	0.07%
12/31/63	White	4,773	4,000 *	84.00%
	Negro	8,757	20	0.23%
8/18/64	White	4,733	4,800 *	100.00%
	Negro	8,757	20 **	0.23%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/1/56 - 4/9/63	White	1903	1903	0%
	Negro	0	0	--
4/9/63 - 8/18/64	White	147	145	2
	Negro	292	4	288

* These figures are estimates.
** There are 212 Negroes on the registration books since 1912. Approximately 90% of them are now deceased.

Case has long background. No Negro was permitted to pay his poll tax in the county from 1956 until the latter part of 1963. As a result, no Negro voted or attempted to register to vote from 1956 until 1963. In March of 1963 several voter registration workers were invited into the County by local Negro farmers, and several Negroes tried to register.

In May, 1963, a suit was filed against the sheriff of Holmes County for the arrest of a Negro farmer and voter registration workers on charges of arson in connection with the fire-bombing of the Negro's house. As part of the complaint, we charged the sheriff with discriminating against Negroes by refusing to allow them to pay poll taxes.

This case was tried in January 1964. On February 25, the Court issued an order in which it declined to issue an injunction but retained jurisdiction. Prior to the trial, the Sheriff had begun to allow Negroes to pay their poll taxes and, in light of this, the Court found that there was no abuse of the criminal process.

In November 1963, a Title III records demand was served. An application for an order to require inspection of the reports was filed on December 6, 1963, and on January 7, 1964, the Court required the Registrar to comply with the Government's request but it limited the inspection to only those records made since May 6, 1960 and November 6, 1962. This limitation was appealed on January 7, 1964 and is still pending.

This complaint was filed under 1971(a) on July 24, 1964 together with a motion for a three-judge Court and a motion to inspect records under Rule 34. The records were photographed on August 17 and 18, 1964. Only four of the 292 Negro applicants between April 1963 and August 1964 were accepted, while only two of the approximately 170 white applicants were rejected. All application forms prior to January 1963 were destroyed, but the remaining forms show section selection discrimination.

A hearing on the merits was held on November 4, 5 and 6th 1964 before Judges Jones, Clayton and Mize. The Government put on 56 witnesses. The Government rested, and the case has been continued until February 17, 1965, when the defense will present its case.

The Government has asked the Court to find a "pattern and practice" of discrimination and grant a permanent injunction including "freezing relief" requiring the registrar to register all future Negro applicants according to the standard which has been applied to whites. Strong case on the facts. As part of relief the Department will ask that certain Negroes whose applications were rejected be ordered put on the registration books.

47. U.S. v. Clayton
(Marshall County, Miss.)
166-40-45 23-093-1
Discrimination in registration (Flannery)

N.D. Miss.: Clayton
Date Filed: 7/24/64
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	4,403	3,403	77.00%
	Negro	8,210	20	0.24%
1/1/60	White	4,342	4,030	93.00%
	Negro	7,168	23	0.32%
9/1/61	White	4,342	4,030*	93.00%
	Negro	7,168	30	0.42%
12/31/63	White	4,342	4,200*	97.0%
	Negro	7,168	130	1.8%
12/7/64	White	4,342	4,229	97.3%
	Negro	7,168	177	2.5%

*Estimate.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
9/61 -	White	68	54	14
6/1/62	Negro	51	27	24
6/1/62 -	White	255	230	23
12/31/63	Negro	287	81	191
12/31/63-	White	29	28	1
8/19/64	Negro	133	47	86

The Complaint in this case was prepared in July of 1961 but not filed because the Registrar's attorney wished to resolve the problems without suit. He agreed to cease discriminating immediately and, after protracted negotiation through his attorney, to adopt standards and procedures proposed by the Department. This agreement, which took effect in December of 1962, provided for lenient grading and the use exclusively, of 5 easy sections of the Mississippi Constitution for the interpretation test. The intended effect of this agreement was registration standards more approximate to pre-1954 standards.

Subsequent investigation disclosed that discrimination was continuing in the form of assistance to white applicants. The Negro rejection rate remained very high, and that for whites rose somewhat. These facts and the defendant's refusal to adopt the standards and procedures decreed in the Panola and Tallahatchie County cases (U.S. v. Shankle and U.S. v. Cox) decided in May and June, 1964, respectively, led to the filing of a revised Complaint under Section 1971(a) on July 24, 1964.

On December 7, 1964, 36 hours before trial, the defendant advised the Government and the Court that all registrants had been purged from the books of Marshall County and that he was willing to conduct a non-discriminatory re-registration of the entire county under court order. The first result of this proposal was an indefinite postponement of the trial.

The defendant also proposed that all applicants be required to meet the high, post-1954 State standards without regard to whether they were previously registered or when they became eligible. The government contended that any use of the interpretation test in this context would violate the 15th Amendment because Negroes are and always have been subjected to inferior schooling.

The Court expressed the view that that was a question of what relief should be granted and that this could be determined without a trial. The Government urged that it was a difficult issue and one requiring the benefit of full adversary proceedings.

The Court directed the parties to proceed as follows: the Government to amend its Complaint to include the educational allegations, which was done December 18, 1964; the defendants to answer the amended Complaint and file Motion for Judgment on the pleadings (by January 5, 1965); and thereafter join the Government and the defendants to file supporting briefs on issues: (1) whether trial is necessary and (2) what relief should be granted if no trial is held.

In this case, as in Benton County, U.S. v. Mathis, the defendants have undertaken to avoid the "freezing relief" authorized by the Court of Appeals in the Panola County case by use of a complete reregistration. The case is important because it directly raises the issues as to what standards and procedures will be used in the event of a complete reregistration.

48. U.S. v. Hosey, et al.
(Jasper County, Miss.)
166-41-50 23-061-1 #60
Discrimination in registration. (Schwelb)

S.D. Miss.: Cox
Date Filed: 9/3/64
Date Tried:
Type
Date of Decree:
Appeal
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
8/1/55	White	5,470	4,228	77.20%
	Negro	4,313	6	0.20%
8/8/55	White	5,327	4,112*	77.10%
	Negro	3,675	6	0.20%
9/26/64	White	5,327	4,200*	79.00%
	Negro	3,675	8	0.22%

* Estimate

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
10/61-9/64	White	354	350	4
	Negro	14	1	13

This action was filed on September 3, 1964. The Government inspected records pursuant to Rule 34 on September 24 and 25, 1964, and answered Interrogatores on December 9, 1964. A trial date is being sought.

The first three Negroes who completed forms during the present registrar's incumbency received the very difficult section 165. The records also show that the two Negroes registered by the present registrar signed a registration book of a precinct other than their own.

49. U. S. v. Allen, et al.
(Chickasaw County, Miss.)
166-40-33 23-017-1 #27
Discrimination in registration and issuance of exemption certificates. (Flannery)

N.D. Miss.: Clayton
Date Filed: 9/3/64
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

DATE	Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
12/31/63	White 6,388	4,522	71.00%
	Negro 3,054	0	0.00%
8/11/64	White 6,388	4,607	72.00%
	Negro 3,054	1	0.03%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/1/64-	White	88	85	3
8/11/64	Negro	7	2*	5

* Although 2 Negroes' forms were accepted, only one signed the registration book. The other thought he registered by filling out the form.

Our investigation showed that seven well qualified Negroes applied to register in January and February, 1964.

The registration records, which were photographed on August 10 and 11, 1964, have not been closely analyzed, but there are only 3 rejected forms of white persons -- all in 1964 -- although the forms go back to 1956.

The Department's efforts to correct the situation by bringing it to the attention of local officials were futile. Suit was filed on September 3, 1964. Answers were filed on September 24, 1964, and the action is awaiting trial.

50. U. S. v. Mathis, et al.
(Benton County, Mississippi)
166-40-31 23-009-1A #14

N. D. Miss.
Date Filed: 9/3/64
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	2,780	2,266	81%
	Negro	1,749	40	2.3%
7/1/62	White	2,514	2,078	82.5%
	Negro	1,419	40	2.8%
9/14/64	White	2,514	2,266	92.0%
	Negro	1,419	55	3.0%
12/8/64	White	2,514	0	0%
	Negro	1,419	0	0%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected	Pending
6/25/62	White	237	188	48	1
9/14/64	Negro	138	15	111	12

12/7/64 All registrants purged by local officials. See text below.

The Complaint in this case was prepared in September of 1961 but not filed because the registrar wished to resolve the problems without suit. He agreed to cease discriminating immediately and, after protracted negotiation through his attorney, to adopt standards and procedures proposed by the Department.

The agreement, which took effect in October of 1963, provided for lenient grading and the use of only 5 easy sections of the Mississippi Consitution for the interpretation test. It was also understood that the agreement would have to keep abreast of developments in the law; that is, it would have to be improved from the Department's standpoint if the courts granted more relief on similar facts.

Subsequent investigation disclosed that the Negro rejection vote remained high and that white applicants continued to receive help with their forms, although their rejection rate rose somewhat. These facts plus the defendant's refusal to adopt the standards and procedures decreed in the Panola and Tallahatchie County cases (U.S. v. Shankle and U.S. v. Cox) decided in May and June, 1964, respectively, led to the filing of a revised Complaint under Section 1971 (a) on September 3, 1964.

On December 1, just before trial, the defendant filed an Offer of Judgment in which he proposed to conduct a non-discriminatory registration under court order. The first result of this proposal was an indefinite postponement of the trial.

After the defendant agreed to accept a finding of a pattern practice of discrimination and an injunction governing his future conduct, what relief was appropriate became the issue. The defendant urged that everyone -- not just those registered after January 1, 1954 -- should be required to meet the higher, post-1954 State standards. The Government's view presented in the form of a proposed judgment, on December 21, 1964, was that persons who became eligible in 1955 and thereafter could be required to meet the higher standards but that persons registered or eligible prior to 1955 should be given a period in which to register under the prior, read and write only standard.

The Court expressed the view that, in any event, the relief to be granted is a legal issue which can be decided without a trial.

The defendant then offered to permit everyone to register or reregister -- for a limited period of time -- under the read and write standard, after which the higher standards would take effect, also for everyone. This is acceptable in principle and it is presently being explored by negotiation. However, if the defendants do not accept the Judgment proposed by the Government on December 21, 1964, or in the absence of an acceptable compromise, the Department will press for an early trial. Based upon the defendant's concession of a pattern and practice and their motion for judgment on the pleadings, it is likely that the Court will rule without trial.

This impasse stems from the suggestion by the Court of Appeals in the Panola County case that a non-discriminatory reregistration is a permissible alternative to the "freezing relief" granted there. However conceptually appealing this may be, it raises difficult problems because a reregistration using high standards discriminates against Negroes on account of the inferior educational opportunities to which they have been subjected, and there may well be problems as to how to treat pre-1955 citizens who were not registered.

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——29

51.
~~52~~. U.S. v. Katherine Mikell (Marion County, Miss.) 166-41-74 23-091-1 #74 Discrimination in registration. (Moore)

S.D. Miss.: Cox
Date Filed: 9/3/64
Date Tried:
Type: Preliminary and permanent injunctions
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
61/62	White	8,997	9,540	100.00%*
	Negro	3,630	363	10.00%
7/23/63	White	8,997	10,123	100.00%
	Negro	3,630	383	11.00%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected	Pending
9/5/62	White	614	583	20	11
7/23/63	Negro	34	20	12	2
	Unknown	7	4	3	

This case was filed September 3, 1964 by us along with a Rule 34 motion and a motion to expedite as provided for by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. On September 11, 1964, Judge Cox granted the Rule 34 motion and denied the motion to expedite. The voter registration records of Katherine Mikell were inspected and copied on October 6, 1964 and a preliminary analysis reveals that a very clear "freeze" has been introduced by the defendant. Interrogatories have been served on us and answered. Supplemental interrogatories are expected. Trial was originally set for early December 1964, but on motion of the defendants, it has been continued until January, or February 1965.

RED TACKS: 1971(b) ACTIONS FILED UNDER 1957 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

Status Date, December 31, 1964

1. U.S. v. Beaty
2. U.S. v. Barcroft
   (Haywood County, Tenn.)
   166-72-2 #41-075-1

   Intimidation by 70 private citizens, 4 corporations (Doar)

W.D. Tenn.: Judge Boyd
Date Filed: 9/13/60; 12/1/60
Date Tried:
Type: Preliminary Injunction
Date of Decree: Consent decree 5/2/62
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
9/13/60	White	6,600*	6,500*	98%
	Negro	7,921	0	0%
10/31/63	White	6,100*	5,600*	92%
	Negro	7,921	2,300*	29%
12/31/63	White	6,100*	5,600	92%
	Negro	7,921	2,500	31.6%
12/31/64	White	6,100*	6,000	98%
	Negro	7,921	2,600*	32.8%

*These figures represent estimations.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

All persons who apply are registered if they meet the age, residence, sanity, and non-conviction requirements because Tennessee has only those objective qualification requirements.

When Negroes in Haywood County began to register for the first time in 1960, Tennessee's simple objective registration requirements could not be used to disqualify them, so more than 100 white citizens met and organized a systematic campaign of intimidation against Negro leaders and registrants. Tenant farmers and sharecroppers were threatened with eviction and loss of their jobs, lists of Negroes to be denied credit were prepared and circulated among banks, merchants, and wholesalers, a school bus driver was fired, and similar economic pressure was brought against white persons who refused to cooperate.

Oral depositions were taken after suit was filed under 42 U.S.C. 1971(b) against more than 70 defendants, and those who were deposed invoked their Fifth Amendment privilege not to answer possibly incriminating questions.

The trial on the Government's motion for a preliminary injunction was theoretically limited to the then impending evictions of tenant farmers, but related evidence was necessarily introduced from Negro victims as well as white persons who had been pressured to join the conspiracy.

The District Court enjoined 13 defendants from intimidation in general terms, but held that to forbid the evictions and termination of sharecropping agreements would illegally infringe on the defendants' property rights -- a result which the statute should not be construed to authorize because to do so would raise grave constitutional problems.

On December 29, 1960, before most of the threatened evictions had taken place, the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit granted the Government's motion for an injunction pending appeal. On appeal that Court read Section 1971(b) broadly to forbid any intimidation intended to interfere with Negro voting rights and reversed the District Court on the theory that conduct, ordinarily legal, may be forbidden if it is undertaken for an illegal purpose (288 F.2d 653 (c.a.6, 1961))

With the legal question settled, a consent decree enjoining more than 50 of the defendants was entered after prolonged negotiations. Many tenants stayed on, credit channels were reopened, and the school bus driver was rehired.

The Division did not receive complaints about registration or voting from Haywood County in 1963 or 1964, but a serious factional split in the Negro leadership has inhibited statistical progress.

Records will be rechecked to determine exact registration statistics.

3. U. S. v. Atkeison
(Fayette County, Tenn.)
166-72-3 #41-047-2

Intimidation by 80 private citizens and one bank. (Flannery)

W. D. Tenn: Judge Boyd
Date Filed: 12/14/60
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree: Consent judgment 7/26/62
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
12/14/60	White	6,500	6,500	100%
	Negro	7,921	58	.73%
10/1/63	White	6,500	6,500	100%
	Negro	7,921	3,500*	44.2%
8/1/64	White	6,500	6,500	
	Negro	7,921	3,500	44.2%

*This figure represents an estimation.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

All persons who apply are registered if they meet the age, residence, sanity, and non-conviction requirements because Tennessee has only those objective qualification requirements.

When Negroes began to register in Fayette County in 1959 and 1960 efforts were made to exclude them from Democratic primary elections: (See U. S. v. Fayette County Democratic Executive Committee, et al.) When that failed many white citizens in the county began a systematic, widespread campaign to deter Negroes from registering by threats, intimidation and coercion. Tenant farmers and sharecroppers were told they would lose their homes and jobs if they registered, white merchants and the local bank denied credit and loans to registrants, wholesalers were pressured to stop supplying certain Negro merchants, and some Negroes were unable to obtain goods and services even for cash.

After suit was filed against 80 individuals and the bank under 42 U.S.C. 1971(b), counsel for the defendants agreed to freeze the status quo, i.e., not to proceed with threatened evictions and to desist from the other intimidation, until the courts had ruled on the novel legal questions by deciding U.S. v. Beaty and Barcroft, a case involving similar conduct in an adjoining county.

In that important case the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit ruled with the Government that Section 1971(b) forbids all kinds of intimidation -- including otherwise lawful conduct -- if it is undertaken for purposes forbidden by the Act. That settled the law, and after oral depositions substantiated the Government's factual claims a consent decree embodying all relief sought by the Complaint was entered against 74 defendants on July 26, 1962.

Negro registration in Fayette County totaled 58 in the summer of 1959 and is at approximately 3,500 now. During the summer of 1954, prior to the important local general election in August, complaints were received of a slowdown in registration and intimidation of registration workers. All were investigated and where a violation had occurred, local authorities acted promptly. Complaints of fraud were also received in connection with the election in August; those complaints are being carefully studied.

12/31/64

4. U.S. v. Deal
(East Carroll Parish, La.)
144-33-254 17-035-2
Intimidation by cotton ginners and merchants against Negroes who testified before Civil Rights Commission
(Ross)

W.D. La: Dawkins
Date Filed: 1/19/61
Date Tried:
Type
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
4/8/61	White	2,990	379	13 %
	Negro	4,183	0	0 %
5/30/62	White	2,990	1,115	37 %
	Negro	4,183	0	0 %
12/11/63	White	2,990	1,838	61 %
	Negro	4,183	159*	4 %
10/3/64	White	2,990	1,939	64.0%
	Negro	4,183	179*	4.5%

*Includes 43 Negroes registered by the Court under 1971 (e)

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
7/62**	Negro	79	43	36
9/1/62	White	884	728	156
12/31/63	Negro	274	113	161
1/64	White	93	81	12
10/3/64	Negro	73	25	48

**Applications made to U.S. District Court under the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1971 (e).

This case was filed against cotton ginners and merchants who participated in an organized boycott against Francis Joseph Atlas, a fairly successful Negro farmer in East Carroll Parish who had testified before the Civil Rights Commission regarding his registration experiences. Suit was filed on January 19, 1961. The defendants agreed to gin Atlas's cotton on February 3, 1961. This was done at a meeting with Judge Dawkins in Chambers. All the defendants were present with counsel. They advised the Court that they would not close the channel of trade to Atlas. Based on this agreement, no hearing on the preliminary injunction was held. Atlas is still farming and is registered to vote.

In March, 1963 defendants moved to dismiss on grounds that they had dealt with Atlas as they would deal with any other farmer. Defendant's motion granted except as against Norris and his Farmers Feed and Seed Company, which has refused to deal with Atlas in the ordinary manner and which the government alleges has taken reprisals against other Negroes who have sought to register in East Carroll Parish. Government's motion to inspect and copy records of the Seed and Feed Company was granted in part. Records have been photographed. Further investigation shows no evidence of remaining defendant causing trouble. The Clerk of the Court has asked us whether we intend to take any further action in this case. (letter from U.S. Attorney - September 22, 1964) We have not yet responded.

5. U.S. v. Wood, et al
(Walthall County, Miss.)
166-41-69 #23-147-2

Intimidation by registrar, sheriff, city attorney, of unregistered voters of Walthall County through use of state criminal process (Owen)

S.D. Miss.: Cox
Date Filed: 9/20/61
Date Tried: 9/21/61
Type: TRO denied
Date of Decree: 9/21/61
Appeal: Government 9/21/61
Appeal Decided: 10/26/61
Settlement: 4/10/63

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
9/20/61	White	4,736	3,903	82%
	Negro	2,490	0	0%
4/10/62	White	4,736	4,736	100%
	Negro	2,490	3	.1204%
11/1/63	White	4,736	4,736	100%
	Negro	2,490	4	.1204%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/1/63 - 9/1/63	White	177	177	0
	Negro	1	0	1

When a Negro voter registration worker, John Hardy, accompanied some Negro applicants to the circuit clerk's office, the clerk ordered him out and struck him with the butt of a revolver as he was leaving. Later that day the registration worker was arrested and charged with breach of the peace.

Government filed a 42 U.S.C. 1971 (b) action and sought a temporary restraining order against further prosecution, which the federal district court denied, on the day before the victim was to be tried. Later that night Judge Rives for the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit enjoined the prosecution pending the Government's appeal of the denial of the TRO. On appeal, the government applied for a preliminary injunction which was granted. Supreme Court denied certiorari to the defendants. Defendants answered. Case set for trial April 9, 1963 and Gov'ts

witnesses were available. In a pre-trial conference the defendants stated that they had returned the bond money of John Hardy and had dropped their prosecution against him for breach of the peace. Defendants' attorney assured the court that there would be no interference or intimidation of Negroes attempting to register to vote, or with Negro workers who come into the county to encourage and help Negroes to register. On the basis of these assurances, a settlement was reached between the parties and filed with the Court on 4/10/63.

This case is significant in that it went a long way to establishing that 1971(b) forbids the misuse of state criminal processes for the purpose of interfering with voting rights, which includes the right of persons to assist and encourage Negroes to become registered voters.

6. U.S. v. Board of Education, et al.
(Greene County, Miss.)
166-41-42 #23-039-2

Intimidation of school teacher (Owen)

S. D. Miss.; Cox
Date Filed: 6/16/62
Date Tried: 7/25-26, 8/2/62
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 8/29/62
Appeal: Government 10/25/62
Appeal Decided: 5/15/64

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	3,491	3,094	88.6%
	Negro	758	43	5.6%
6/1/62	White	3,518	3,300	94%
	Negro	859	43	5%

Mrs. Ernestine Talbert, a Negro school teacher and librarian was notified that her employment contract to teach school would not be renewed the day after the District Court entered a TRO in a 1971(a) voting case in George County, Mississippi. Mrs. Talbert, and others had given affidavits which had received wide publicity, and which were used in support of the TRO application. The government's suit filed 6-16-62, alleged that the reason for her discharge was the filing of her affidavit and involvment in the registration suit, and that the failure to renew her contract was an attempt to intimidate her and other Negroes in the free exercise of their right to register to vote.

To support this claim the government introduced evidence to show that Mrs. Talbert's record as a teacher was excellent. She has been recommended by her principal for re-employment one month before news of the affidavit was circulated. The superintendant of the school decided not to renew her contract without discussing it with the principal who recommended her for re-employment.

The superintendant testified that he did what he thought was in the best interest of the school; that the affidavit was a factor only in so far as he did not like any of his teachers to become involved in litigation; that Mrs. Talbert's record had not been superior but, in fact, had been inferior, and that the replacement for Mrs. Talbert was

one who had been preferred over Mrs. Talbert when she was originally hired. The replacement hired had no library experience.

In the district court, Judge Cox held that the government had failed to prove that the discharge was done with the "purpose" of interfering with the right to vote.

On appeal the Government contended that Judge Cox had erred in that finding. The Court of Appeals per Judge Gewin, held there was no basis for de novo review, and, applying the "clearly erroneous" test, affirmed the District Court.

7. U. S. v. Mathews, et al
(Terrell County, Ga.)
166-19M-35 10-073-1A
Intimidation by local police officers and private citizens (Nixon)

M.D. Ga.: Elliott
Date Filed: 8/13/62
Date Tried: Consent Judgement
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 1/27/64
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
4/16/58	White	3,233	2,810	86.0%
	Negro	5,000	48	1.0%
9/13/60	White	3,038	2,900	95.0%
	Negro	4,057	53	1.3%
12/1/63	White	3,038	3,146	100.0%
	Negro	4,057	188	4.6%
12/11/64	White	3,038	3,385	100.0%
	Negro	4,057	333	8.0%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

2/24/61	White	217	215	2
12/1/65	Negro	146	131	12
12/1/63	White	240	239	1
12/64	Negro	154	145	9

Filed August 13, 1962, against sixteen defendants Sheriff of Terrell County and his two deputies, the Chief of Police of Dawson, the Mayor and the City Commissioner of Sasser, two City Councilmen in Sasser, and eight private citizens in Terrell County). On August 14, Judge Elliott denied application for a Temporary Restraining Order to restrain the continuation of local criminal prosecutions for vagancy against two SNCC workers who were in the county working on voter registration. The Department attorneys negotiated with the official in charge of the prosecution of the two SNCC workers on the vagrancy charges and he agreed to postpone any prosecutive action on the charges pending the hearing on the Government's motion for a Preliminary and Permanent Injunction in this case. Pre-trial conference held January 7, 1963. Pursuant to negotiations between Departmental attorney and attorney for all but one defendant, fifteen defendants agreed to enter a consent judgment in favor of the plaintiff. The remaining defendant was dismissed.

Among other things, the judgement, which was entered on January 27, 1964, enjoined the Sheriff of Terrell County and his deputies and the Chief of Police of Dawson "from refusing reasonable police protection to any person in need thereof, and from surveilling, interrogating, searching, arresting threatening to arrest, prosecution or threatening to prosecute, or participating in the prosecution of any person for the purpose of preventing or discouraging such person or any other person from registering to vote or from voting, or as punishment for having voted."

12/31/64

8. U. S. v. City of Greenwood
(Leflore County, Miss.)
166-40-3 23-083-9 (#50)
Intimidation of voter registration workers.
(Rosenberg)

N. D. Miss.: Clayton
Date Filed: 3/30/63
Date Tried: Settled: 10/21/64
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
6/10/63	White	10,274	7,348	72.00%
	Negro	13,567	281	2.00%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
3/30/63-	White	119	70	49
6/10/63	Negro	681	8	673*
	Unknown		1	170**

* Many of rejected Negro forms indicate very low literacy.
** Most are probably Negro.

Complaint filed on March 30, 1963, against the City of Greenwood, its mayor, fire commissioner, police chief, city prosecutor; and against Leflore County, its county attorney and deputy sheriff. Complaint sought injunctive relief against interference with voter registration and with voter registration activities of SNCC, including activities under the First Amendment of free speech and free assembly.

Eight registration workers had been convicted after they and about 100 local Negroes walked to the City Hall on March 27, 1963, to protest a shooting into the home of a Negro registration worker. The eight workers were sentenced to four months and

$200 fines each. On 3/30/63 Government sought a Temporary Restraining Order for the immediate release of the workers pending a full hearing in federal court. Court denied application for Temporary Restraining Order but set hearing for Thursday, April 4, 1963. At that time Government withdrew its motion for preliminary injunction after city and county officials had agreed to release workers on their own recognizance pending a full and final decision in the federal district court.

On June 3, 1963 defendants answered complaint. Defendant Fraiser and defendant Leflore County filed motion on June 3, 1963 to dismiss answer as to them. July 26 district court sustained motion of County and Fraiser to dismiss; granted Government's leave to amend its complaint within 30 days. On August 20, 1963 Government amended its complaint against defendant Fraiser. On September 2, 1963 defendant Fraiser filed motion to dismiss on the ground that the Government failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and all defendants moved to strike the amendment to the complaint or in the alternative to strike J. T. Fraiser, Jr. as a defendant or in the alternative to grant separate trials on the complaint and the amendment. December 17, 1963 court ordered that these motions would be carried with the case and heard when the case is presented on the merits.

The theory of the complaint is that city and county officials were out to destroy SNCC organization, which was working on voter registration. Government has the standing to protect not only Negroes who apply to register but also Negro registration workers, and to protect not only their right to go to the registration office but their right to exercise other constitutional privileges as well, including the right to petition local government (about their grievances in connection with voter activity), and the right of free speech and assembly.

On October 16, 1964, attorneys for the Government and for the defendants reached an agreement which provided that with the Court's approval, the case be dismissed on the Government's motion if the defendants set aside the convictions of the eight Negroes and state to the Court their intention not to interfere with Negro voter registration activity. On October 21, 1964, defendants complied with the agreement in open court, and on the Government's motion, Judge Clayton ordered the case dismissed with prejudice. No costs were assessed. Government felt the settlement was favorable since the primary object of suit, to set aside the convictions of the Negroes, was accomplished. Also proof was weak on continued intimidatory activity after the initial incidents alleged in complaint. This made the likelihood of getting an injunction doubtful. Moreover, the Negroes involved had not appealed their convictions, so that if Government had lost their suit, the Negroes would have been without recourse.

9. U. S. v. Edwards, et al. (Rankin County, Miss.) #55
166-41-62 #23-121-2

Intimidation of Negro applicants for registration (Owen)

S.D. Miss.: Cox
Date Filed: 5/6/63
Date Tried: 5/18,25/63
Type: Preliminary Injunction
Date of Decree: 8/6/63
Appeal: Government, 10/2/63
Appeal Decided: 6/18/64

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
1/1/56	White	9,289	5,711	61.4%
	Negro	7,259	33	0.45%
6/1/62	White	13,246	12,000	90%
	Negro	6,944	94	1.35
5/6/63	White	13,246	13,000	98%
	Negro	6,944	100*	1.44%
8/30/63	White	13,246	12,000	90.1%
	Negro	6,944	94	1.3%

*This figure represents an estimate.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/1/57	White	4,199	4,199	
8/8/63	Negro	82	50	32 (19 Pending)

On May 6, 1963, the United States filed the complaint and a motion for a preliminary injunction against Jonathan Edwards, Sheriff of Rankin County, under 42 U.S.C. 1971(b). The complaint alleged that Edwards and his agents intimidated Negro citizens in Rankin County to prevent them from registering to vote by assaulting Negroes in the registration office, 3 of whom were registering. The matter was heard on a motion of a preliminary injunction on May 18th and 25th, 1963. On August 6, 1963, Judge Cox entered an order denying the preliminary injunction.

This case arose out of an incident which took place in the courthouse of Rankin County, Miss., on February 1, 1963. That morning four Negroes met at the courthouse. Three of them Wallace Davis, Oscar Lee Hicks, and M. C. Carr decided to apply for registration for voting. The fourth, D. Mitchell Grim, had registered the previous year. While the three were standing in the small registrar's office filling out application forms, Grim waited in the hallway. The Sheriff's office is located across the hall from the registrar's office. Grim entered the office of the registrar to see what time it was. Grim remained near the door inside the office to wait. A short time thereafter Grim was physically attacked in the registrar's office by Sheriff Edwards, and severely beaten about the head and shoulders with a blackjack. Seeing the attack on Grim, the other three Negroes started to leave the room. Before they were able to leave Davis and Carr were themselves assaulted by Deputy Sheriff, J. B. Collum. Hicks ran out before he was assaulted. The victims testified that the assault came without warning. Sheriff Edwards testified that he beat Grim because he was blocking the passageway and being insolent. Other testimony indicated that the Negroes were all well-behaved just prior to the assault. Judge Cox found that Grim was beaten as a result of an altercation, but the connection of the incident with the office of the registrar was purely coincidental.

With respect to the second beating, the sheriff and Deputy Sheriff, Collum, testified that it never took place because Collum was not present at the time of the beating. Judge Cox found, to the contrary, that Collum was there, and that Collum unjustifiably assaulted Carr and Davis who were in the process of registering to vote. The court went on to say however, that Collum committed these "officious" acts solely because he "was obviously vexed at the crowed condition of the registrar's office." This incident he concluded "had no purposeful intention to intimidate these citizens."

The government filed a notice of appeal on October 2, 1963, and filed its brief on December 20, 1963. On June 18, 1964, the Court of Appeals sustained (2-1) the district court, finding that the government had failed to satisfy the burden placed upon it by Rule 52(a), of showing the Court's findings of fact to be "clearly erroneous." Judge Brown dissented.

The Division, by memorandum to the Solicitor General (Sept. 15, 1964) recommended the government not seek a writ of Certiorari on the grounds that an injunction in this case would not do enough good to warrant further review. This recommendation was based in part upon the fact that the sheriff's term of office had expired.

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——30

10. U.S. v. Holmes County, et al.
(Holmes County, Miss.)
166-41-9 #23-051-4

Intimidation by deputy sheriff and constable against voter registration workers and Negro farmer (Owen)

S.D. Miss.: Cox
Date Filed: 5/11/63
Date Tried: 5/22/63, 1/1-2/64
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 2/25/64
Appeal: 4/21/64
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	5,569	3,616	64.90%
	Negro	11,468	8	0.07%
12/31/63	White	4,773	4,000*	84.00%
	Negro	8,757	20	0.23%
8/18/64	White	4,773	4,800*	100.0%
	Negro	8,757	20**	0.23%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
4/1/56-	White	1903	1903	0
4/9/63	Negro	0	0	-
4/9/63-	White	147	145	2
8/18/64	Negro	292	4	288

* These figures are estimates.

** There are 212 Negroes on the registration books since 1912. Approximately 90% of them are now deceased.

Sheriff refused to accept poll tax payments from Negroes from 1956 when he first went into office until sometime after filing of suit. No Negro attempted to register to vote or to vote in the county from 1956 until April 9, 1963, when 14 Negroes went to the courthouse to register. The Sheriff ordered them to wait outside and to apply one at a time.

On May 7, two fire bombs were thrown into the house of Hartman Turnbow, a local Negro farmer who was a leader in the registration effort. Turnbow and four voter registration workers were arrested the following day on suspicion of arson. The Government filed a complaint on May 11, 1963, seeking injunction against intimidation and misuse of the State Criminal process by the Deputy Sheriff and the District and County Attorneys. Complaint amended to include application for relief against discriminatory refusal to accept poll tax. On May 13, 1964, the arson charges were dropped against the four registration workers, Turnbow, was released on bond pending a hearing on the arson charge by the State Grand Jury, and one registration worker was fined $50.00 for impeding an investigation. A hearing on the Government's application for a preliminary injunction was held on May 22, 1963, and then continued to a later date. Subsequent to the hearing, the grand jury returned a no bill on the arson charge against Turnbow but indicted him and his wife on a charge of unlawful cohabitation. Turnbow pleaded guilty and paid the fine.

The federal hearing was held on January 2 and 3 1964, as a hearing for a permanent injunction. The District Court entered its judgement in the case on February 25, 1964. The Court found that the arrests and prosecutions were not improper and ordered the case dismissed as to the County and District Attorney. The Court also found that the Sheriff had improperly but not with any wrongful intent refused to accept poll tax payments from Negroes, he declined to issue an injunction but retained jurisdiction of the Sheriff during his tenure in office. In addition legal costs were assessed to the Sheriff. A bill of costs had been filed and the attorney for the State has been contacted with regard to collection. Notice of appeal was filed by the government on April 21, 1964, and the matter is set for argument on January 11, 1965.

11. U.S. v. Dallas County
(Dallas County, Ala.)
166-3-1 1-047-22

Intimidation of voter registration workers (Landsberg)

S.D. Alabama: Thomas
Date Filed: 6/26/63
Date Tried: 7/25, 10/15/63
Type: Permanent Injunction
Date of Decree: 3/19/64
Appeal: Government - 3/24/64
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
	White	14,400	9,195	64.0%
4/13/61	Negro	15,115	156	1.03%
	White	14,400	8,597	59.7%
4/1/62	Negro	15,115	242	1.6%
	White	14,400	9,162	63.6%
11/18/63	Negro	15,115	298	1.9%
	White	14,400	9,542	66%
8/17/64	Negro	15,115	335	2.2%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
6/61-	White	480	443	37
5/62	Negro	114	71	43
5/62-	White	725	546	178
11/1/62	Negro	469	50	419
11/2/63-	White	507	399	108
8/17/64	Negro	326	43	283

Complaint filed on June 26, 1963 against sheriff and circuit prosecuting attorney seeking injunction restraining them from intimidating voter registration workers by arresting them on baseless charges of vagrancy, disturbing the peace and carrying on under assumed names. These acts of intimidation took place from June 17, 1963 to June 27, 1963. The Government requested a Temporary Restraining Order which was denied by district court and the Court of Appeals (Rives, Tuttle, Gewin). A one-day hearing on our motion for preliminary injunction was held before the district judge, but the hearing was not completed and was to be resumed on October 3, 1963. On September 30, 1963 Judge Thomas postponed the October 3rd hearing on the grounds that Selma was not the place nor October 3rd the time to hold a hearing on civil rights cases. On October 4th he issued an order continuing the case. Government filed a writ of mandamus to compel court to hold hearing. Several days thereafter the court set the case for hearing on October 15th and the hearing was held. On December 5th at first day of the hearing in U.S. v. McLeod, the Government moved the court to consolidate the case with McLeod and to decide both cases together. The court declined to consolidate but agreed to consider all of the evidence in this case in the McLeod case. So the cases are for all practical purposes consolidated.

On March 19, 1964 the district court denied the Government's motion for a preliminary injunction, finding each of the acts complained of justifiable. On March 24, 1964 the Government filed notice of appeal. On September 9, 1964 the Government's brief on appeal was filed. Argument on the appeal has not yet been set.

12/31/64

12. U.S. v. LeFlore County, et al.
(Itta Bena, Miss.)
166-40-3 23-083-9 #11

Intimidation of Negro residents who had attended voter registration meeting and were seeking police protection. (Rosenberg)

N. D. Miss.: Clayton
Date Filed : 6/28/63
Date Tried : 7/11-12, 19/63
Type: Preliminary Injunction
Date of Decree: 7/22/63
Appeal: Government 9/5/63
Appeal Decided: Government dismissed 12/63

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55		10,331	5,563	54 %
		17,893	400	2.2%
6/1/62	White	10,274	7,168	70 %
	Negro	13,567	268	2 %
6/1/63	White	10,274	7,348	72 %
	Negro	13,567	281	2 %

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
3/30/63 -	White	119	70	49
6/10/63	Negro	681	8	673*
	Unknown		1	170

* Most of rejected Negroes are illiterate.

Complaint filed June 28, 1963 seeking release of 45 residents of Itta Bena who were arrested, convicted and given heavy sentences by a Justice of the Peace, after they marched downtown to seek police protection after unknown person had

allegedly released noxious substance into church where voter registration meeting held. After three-day hearing district court ruled that Government had not established a violation of 1971(b). On September 5, 1963 Government filed appeal. Government filed petition for injunction pending appeal or for hearing on an expedited basis. Appellees filed opposition to petition September 23. The Court of Appeals denied injunction pending appeal but granted a hearing on an expedited basis. Hearing set down for January 8, 1964. In late December 1963 Government concluded to dismiss appeal and try to establish stronger case before district court on hearing for permanent injunction.

The Negroes who had been convicted by the Justice of the Peace were released on bond after serving two months of their sentence. Their appeal to the County Court of LeFlore County was heard de novo January 20-22, 1964, having been postponed from the October 1963 term. All were found guilty, and given $500 fines, and sentences of 6 months with 3 months suspended on good behavior. In the November 1964 term, the Circuit Court affirmed the convictions of the County Court. Notice of Appeal to the Mississippi Supreme Court has been filed. Case was not set for hearing on the merits in October 1964 term because of illness of defense counsel. Will probably be tried February 1965.

13. U.S. v. McLeod, et al.
(Dallas County, Ala.)
166-3-1 1-047-22

Misuse of the state law enforcement machinery, including the Grand Jury, the sheriff's office, the prosecutor's office and the judicial processes to intimidate Negroes for the purpose of interfering with their right to vote (Greene)

S.D. Alabama: Thomas
Date Filed: 11/12/63
Date Tried: 12/5-6, 12/16-18/63
Type: Preliminary Injunction
Date of Decree: 3/19/64
Appeal: Government - 3/24/64
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
	White	14,400	9,195	64%
4/13/61	Negro	15,115	156	1.03%
	White	14,400	8,597	59.7%
4/1/62	Negro	15,115	242	1.6%
	White	14,400	9,162	63.6%
11/18/63	Negro	15,115	298	1.9%
	White	14,400	9,542	66%
8/17/64	Negro	15,115	335	2.2%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
6/61-	White	480	443	37
5/62	Negro	114	71	43
5/62-	White	725	546	178
11/1/63	Negro	469	50	419
11/2/63-	White	507	399	108
8/17/64	Negro	326	43	283

Complaint filed November 12, 1963. Complaint in two causes of action. The first claim arose out of the state's action in convening a grand jury investigation to look into the incident involving the unauthorized use by a departmental attorney of an automobile rented by the Department when he permitted the car to be used to transport Martin Luther King, Jr. from Birmingham to Selma on October 15, 1963. The claim asserts the grand jury lacks power to investigate the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. The second cause challenges the widespread misuse of the criminal processes of the county and state as a means by which to intimidate prospective voters.

The Government filed application for a Temporary Restraining Order to quash the subpoenaes which had been issued against employees of the Department of Justice. Motion for the order denied on November 12th. On November 13th the court of appeals reversed the district court and ordered the district court to issue the order which was to remain in effect until the motion for a preliminary injunction had been decided.

The motion for preliminary injunction was heard on December 5, 6, 16 and 18, 1963 in Selma. At the close of the Government's case defendants moved for a directed verdict and the court took the motion under advisement.

Evidence showed that all the mechanisms of the criminal law were being misused by wilful public officials who desired to discourage and interfere with the exercise of the rights provided by federal law and federal constitution. Among the mechanisms used were: (a) police surveillance of voter registration meetings; (b) legally baseless arrests of voter registration workers; (c) setting of unreasonable bail and appeal bond; (d) legally baseless convictions of those arrested; (e) improper police control over the movements of persons attempting to register to vote; (f) legally baseless arrest and conviction of those urging Negro voter registration by picketing; and (g) misuse of subpoena power and secrecy provision of the grand jury proceeding.

On March 19, 1964 the district court dissolved the Temporary Restraining Order and denied the Government's motion for a preliminary injunction. On March 24, 1964 the Government filed a notice of appeal and also moved for an injunction, pending appeal, restraining the defendants from commanding or attempting to compel the attendance of departmental attorneys before the Dallas County Grand Jury. Argument on the motion took place on March 30, 1964 and on the same day Judge Thomas denied the motion. Argument of the appeal has not been set.

12/31/64

14. U.S. v. Dallas County Citizens Council, et al.
(Dallas County, Ala.)
166-3-1 1-047-22

Citizens Council seeking to intimidate and coerce Negroes for the purpose of interfering with their right to register to vote through newspaper advertisements and by other techniques (Landsberg)

S.D. Alabama: Thomas
Date Filed: 11/12/63
Date Tried:
Type:
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
	White	14,400	9,195	64%
4/13/61	Negro	15,115	156	1.03%
	White	14,400	8,597	59.7%
4/1/62	Negro	15,115	242	1.6%
	White	14,400	9,162	63.6%
11/18/63	Negro	15,115	298	1.9%
	White	14,400	9,542	66%
8/17/64	Negro	15,115	335	2.2%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
6/61-	White	480	443	37
5/62	Negro	114	71	43
5/62-	White	725	546	178
11/1/63	Negro	469	50	419
11/2/63-	White	507	399	108
8/17/64	Negro	326	43	283

This was originally part of the case of U.S. v. McLeod, but the Citizens Council aspect was severed on motion of the defendants on December 5, 1963. The Citizens Council and its officers are defendants. Government alleges that Citizens Council has engaged in threats and intimidation against Negroes in Dallas County for the purpose of interfering with the right of Negroes to register to vote. They have attempted to carry our programs to use economic sanctions against Negroes, to frustrate federal investigations regarding registration, to frustrate federal court orders designed to eliminate discrimination in registration, to prevent Negroes from attending voter registration meetings and to prevent wholesale Negro voter registration. No hearing has yet been held or set. The Government planned to take discovery depositions but has not as yet.

12/31/64

15. U.S. v. Bruce, et al.
(Wilcox County, Ala.)
166-3-12 1-131-3

Intimidation by 27 white landowners who signed a petition directed at a Negro insurance salesman active in voter registration work to remain off their land. (Gabel)

S.D. Ala.: Thomas
Date Filed: 12/20/63
Date Tried: 4/7/64
Type: Motion to Dismiss
Date of Decree: 6/30/64 - Complaint dismissed
Appeal: Government - 8/27/64
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
12/20/63	White	2,624	2,810	100.00% ✓
	Negro	6,085	0	0.00%
12/20/64	White	2,624	2,810	100.00% ✓
	Negro	6,085	0	0.00%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

Complaint filed December 20, 1963. Negro insurance salesman has been active in encouraging Negro voter registration in the county and he and his wife were the first Negroes to attempt to register in over 60 years, although the Negroes outnumber the whites. Government moved for a preliminary injunction. Oral argument on defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint was heard on April 7, 1964. On June 30, 1964 the district court granted the defendants' motion to dismiss. The court gave no reason for the dismissal. Notice of appeal was filed by the United States on August 27, 1964. There have been reports of harassment of SNCC workers in the county.

12/31/64

16. U.S. v. Warner
(Clarke County, Miss.)#39
166-41-38 #23-023-2

State perjury indictment of government witnesses in voting case. (Flannery)

S.D. Miss.: Mize
Date Filed: 3/20/64
Date Tried: 4/20/64
Type: Preliminary Injunction
Date of Decree: 4/20/64
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
11/3/63	White	6,072	4,785	79%
	Negro	2,998	45	1.5%
9/4/64	White	6,072	4,829	80%
	Negro	2,998	64	2.2%

This action grew out of the trial of the Clarke County, Mississippi, 1971(a) case, United States v. Ramsey, tried in December 1962, in which United States District Judge Cox expressed the view that two Negro witnesses had committed perjury. The two witnesses for the United States (a Reverend Goff and a Mr. Kendrick), testified that some seven years earlier, they had attempted to register at an out-of-door place of registration temporarily set up in Stonewall, Mississippi; that the Registrar, Mr. Ramsey, had declined to register them or give them application forms; that they had seen white people registering there on that day; and that one white man, B. Floyd Jones, had been near the registration table, had talked to Mr. Ramsey, the Registrar, and had signed the registration book.

Mr. Ramsey testified on direct examination that Mr. Jones had not registered at that time or place, and the registration book showed that B. F. Jones had registered in Enterprise more than a year before.

When counsel for the State, Mr. Riddell, completed Mr. Ramsey's direct examination, and before his cross-examination, respondent Judge W. Harold Cox, who was presiding, stated:

> "I want to hear from the government about why this Court shouldn't require this Negro Reverend W. G. Goff and his companion Kendrick to show cause why they shouldn't be bound over to await the action of the grand jury for perjury. I want to hear from you on that . . . I think they ought to be put under about a $3,000.00 bond each to await the action of a grand jury. Unless I change my mind that is going to be the order . . .
>
> I just want these Negroes to know that they can't come into this Court and swear to something as important as that was and is and get by with it. I don't care who brings them here . . . And I mean that for whites alike, but I am talking about the case at hand. I just don't intend to put up with perjury. That is something I will not tolerate. All right."

Floyd Jones later testified that he was near the outdoor registration table in Stonewall in 1955 and observed Mr. Ramsey registering white people there. He further stated that he had talked to Mr. Ramsey and had shaken hands with him. It was undisputed that white people were being registered in Stonewall on that occasion.

In September 1963 the Government declined to prosecute the witnesses because it believed that they had not committed perjury.

On October 13, 1963, Goff and Kendrick were arrested for violations of state law for falsely testifying in Federal court before Judge Cox in the Ramsey case. The state prosecution was based on affidavits filed by Tally Riddell, counsel for the Registrar and the State in the Ramsey case.

Goff and Kendrick were arrested, placed in jail for two days and made $3,000.00 bond. Later they were indicted by a state grand jury. Efforts by departmental attorneys to persuade local officials not to proceed were unavailing despite the U. S. Supreme Court case, In re Loney, 134 U.S. 372, explicitly forbidding, on grounds of pre-exemption, state officials' prosecution for perjury allegedly committed in a federal court. On March 20, 1964 the United States filed suit against the state district attorney, seeking to enjoin the state prosecution on the grounds that the states have no authority to prosecute for perjury in a federal court, and upon the ground that the purpose and effect of that suit was to threaten and coerce Reverend Goff and Mr. Kendrick and to intimidate them and other Negro voters for the purpose of interfering with their right to vote. In answer to that suit, the defendant alleged Mr. Riddell had intended to present the evidence to a federal grand jury, and had "assembled the evidence for presentation to a Federal Grand Jury." The defendant state prosecutor further alleged that the "purpose of instituting the state prosecution was for the reason that the Department of Justice failed, neglected, and refused to vindicate the United States District Court after having been directed to cause the matter to be presented to a Federal Grand Jury by the District Judge."

On April 21, 1964 the district court (per Mize, J.) ruled that neither the State of Mississippi nor its agents had authority to prosecute persons for giving information or sworn statements to any agency of the Federal Government. He further stated that the threatened enforcement of the state statutes was unlawful under the ruling in In re Loney, and is contrary to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1971(b) which outlaw intimidation for the purpose of interfering with voting rights, and held that the state indictments were "null and void." The Court entered a preliminary injunction enjoining the prosecution of the witnesses.

17. U.S. v. Clark, et al.
(Dallas County, Ala.)
166-3-1 1-047-22A

S.D. Alabama: Thomas
Date Filed: 9/2/64
Date Tried: 12/8-12/64; 12/21-22/64
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

Interference by city and county officials, including the sheriff, prosecutor, judges, and police, with the right of Negroes to vote and to the equal use of public accommodations. (Doar)

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
	White	14,400	9,195	64%
4/13/61	Negro	15,115	156	1.03%
	White	14,400	8,597	59.7%
4/1/62	Negro	15,115	242	1.6%
	White	14,400	9,162	63.6%
11/18/63	Negro	15,115	298	1.9%
	White	14,400	9,542	66%
8/17/64	Negro	15,115	335	2.2%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
6/61-	White	480	443	37
5/62	Negro	114	71	43
5/62-	White	725	546	178
11/1/63	Negro	469	50	419
11/2/63-	White	507	399	108
8/17/64	Negro	326	43	283

Complaint filed September 2, 1964, with certificate of general public importance and request for a three-judge court. On October 1, 1964 Judges Rives, Judge Thomas and Judge Johnson were appointed to the panel. The complaint is based on intimidatory and coercive acts committed in July 1964, and having the purpose of interfering with the rights secured by 42 U.S.C. 1961 and by Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. These acts include: (a) arrests of Negroes for using public accommodations; (b) baseless arrests of Negroes for urging voter registration (including some arrests of bystanders); (c) setting of unreasonable and discriminatory bond; (d) improper treatment of arrested Negroes in juvenile court; (e) failure to provide police protection to Negroes attempting to use a movie theater; (f) use of unreasonable force against Negroes gathered outside the theater; (g) brutality and vandalism by sheriff's department against Negroes attending a meeting at which voter registration and the use of public accommodations were encouraged; (h) police surveillance of such meetings; (i) improperly stationing large numbers of sheriff's deputies and posse-members at all entrances to the courthouse where voter registration takes place; and (j) issuing and enforcing an injunction that effectively stopped civil rights activity in Selma.

On September 22, 1964 the defendants filed a motion to dismiss. The Court took the motion under submission after the filing of briefs by both sides. Trial on the merits was held on December 8th to 12th and December 21st to 22nd. At the trial over 100 witnesses testified and numerous documents, including arrest reports, warrants, court dockets, juvenile court case files, radio logs, and jail registers, were introduced into evidence. The Government summarized this evidence in a 130-page trial brief, accompanied by six volumes of tables, filed on January 23, 1965.

12/31/64

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——31

PURPLE TACKS: 1971(a) MATTERS UNDER ACTIVE INVESTIGATION

ALABAMA December 31, 1964

1. Autauga (M) (Sutin)
166-2-2 1-001-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
12/3/63	White	6,353	4,543	72 %
	Negro	3,651	72	2 %
	White			
	Negro			
	White			
	Negro			

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1960	White	1000	743	257
1/29/64	Negro	50	1	49

Demand letter was served August 17, 1964, to photograph records. Board of Registrars refused to allow photographing or inspection of records, although Probate Judge allowed photographing. Problems are (1) identifying race, and (2) registrar rejects qualified whites. Board has a high standard. We should have a complaint filed in early 1965.

2. Barbour (M) (Norman)
166-2-3 1-055-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
1/1/60	White	7,338	6,400	87.0 %
	Negro	5,787	400	7.0 %
5/3/64	White	7,338	7,107*	96.8 %
	Negro	5,787	450*	7.9 %

*Figures from Birmingham News, 5/3/64.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

The records were rephotographed September 3, 1964, but have not yet been analyzed. A survey in July, 1964, indicated that few Negroes were attempting to register. Statistics obtained at the September photographing indicate that 207 Negroes applied between October 1, 1963, and August 31, 1964. During that period, the Board accepted 99% of the white applicants and 75.3% of the Negro applicants.

3. Butler (M) (Miller)
166-2-5 1-013-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
7/1/62	White	8,363	8,402	100 %
	Negro	4,820	341	8 %
8/21/64	White	8,363	8,604*	100 %
	Negro	4,820	482*	10 %

*From 7/1/62 to 8/1/64, 10 Negroes and 403 white persons were purged from the registration books.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
7/1/62	White	613	605	8
8/1/64	Negro	285	151	134
	Unknown	28**		28

The FBI is presently conducting a race identification investigation for these forms.

A preliminary survey indicates that assistance is given to whites but not to Negroes. Negro leaders planned a registration drive for October, 1964. It is difficult to get Negroes to attempt to register because the county has begun using the new form and insert. There is sufficient indication of discrimination to warrant a full investigation by the Department.

4. Clarke (S) (Gabel)
166-3-4 1-025-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
2/1/63	White	7,899	8,833	100 %+
	Negro	5,333	537	10 %
11/1/63	White	7,899	8,800	100 %+
	Negro	5,333	611	11.4%
8/18/64	White	7,899	9,432	100 %+
	Negro	5,333	768	13.1%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
5/1/63	White	128	126	2
10/30/63	Negro	100	74	26
10/30/63	White	458	443	15
8/18/64	Negro	222	157	65*

*This figure does not include 8 applications from which race cannot be determined.

The records were photographed January 29, 1962. On January 22, 1963, a Department attorney and the U.S. Attorney met with the Clarke County Board of Registrars and submitted a specific settlement letter. The Board assured the government spokesmen that they would comply; but when Negroes began to try to register, the Board resigned. On February 14, 1963 the Department wrote the Alabama Attorney General advising him of the situation. On February 28, 1963, he replied that a new Board would be slow in coming. On February 28, 1963, the Department wrote that a suit would be filed on March 18, 1963, unless a new Board, which would agree to our demands, was

appointed. The new Board was appointed during the second week of March. The Department decided not to sue, but to give the new Board an opportunity to be fair.

Additional interviews were conducted April 8, 1963, and it was learned that the new Board had not yet started to receive applications. It was also learned that Mr. Mill, one of the new appointees, had resigned.

At the end of October, 1963, there were approximately 225 Negroes registered in the county. The Board did not reject any Negroes in October, 1963. The present board now has three members. Recent survey indicates that the board continues to be tough.

The Board used the monthly inserts from February through August, 1964. In September it began to use the new insert with 100 variants. There is some indication that white applicants are aided more than Negroes in the registration process.

There is not much registration activity. There is no voter organization in the county and local leadership is poor.

5. Conecuh (S) (Sutin)
166-3-5 1-035-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
4/15/63	White	5,907	2,947	50 %
	Negro	3,635	252	7 %
8/28/64	White	5,907	3,324	56.0%
	Negro	3,635	318	8.7%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
4/15/63	White	392	387	5
8/28/64	Negro	71	66	5

Records were photographed March 23, 1962, May 21, 1963, and August 31, 1964. From April 15, 1963 through August 28, 1964, 387 whites were accepted, at least 5 rejected; 66 Negroes were accepted. At least 5 rejected. A re-registration was begun in 1958. At one time prior to that there were 900 Negroes registered. Applications submitted before January 1, 1959, were destroyed. The use of the new insert Part III has discouraged Negro registration. Active Negro leadership is developing in the county.

6. Crenshaw (M) (Norman)
DJ:_____Docket_____(Not assigned)

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
1960	White	6,310	2,441	39%
	Negro	2,207	332	15%
5/3/64	White	6,310	3,452*	86.4%
	Negro	2,207	492*	22.2%

*Figures based on Birmingham News report of 5/3/64.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

A Negro voter organization is working in the County. Reports from the organization are that only 65 Negroes registered from April 1, 1962 to July, 1963, because of fear of economic retaliation. During the last six months of 1963, most of the approximately 50 Negroes who applied were registered. The records in this County have never been photographed.

7. Etowah (N) (Marlin)
166-1-04 1-055-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/23/62	White	48,563	34,2[illegible]9*	70.4%
	Negro	7,661	2,1[illegible]6*	27.7%
7/1/63	White	48,563	35,0[illegible]3**	72.0%
	Negro	7,661	2,233**	29.1%
3/10/64	White	48,563	36,574***	75.3%
	Negro	7,661	2,407***	31.4%

*Qualified voters (have paid poll tax)
**Accepted applications added to 3/23/62 total
***Accepted applications added to 3/23/63 total

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1960 -	White	3,363	3,339	24
1962	Negro	216	191	25
1/1/63 -	White	423	420	3
10/1/63*	Negro	348	73	275
10/1/63 -	White	1,415	1,3[illegible]8	47
3/10/64**	Negro	240	156	84

*An entire new membership of the Board of Registrars began office on or about October 1, 1963.

**Date of last photographing.

Beginning in late 1962 and continuing until October, 1963, in response to a Negro voter registration drive, the Board of Registrars adopted a number of racially discriminatory practices. About 80% of the Negro applicants were rejected. Attempts to negotiate were repulsed.

New Board members began office in October, 1963 and accepted 65% of Negro applicants as of March 10, 1964. The new Board, however, continued some discriminatory practices and, in addition, purged 12 newly-registered Negroes from the rolls in February because they stated on their application form they had not "previously applied for and been denied registration as a voter." Each had been previously rejected but had not been notified of that.

The Board is now using the new application form and the revised Insert Part III (100 tests). The records will be inspected again in early 1965. If the records disclose continued discrimination, this county will be an excellent illustration of the freezing effect of the Insert tests in a broadform suit or independent 1971(a) suit.

8. Greene (N) (Sutin)
166-1-6 1-063-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
10/1/61	White	1,649	1,731	100%
	Negro	5,001	179	4%
11/30/63	White	1,649	1,915	100%
	Negro	5,001	451	9%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
10/1/61 -	White	184*	184	0
11/30/63	Negro	488	272	216

*Does not include 20 application forms for which race has not been identified.

Records photographed on June 30, 1961. The white voucher rule was dropped in July, 1961. Department attorneys surveyed county in August and September 1962 and records were rephotographed on September 7, 1962. Records photographed again on December 9, 1963. Most of records through 1963 have been analyzed. Records rephotographed on September 18, 1964; not yet analyzed. Southern part of county is well organized by Negroes; northern part beginning to show signs of voter activity. Many Negro applicants interviewed throughout 1963 and in January 1964. Government believes that Negroes are being discriminated against as Board is using form as test; Negro high school and college graduates have been rejected. The records indicate that white persons are receiving assistance in registration.

9. Lowndes (H) (Norman)
166-2-9 1-085-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
1/10/61	White	1,900	1,900	100%
	Negro	5,122	0	0%
5/3/64	White	1,900	2,314*	100%+
	Negro	5,122	0*	0%

*Figures from Birmingham News report of 5/3/64.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

Records were photographed on May 10, 1961. They have been analyzed. The Board admits that it does not reject whites. No Negroes had ever tried to register until January, 1964, when two Negroes went to the courthouse. They were not permitted to apply as, they were told, it was not a registration day. In September, 1964, one Negro stated that after the deadline for registering for the November election, Negroes will apply.

10. Marengo (S) (Gabel)
166-3-8 1-091-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
10/5/62	White	6,104	5,600	92%
	Negro	7,791	141	2%
12/31/63	White	6,104	5,800*	95%
	Negro	7,791	321	4%
8/1/64	White	6,104	5,910	96.8%
	Negro	7,791	401	5.2%

*Estimate

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
3/1/62 - 11/29/62	White	145	145	0
	Negro	66	14	52
11/29/62 - 12/31/63	White	446	445	1
	Negro	348	180	168
12/31/63 - 8/1/64	White	114	110	3
	Negro	144	80	64

A complaint was prepared on October 5, 1962 but was not filed because, in November, the Board agreed to cease discriminating and to follow generally the provisions of the Bullock County decree. A conference was held in January, 1963 to determine whether the Board was acting in accordance with the agreement. Records were inspected, and at that time it was determined the Board was not complying, as Negroes were being rejected for technical errors. During December and January, about two-thirds of the Negro applicants had been accepted. (Thirty were accepted in all.)

Further investigation was made during the week of April 8, 1963. It was found that two Negro schoolteachers had been rejected for failing to sign the oath. Records were rephotographed April 16, 1963.

In March or April the Board began a monthly reporting procedure. Progress was poor until August, when 43 of the 48 Negroes who had applied were accepted. In September, 10 out of 13 were accepted; in October, 9 were accepted. In November 1963, the Board registered 12 Negroes but rejected 25. During the same period, the Board registered 113 whites and rejected one.

The Board is still making registration more difficult for Negroes than for whites. It began using the monthly insert form in February 1964 and the 100 variation insert in September. Mr. McCants resigned from the Board in the Summer of 1964. A replacement has not yet been named.

11. Monroe (S) (Gabel)

166-3-10 1-099-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
11/1/61	White	6,600	5,800	88%
	Negro	4,900	140*	3%
11/19/63	White	6,600	6,000**	91%
	Negro	4,900	425	9%
8/19/64	White	6,600	6,791	100%+
	Negro	4,900	478	9.7%

* U.S. Attorney stated that 203 are registered.
** Estimate

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
12/1/61-	White	102	102	0
3/15/62	Negro	90	73	17
3/15/62-	White	116	115	1
12/1/62	Negro	89	88	1
12/1/62-	White	189	189	0
11/19/63	Negro	139	124	15
11/19/63-	White	584	584	0
8/9/64	Negro	82	53	29

A complaint was prepared on November 13, 1961. The U.S. Attorney negotiated with local authorities in Fall, 1961, and they agreed to register Negroes. At the end of August, 1963, 650 Negroes (estimate of local Negro leader found to be accurate) were registered. Negroes were rejected in September and October 1963: one white has been rejected since May, 1963. The records were last photographed on August 19, 1964. The pace of Negroes registration has slowed considerably because of apprehension and difficulty with the new form. The Board began using the 100 sheet insert in September, 1964.

ALABAMA December 31, 1964

12. Pickens (N) (Sutin)
166-1-14 1-107-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
6/1/62	White	7,336	5,581*	76%
	Negro	4,373	528*	12%
	White			
	Negro			
	White			
	Negro			

*Estimate.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
	White			
	Negro			

Records were photographed on June 29, 1961, July 10, 1961, May 2-3, 1963, and February 11, 1964. Since April 1960, only approximately 1,075 applications have been filed with the Board. The Negroes are afraid and there is very little registration activity. There were six cross-burnings in 1963.

13. Pike (E) (Norman)

166-41-35 23-113-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
6/10/62	White	9,126	8,635	95.7%
	Negro	5,259	461	8.4%
9/4/64	White	9,126	8,000	88.0%
	Negro	5,259	300	6.0%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
2/58-1/62	White			
	Negro	93	78	15
1/62-7/63	White			
	Negro	102	77	25
8/63-9/64	White		495	
	Negro		125	

Records photographed August 13-14, 1963. Little Negro registration activity. December, 1963, survey indicates that 75% of the 20-30 Negro persons were rejected. The records were rephotographed September 4, 1964.

A December, 1963, survey indicated that Negroes, even those with good educations, were having difficulty getting accepted. A survey in January, 1964, disclosed that Negroes are afraid and are therefore not applying for registration.

The records need to be analyzed and control cards must be typed. Applications submitted since the February, 1964, inspection must be inspected and photographed. Applicants should be interviewed to determine Board procedures.

14. Russell (D) (Miller)

166-2-13 1-113-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
1/1/60	White	13,761	10,531*	77%
	Negro	7,828	700*	9%
9/2/64	White	13,761	11,654	84.7%
	Negro	7,828	963	12.3%

* Estimate

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/1/60-	White	1,250	1,229	21
7/1/63	Negro	322	286	36
	Unknown	61		
7/1/63-	White	1,147	1,123	24
8/64	Negro	357	263	94
	Unknown	117		

Records were first photographed on October 1, 1961. They were rephotographed in July, 1963, and again in September, 1964. The records show that 480 Negroes were accepted between 1955 and 1960; 559 Negroes accepted between 1960 and August, 1964. The applications photographed in September, 1964, have not yet been analyzed. Reports are that the new Board is fairly administering the new test and thus, imposing a "freeze" on the registration process.

PURPLE TACKS: 1971(a) MATTERS UNDER ACTIVE INVESTIGATION

(GEORGIA) December 31, 1964

1. Baker (M) (Quaintance)
166-19M-4 10-007-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
9/1/61	White	1,139	1,500	100% +
	Negro	1,285	0	0%
12/3/63	White	1,139	1,500	100% +
	Negro	1,285	450*	35%
12/22/64	White	1,139	1,644	100% +
	Negro	1,285	531	41,32%

*Information from Negro leader. As of April 6, 1963, 229 Negroes definitely registered and no obstacles or complaints since then.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
4/63	White			
	Negro		200*	
4/63-4/64	White			
	Negro		300*	0
4/64-12/64	White	13	13	0
	Negro	38	29	9

*Estimates made by local Negro leader.

After 18 months of negotiations, including the preparation of a complaint in February, 1963, the Board was told, on March 4, 1963, that it must correct its abuses within 60 days. By a letter of March 18, 1963, the Board agreed to our requirements. A Department attorney met with the Board and the County attorney from March 29 to April 6, 1963. 200 Negroes were registered, 43 were rejected.

The records were photographed in June, 1963. The records are poorly kept and the rolls have not been purged in years. All applicants are examined orally; no written test is administered.

The Board is generally cooperative, but extremely inefficient. In one respect, that of providing the Department with monthly reports, the Board has not cooperated at all.

From September through December, 1964, most applicants of both races were accepted. One Negro was rejected and no Board member could recall the reason for his rejection. No action is planned other than periodic checking to see that all is progressing well.

2. Bullock (S) (Quaintance)
166-20-5 10-031-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
5/1/64	White	10,101	7,780	77.02%
	Negro	4,337	1,403	23.50%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

The registration application form for Negroes is a different color than that used for whites. Also, separate voters lists are maintained and whites and Negroes use different ballot boxes when voting. Department attorneys have conferred with local officials on these matters, but the conferences were largely unsuccessful. The chief registrar did agree to compile voting lists without racial distinction. A Department attorney threatened to file suit if the discriminatory practices were not eliminated by the September 1964 primary. It is expected that the Department will be filing suit.

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——32

3. Clay (M) (Quaintance)
166-19M-10 10-061-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
5/1/64	White	1130	1094	96.81%
	Negro	1441	88	6.11%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	White	Negro

A Department attorney negotiated a settlement with the Board in February, 1964. Negroes are to be registered under a simple procedure, which is to be applied also to whites. In the past, whites did not have to take any test. Local Negroes report that the new system is working well. The Department will be checking periodically to see if Negro registration is improving.

4. Colquitt (M) (Quaintance)
166-19M-11 10-071-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
	White			
	Negro			

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

Segregated voting lines existed at the September 1964 primary. Also, it appears that there are separate lists of Negro and white voters. The Department plans to negotiate in 1965. No registration figures have been compiled for this county yet.

5. Crisp (M) (Quaintance)
166-19M-36 10-081-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
5/1/64	White	6,451	5,179	80.3%
	Negro	5,179	890	17.2%
	White			
	Negro			

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

The Department has no recent information on Crisp County registration and there has been no photographing.

With respect to discrimination in voting, we have affidavits of compliance with the laws from the Ordinary and Democratic Executive Committee. In the September primary, however, Negroes had to use a different door to get into the voting facilities in one of the precincts. A member of the Democratic Executive Committee assured the F.B.I. this situation would be remedied for the November election. The Government is looking into this matter.

6. Lee (N)(Quaintance)
166-19M-21 10-177-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
10/21/63	White	1,427	1,134	79.4%
	Negro	1,795	120	7%
1/30/64	White	1,427	1,444	100%+
	Negro	1,795	155	8.1%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1960 - 9/1/63	White		172	0
	Negro		78	13

The situation in this county shows improvement. Negroes have had some difficulty in finding the Tax Collector who distributes application forms, in his office. A new younger Tax Collector will take office January 1, 1965. There has been trouble with SNCC workers. At least one has gone into school during class hours to recruit and to lead freedom songs. Apparent reprisals have come in the form of arrests for traffic violations. Generally, however, there has been very little SNCC activity or voter registration activity by Negroes in the second half of 1964. Negroes have been given the thirty-question test more frequently than have whites; it appears that some Negroes are not given the election whether to take the literacy test or the thirty-question test.

7. Miller (M) (Quaintance)
166-19M-25 10-201-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
4/28/63	White	3,095	3,220	100%
	Negro	946	6	6.4%
	White			
	Negro			
	White			
	Negro			

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
	White			
	Negro			

The few Negroes registered in this county do not vote out of fear. Both apathy and fear have prevented more registration attempts by Negroes. A visit by Department attorneys resulted in a half-dozen interviews with local leaders who knew of no Negroes attempting to register recently. A Negro boy was allegedly pistol-whipped by a garageman in 1964. The Department is investigating this incident.

8. Peach (M) (Quaintance)
166-19M-29 10-225-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
5/1/64	White	3,650	2,539	69.56%
	Negro	4,662	1,398	29.99%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/1/64	White			
5/1/64	Negro*	2,000	700	1,300

*These figures represent estimates

Early in 1964, the Department was informed that Negroes were being rejected for mispronouncing words from the constitution. Negotiations this year to relieve discrimination in polling facilities have been successful. Contact with local Negroes and investigation is planned for 1965.

9. Sumter (N) (Quaintance)
166-19M-34 10-261-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
	White	7,730	5,681	73%
5/1/62	Negro	6,710	548	8.1%
	White	7,730	5,800	75%
10/1/63	Negro	6,710	639	9.5%
	White			
	Negro			

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
5/1/62	White		105	
5/1/63	Negro		6	
5/1/63	White			
10/1/63	Negro	128	85	43
	White			
	Negro			

From May 1962 to May 1963 approximately 105 whites and 6 Negroes were registered. As a result of a meeting with the Board and their counsel in late May 1963 the Board agreed to reconsider several applications of rejected Negroes, to hold special sessions to consider the large number of pending applications, and to establish a policy of passing upon applicants on a first-come-first-served basis. Shortly

after this meeting registration was held in which a large number of Negroes were notified to attend. Most of those appearing were registered. Following this conference, the Board began holding meetings to test qualifications of Negro applicants. By the end of September, 1963 it had passed on the applications of 128 Negroes. 85 of these were accepted and 43 rejected. These records were inspected and the rejections appear justified with the possible exceptions of two or three cases. By the end of 1963, complaints were still being received that the Board was delaying the receiving and consideration of applications of Negro citizens of the county.

During 1964, the Board used separate days for registering Negroes and Whites and was slow in processing Negro applications. The attorney for the Board said he intended to tell the Board to stop having segregated meetings. Whether he followed through will be checked in 1965. Department attorneys attempted twice in 1964 to check registration records but could not find the chairman of the Board. Americus had segregated voting lines in the September primary and in the November election. Department attorneys are negotiating with local officials on this matter.

10. Webster (M) (Quaintance)
166-19M-42 10-307-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
4/28/63	White	775	766	98.8%
	Negro	975	0	0.0%
12/23/64	White	775	766	98.8%
	Negro	975	7	0.7%
	White			
	Negro			

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

Date		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
5/1/64	Negro	11	7	4
5/1/64	White			
7/1/64	Negro	6	0	6

There is a long history of discrimination by the Board in this county.

The records were photographed December 19, 1963. Department attorneys met with the Board and its attorney. The Board agreed to allow Negroes who had been rejected to reapply. Eleven Negroes appeared on February 14. The Board processed the applications of the 11 Negroes in April after the Department threatened suit. Seven Negroes were accepted. Those Negroes who took the literacy test were required to copy a very lengthy article of the Georgia Constitution, an article that had not been given to white applicants during the past four years. Six Negroes applied during the summer of 1964, but all were rejected. They were given the twenty-questions test, rather than the literacy test. The Chairman of the Board of Registrars agreed orally in September with Department attorneys that the Board would give and explain to Negroes, as well as to whites, an election between taking the literacy or the twenty-questions test. The Chairman also agreed that Negroes electing to take the literacy test would not have to read or copy more lengthy or difficult constitutional provisions than whites. Finally, the Chairman renewed his agreement that the Board would allow any applicant to reapply. No Negroes have applied since July. The Department plans investigation in 1965 of intimidation.

PURPLE TACKS: 1971 (a) MATTERS UNDER ACTIVE INVESTIGATION

(MISSISSIPPI) December 31, 1964

1. Clay (N) (Schwelb)
(29)
166-40-36 23-025-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
9/1/55	White	4784	3521	73.5 %
	Negro	4922	12	.24 %
8/7/63	White	4860	3657*	75.2 %
	Negro	4444	12*	.27 %
	White			
	Negro			

* Estimate

Complaints of discrimination against Negroes received. Records were photographed under Title III in September, 1964, but race has not yet been identified. Investigation continuing. Preliminary work indicates probable necessity for filing suit.

2. Grenada (II) McIntyre
(16)
166-40-38 23-043-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	5,599	3,467*	62%
	Negro	4,980	130	2.6%
6/1/62	White	5,792	5,518*	95%
	Negro	4,323	135	3.1%
	White			
	Negro			

*Estimate

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
4/6/55 -	White	1,355	1,355	0
4/4/63	Negro	28	7	21
	Unknown	3		3

FBI investigation in May 1961 disclosed some private intimidation. Voting records photographed and registrar interviewed April 24, 1963. Much evidence of assistance to whites, and section selection discrimination. Another Negro has been registered since photographing of records, on his fourth attempt. June 1964 attempts to negotiate freezing relief similar in nature to Panola and Tallahatchie cases failed after local attorney conferred with approximately one dozen white leaders of community. Attorney advised that complaint would be filed as soon as possible. Records now being organized and analyzed in preparation for white standards investigation, justification memo, and complaint. Publication materials and limited Negro interviews indicates very little registration activity. Complaint should be filed early in 1965. Need additional interviews of Negroes before complaint filed.

3. Leake (S) (Owen)
(51)
166-41-55 23-079-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	7407	5002	68%
	Negro	3835	185	4.8%
6/1/62	White	6754	5927	88%
	Negro	3397	185 (approx)	3.4%
3/9/64	White	6754	6000 (approx)	89.0%
	Negro	3397	221	6.6%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/2/60	White	142 (5 pending)	133	4
12/3/62	Negro	27	12	15
12/4/62	White	333	330	3
10/23/63	Negro	25	17*	8*
10/23/63	White	50 (approx)	50 (approx)	0
3/9/64	Negro	20	20	0

FBI investigation in September 1961 reflects that Negroes uniformly rejected for registration. Records photographed on December 13, 1962. Rejected forms very poor. Records indicate discriminatory selection of constitutional sections and assistance to white applicants. Registration book reflects about 116 Negroes registered. All except 12 registered prior to 1955. Check by Department attorney of 6 teachers listed as registered reveals that they were unaware they were registered. 4 of the rejected applicants were thereafter accepted and notified accordingly.

Negotiations with attorneys for registrar resulted in agreement by latter to grade very leniently, to register four of the eight Negro applicants rejected during 1963, and to place the names of all registered Negroes on the poll books. All of the above has been accomplished, and all known Negro applicants during 1964 have been accepted. Negotiations are still pending as to a more satisfactory system for notifying applicants of the result of their examination. Examination of publication materials indicates a small but steady stream of Negroe applicants since March 1964. Records will be inspected again in early 1965. So far this county is best negotiation situation in state.

4. Quitman (N) (Danziger)
(5)
166-40-52 23-119-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	5,186	3,571	68.8%
	Negro	7,884	318	4.0%
6/1/62	White	4,176	2,991	71.6%
	Negro	5,673	436	6.6%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/30/61	White	338	336	x
4/25/63	Negro	37	0	x

The Registrar has rejected Negroes on basis of good moral character test. Analysis of registration records show discrimination in selection of sections, and low standards for whites. Race identification has been determined for 50 previously unidentified persons who are accepted, but not listed on registration or poll books. No other investigation or action has been taken in the county in the past year. Review of county to be undertaken early in 1965. Prior analysis and interviews indicate that problem should be called to attention of registrar to give him an opportunity to remedy the situation. If this is not done, suit should be finally prepared.

5. Rankin (S) Danziger
(55)
166-41-61 23-121-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	9,829	5,711	58%
	Negro	7,295	43	.59%
6/1/62	White	13,246	12,000	90%
	Negro	6,944	94	1.35%
	White			
	Negro			

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/1/57	White	4,199	4,199	0
8/8/63	Negro	82	50	32

Records were photographed on August 30, 1963 Analysis indicates massive section discrimination and assistance to whites both in terms of standard answers and completion of the form by persons other than the applicant. (FBI handwriting analysis is complete). Interpretation test is being strictly administered to Negroes. Potential Negro witnesses have been interviewed. A justification memorandum and complaint has been prepared. Negotiations begun but not terminated. Attorneys for the registrar indicate a willingness to restrict sections of constitution to be used. Decision made, in light of massive discrimination and assistance to whites, to insist on elimination of constitutional test. Suit ready for filing if negotiations unsuccessful.

6. Scott (S) (Schwelb)
(56)
166-41-63 23-123-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	7,247	5,293*	73 %
	Negro	4,329	15	.34 %
6/1/62	White	7,742	4,786*	62 %
	Negro	3,752	16	.42 %
8/12/63	White	7,742	5,400*	69.7%
	Negro	3,752	16	.42 %

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

	Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
White			
Negro			

* Estimate

Records photographed 9/12-13/63. Records retained since August, 1956. All records sent to FBI for analysis. Department attorneys interview of Negroes indicates few Negroes have registered or tried to register since 1955. Current registrar tore up forms in the presence of 2 Negroes who applied in 1959. Control cards have not been typed and there has been only the partial analysis of the records done on the day of photographing.

7. Warren (S) (Danziger)
(43)
166-41-70 23-149-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	12,756	8,408	66.0%
	Negro	12,312	2,088	16.3%
6/1/63	White	13,530	11,153	83.0%
	Negro	10,726	2,360	22.0%
	White			
	Negro			

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
4/1/55	White	2,859	2,820	39
1/10/63	Negro	487	280	207
	Unknown	98	44	54
1/10/63	White	447	444	3
1/1/64	Negro	79	65	14
	Unknown	10	0	10

Records first photographed in January of 1963, records and interviews indicate massive assistance and very low grading standard for whites and occasional assistance and low grading standards for some Negroes between April 1955 and March 1961. 2 or 3 rejected Negro forms with adequate answers during this period; worst discrimination occurred during the latter part of 1961 prior to election of present registrar in January of 1962. Present registrar applying higher standards with some section discrimination in 1962. Records were photographed again by agreement in January of 1964. Preliminary analysis indicates some improvement. Although Negroes still are required to make a greater effort to register than whites, discrimination here is less of an obstacle to registration than in other counties and Registrar indicates a willingness to negotiate. Current records to be analyzed and white standards determined. County to be watched closely.

PURPLE TACKS: 1971(a) MATTERS UNDER ACTIVE INVESTIGATION

SOUTH CAROLINA December 31, 1964

1. Williamsburg (E) (Nixon)
166-67-9 39-089-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
6/1/62	White	7,590	6,200	82 %
	Negro	10,535	400	4 %
12/1/63	White	7,590	6,200	82 %
	Negro	10,535	762	7.2%
6/15/64	White	7,590	6,203	82 %
	Negro	10,535	1,458	14 %

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
2/4/63	White			
6/1/63	Negro	76	51	25
6/1/63 to	White			
5/64	Negro	1564	660	219

A complaint was prepared in June, 1963 after a five-month period during which the registrar processed at most 17 persons on each once-a-month registration day, in spite of the fact that 236persons appeared on a single day to register. The complaint is being held pending further performance by the Board, and that performance is improving. The Board has lived up to its agreement to process at least 70 persons each registration day. Negro registrations averaged about 100 in each of the first three months of 1964. However, the Board still appears to be rejecting qualified Negroes on technical grounds and periodic examination of the Board's performance should and will continue.

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——33

Foll wing is a day-by-day statistical record of the Negroes' attempts to register:

Date	No of Negro Applicants	Number Processed	Accepted	Rejected
1/6/64	81	54	42	12
1/7/64	71	46	26	20
1/8/64	63	41	28	13
2/3/64	54	31	22	9
2/4/64	67	54	48	6
2/5/64	53	45	31	14
3/2/64	53	41	27	14
3/3/64	61	56	37	19
3/4/64	65	57	37	14

Departmental negotiations with local officials were carried on through the United States Attorney. In the spring of 1964 Negro leaders advised Departmental attorneys that, in their judgment, the registration problems had ended. The candidate for Sheriff supported by the Negroes won in the primary, and the Negro leaders were themselves negotiating satisfactorily about remaining registration issues with the chairman of the Election-Commission.

BLUE TACKS: 1971(b) MATTERS UNDER ACTIVE INVESTIGATION

GEORGIA December 31, 1964

1. Terrell County (M) (Nixon)
166-19M-35 10-273-1

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
4/16/58	White	3,233	2,810	86 %
	Negro	5,000	48	1.0 %
9/13/60	White	3,038	2,900	95 %
	Negro	4,957	53	1.3 %
12/1/63	White	3,038	3,146	100 %
	Negro	4,057	188	4.6 %
12/11/64	White	3,038	3,385	100 %
	Negro	4,057	333	8.0 %

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
12/1/61	White	217	215	2
12/1/63	Negro	146	131	12
12/1/63	White	240	239	1
12/1/64	Negro	154	145	9

On December 8, 1963, home of Negro voter registration leader shot into and struck with explosive device. Matter being investigated. At least one suspect located but is also defendant in another civil rights criminal action.

BLUE TACKS: 1971(b) MATTERS UNDER ACTIVE INVESTIGATION

(LOUISIANA) December 31, 1964

1. East Feliciana Parish (E) (Kauder)
166-32-13 17-032-2

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
1/1/61	White	4,200*	2,448	58%
	Negro	4,102*	82	2%
12/11/63	White	4,200*	2,720	65%
	Negro	4,102*	126	3%
10/3/64	White	4,200*	2,728	65*
	Negro	4,102*	180	4.4%

*East Louisiana State (mental) Hospital, Jackson, Louisiana, is located in this parish. There are 4,852 persons there, 1,979 Negroes; 2,843 whites.

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
1/64 - 11/30/64	White	128	109	19
	Negro	253	49	204

As a reaction to the CORE voter registration drive in August 1963, numerous acts of reprisal and intimidation took place in East Feliciana Parish. They included the arrest and prosecution of two CORE workers; the firing from their jobs of four Negroes who associated with CORE; the interviewing of Negro applicants outside the registrar's office by the sheriff and the district attorney; a statement by the Superintendent of Schools to Negro teachers concerning CORE; and an injunction obtained in state court prohibiting CORE from meeting and demonstrating in East Feliciana Parish. In addition, CORE was charged with conducting a criminal conspiracy and twelve local Negro citizens were indicted on December 2, 1963 on charges of public intimidation and conspiracy to commit public intimidation as a result of a letter each signed calling for a bi-racial committee. A CORE worker was held in lieu of $14,000 bond in connection with the writing of the letter. CORE picketing led to over 50 arrests on breach of the peace and disorderly conduct charges. All criminal charges against CORE participants were held in abeyance by local officials throughout 1964.

2. West Feliciana Parish (E) (Kauder)
166-32-5 17-125-2

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
10/29/63	White	1,632	1,207	74%
	Negro	2,235	8	.36%
11/7/63	White	1,632	1,341	82%
	Negro	2,235	13	.6%
	White	1,632	1,345	82%
	Negro	2,235	85	4%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
8/1/63 - 12/1/63	White	229	217	12
	Negro	67	13	54
1/1/64 - 11/30/64	White	44	44	0
	Negro	210	68	142

Before October, 1963, no Negroes had registered in West Feliciana Parish since 1904. Two Negroes attempted to register on August 15, 1963. One was told he needed two witnesses to identify him; the other was engaged in conversation by the Sheriff, who then arrested him on a charge of disturbing the peace. The District Attorney had agreed to dismiss the charge, but the victim filed a damage suit against the Sheriff, causing the District Attorney to postpone indefinitely the dismissal. The complaint against the Sheriff was prepared.

On October 17 and 18, a busload of Negroes went to the courthouse to try to register. On the night of October 17, two Negroes were assaulted, one of whom was beaten by three white men who said they would kill them if they attempted to register again. Investigation has not revealed the identities of the principals.

Two Negro bus drivers had their insurance cancelled because of their involvement in the voter registration attempts. Investigation is being conducted, and a complaint will be filed if purpose of cancellation is clear enough. One Negro tenant farmer's lease was cancelled for no apparent reason other than his attempt to register. The investigation of this is proceeding.

In March 1964 a group of CORE workers and several Negro applicants were chased from the vicinity of the courthouse and shot at by an ex-deputy sheriff. No one was injured. The ex-deputy was arrested by local police, but the parish grand jury returned a no-bill when the matter was presented to it. Matter investigated and no further action contemplated.

In November 1964 two Negroes and one white person were indicted by the parish Grand Jury for making "false statements" on their application forms. Depositions of all three taken by the Government in U.S. v. Board of Registration to demonstrate deterrent effect of the ambiguous application form test. The Negro defendants removed to federal court, and the Department has under consideration participation in the removal proceedings.

In April 1964 large number of Negroes were not given contracts for their sweet potato crops by the local canning company. Investigation by Department attorneys did not show a pattern of reprisal for participation in voter registration activities. Reports in the Fall of 1964 indicated that pressures brought to bear by CORE's national officers induced the canning company to purchase most of the potato crop anyway.

BLUE TACKS: 1971 (b) MATTERS UNDER ACTIVE INVESTIGATION

(MISSISSIPPI) December 31, 1964

1. Forrest (S) McIntyre
(68)
166-41-6 23-035-11

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	19,708	9,123	46.0%
	Negro	7,406	12	0.1%
6/1/62	Whitke	22,431	10,903	48.6%
	Negro	7,495	22	0.3%
6/16/64	White	22,431	13,253	59.0%
	Negro	7,495	236	3.1%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
4/10/62	White	957	441	536
12/10/63	Negro	398	82	355
12/19/63	White	199	150	49
3/14/64	Negro	590	83	507

Large voter registration drive initiated on January 22, 1964. Clergymen and COFO picketed County Courthouse over extended period. Several arrests of both clergymen and COFO workers, reports of police harassment of COFO workers. Newly passed state statute prohibiting picketing of public buildings such as County Courthouse, so as to block ingress and egress involved against 39 pickets early in April, 1964. FBI requested to interview several of the clergymen and COFO workers who were arrested and/or allegedly harassed by local law enforcement personnel. Investigation produced some evidence of possible 1971(b) violations, but primarily incidents that would present questions of fact and judgement as to enforcement of local ordinances. Picketing and arrests ended at about time 1971(a) case tried in Hattiesburg, (mid April, 1964). Negroes continuing to apply in large numbers. Investigation presently limited to individual incidents as reported. Case presently being held open in the event of future harrassment.

2. Madison (S) (Schwelb)
(53)
166-41-34 23-089-3

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	5,606	4,302	77 %
	Negro	11,586	476	3.8%
6/1/62	White	5,622	5,458	97 %
	Negro	10,366	121	1.1%
7/13/64	White	5,622	6,256	100 %
	Negro	10,366	218	2.0%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
7/5/60	White	640	518	122
9/4/64	Negroes	637	65	572

A full investigation is underway in this county of some 40-50 incidents of alleged intimidation and interference both by the police and by private individuals. Investigation to date indicates possible violations of 1971(b) and 18 USC 242.

Investigation indicates that intimidation by private individuals may include besides physical violence, forms of economic reprisal, as (1) loss of employment and failure to be rehired on seasonal jobs, (2) cancellation of insurance policies, (3) cancellation of commercial agreements, refusals to trade, or withdrawal or refusal to extend credit, and (4) evictions, or refusals to renew leases.

Among the extensive allegations of police interference, or interference by other officials are the following: that (1) persons engaged in voter registration activity have been arrested and prosecuted for offenses for which arrests were previously seldom or never made; that (2) persons engaged in voter registration activity have been placed under arrest and confined for traffic or other minor offenses which, under other circumstances, would have resulted only in the issuance of tickets, without confinement; that (3) inordinately high bail for minor offenses is being imposed, and sentences far more severe than given to other persons for similar offenses are being levied by the courts and Justices of the Peace; that (4) police officials search out violations on the part of persons engaged in voter registration or other civil rights activity, e.g. by stationing themselves near voter registration

meetings, checking the licenses or the conditions of the vehicles of persons attending and checking for minor traffic offenses and arresting or ticketing persons in connection with them, while not making any such concentrated efforts with respect to other persons; that (5) information gained by such surveillance is being disseminated to the Canton White Citizens Council for the purpose of bringing pressure to bear on individuals engaged in civil rights activities; and that (6) there have been instances of police brutality, and on at least one occasion, that police fired a pistol with blanks at a Negro who had registered to vote four days earlier, and who they were interrogating to obtain names of persons involved in voter registration activities.

3. Panola (N) (Flannery)
(4)
166-40-9 23-107-4

Unlawful arrests, fines and sentences

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
3/24/55	White	8,139	5,344	65.7 %
	Negro	8,628	2	0.023%
6/1/62	White	7,639	5,309	69.9 %
	Negro	7,250	2	0.068%
11/30/64	White	7,639	5,922	77.5%
	Negro	7,250	878	12.1%

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
3/21/63	White	180	162	18
12/31/63	Negro	56	22	34
1/1/64	White	430	417	13
11/30/64	Negro	1,037	854	183

Panola County Negro arrested, tried, convicted, and sentenced to eighteen months in prison for perjury in connection with his Sworn Written Application for Registration. Allegations made that local District Attorney improperly pressured the Negro applicant into pleading guilty and declining counsel, despite Negroes low literacy level. District Attorney and a local Justice of the Peace also abusing their authority for purpose of punishing COFO workers and persons assisting them. COFO workers interviewed by departmental attorneys and FBI, subjects interviewed by FBI, strong 1971(b) case indicated. Draft complaint prepared.

4. Sunflower (N) (Owen)
(12)
72-40-46 11,360

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
8/9/62	White	8,785	6618	75 %
	Negro	13,524	118	.84 %
9/22/64	White	8,785	7082	80 %
	Negro	13,524	155	1.1 %
10/29/64	White	8,785	7082	80 %
	Negro	13,524	185*	1.4 %

REGISTRATION PROGRESS

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
8/9/62 to 9/19/64	White	520	464	56
	Negro	558	37	521

Negro registration activity commencing in the late summer of 1962 resulted in widespread economic reprisals against participating Negroes by city officials, merchants, and farmers. An extensive investigation conducted in 1963 and continued in 1964 confirmed the alleged intimidation but the evidence as to the actors' purposes was not specific enough to satisfy the requirements of Section 197(b).

The matter is being held open because the information developed may tie in with future intimidation as registration by Negroes continues.

*On October 14 and 29, 1964, U.S. District Court ordered 30 previously rejected Negroes registered in time to vote in November, 1964, election. See U.S. v. Campbell, et al (1971 (a) case) for details.

YELLOW TACKS December 31, 1964

VOTING RECORDS INSPECTED UNDER 1957
OR 1960 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

MISSISSIPPI	DATE OF DEMAND	DATE OF INSPECTION
Adams (32)	April 8, 1963	
#38	July 15, 1963 (Court Order)	August 15-16, 1963

STATUS

As of 7/1/55: 10,097/4774; 9,338/641.* Government photographed pursuant to Court Order. On 9/27/63, Government filed application to inspect records which registrar had previously refused access to, including old registration books, old poll books, materials used in interpretation test, and old poll tax payers list. December 27, 1963. Judge Cox ruled in Jasper County case that Government was not entitled to records prior to May 1960. Government appealed that ruling 1/7/64. Still pending. We were able to get registration books on film going back to 1956. Control cards typed and race identification of application forms of the F.B.I. is nearly complete. Race identification on registration or poll books has not been done.

*White persons of voting age/ white persons registered; Negro persons of voting age/ Negroes registered. U.S. Census, 1960, shows 10,888 white persons, 21 and over; 9,340 Negro persons, 21 and over.

MISSISSIPPI	DATE OF DEMAND	DATE OF INSPECTION
Amite (27) #46	November 11, 1962	March 22, 1963

STATUS

As of 6/1/62: 4,449/3,532; 3560/1.* 19 accepted forms, 6/26/62-3/29/63; 39 rejected forms, 6/14/55-6/29/63. All prior accepted forms destroyed. Of these 58 forms photographed, 18 whites accepted, 18 whites rejected; 1 Negro accepted, 21 rejected. Control cards typed. Analysis in answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B1-46, pages 5-8.

---

*White persons of voting age/ white persons registered; Negro persons of voting age/ Negroes registered.

MISSISSIPPI	DATE OF DEMAND	DATE OF INSPECTION
Benton (8) #14	December 20, 1962	December 20, 1962 May 8, 1963 October 25, 1963 Spptember 4, 1964

STATUS

As of 9/14/64: 2,514/2,226; 1,419/55.* Local officials purged all registrants as of 12/8/64, pending total reregistration. 403 forms photographed, 6/25/62-9/3/64: 187 accepted, 205 rejected, 1 pending. Analysis and race identification completed. 1971 (a) case, U.S. v. Mathis, pending.

---

*White persons of voting age/ white persons registered; Negro persons of voting age/ Negroes registered.

MISSISSIPPI	DATE OF DEMAND	DATE OF INSPECTION
Bolivar (1) #1	August 11, 1960	June 24, 1964

STATUS

As of 9/1/55: 10,031/4,266; 15,939/511.* After proceedings which lasted just under 2 years, on November 15, 1962, Judge Clayton issued order allowing inspection which was limited to records relating to persons accepted for registration, excluding records of persons rejected for registration and limiting inspection to records received prior to date of demand letter. Notice of appeal filed on 12/27/62; defendant filed cross-appeal 1/9/63; Court of Appeals decision 12/6/63, modified Judge Clayton's order to include rejected applications and records obtained after the date of demand. In January, 1964, Judge Clayton insured an order granting the inspection and photographing of records. Defendant then petitioned the Supreme Court for writ of certiorari, during the pendency of hhich the District Court order was staged. Certiorari was denied 5/18/64, and words photographed 6/24/64. No analysis completed.

---

*White persons of voting age/ white persons registered; Negro persons of voting age/ Negroes registered.

MISSISSIPPI	DATE OF DEMAND	DATE OF INSPECTION
Carroll (40) #9	April 29, 1963	August 13, 1964

STAUTS

As of 7/1/55: 3,880/2,887; 3,958/1.* On July 31, 1964, the Court ordered the registar to permit the government to inspect records. Inspected records August 13, 1964. Forms - there are 2 county seats. (1) Carrolton: From 4/5/55, there are 671 forms - 191 accepted, 1 rejected, 14 pending, 565 no indication, but probably accepted. (2) Varden: From 2/6/62, 46 forms - 45 accepted, 1 rejected. Analysis done at the time of photographing indicated assistance, standard answers, low literary whites. (see Caroll Co. investigation folder.) Race identification has not been done yet, but based on interviews to date with the clerk and Negroes, there are no Negro application forms. However, 4 Negroes were put on the registration books in 1959 for jury duty. No case is pending in this county. No control cards have been typed.

---

* White persons of voting age/ white persons registered; Negro persons of voting age/ Negroes registered. Voting age population statistics, 1960 U. S. census report: white 21 and over, 2969; Negro 21 and over, 2704.

MISSISSIPPI	DATE OF DEMAND	DATE OF INSPECTION
Chickasaw (41) #27	April 29, 1963	August 10-11, 1964

STATUS

As of 8/11/64: 6,388/4,548; 3,054/1.* Records demand case consolidated with other cases in Nothern District. Government filed motion for judgment 4/24/64. Hearing held and inspection order issued by Judge Clayton, 7/31/64. 677 forms photographed: 663 accepted; 8 rejected; 6 pending. Control cards not typed; preliminary analysis done at time of photographing. Race identification for accepteds can be obtained from Registration books. 1971 (a) case, U.S. v. Simpson, pending.

---

*White persons of voting age/ white persons registered; Negro persons of voting age/ Negroes registered.

MISSISSIPPI	DATE OF DEMAND	DATE OF INSPECTION
Claiborne (28)	November 27, 1962 (Rule 34)	March 14, 1963

Status

As of 3/15/63: 1,688/1,528; 3,969/26.* 54 forms, 6/29/62--3/12/63: 35 accepted whites; no rejected whites; 18 whites pending; no accepted Negroes; no rejected Negroes; 1 Negro pending. Analysis complete. FBI interviewed white applicants. Evidence of some whites of low literacy registered by present Registrar and some evidence of aid and assistance to white applicants. Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U. S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B1-39, pages 7-15.

---

*White persons of voting age/ white persons registered; Negro persons of voting age/ Negroes registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Clarke (4) #59	July 6, 1961 (Rule 34)	July 12, 1961 August 11, 1962 April 10, 1963 June 22, 1963

Status

As of 9/4/64; 6,072/4,829; 2,998/64.* Period May 11, 1960-December 26, 1962, photographed 236 forms; 233 accepted whites; 3 accepted Negroes. Records since trial on December 26, 1962 have been analyzed through June 22, 1963 for Negro accepted applications. Analysis shows 42 accepted Negroes and approximately 21 rejected Negroes. Analysis in Brief U. S. v. Ramsey, Answers to Interrogatories, U. S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B2-59, pages 4-11. Records presented in evidence at trial. Registration progress from November 3, 1963 - September 5, 1964 (informed inspection by Department attorney) 44 accepted whites, no rejected whites, 17 pending; 19 accepted Negroes, no rejected Negroes, 17 pending. Mrs. Harris, the new registrar, whose incumbancy began in January 1964 has accepted all applicants, white and Negro so far.

*White voting age population/whites registered; Negro voting age population/Negroes registered.

MISSISSIPPI	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Clay (37) #29	May 1, 1963	August 31, 1964

STATUS

As of 7/1/55: 4,784/3,521; 4,922/12.* Enforcement application filed 5/7/63. Order issued by Judge Clayton 7/31/64. Analysis, control cards typed. No race identification as yet. Cursory analysis and investigation by attorneys indicates full analysis needed and suit should be prepared.

---

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. U.S. Census, 1960, shows 5,547 whites, 21 and over; 4,444 Negroes, 21 and over.

MISSISSIPPI	DATE OF DEMAND	DATE OF INSPECTION
Coahoma (13) #2	June 13, 1962	July 14-15, 1962 December 13, 1962

STATUS

As of 6/1/62: 8,708/6,380; 14,004/1,061* 2,425 forms 4/19/55 -- 6/28/62: 1,899 accepted whites; 22 rejected whites; 194 accepted Negroes; 310 rejected Negroes. Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B1-2. Interviews during Summer, 1964, reflect grading and delay as methods of discrimination.

*White persons of voting age/white persons registered; Negro persons of voting age/ Negroes registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Copiah (24) #47	September 17, 1962	Jan. 3, 1963 March 10, 1964 Oct. 22, 1964

Status

As of 12/18/63: 8,153/7,533; 6407/25.* 543 forms, 2/15/60-1/63: 525 accepted whites; 5 rejected whites; 4 accepted Negroes; 9 rejected whites; 4 accepted Negroes; 9 rejected Negroes. Analysis of these records complete; shows widespread assistance to white applicants and rejection of qualified Negroes. (Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U. S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B1-47, pages 3-34, Supplemental Appendix, B-47, pages 2-8,) Government filed a 1971(a) suit in Copiah (U. S. v. Weeks) 12/17/63. Records photographed in 1964 being analyzed in preparation for trial.

*White voting age population/whites registered; Negro voting age population/ Negroes registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Covington (49) #67	May 27, 1963 July 15, 1963 (Court Order)	July 22, 1963

Status

As of 6/1/62: 5,329/3,991; 2,032/702.* No control cards typed. Race of 836 persons identified in 8/31/63 FBI report. No work done in this county during 1964 due to relatively high percentage of Negro voters.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
DeSoto (47) #3	May 1963 (By Agreement)	May 25, 1963

Status

As of 6/1/62: 5,338/4,030; 6,246/11.* 627 forms, 4/8/60-4/18/63: 569 accepted, 58 rejected. Control cards typed; analysis and race identification incomplete. Preliminary analysis showed evidence of assistance and lenient grading of white forms. Only a few Negro applicants.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Forrest (3) #68	August 11, 1960 July 6, 1961 (Rule 34)	March 9, 1962 August 3, 1962 September 24-25, 1963 January 11, 1964 January 18, 1964 March 4, 1964 April 16-17, 1964 July 20, 1964

Status

As of 6/16/64: 22,431/13,253; 7,495/236.* Only 14 Negroes registered between 1949 and April 1962. No Negroes registered between 1954 and April 1962 although there were 2 Negro transfers. Registration Progress: 4/10/62-12/10/63: 441 whites accepted, 536 whites rejected; 82 Negroes accepted (43 by court order), 355 Negroes rejected. 12/11/63-6/16/64, 253 whites accepted, 89 whites rejected; 142 Negroes accepted, 814 Negroes rejected. Analysis in Brief U.S. v. Lynd (contempt case) and Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B2-68, pages 42-48. Control cards typed for all forms photographed; analysis made and forms of Negroes whom we believe should be registered, furnished to the Court.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Franklin (36) #48	April 17, 1963	August 1, 1963

Status

As of 6/1/62: 3,403/3,731; 1,882/236.* 97 forms, 12/27/62 - 7/13/63: 88 accepted whites; 0 rjected whites; 5 accepted Negroes; 4 rejected Negroes. Analysis and race identification complete, found in Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi Appendix B-48, pages 2-8. Analysis reveals that only Section 67 of Mississippi Constitution used for interpretation test. Among white applicants there are 2 pattern answers. Not much activity in county.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
George (19) #77	July 26, 1962 November 23, 1962 (Rule 34)	July 28, 1962 November 27, 1962 January 13, 1964 May 25, 1964

Status

As of 4/22/64: 5,276/4,200; 580/14. * 1,129 forms, 5/21/60-12/17/64: 1,044 accepted whites; 24 rejected whites, 11 accepted Negroes; 5 rejected Negroes. Trial in U.S. v. Ward held 1/27-28/64. Judge ordered an end to discriminatory practices and registration of illiterates. The order gave the Government the right to inspect records every four months. Control cards typed and analysis made. Analysis found in George County Records Investigation file.

---

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/ Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Greene (18) #69	July 27, 1962 (By Agreement)	July 27, 1962

Status

As of 6/1/62: 3,518/3,000; 857/43.* 750 forms from April 8, 1955-July 19, 1962; 748 accepted whites; 2 accepted Negroes. Analysis complete. FBI handwriting analysis shows forms have been filled out by Registrar and deputy. Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B2-69, pages 1-10.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Grenada (30) #16	April, 1963 (By Agreement)	April 24, 1963 April 8, 1964

Status

As of 6/1/62: 5,792/5,518; 4,373/135* 1,377 forms, 4/6/55-4/4/63: 1,348 white accepted; no white rejected; 4 Negro accepted; 22 Negro rejected; 3 rejected, race unknown; 27 pending, race unknown.

Forms photographed 3/1/63-4/8/64: nearly all accepted; 3 rejected; 10 pending. No analysis on second photographing; first photographing analysis complete. Race identification needed for 60 applicants in first photographing. Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U. S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B1-16, pages 1-8 and Supplemental Appendix B1-16, pages 1-2.

*White voting age population/whites registered; Negro voting age population/Negroes registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Hinds (15) #49	July 2, 1962	January 17, 1963 June 17, 1963 July 12-15, 1963+ March 18, 1964 October 22, 1964

Status

As of 10/21/64: 67,836/62,410; 36,138/5,616.* 12,363 forms (since 1960): 9,926 accepted white; 39 rejected white; 1,390 accepted Negro; 1,008 rejected Negro; 469 rejected unknown race; 10 accepted unknown race.** Analysis complete through 3/18/64 photographing; in progress for 10/22/64 photographing. Race identification complete except for last photographing. White applicants are registered regardless of answers. Few standard answers but many are incorrect. Copying of section annotations for question 19 answers. Few illiterate whites but evidence of assistance. Negro standards raised severely since registration drive in June 1963. Negro rejects with good interpretations. Section selection discrimination. Case expected to go to trial February, 1965.

+Not photographed.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

**Unknown forms from most recent photographing.

MISSISSIPPI	DATE OF DEMAND	DATE OF INSPECTION
Holmes (53) #50	November 3, 1963 - Rule 34 -	1/17/64 8/18-19/64 9/2-3/62 11/6/64

Status

As of 8/18/64: 4,773/4,800+; 8,757/20.*
After 11/63 records demand served, application for order made 12/6/63. Order issued 1/7/64 limiting inspection to those records dated between 5/6/60 (effective date of 1960 C.R. Act) and 11/6/62 (date of last federal election held within 22 months of demand). Limitation appealed 11/7/64. Complaint in 1971(a) case (U.S. v. McClellan) filed 7/24/64. Records photographed under Rule 34 8/18/64-8/19/64. 462 forms 1/63-8/19/64: 167 whites accepted: 2 whites rejected; 4 Negroes accepted; 389 Negroes rejected. All forms prior to 1/63 destroyed.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Humphreys (44) #10	April 30, 1963	August 6, 1964

Status

As of 8/6/64: 3,806/2,600; 7,712/0.* 141 forms, 10/9/62-8/6/64: 113 accepted forms; 28 rejected forms. No race identification done but 20 Negroes known to have applied. Form seems to be used as technical test. No control cards typed. Delay between date of demand and date of photographing due to litigation. Record demand served 2/30/63; application for order filed 5/15/63; motion to dismiss filed 6/4/63; motion submitted on memorandum briefs and overruled 8/5/63; answers filed 8/30/63; motion for judgement filed 4/28/64; order requiring production and inspection issued 7/31/64.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Issaquena (54) #40	October 6, 1963	January 20, 1964 December 3, 1964 ✓

Status

As of 1/15/64: 640/640; 1,081/5.* Government's enforcement order filed 12/6/63. On 12/26/63 Judge Cox granted order but limited inspection and photographing to records since 5/6/60. Government's motion of appeal filed 1/7/64. Arguments to be heard 2/22/65. Analysis shows standards and procedures more stringent for Negroes than for whites; many whites not required to complete application form; whites also receive extensive assistance. Approximately 35 Negro applicants since 1/64, 5 of whom accepted. Letter sent to registrar's attorney 12/17/64 suggesting standards for registrar to apply to avoid litigation. Response indicated litigation necessary. Suit to be filed early in 1965.

✓ Not photographed.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Jasper (52) #60	October 31, 1963	January 22, 1964 October 2, 1964

Status

As of 10/2/64: 5470/4500; 4313/10.* Enforcement order filed on December 6, 1963. On December 26, 1963, Judge Cox entered an order allowing photographing only of those records after May 6, 1960 made by the Registrar in connection with 1962 primary and general elections for Federal office. Of 334 white applicants, only 4 were rejected. Of 13 Negro applicants, 11 were rejected. Both of the accepted Negroes were put in the wrong precinct on the registration and poll books, and were not able to vote. Complaint filed 9/3/64 (U.S. v. Hosey) County rephotographed October 2, 1964. Analysis is substantially complete except for standard answers. Discrimination in assistance and grading. Very low white standards. (Analysis in U.S. v. Hosey records investigation bill). Race identification is known but not proved, control cards typed but additional clerical work needed. On January 7, 1964, the government filed Notice of Appeal from Judge Cox's order limiting the inspection. This appeal is still pending.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Rejected; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Jefferson (33)	April 8, 1963	
#41	July 15, 1963	July 19, 1963

Status

As of 7/1/55: 1,901/1,675; 4,304/0.* 200 forms photographed. Control cards typed; race identification complete. Analysis as yet unfinished. Preliminary analysis shows 1 Negro registered, a few rejected.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

U.S. Census, 1960, shows 1,660 whites, 21 and over; 3,546 Negroes, 21 and over.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Jefferson Davis ( )	August 3, 1961	June 28, 1962
#41	(-Rule 34)	October 15, 1963
	December 18, 1961	November 26, 1964
	(-Rule 34)	November 29, 1964
		December 10, 1964

Status

As of 12/10/64: 3,629/3,236; 3,222/126.* Complaint against the registrar (U.S. v. Daniel, 1971(a)) and a Rule 34 motion filed 8/3/61. 9/5/61 Rule 34 motion denied unless plead with particularity. Amended complaint and another Rule 34 filed 12/18/61. 5/15/62 hearing on Rule 34 set for 6/8/62. Records first photographed 6/28/62. All control cards typical and analysis complete except for 12/10/64 photographing. Race identification incomplete, but request out. U.S. v. Daniel set for trial on permanent injunction 2/8/65.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Jones (42) #71	April 29, 1963	September 9-10, 1963

Status

As of 9/9/63: 25,943/2,000*; 7427/750.* 253 forms photographed, 8/62-9/63: control cards typed. Partial race identification on applications known. Registration and poll books race identification incomplete. Few forms indicate that either whites register without forms or registrar has destroyed most forms. During period covered by forms approximately 800 new registrants, only 253 forms found for photographing. Case being prepared for negotiations probably early 1965.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. Estimates based on projected race identification from old poll books in selected precincts and poll tax receipts.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Kemper (43) #61	April 23, 1963	July 29, 1963

Status

As of 6/1/62: 3113/3224; 3221/30.* 300 forms, 6/3/60-7/8/63: 296 accepted whites; 3 rejected whites; no accepted Negroes; 1 rejected Negro. Preliminary analysis in Kemper investigation file. Control cards to be typed; further analysis to be done. Race identification completed except for 30 names.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Lafayette (48) #17	July 26, 1963	August 3, 1964

Status

As of 7/1/55: 8,957/4,496; 3,844/105.* Enforcement order filed 9/7/63. Records demand case consolidated with others 3/23/64. Order to produce records handed down in July, 1964. Analysis incomplete. 1/30/60 - 8/3/64: 1,074 forms; 1,021 accepted, 53 rejected. No control cards typed; race identification incomplete, but preliminary analysis indicates assistance to whites and discrimination in section selection and grading.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. U.S. Census, 1960, shows 8,074 whites, 21 and over; 3,239 Negroes, 21 and over.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Ramar (38) #72	April 22, 1963 September 27, 1963	July 25, 1963

Status

As of 7/5/63: 6,489/5,752; 1,071/0. * 463 forms, 7/18/60-7/5/63: 461 accepted whites; 2 rejected whites; no Negro applicants. Analysis and race identification complete. Analysis filed in Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, appendix B2-72, pages 1-32. Analysis reveals very strong evidence of standard answers.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Lauderdale (9) #62	February 26, 1962	December 6-7, 1962 March 2, 1964 September 23, 1964

Status

As of September 25, 1964: 27,806/18,000; 11,924/1700*. 3035 forms photographed from August 1961-July 5, 1964. 2621 accepted whites; 31 rejected whites; 247 accepted Negroes; 136 rejected Negroes. Applications later than 7/5/64 were all pending on 9/23/64. Complaint filed December 17, 1963. Analysis in investigation file, U. S. v. Coleman and Answers to Interrogatories, U. S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B2-62, pages 6-29. Preliminary injunction granted July and October 30, 1964 registering a total of 20 rejected Negroes. Trial on permanent injunction awaited. Registrar sick. Analysis complete except for a few pending forms. Race identification almost complete. In case, defendants stipulated to race identification subject to corrections.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Leake (25) #51	September 17, 1962	December 13, 1962 November 23, 1963 March 9, 1964 (not photographed)

Status

As of 3/9/64: 6754/6000; 3397/220.* 169 forms January 2, 1960-December 3, 1962; 133 accepted whites; 4 rejected whites; 5 whites not graded; 12 accepted Negroes; 15 rejected Negroes. Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U. S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B1-51, pages 4-23. 358 forms, December 1962-October 23, 1963; 330 accepted whites; 3 rejected whites; 21 accepted Negroes; 4 rejected Negroes. Analysis made at time of photographing. Race identification complete. Forms not typed on control cards. October 23, 1963 to March 9, 1964 approximately 120 accepted whites, no rejected whites; 20 accepted Negroes, no rejected Negroes. Analysis since 12/13/62 has been only superficial. (located in the Records Investigation file.) Massive discrimination until December 1962, but all Negro applicant have been registered since informal agreement with Registrar's attorneys. This agreement provides for "lenient grading." Control cards partially typed; Race identification furnished by registrar. So far, best negotiation situation in Mississippi.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. These figures are estimates.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Lee (19) #31	August 22, 1962	August 24, 1964

Status

As of 7/1/55: 17,082/10,455; 5,531/90* Title III records demand consolidated with similar cases in other counties. Department filed motion for judgment 4/24/64. Inspection order issued by District Judge Clayton 7/31/64. Records photographed 8/24/64. Due to camera difficulties necessary to re-photograph. 133 Negroes on poll books, 1949 - August, 1962. A re-registration in August, 1962, may have decreased Negro registrants. 293 forms photographed, 8/30/62 - 8/24/64: 274 accepted forms, 59 of which identified as Negro; 19 rejected forms, 17 identified as Negroes. Race identification for all Forms not complete. No control cards typed.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Leflore (2) #11	August 11, 1960 November 26, 1962	Sept. 21-23, 1960 March 15. 1963 July 15, 1963

Status

As of 6/10/63: 10,274/7348; 16,567/281.* Control cards typed; records analyzed through second photographing. March 28, 1955-March 15, 1963, 2,086 forms photographed: 1,597 accepted whites, 284 rejected whites; 17 accepted Negroes, 188 rejected Negroes. March 15, 1963-July 15, 1963, 1505 applications photographed: 74 accepted whites, 55 rejected whites; 12 accepted Negroes, 816 rejected Negroes; 1 accepted unknown, 282 rejected unknown; 243 pending, ungraded applications, race not yet identified. Control cards all typed. Race identification complete, except pending application forms, and 282 which FBI could not identify. Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U. S. v. Mississippi, Appendix 1-11, pages 6-39, and Supplemental Appendix B11, pages 42-45.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/ Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Lowndes (13) #32	June 21, 1962 December 10, 1962 (Rule 34)	March 25, 1963

Status

As of 3/25/63: 16,460/8,687; 8,362/99.* 1,275 forms photographed: 1,137 accepted, 11/9/60-3/25/63; 60 rejected, 1/30/56-3/25/63. 1,112 accepted whites; 17 rejected whites; 74 pending whites; 25 accepted Negroes; 43 rejected Negroes; 4 pending Negroes. Analysis complete. FBI request for white standards complete; shows whites of low literacy registered and evidence of assistance to white applicants. Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B1-32, pages 4-30. Records proof very strong on discrimination.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Madison County (12) #53	April 30, 1962	June 21, 1963 March 25, 1964 July 13, 1964 September 11, 1964

Status

As of 7/13/64: 5,622/5400 (approx.); 10,366/221.* Case tried August 24-26, 1964. Briefs filed. See U. S. v. L. F. Campbell Records Analysis file. Race identification complete. 1277 forms photographed (7/5/60-9/11/64): 518 white accpeted, 122 white rejected; 65 Negro accepted, 572 Negro rejected. Registration progress: 7/5/60-4/25/62, 127 accepted whites, 2 rejected whites; 2 accepted Negroes, 7 rejected Negroes. 4/26/62-4/23/63, 224 accepted whites, 28 rejected whites; 3 accepted Negroes, 10 rejected Negroes. 4/24/63-3/5/64, 98 accepted whites, 31 rejected whites; 39 accepted Negroes, 277 rejected Negroes, 3/6/64-9/11/64, 69 accepted whites, 61 rejected whites; 21 accepted Negroes, 278 rejected Negroes.

*White voting age population/whites registered; Negro voting age population/Negroes registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Marion (39) #74	April 22, 1963	July 26, 1963 October 6, 1964

Status

As of 7/23/63: 8997/10,123; 3630/383.* 655 forms, September 5, 1962-July 23, 1963; 583 accepted whites; 20 rejected whites; 11 pending whites; 20 accepted Negroes; 12 rejected Negroes; 2 pending Negroes; 4 accepted, race unknown; 3 rejected, race unknown. Analysis complete. Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, Supplemental Appendix B-74, pages 1-16. FBI request made to interview applicants to establish standards. On 9/3/64, Government filed a 1971 (a) suit in this county and on October 6, 1964, the complete voter registration records were photographed under a Rule 34 order. These records are now in the process of being analyzed in preparation for trial.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Marshall (7) #18	March 1962	March 17, 1962 May 8, 1963 October 25, 1963 August 14, 1964

Status

As of 12/6/64: 4,342/4,229: 7,168/177.* 1971(a) case pending; local officials purged all registrants as of 12/7/64, pending total registration. Analysis of forms and race identification completed. Forms 9/16/61 - 3/18/64: 711 accepted; 343 rejected; 166 pending.

		Total Applied	Accepted	Rejected
9/61-	White	68	54	14
6/1/62	Negro	51	27	24
6/1/62-	White	255	230	23
12/31/63	Negro	287	81	191
12/31/63-	White	29	28	1
8/19/64	Negro	133	47	86

*White Voting Age Population/Whites registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

MISSISSIPPI	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Montgomery (46) #19	May 14, 1963	July 27, 1964

Status

As of 7/1/55: 5039/4050: 2978/10.* Demand filed May 14, 1963. Inspection order granted 7/14/64; records photographed 7/27/64. 674 application forms were photographed. All were accepted forms. Registrar claims rejected forms destroyed. Partial analysis done at photographing. Accepted forms have many poor interpretations and non-responsive answers. Analysis in Montgomery County investigation folder. Race identification: None so far. Interviews with local Negroes indicate no Negro applicants in this County since 1955. No control cards typed yet.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. 1960 U. S. Census shows: white 21 and over, 4700; Negro, 21 and over, 2627.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Newton (51) #64	July 26, 1963	August 12, 1963

Status

As of 6/1/62: 8,014/5,700; 3,018/104.* 613 forms; 604 accepted whites; no rejected whites; 2 accepted Negroes; 7 rejected Negroes. Records partially analyzed. Analysis in investigation file. No white standards, but very poor Negro forms. Race identification complete. Nothing has been done since other cases seem more urgent. Probably can make out a discrimination case but Negroes so far interviewed (including almost all known rejects) very weak. Most are scared. Control cards typed.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Noxubee (45) #65	April 23, 1963 Sept. 27, 1963	July 30, 1963

Status

As of 7/1/55: 10,810/6,975; 2,984/8.* 276 forms, January 14, 1961-July 20, 1963; all 276 accepted whites; registrar states there have been no Negro applicants. Analysis complete; filed in Answers to Interrogatories. U. S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B2-65, pages 1-14. September 27, 1963 Government filed application for supplemental order to photograph applications prior to June 3, 1960. Judge Cox withheld his ruling pending an appellate court decision in U. S. v. Lewis, which case was said to involve the same issue. Further action may also await the determination of the same issue in the Holmes County records demand case, now on appeal.

U. S. Census, 1960 shows 2,997 whites, 21 and over; 5,172 Negroes, 21 and over.

*White voting age population/whites registered; Negro voting age population/Negroes registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Oktibbeka (26) #34	October 1, 1962	August 20, 1964 September 15-16, 1964

Status

As of 12/16/63: 8,423/c.4,413; 4,952/128.* Records to be analyzed, control cards typed and race identification to be made in preparation for trial of U.S. v. Henry, Spring, 1965.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Panola (16) #4	July 6, 1962 (Rule 34)	January 28-30, 1963 March 23, 1963 October 15, 1964

Status

As of 11/30/64: 7,639/5,922, 7,250/878.*
2,022 forms 1/7/60-11/30/64: 1,748 accepted, 274 rejected.
1,703 forms 3/21/63-11/30/64: 579 whites accepted; 31 whites rejected; 876 Negroes accepted; 217 Negroes rejected.
Decree in U.S. v. Duke (6/25/63) ordered Panola County registrar to file with the Department monthly reports on registration progress, including analysis and race identification.

*White persons of voting age/white persons registered; Negro persons of voting age/ Negroes registered. U.S. Census, 1960, shows 10,888 white persons, 21 and over; 9,340 Negro persons, 21 and over.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Pike (10)	April 6, 1962	April 18, 1962 December 16, 1962

Status

As of 6/1/62: 12,163/7,864; 6,936/150.* 640 froms from 4/20/60 - 12/16/62: 508 accepted whites; 15 rejected whites; 61 accepted Negroes; 56 rejected Negroes. Control cards typed. Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B2-54, pages 5-9 and Supplemental Appendix B-54, pages 10-24.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Pontotoc (57) #20	October 31, 1963	July 22, 1964

Status

As of 7/1/55: 9,608/6,274; 1,847/6. Litigation to produce records consolidated with similar demands. Department filed motion for judgment on pleadings 4/28/64. Hearing held 7/14/64 and order issued by Judge Clayton requiring production of records for inspection and photographing. 999 forms, 1960-1964. No analysis made or control cards typed.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Prentiss (56) #35	October 31, 1963	September 11-12, 1964

Status

As of 7/1/55: 10,103/6,367; 1,170/18.* Federal District court ordered production of records 7/31/64. Records photographed in September. 880 forms photographed. No indication that any were passed or failed. No race identification. Analysis partially done; indications of assistance to white applicants. Circuit clerk stated no applicant has failed since 1960, when he came into office.

*White Voting Age Population/ Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. U.S. Census, 1960, shows 9,535 whites, 21 and over; 1,070 Negroes, 21 and over.

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——35

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Quitman (31) #5	(By Agreement)	April 25-26, 1963 May 28-29, 1963

Status

As of 6/1/62: 4,176/2,991; 5,673/436.* 452 forms, 1/3/61-4/25/63: 336 accepted whites; 2 rejected whites; 3 pending whites; 10 accepted Negroes; 37 rejected Negroes; 1 pending Negro. Control cards typed; race identification complete. Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, Supplemental Appendix B-5, pages 3-15.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Rankin (22) #55	August 24, 1962	August 30-31, 1963

Status

As of 6/1/62: 13,246/12,000; 6,944/44.* 4,333 forms, 1/1/57 - 8/8/63: 4,199 accepted whites; 0 rejected whites; 50 accepted Negroes; 32 rejected Negroes. Names of 33 applicants not found in registration books and 19 applications pending as of August, 1963. Analysis completed. Shows massive assistance to whites. Analysis in Answers to Interrogatories, U.S. v. Mississippi, Supplemental Appendix B-55, pages 2-9.

*White voting age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Scott (50) #56	June 17, 1963	August 12, 1963

Status

As of 8/12/63: 7,742/5,400; 3,752/16.* 733 forms: 658 accepted; 43 pending; 32 rejected. Control cards to be typed. Race identification not done and analysis very incomplete. (See Records Investigation File). This is a tough county; many Negroes scared, uncooperative; little Negro activity or promise thereof.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Sharkey (55) #42	October 31, 1963	January 20, 1964

Status

As of 7/1/55: 2,124/1,602; 4,533/1.* Government enforcement order filed 12/6/63. 1/7/64 Judge Cox granted order, limiting inspection to records since 5/6/60. Government filed notice of appeal 1/7/64. Arguments to be heard 2/22/65. Pursuant to original order, records since 5/6/60 photographed 1/20/64. No analysis completed.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. U.S. Census, 1960, shows 1,182 whites, 21 and over; 3,152 Negroes, 21 and over.

MISSISSIPPI	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Sunflower (62)	September 13, 1963 (Rule 34)	January 20, 1964 Sept. 21-22, 1964

Status

As of 10/29/64: 8,785/7,082; 13,524/185.* 1,111 forms, 8/9/62 - 9/21/64: 464 white accepted; 56 white rejected; 37 Negro accepted; 523 Negro rejected; 1 unknown accepted; 30 unknown rejected. Analysis and race identification - complete 1971 (a) case in Sunflower Co. tried 10/12-14/64. On 10/14/64 and 10/29/64; Court ordered 30 rejected Negroes to be registered pending final disposition of case.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Tate (35) #7	April 16, 1963	June 22, 1964

Status

As of 8/55: 4,506/3,134; 4,326/0.* 429 forms, 9/20/62-6/12/64: 425 accepted, 7 rejected. Control cards not yet typed; analysis and race identification incomplete.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

U.S. Census, 1960, shows 1,506 whites, 21 and over; 4,326 Negroes, 21 and over.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Tallahatchie (23) #6	Stipulation	December 20, 1961 August 23-24, 1962 November 18, 1963

Status

As of 11/2/64: 5,099/4,464; 6,483/17.* 76 forms, 1/30/60-8/23/62: 69 accepted whites; no rejected whites; 4 accepted Negroes; 3 rejected Negroes. Analysis in Supplemental Appendix, Answers to Interrogatories, U. S. v. Mississippi, B1-6, pages 9-19. 248 forms, 8/62 - 11/18/63: 241 accepted whites; 5 rejected whites; 1 accepted Negro; 1 rejected Negro. Analysis in trial brief. According to registrar's compliance reports 6/24/64 (date of trial) - 11/30/64, 139 applicants: 54 white accepted; no whites rejected; 25 Negroes accepted; 58 Negroes rejected.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Tippah (60) #21	October 31, 1963	November 11, 1963

Status

As of 7/1/55: 8,037/5,360; 1,603/144. * 2,166 accepted applications and 44 rejected forms 1955-12/63. Race unknown. Control cards to be typed; records to be analyzed.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

U.S. Census, 1960 shows 7,513 whites, 21 and over; 1,281 Negroes, 21 and over.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Tunica (29) #8	March 1963 Unformal	March 28, 1963

Status

As of 3/28/63: 2,011/1,407; 5,822/38.* 497 forms were photographed covering the period 4/9/55 - 2/22/63: 420 accepted whites, 12 rejected whites, 27 pending whites; 28 accepted Negroes, 4 rejected Negroes, 2 pending Negroes; 4 accepted, race unknown. Both race identification and analysis is complete.

* White Voting Age Population/ White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Union (58) #22	Oct. 31, 1963	July 20, 21, 1964

Status

As of 7/1/55: 10,008/6,644; 1,904/67.* Title III suit filed December 9, 1963. Title III case consolidated with similar demands against other registrars. Department filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings, April 28, 1964. Hearing and order signed by Judge Clayton on July 14, 1964 requiring the production of records. Records photographed on July 20-21, 1964. 3,358 accepted applications photographed. No rejected applications found. 146 Negroes registered according to poll book count. Evidence of standard answers. Section selection analysis completed. Heavy use of section 240. Some of the control cards typed. Race identification not complete. Count of registration books has not yet been done either. Members of the Department should interview in this county.

*White voting age population/whites registered; Negro voting age population/Negroes registered. U. S. Census, 1960 shows 9,462 whites, 21 and over; 1,626 Negroes, 21 and over.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Walthall (6) #76	August 3, 1961 (-Rule 34)	July 9, 1962 April 10, 1963 September 10, 1963

Status

As of 12/3/63: 4,536/4,536; 2,499/4.* 1,189 forms photographed from April 14, 1955 through April 1, 1963; 1,125 accepted whites; 2 rejected whites; 54 pending whites; 2 accepted Negroes; 7 rejected Negroes.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Warren (20) #43	August 15, 1962	January 8, 1963 January 23, 1964

Status

As of 12/31/64: 13,530/11,654; 10,726/2433.* 3,495 forms, 4/11/55-1/10/63: 2,828 accepted whites; 39 rejected whites; 277 accepted Negroes; 207 rejected Negroes; 98 forms unidentified as to race and 46 pending forms. Preliminary analysis of forms for 1963 seems to indicate some improvement. No control cards typed or detailed analysis completed for this last photographing.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. The registration figures are somewhat inflated due to the fact that registration and poll books have not been purged for deaths and transfers.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Washington (17) #13	July 3, 1962	July 25, 1962

Status

As of 6/1/62: 19,437/10.838; 20,619/1,762, all forms prior to 1/30/61 destroyed. 141 forms photographed, 1/30/61 - 7/21/62 5 accepted whites; 4 rejected whites; 23 pending whites; 38 accepted Negroes; 33 rejected Negroes; 35 pending Negroes; 1 accepted Chinese; 1 rejected Chinese; 5 rejected, race unknown, 1 pending, race unknown. Analysis of 141 forms shows only Negroes and not whites were asked if they paid their income taxes. There is no immediate evidence of discrimination by grading.

Records since 1962 should be photographed, especially since a new registrar has taken office since the last photographing.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Wayne (61) #66	October 31, 1963	November 12-13, 1963

Status

As of 7/1/55: 5,854/4,530; 2,857/0.* 1,509 accepted whites since 1955. At least 50% of white applicants did not interpret Constitution or give statement of duties and obligations of citizenship. No Negroes registered and none have applied. Control cards to be typed and records to be analyzed.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

U.S. Census, 1960, shows 5,881 whites, 21 and over; 2,556 Negroes, 21 and over.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Wilkinson (34) (44)	April 8, 1963 Sept. 27, 1963	August 2, 1963

Status

As of 6/1/62: 2,340/2,438; 4,120/60.* 234 forms, 1/14/61-8/2/63: 213 accepted whites; 14 rejected whites; 7 accepted Negroes; 0 rejected Negroes. Control cards have been typed. Analysis shows assistance to whites -- standard answers for whites and Negroes. Analysis in Wilkinson Investigation File #44. On September 27, 1963, Government filed application for supplemental order to photograph forms prior to Janauary 14, 1961. Judge Cox's ruling in the Jasper County case, prohibiting photographing of forms prior to May 1960, applicable. This application still pending along with several like it in other counties.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Yalobusha (59) #24	October 31, 1963	September 8-9, 1964

Status

As of 3/24/55: 5271/3384; 3142/9. Title III suit filed 12/9/63. Case consolidated with similar demands against other registrars. Government motion for judgment on pleadings filed 4/28/64. Hearing held 7/14/64 and order issued by Judge Clayton requiring production of records for inspection and photographing. Only 6 applications photographed; records destroyed after demand made. Total entries in current registration books (1939-Aug. 9, 1964): 8,804; 17 Negroes (through 1955). Race usually not identified after 1955.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Mississippi	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Yazoo (11) #45	April 6, 1962 June 4, 1962	June 25, 1962

Status

As of 6/1/62: 7,598/7130; 8,719/256.* 1,249 forms photographed, 3/9/55-6/21/62: 1,247 accepted; 2 rejected. Race identification incomplete. Records show low standards applied to all applicants. Analysis in Answers To Interrogatories, U. S. v. Mississippi, Appendix B1-45, pages 5-6.

*White voting age population/whites registered; Negro voting age population/Negroes registered.

YELLOW TACKS December 31, 1964

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(6) Autauga	May 9, 1961 Nov. 28, 1962 Aug. 17, 1964	May 9, 1961 Dec. 3, 1962 Feb. 3, 1964 Sept. 1, 1964 Dec. 14, 1964

Status

As of June 1962: 6,353/4,139; 3651/71.* Accepted applications since 1955, and rejected application since March, 1960, photographed, to talling approximately 2,329 applications. Control cards have been typed for applications from 1956 - 1960, and from December 1962 through January 1964. Some analysis has been done on the control cards. On August 17, 1964 Demand was made to inspect the voter registration records: the Board on September 1, 1964, refused to permit inspection without a court order allowing inspection. The U. S. District Court for the Middle District of Alabama thereafter issued an order permitting the inspection and photographing of records to take place on December 14, 1964.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(26) Baldwin County		July 29-30, 1963

Status

As of May 1964: 22,236/2,021; 4,527/1,100.* 5,000 accepted applications and no rejected applications. No race identification problems. General analysis made; accepted application 1962 - 1963 analyzed for ink changes. Analysis and report of photographing in Investigation File.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(11) Barbour	July 31, 1961	July 31, 1961 March 5, 1962 August 12, 1963
	August 13, 1964	September 3, 1964

Status

As of May, 1964: 7338/7107; 5787/450.* Control cards typed through August, 1963 photographing; records to be analyzed for 1963. No control cards typed for September 1964 photographing; these records also yet to be analyzed. All registration books from 1932 to date which could be located have been photographed.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. Birmingham News May 5, 1964.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(27) Bibb	August 6, 1963	August 6, 7, 1963

Status

As of May 1964, 5,807/7,107; 1,190/450.* From 1952 to 1963, 2,546 Accepted whites (1963 not counted); 165 Accepted Negroes; 24 rejected Negroes; 11 rejected whites; 6 unidentified rejected applications. Race identification of accepted applications only, after 1951. Race not indicated on rejected applications. Identification partially made through extrensic sources. Rejected applications analyzed; report in Investigation File.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(12) Bullock	September 13, 1961 (Subpoena)	October 3, 1961 October 12, 1961 (monthly beginning July, 1962 (enforcement)

Status

As of November 1, 1964: 2387/2631; 4450/1386.* Records used in connection with trial, U.S. v. Alabama, #1677-N and subsequent hearings. Analysis also in Bullock County enforcement file. Records photographed monthly through November, 1963, quarterly thereafter. April 1, 1961 - November 1, 1963: 354 accepted white applicants, 26 rejected white applicants; 1225 accepted Negroes, 1189 rejected Negroes. November 1, 1963 - November 1, 1964: 244 accepted whites, 5 rejected whites; 156 accepted Negroes, 72 rejected Negroes. Analysis and records work up to date.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(21) Butler	Informal August 11, 1964	July 9, 1962 August 20, 1964

Status

As of August 1964: 8,363/8,604; 4,820/482.* Control cards typed; records partially analyzed. No race identification on many of the rejected forms. July 1962 records photographed.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(31) Calhoun County	September 14, 1964	February 12-14, 1964 September 15-16, 1964

Status

As of September 15, 1964: 44,739/32,524; 9,036/2,979.* Records have been surveyed; no control cards typed; Rejected analyzed; only 188 Negroes and 25 whites rejected between Dec. 1959 and Feb. 1964; Race identification completed by F.B.I.; Recent complaints concerning use of New Insert and slowdown in processing applicants.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(24) Chambers	July 24, 1963	July 24-25,1963

Status

As of 5/64: 15,369/10,083; 6,497/850.* From 11/55-8/63: 2,730 accepted whites; 399 accepted Negroes. From 1954, records indicate no rejected applications. Total Negro registration has not changed since last status report. Voter registration books since 1919 were also photographed. Report in Investigation file.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. "Birmingham News"

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(17) Choctaw	February 19, 1962	February 28, 1962 February 5, 1963

Status

As of 2/63: 5,192/3,697; 3,982/176.* Records used in connection with trial, U. S. v. Doggett. 2,975 applications photographed: 2,479 accepted whites, 2 rejected whites; 234 accepted Negroes, 260 rejected Negroes. All rejected applications prior to 1959 were destroyed. Analysis in Trial Brief. No photographing since 2/5/63.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(16) Clarke County	Jan. 8, 1962	Jan. 29, 1962 Feb. 6, 1963 Nov., 1963*
	Aug. 7, 1964	Aug. 18, 1964

Status

As of October, 1963: 7899/8959; 5833/601.** Records have been analyzed and control cards have been typed to February, 1963, photographing Analysis on control cards. Investigation shows prior to negotiation with Board in January, 1963, 8833 whites accepted, 537 Negroes accepted, 125 of whom registered since October, 1955. During that period, 1803 whites accepted; 3 whites rejected; 199 Negroes rejected. From January, 1963, to August 18, 1964, 569 whites accepted; 17 whites rejected; 231 Negroes accepted; 91 Negroes rejected.*** Race is indicated on most forms; sometimes identified by other means. Negroes discouraged because of use of New Insert Part III.

* Inspection only -- no photographing. Informal.

** White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Population/Negroes Registered.

*** 8 race unknown.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(19) Cunecuh County	March 5, 1962	March 23, 1962 May 21, 1963 August 31, 1964

Status

As of 8/28/64: 5,907/3,324; 3,635/318.* Approximately 1,700 control cards from March 1962 photographing typed. No records analysis.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negores Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(5) Dallas	April 13, 1961 (Rule 34)	November 13, 1961
	Motion for inspection	March 1, 1962 Nov. 27, 29, 1963 March 19-20, 1964 September 2, 1964

Status

As of 8/17/64: 14,400/9542; 15,115,335.* Records used in evidence in case of U.S. v. Atkins. First two photographings, 1952-1960, 4,508 applications photographed: 4,420 accepted whites; 80 accepted Negroes; no rejected applications as they had been destroyed. June, 1961-November 1, 1963 884 whites accepted, 171 rejected, 62 pending; 119 Negroes accepted, 378 Negroes rejected, 89 pending; November 1, 1963-August 17, 1964, 486 whites accepted, 159 rejected; 44 Negroes accepted, 369 rejected. Control cards and race identification completed through last inspection. Analysis also completed in preparation for hearings in October, 1964.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Elmore	July 19, 1961 November 27, 1962	August 2, 1961 November 27, 1962 August 7, 1963 September 22, 1963 December 3, 1963 March 12-13, 1964 November 23, 1964

Status

As of 11/16/64: 12,510/12,022; 4,808/592.* Case tried July 19, 1963. Registration Progress: From 12/59 - 12/31/63, 1,832 accepted whites, 96 rejected whites; 9 accepted Negroes, 206 rejected Negroes. 12/31/63 - 11/16/64: 845 accepted whites, 23 rejected whites; 229 accepted Negroes, 50 rejected Negroes. Race identification and analysis complete through November 1964. Control cards through trial.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Etowah	July 16, 1963	July 16, 1963 March 9-10, 1964

Status

As of 3/10/64: 48,563/36,574; 7661/2407.* Records show that nearly 80% of Negro applicants in 1963 (through June) were rejected. All rejected and a sample of the accepted applications for this period have been analyzed. Control cards typed and analysis done up to September 1962. A new Board of Registrars appointed late in 1963 and the Attorney General of the State of Alabama has stated that the new Board would not discriminate. Analysis in investigation file of trial file. Registration Progress: 1960-1962: 3,339 whites accepted, 24 whites rejected; 191 Negroes accepted, 25 Negroes rejected. 1/1/63 - 10/64: 420 whites accepted; 3 whites rejected; 73 Negroes accepted; 275 Negroes rejected. 10/1/63 - 3/10/64: 1368 whites accepted; 47 whites rejected; 156 Negroes accepted; 84 Negroes rejected.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——36

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(9) Greene County	June 28, 1961	June 30, 1961
		July 13, 1962
		Sept. 7, 1962
		Dec. 9, 1963
	Sept. 11, 1963	Sept. 18, 1965

Status

As of November, 1963: 1649/1915; 5001/451.* Control cards typed and records partially analyzed through September, 1962 photographing. Analysis can be found on control cards. July, 1961 - November, 1963, preliminary analysis indicates 178 accepted whites; 1 rejected white; 271 accepted Negroes; 189 rejected Negroes. Race is not indicated on all rejected forms. A count of Negroes rejected in 1964 can be made only by additional field work. Statistics show that the rate of Negro accepted applicants has been decreasing since September, 1962.

* White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(13) Hale	Dec. 13, 1961	Dec. 22, 1961
		March 1, 1962
		Aug. 29, 1963

Status

As of December, 1963: 3600/3674; 6000/200.* All control cards typed; records analyzed; analysis can be found on control cards. 1954 to present time: 3203 accepted whites; 254 accepted Negroes; 10 rejected whites; 110 rejected Negroes. The rejected applications are not identified by race -- but all except approximately 15 have been identified by other means. Records are to be photographed early in January, 1964.

* White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(28) Henry	August 8, 1963	August 8-9, 1963

Status

According to Birmingham News of 9/3/64: 516/4958; 3168/703.* 2660 accepted applications and 34 rejected applications photographed in August 1963. No race identification problems. Control cards to be typed; records to be analyzed. No work was done in this county during 1964.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(20) Jefferson	June 25, 1962	June 25-29, 1962
		June 25-30, 1963
		January 27 - February 1, 1964
		August 24 - September 9, 1964

Status

As of 10/1/64 256,319/134,939; 116,160/27,013.* Control cards for rejected all typed; control cards for accepted typed up to June 1963. Rejected analyzed for use in case of U. S. v. Bellesnyder; Sample of Accepted applications to be analyzed. Registration progress: 1961: 6,430 white accepted, 40 whites rejected; 1,078 Negroes accepted, 579 Negroes rejected. 1962: 6,266 whites accepted, 71 whites rejected; 2,313 Negroes accepted, 929 rejected. 1963: 16,137 whites accepted, 79 rejected; 8,833 Negroes accepted, 1922 Negroes rejected. 1964: 8626 whites accepted, 25 whites rejected; 2,302 Negroes accepted, 936 Negroes rejected.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. Statistics from "Birmingham News," 10/18/64.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(7) Lowndes	May 10, 1961	May 10, 1961

Status

As of July, 1963: 1,900/2,250; 5,122/0.* Records analyzed for white standards; no Negroes have applied. 679 white applications analyzed; all accepted. No analysis report yet written. Analysis on control cards.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
Macon	February 12, 1959 (Rule 34)	November 21, 1960 each month beginning September 1961. (Quarterly beginning July 1963.) October; 1963 February 6, 1964 April 27, 1964 July 28, 1964 October 28, 1964

Status

As of 10/31/64: 2,818/2946; 8,493/4188.* Records first photographed in November; used in connection with Trial of U.S. v. Alabama, 479-E (March 1961). Beginning in September, 1961, and continuing to July 1963, records were photographed monthly in connection with enforcement of the decree. Photographing has been roughly quarterly since then. Contempt action brought 11/13/64. Control cards are typed through 10/19/64, and analysis complete through that date. (See Macon County Enforcement File). Registration Progress: 10/1/61 - 2/17/64: 427 whites accepted, 19 rejected; 2,109 Negroes accepted, 598 rejected. 2/17/64 - 9/1/64: 67 whites accepted, 2 rejected; 79 Negroes accepted, 70 rejected. 9/1/64 - 10/19/64: 16 whites accepted, 5 rejected; 19 Negroes accepted, 38 rejected.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(32) Madison County	September 11, 1964	November 16, 1964

Status

Application photographed from 1952 through November 16, 1964: All rejected applications photographed; one out of each ten accepted applications (in alphabetical order) from 1952 to January 1964 photographed; all accepted applications since January 1, 1964 photographed. FBI is presently checking the quality of the film to determine whether additional photographing must be done. There has been very little Negro registration since October 1963 when the Board was appointed.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(18) Marengo County	March 5, 1962	March 15, 1962 January 23, 1963 April 16, 1963 November 19, 1963 August 18, 1964

Status

As of August 1, 1964: 6,104/6,200; 7,791/415.* Photographed 4,131 applications from 3/15/62 - 8/18/64. From December 1, 1962 to August 1, 1964, 555 whites accepted; 4 whites rejected; 260 Negroes accepted; 232 Negroes rejected. Records analyzed and control cards typed through November 19, 1963. Analysis must be made of the Board's use of Insert Part III of the new application form. This will determine the course for future registrations.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negores Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(30) Mobile County		August 19-24, 1963

Status

Film bad on records photographed. Rephotographing was scheduled for summer of 1964 but has been delayed. Up to October, 1963, no evidence of discrimination in registration. New Board appointed in October, 1963, has tightened up on registration requirements. Records should be rephotographed early in 1965.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(15) Monroe County	January 8, 1962	Jan. 15, 1962 Dec. 18, 1962 May 21, 1963 Nov. 19, 1963 Aug. 19, 1964
	Inspection by U. S. Attorney	(March 4, 1963 (March 5, 1964

Status

As of August, 1964: 6631/6791; 4894/478.* Original records photographed have been analyzed; analysis on control cards. Since negotiation began, November, 1961, 991 whites registered; 1 white rejected; 338 Negroes accepted; 62 Negroes rejected. Board accepted about 65% of Negroes who have applied since November, 1963, photographing. This is a lower percentage than under prior Boards; it reflects a tightening of registration requirements. The records reflect that whites are receiving aid in filling out Insert Part III of the new application form. A detailed analysis must be made of the Board's use of Insert Part III. This will determine the course for future negotiations.

* White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(3.) Montgomery County	May 23, 1960	Oct. 4, 1960 Sept. 21, 1961 Jan. 28, 1963 March 21-22, 1963 July 18, 1963 Aug. 15, 29, 1963 Sept. 11, 1963 Feb. 4-5, 1964 June 10, 1964 November 17, 1964

Status

As of 12/15/61: 62,911/33,846; 33,056/3,766.* Records to June, 1961, used in evidence in trial of U. S. v. Penton. From December 1, 1962, following decree, through November 18, 1964, 11,230 applications photographed. Analysis completed up to August, 1964, in preparation for supplemental hearings. For period from December 1, 1962 to August, 1964, 5388 accepted whites; 416 rejected whites; 2684 accepted Negroes; 1145 rejected Negroes. Analysis may be found in briefs in support of plaintiff's motions for registration of Negroes, appointment of voting referee, and amendment of the decree. No applications photographed subsequent to June, 1963, have been analyzed. Control cards have been typed and numbered from December 3, 1962, through May 18, 1964. No application subsequent to November 18, 1964, have been photographed. The rate of persons registered between November 1, 1961, and November 20, 1962, has not been determined.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(14) Perry	December 13, 1961	December 19, 1961 January 9, 1963 August 7, 1963 September 17, 1963
	Sept. 20, 1963 (Rule 34)	Sept. 23-25, 1963 March 20, 1964

Status

As of August 17, 1964: 3441/3260; 5202/364.* Records used in trial of preliminary injunction in U.S. v. Mayton. December, 1961, photographing, 283 applications: 281 accepted whites; 2 rejected Negroes. On next three photographings photographed a total of 349 letters of applications from Negroes to the Court. September 23-25 photographing, records analyzed; control cards typed for use in connection with enforcement, and in contempt and permanent injunction proceedings (April 1964). September 1, 1963-August 17, 1964, 541 applications. 160 accepted whites, 40 rejected whites; 64 accepted Negroes, 277 rejected Negroes. These figures obtained from the Board reports.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(6) Pickens County	May 2, 1963*	June 29, 1961 July 10, 1961 May 2-3, 1963 February 11, 1964

Status

As of June, 1962: 7336/5581; 4373/528.** All applications prior to April, 1960 (date of passage of Civil Rights Act) destroyed. All existing applications from April, 1960, to February 3, 1964, have been photographed. They total approximately 1075. Race is not indicated on all rejected forms; race of approximately 94 rejected applicants identified by other means. Accepted applicants are identified by race in the registration books. Few control cards typed. Records partially analyzed; analysis not yet transcribed onto control cards.

* Copies of the demand letters were given to the Registrar for the Board's files, but the letter was not "served."

** White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(29) Pike	August 13, 1963 August 13, 1964	August 13-14, 1963 September 4, 1964

Status

As of September, 1964: 9,126/8,635; 5,259/461.* Control cards to be typed; records to be analyzed.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(25) Russell	August 1, 1961 July 25, 1963 August 11, 1964	August 1, 1961 July 26, 1963 September 23, 1964

Status

As of September, 1964: 13,761/8951; 10,531/963.* Control cards to be typed; records to be analyzed. August 1961 records photographed: 3,650 accepted; 1,033 rejected. July, 1963 photographing: 28 accepted; 118 rejected. Race identification and records analysis needs to be done on all these photographings.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. "Birmingham News" 9/3/64.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(4) Sumter	June 6, 1960 October 31, 1960	June 6, 1960 January 24-27, 1961 March 6, 1962 May 9-10, 1963 Sept. 20, 1963 May 13, 1964

Status:

As of 11/1/64: 3,061/3,297; 6814/358.* Analysis and records work finished for trial. See U.S. v. Hines, May, 1964. Decree issued in September of 1964. Contempt proceeding in December. Records subpoenaed for this proceeding: Registration progress April 1, 1964 - September 17, 1964: 32 whites accepted, 9 whites rejected; 16 Negroes accepted, 51 Negroes rejected. September 17, 1964 - November 1, 1964: 27 whites accepted, 1 white rejected; 27 Negroes accepted, 1 Negro rejected.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(23) Tallapoosa	July 22, 1963	July 22, 1963

Status

As of May 1964: 15,310/14,880; 4,999/903.* 3,941 accepted applications photographed covering period 1954 - 1963. 58 rejected applications photographed between 1957 and 1963. Voter registration books from 1917 to 1963 photographed. Control cards to be typed, records to be analyzed. No race identification problems. There is a very low standard for acceptance of whites, but there are no known instances of qualified Negro rejections. Except for approximately fifty Negro application forms which are incomplete and not known to be accepted or rejected. The present board seems to be accepting almost all of the Negro applicants.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered. Figure based on Birmingham News, 9/3/64.

YELLOW TACKS December 31, 1964

Alabama	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(2) Wilcox	May 12, 1960 November 26, 1962 November 27, 1962 October 28, 1963 Rule 34	March 7, 1962 November 29, 1963

Status

As of 5/3/64: 2,647/2,974; 6,085/0.* Motion for supplemental order directing Board to permit photographing of all records (photographing of some having been denied) heard 8/23/62. District court judge denied motion; notice of appeal filed 1/17/63. Nothing more has been done on this - Awaiting ruling on 2nd demand which is being held in abeyance pending outcome of appeal in U. S. v. Wall. Second demand was that served on Circuit Judge, Circuit Solicitor and Foreman of the Grand Jury. Statistics from 1/59-10/17/63: 415 applications: 375 accepted whites; 11 rejected whites; 29 rejected Negroes, no accepted Negroes. These statistics were the basis of the case in this county. U. S. v. Wall (tried 12/17/63)

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

YELLOW TACKS December 31, 1964

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(34) Acadia	By Agreement	March 18, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 22,399/20,187; 4,557/3,480.* As of 3/18/64: 4 whites rejected, 67 Negroes rejected and 156 persons of unknown race rejected. Almost all of the rejects were on the citizenship test. No rejects are dated prior to 9/62. White registration has decreased by 791 and Negro registration has decreased by 200 since 12/63.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(42) Allen	By Agreement	April 21, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 8,357/8,343; 2,310/1,884.* As of 4/21/64: 79 white persons rejected, 32 Negroes rejected and 64 persons of unknown race rejected. All those rejected failed the citizenship test or were illiterate. Negro registration has increased by 26 since 12/63.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(50) Ascension	By Agreement	April 23, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 10,110/8,833; 4,171/2,505.* As of 4/23/64: 70 white persons rejected, 87 Negroes rejected and 20 persons of unknown race rejected. Only 3 of these, all Negroes, were persons who passed the citizenship test. Since 12/63, white registration has decreased by 716 and Negro registration has decreased by 53.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(47) Assumption	By Agreement	April 22, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 5,319/5,141; 3,237/1,933.* As of 4/22/64: 18 white persons rejected, 70 Negroes rejected and 38 persons of unknown race rejected. Of these, 6 whites and 28 Negroes passed the citizenship test. The registrar apparently rejects applicants for marking the have - have not part of the card incorrectly. Since 12/63, white registration has decreased by 196 and Negro registration has decreased by 152.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(30) Avoyelles	By Agreement	March 17, 1963 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 15,845/13,156; 4,717/1,757.* As of 3/17/64: 209 whites rejected, 182 Negroes rejected and 169 persons of unknown race rejected. Few of the rejections (which date back to 1959) are of a highly technical nature. Both white and Negro registration had declined since 12/63 (whites by 434 and Negroes by 10) presumably the result of a clean-up of the rolls.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(56) Beauregard	By Agreement	April 27, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 8,682/7,936; 2,145/1,048.* As of 4/27/64: 9 white persons and 11 Negroes rejected, all on the citizenship test. The registrar does not reject for error on the card. Since 12/63, white registration has decreased by 273 and Negro registration has decreased by 6.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(4) Bienville Parish	July 5, 1960, Rule 34	October 13, 1960
		November 17, 1960
	Decree	June 4, 1964
		Dec. 4, 1964

Status

As of 10/8/60: 5,617/5,184; 4,077/26*. Records put in evidence in trial of U. S. v. Association of Citizens Councils. 5,175 accepted whites; 10 purged whites; 25 accepted Negroes; 570 purged Negroes. Records photographed in January, 1964, show, for the period January, 1961, through December, 1963: 744 whites accepted, 44 whites rejected; 111 Negroes accepted 134 Negroes rejected. Registrar's Reports, U. S. v. Louisiana, January through November, 1964: 159 whites accepted, 5 whites rejected; 48 Negroes accepted, 43 Negroes rejected. In accordance with the decree in U. S. v. Louisiana, the registrar no longer uses the citizenship test; however, he continues to reject Negro applicants for technical errors on the application card. Analysis of 1964 white accepted cards is found in the U. S. v. Ass'n. of Citizens Councils investigation file (post-decree). Records scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(12) Bossier Parish	March 12, 1962	August 7, 1962
	By Agreement	March 9, 1964

Status

As of 8/31/62: 23,696/12,772; 6,847/539.* 16 rejected whites; 25 rejected Negroes. The records by themselves are inconclusive as to discrimination. Negro registration generally has been quite slow in this parish. However, the total of Negro registrants increased by about 30 in June of this year and another 35 in September. These were the first significant increases in over two years.

The registrar's records contain only a few rejects -- 16 white persons and 25 Negroes rejected on the card since 1959.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(15) Caddo Parish	April 17, 1962	August 14, 1962
	By Agreement	Jan. 13, 1964

Status

As of 8/31/62: 87,774/58,316; 41,749/4,530.* A 10% sample of the accepted cards (6,000 of 60,000) and all rejected cards were photographed in August, 1962. Based on a count of these and a count of the cards photographed in January, 1964, the records show, from January, 1959, through December, 1963: 20,061 whites accepted, 82 whites rejected; 772 Negroes accepted, 1,111 Negroes rejected. The records show that the application card has been used as a test for Negroes but not for whites. The accepted applications, A-J, for the period January 1, 1952, through August 14, 1962, have been typed on control cards. Limited analysis is contained on these control cards and in the Caddo and U. S. v. Board investigation files. Depositions of white accepted applicants, taken in December, 1964, in connection with U. S. v. Board, were inconclusive as to assistance given white applicants by the registrar. Since 12/63 Negro registration has increased by 323.

* Voting Age White Population/Whites Registered; Voting Age Negro Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(57) Calcasieu	By Agreement	April 27, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 62,987/46,918; 14,924/8,213.* As of 4/27/64: 27 white persons rejected, 52 Negroes rejected and 254 persons of unknown race rejected (216 of these are persons who failed the citizenship and did not fill out an application card). The records show that the registrar does not reject for technical errors and that almost all rejections, other than those who failed the citizenship test, were of persons who could not write. Since 12/63, Negro registration has increased by 9, but white registration has declined by 197.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(27) Caldwell	By Agreement	March 16, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 3,843/3,785; 1,161/361.* As of 3/16/64: 0 whites rejected, 1 Negro rejected and 1 person of unknown race rejected. The only recent registration activity by Negroes was for the gubernatorial election a year ago. The records show the registrar has applied easy standards. Negro registration has increased by 17 since 12/63.

*White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(5) Claiborne Parish	April 11, 1961	April 24, 1961
	Decree	June 30, 1964

Status:

As of 4/30/61: 6,415/5,492; 5,032/33.* Records contain approximately 5,452 accepted whites; 31 accepted Negroes and 15 rejected Negroes. Records have been analyzed but no control cards have been typed. Analysis by itself except for the rate of acceptance for each race is inconclusive. January, 1962, through January, 1964: 28 whites rejected; 37 Negroes rejected. Registrar's Reports, U. S. v. Louisiana, March through November, 1964: 157 whites accepted, 48 whites rejected; 28 Negroes accepted, 68 Negroes rejected. The records show that the registrar, in accordance with the decree in U. S. v. Louisiana, is no longer using the citizenship test and that the registrar has used the application card test mostly for Negroes, but has not applied standards as strict as other North Louisiana Registrars.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——37

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(28) Concordia	By Agreement	March 16, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 5,963/5,505; 4,582/563.* As of 3/16/64: 40 rejected white persons, 11 rejected Negroes and a rejected person of unknown race. Records show that the registrar does not reject for technical errors on the application cards. Negro registration has increased by 38 since 12/63.

*White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/ Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(14) DeSoto Parish	March 23, 1962	August 7, 1962 Jan. 17, 1964
	Decree	June 3, 1964

Status

As of 8/31/62: 6,543/5,633; 6,753/599.* Accepted applications A - E for the period January 1, 1952, through August 7, 1962, have been typed on control cards. Analysis of these applications, which is on the control cards and in the De Soto Investigation file, shows that over 40% of the accepted whites have errors for which Negroes were rejected. The records show that the registrar first rejected applicants for errors on the card in January, 1958. From that date through December, 1963: 1,778 whites accepted, 23 whites rejected; 359 Negroes accepted, 314 Negroes rejected. Registrar's Reports, U. S. v. Louisiana, January through November, 1964: 186 whites accepted, 8 whites rejected; 102 Negroes accepted, 83 Negroes rejected. Negro registration began to pick up about two years ago, after a three-year lull, and has increased from 600 to 849, including a gain of 74 in September, 1964.

The records show that the present registrar and his predecessor have been erratic in their treatment of Negro applicants. There was a purge in 1956, and most of the Negroes challenged were able to get back to the rolls, reportedly through the intervention of a local white lawyer. After that, until his retirement in 1959, the prior registrar (Slawson) rejected some Negroes on the card and the interpretation test, but he registered some others who had little education. The present registrar (Platt) has used the application card test just for Negroes, but since the U. S. v. Louisiana decree has eased up somewhat on his standards. The records are scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

* Voting Age White Population/Whites Registered; Voting Age Negro Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(25) East Baton Rouge	Rule 34	Nov. 26-Dec. 4, 1963

Status

As of 12/11/63: 87,905/71,427/ 36,908/11,418.* Photographed 8,594 (10%) accepted whites; 11,153 accepted Negroes and 1,504 rejected applications. In preparation for U. S. v. Board, the cards have been counted by month, by race, and by season for rejection. Analysis in U. S. v. Board file. The records show that the first rejections were in January 1961. From that time through November 1963: 11,398 whites accepted, 478 whites rejected; 1,539 Negroes accepted; 947 Negroes rejected. Deposition of white applicants, taken in December 1964 in connection with U. S. v. Board, show some evidence of assistance to white applicants by the registrar. Since December 1963 Negro registration has increased by 572.

*White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/ Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(1) East Carroll	May 13, 1960 Decree	Dec. 12, 1960 Sept. 22, 1961 Aug. 22, 1962 April 11, 1963 Jan. 21, 1964 June 23, 1964

Status

As of 12/31/60: 2,900/2,845; 4,183/0.* The records contain about 2,845 accepted white applications from 1957-60. 1/1/61 through August, 1962: 1,293 accepted whites; 200 rejected whites; 22 accepted Negroes; 50 rejected Negroes. The current accepted applications through August 22, 1962, were typed and arranged chronologically in preparation of In re Manning. A partial analysis appears in the trial file of U. S. v. Manning. From September, 1962, through December, 1963: 728 accepted Whites; 156 rejected whites; 113 accepted Negroes; 161 rejected Negroes -- analysis done in preparation for U. S. v. Board. Records scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(2.) East Feliciana	May 23, 1960 Rule 34 Decree	Aug. 8-9, 1960 March 27, 1961 December 18-19, 1963 Sept. 9, 1964

Status

As of 8/31/60: 4,200/2,431; 4,102/81. Through December, 1963: 2,560 Whites accepted; 647 Whites rejected; 126 Negroes accepted, 652 Negroes rejected -- analysis done in preparation for U. S. v. Board. Registrar's report, U. S. v. Louisiana, January through November, 1964: 109 Whites accepted, 19 Whites rejected; 49 Negroes accepted 204 Negroes rejected. Records also contain cards of 1,100 Whites and 425 Negroes purged from the rolls in 1958. Analysis of the 1963 cards shows a discriminatory distribution of the five different application cards. Analysis appears in the U. S. v. Palmer investigation file. The records show that the registrars, in accordance with the U. S. v. Louisiana decree, is not using the citizenship test, but he continues to reject applicants for technical errors on the application card. Records scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(39) Evangeline Parish	By Agreement	March 19, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 13,652/14,055; 3,342/3,136.* As of 3/18/64: 236 white persons rejected, 219 Negroes rejected and 291 persons of unknown race rejected. These cards date back to July, 1959. These are cards of 27 whites and 35 Negroes who passed the multiple-choice test and were rejected on the application card. The literacy level for both whites and Negroes is very low in this parish, but as the figures show, almost everybody is accepted as the result of low standards applied until the last few years. Negro registration has increased by seven since 12/63.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(11) Franklin Parish	November 28, 1961	May 24, 1962
	Decree	Sept. 2, 1964

Status

As of 5/31/62: 8,954/4,258; 4,433/148.* Control cards to be typed. 4,255 accepted whites and 149 accepted Negroes. There were no rejected applications. Preliminary analysis inconclusive as to presence of proof of discrimination. Analysis in Investigation file. Registrar's Reports, U. S. v. Louisiana, March through August, 1964: 146 whites accepted, 0 whites rejected; 23 Negroes accepted, 3 Negroes rejected. The records are scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(1) Grant	By Agreement	March 17, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 6,080/5,896; 1,553/618.* As of 3/17/64: 36 whites rejected, 36 Negroes rejected and 21 persons of unknow race rejected. There was a small purge in this parish in 1956, but it had no lasting effect on Negro registration, except perhaps as a deterrent. There has not been much recent registration activity by Negroes (an increase of 12 since 12/63). Negro registration reached 38% of the adult Negro population in September, 1962. The records contain a few rejects on the card, but the citizenship test seems to be more of a barrier. The registrar's standards on the card have not been strict.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(35) Iberia	By Agreement	March 18, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 20,200/17,670; 7,165/4,336.* As of 3/18/64: 20 whites rejected, 66 Negores rejected and 191 persons of unknown rejected. The records show that most of the rejections were on the citizenship test. 87 of the race unknown cards have notes indicating the applicant could not read or wirte. Both white and Negro registrations declined this year: whites by 203 and Negroes by 179.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Regiestered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(21) Iberville Parish	May 2, 1963	May 13-14, 1963

Status

As of 5/31/63: 8,733; 7,060/2,636. 6800 accepted whites; 92 rejected whites; 2,650 accepted Negroes; 424 rejected Negroes. Control cards to be typed; records to be analyzed. Preliminary analysis indicates evidence of discrimination, but the comparatively large number of Negroes registered (42% of voting age population) gives this records work a low priority. Limited analysis in Iberville investigation file, showing that since 1961: 456 whites accepted, 27 whites rejected; 334 Negroes accepted, 186 Negroes rejected.

*White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/ Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(6) Jackson Parish	April 11, 1961	April 25-26, 1961 December 6, 1962
	Decree	Jan. 24, 1964 June 5, 1964

Status

As of 4/30/61: 6,607/5,785; 2,535/483.* Records were used in trial of U. S. v. Wilder. Control cards typed; 5,793 accepted whites; 45 rejected whites; 13 purged whites; 441 accepted Negroes; 791 rejected Negroes; 953 purged Negroes. Control cards arranged chronologically and alphabetically. Analysis of white applications based on scientifically constructed sample of 500 white applications dated prior to 1956 purge and 250 white applications after purge. Records show Negroes were discriminated against through series of tests on application form and discriminatory purge. Records analysis summarized in trial brief. January, 1963, through December, 1963: 832 whites accepted, 78 whites rejected; 183 Negroes accepted, 110 Negroes rejected. Registrar's Reports, U. S. v. Louisiana, January through November, 1964: 159 whites accepted, 4 whites rejected; 142 Negroes accepted, 17 Negroes rejected. The 1964 records show that the registrar, in accordance with U. S. v. Louisiana, has stopped using the citizenship test, and, in accordance with U. S. v. Wilder, has ceased rejecting applicants for technical errors on the application card. The records are scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(51) Jefferson	By Agreement	April 23, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 98,103/86,430; 14,970/8,177.* As of 4/23/64: 625 white persons rejected, 135 Negooes rejected and 1,647 persons of unknown race rejected (1,494 of these filled out citizenship test cards only). This parish has two registration offices, one in Gretna and one in Metarie. It appears from the records that the one in Metarie rejects applicants for errors on the card, while the one in Gretna does not. 418 of the white persons and 78 of the Negroes passed the citizenship test. Since 12/63 white registration has increased by 1,635, but Negro registration has decreased by 278.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(43) Jefferson Davis	By Agreement	April 21, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 12,892/10,056; 2,881/1,549.* As of 4/21/64: 86 white persons rejected, 48 Negroes rejected and 39 persons of unknown race rejected. Twelve of the whites and 8 of the Negroes apparently failed the application card; however, there is no evidence that the registrar uses high standards in grading the card. Since 12/63, Negro registration has decreased by 37 and white registration has decreased by 28.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(44) LaFayette	By Agreement	April 21, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 35,513/32,336; 9,473/5,780.* As of 4/21/64: 41 white persons rejected, 79 Negroes rejected and 157 persons of unknown race rejected. Of these, 9 whites and 6 Negroes passed the citizenship test and substantially filled out the application card. The registrar's standards do not appear to be high. Since 12/63, white registration has increased by 145, but Negro registration has decreased by 101.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(48) Lafourche	By Agreement	April 22, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 25,737/24,729; 3,078/2,022.* As of 4/22/64: 18 white persons rejected, 66 Negroes rejected and 6 persons of unknown race rejected. Of these, 15 whites and 53 Negroes passed the citizenship test and apparently were rejected on the application card. Since 12/63, white registration has increased by 266, but Negro registration has decreased by 64.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(29) La Salle		March 16, 1964 June 26, 1964

Status

As of 10/3/64: 6,799/6,961; 849/272.* As of 3/16/64: 96 whites rejected, 176 Negroes rejected and 57 persons of unknown race rejected. Most of the rejected cards pre-date the current registration period (which started 1/61). The records show that the registrar's standards on the application card are not high. This parish is one of the 21 enjoined from using the citizenship test. Negro registration has increased by 18 since 12/63. Registrar's Reports, United States v. Louisiana (3/64 through 9/64): 221 whites accepted, 0 rejected; 10 Negroes accepted, 1 rejected.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(26) Lincoln		March 10, 1964

Status

As of 10/3/64: 9,611/6,962; 5,723/1,314.* As of 3/10/64: 1 rejected white, 57 rejected Negroes, and 29 rejected persons of unknown race. This is one of the 21 parishes enjoined from using the citizenship test which was responsible for the rejection of 40 of the 57 Negroes. Negro registration shows a net increase of 103 since 12/63; white registration declined by 700 during the same period as a result of a clean-up of the rolls through a change from periodic to permanent registration. Analysis of the rejected cards show that the registrar's standards are quite lenient; however, the only persons currently being rejected are Negroes: Registrar's Reports, United States v. Louisiana, 3/64 through 9/64: 473 whites accepted, 0 rejected; 198 Negroes accepted, 22 rejected.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(20) Madison Parish	Subpoena	Dec. 6-7, 1962
	Decree	Jan. 20, 1964 June 23, 1964

Status

As of 12/31/62: 3,334/1,866; 5,181/21.* Records introduced in evidence in U. S. v. Ward. 1,900 current and 2,700 1957-60 accepted white applications; 35 current white rejected applications. No Negro applications. Control cards typed for current accepted cards and arranged alphabetically and chronologically. These records show white applicants received no test until September 1962. Records summarized in the Brief. Records photographed after the trial for the period December 1962 through December 1963: 717 whites accepted, 46 whites rejected; 259 Negroes accepted, 115 Negroes rejected. The records and the registrar's deposition, which is in the U. S. v. Board file, show that the registrar is now using the application card in a strict test. Records are scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

*White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(10) Morehouse Parish	November 28, 1961	May 24, 1962
	Decree	March 11, 1964

Status

As of 5/31/62: 10,311/5,424; 7,208/250.* 5,462 accepted whites; 35 rejected whites; 250 accepted Negroes; 35 rejected Negroes. Preliminary analysis does not disclose clear discrimination on application form test. This analysis in Investigation file. Analysis of records photographed in March, 1964, is inconclusive due to low number of Negro applicants. Registrar's Reports, U. S. v. Louisiana, September, 1964: 174 accepted whites, 4 rejected whites; 74 accepted Negroes, 39 rejected Negroes. These applications represent the only substantial registration effort by Negroes in this parish in over a year. These cards are scheduled to be photographed soon under the provisions of the U. S. v. Louisiana decree. The registrar's deposition is in the U. S. v. Board file.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(11) Natchitoches	By Agreement	April 20, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 11,328/9,730; 7,444/1,996.* As of 4/20/64: 82 white persons rejected and 223 Negroes rejected. Among the records photographed for United States v. Board are a handful that were apparently rejected on the interpretation test. This parish is not included in the United States v. Louisiana decree.

The records also contain the cards of 103 Negroes and 56 white persons who were rejected on the application card test. It appears from these cards that the registrar has not been as strict on the card as others in North Louisiana, but there have been a few well qualified Negroes rejected on these grounds. Negro registration has remained the same since 12/63.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(16) Orleans Parish	June 22, 1962	August 22, 1962
		December 16, 1963
	By Agreement	Jan. 13, 1964

Status

As of 8/31/62: 257,495/170,275; 125,752/35,585.* In August and September, 1962, we photographed all of the approximately 9,000 white and 1,500 Negro applications of persons registered after July 24, 1961, and 4% of applications of those registered before that date or about 6,040 white and 1,300 Negro accepted applications and 2% of approximately 300,000 applications (6,000) of those removed from the rolls. In addition all of the rejected applications (8,550 Negro and 1,411 whites before July 24, 1961) were photographed. Control cards have been typed for "A-LaCoste" of the accepted applications from July 24, 1961 to August, 1962, and "A-D" of the rejected applications from July 24, 1961, to August, 1962. "A-E" of the accepted applications from July 24, 1961, to August, 1962, have been analyzed and put in chronological order. Analysis on control cards and in records section of parish investigation file. In preparation for U. S. v. Board, all applications from January, 1959, through December, 1963 (through July 24, 1961, based on a 4% sample of the accepted cards) were counted: 46,897 accepted whites, 7,344 rejected whites; 8,713 accepted Negroes, 17,308 rejected Negroes. In addition, the accepted-rejected rate by deputy registrar was determined for the period July 24, 1961, through December, 1963. Other analysis of the records are found in the Orleans and the U. S. v. Board investigation files. Since 12/63 Negro registration has increased by 729, whereas white registration has decreased by 384.

* Voting Age White Population/Whites Registered; Voting Age Negro Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(3) Ouachita Parish	May 23, 1960 Rule 34	Dec. 12-16, 1960 Mar. 28-Apr. 10, 1963 Dec. 13-14, 1963

Status

As of 12/31/60: 40,185/24,789; 16,377/729.* The records were analyzed in preparation for trial in February, 1964, of United States v. Lucky. Control cards have been typed for approximately 25,000 accepted whites; 425 rejected whites; 4,000 whites removed from the registration rolls; about 2,000 names of white persons that appear on lists; 1,000 accepted Negroes; 900 rejected Negroes; 4,250 Negroes removed from the registration rolls; 900 affidavits of retention of Negroes; and 700 returned envelopes. These forms have been analyzed and the control cards placed in chronological and alphabetical order. Among the records photographed December, 1963, there are approximately 3,727 accepted whites; 225 rejected whites; 278 accepted Negro, 225 rejected Negroes; and 210 unseparated accepted applications. The records show Negroes were purged and rejected on standards different than those applied to white persons. Registrar's report, United States v. Louisiana, June through November, 1964: 1,269 whites accepted, 36 whites rejected; 281 Negroes accepted, 144 Negroes rejected. The records show that the registrar, in accordance with the U. S. v. Louisiana decree, is not using the citizenship test, but he continues to reject applicant for errors on the application card. The records have not been photographed as originally scheduled (every six months) due to an apparent misunderstanding with the Parish District Attorney.

* Voting Age White Population/Whites registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(7) Plaquemines Parish	June 19, 1961 July 10, 1961 Decree	March 31, 1962 Sept. 9, 1964

Status

As of 3/31/62: 8,633/6,731; 2,897/48.* Records used at trial on preliminary injunction in U.S. v. Fox and trial of U.S. v. Louisiana, constitutional interpretation test case. Control cards typed. 6,700 accepted whites; 19 rejected whites; 50 accepted Negroes; 43 rejected Negroes. Records show that Negroes were given a different and more difficult interpretation test than white applicants and that Negroes but not whites were rejected for errors on their applications. Records summarized in trial brief. Registrar's reports in U. S. v. Fox showed that registrar continued to use the citizenship test in violation of the decree in U. S. v. Louisiana. The Court in the latter case has ordered her to cease this practice. The records photographed in September, 1964, show that only 2 Negroes (both of whom failed) have applied for registration in Plaquemines Parish this year.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(22) Pointe Coupee		May 9-10, 1963

Status

As of 5/31/63: 6,085/3,836; 5,273/1,328. 3,850 accepted whites; 698 rejected whites; 1,325 accepted Negroes; 385 rejected Negroes. Preliminary analysis discloses Negroes appear to have had little difficulty in registering prior to September 1962. September 1962 through May 10, 1963: 260 whites accepted, 188 rejected; 84 Negroes accepted, 149 rejected. Most rejections on the card are for incorrectly marking the have -- have not portions.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(32) Rapides	Decree	March 17, 1964 June 26, 1964 July 16, 1964

Status

As of 10/3/64: 44,823/32,426; 18,141/3,822.* As of 3/17/64: 337 white persons rejected, 391 Negroes rejected and 454 persons of unknown race rejected. A majority of these rejections were on the citizenship test, which the registrar has now been enjoined from using. The records show that the application card is not presently a great barrier to Negro registration; however, it appears that only Negroes are being rejected. Registrar's Reports, United States v. Louisiana (3/64 through 9/64): 1,362 whites accepted, 12 rejected; 338 Negroes accepted, 104 rejected.

*** White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.**

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(8) Red River Parish	July 21, 1961 June 20, 1963, Rule 34 Decree	July 21, 1961 June 25, 1963 January 15, 1964 June 3, 1964

Status

As of 7/31/64: 3,294/2,948; 2,181/27.* Records used in evidence in U.S. v. Crawford. Control cards typed. 3,243 accepted whites; 8 rejected whites; 27 purged whites; 36 accepted Negroes, 49 rejected Negroes and 1,120 purged Negroes. Records show whites were not tested while Negroes were tested on their understanding and ability to fill out application form. Records summarized in trial brief and trial notebook. From June, 1963, through December, 1963: 320 whites accepted, 6 whites rejected; 42 Negroes accepted, 104 Negroes rejected. Registrar's Reports, U.S. v. Louisiana, January, 1964, through November, 1964: 61 whites accepted, 0 whites rejected; 19 Negroes accepted, 29 Negroes rejected. The records show that the registrar, in accordance with the U.S. v. Louisiana decree, is not using the citizenship test and that he is rejecting Negroes for errors on the application card. However, these rejections are of persons who had obvious difficulty in filling out the card. The records are scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered;
Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(18) Richland Parish	June 28, 1962	November 15, 1962
	Decree	March 11, 1964 September 1, 1964

Status

As of 11/30/62: 7,600/4,027; 4,608/218.* Preliminary survey does not disclose clear discrimination; survey in investigation file. Through December 1963: 5,900 accepted whites, 112 rejected whites; 283 accepted Negroes, 58 rejected Negroes. Registrar's Report U. S. v. Louisiana: 223 whites accepted, 13 whites rejected; 94 Negroes accepted, 34 Negroes rejected. The records show that the registrar, in accordance with the decree in U. S. v. Louisiana, has ceased using the citizenship test. Her standards in grading the application forms are not strict. The records are scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

*White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(55) St. Bernard	By Agreement	April 24, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 15,836/18,425; 1,105/682.* As of 4/24/64: 11 white persons rejected, 33 Negroes rejected and 6 persons of unknown race rejected. Of these, 2 Negroes passed the citizenship test. Since 12/63, Negro registration has increased by 4.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(52) St. Charles	By Agreement	April 23, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 8,117/7,969; 2,621/2,342.* As of 4/23/64: 39 white persons rejected, 47 Negroes rejected and 11 persons of unknown race rejected. Of these, 8 whites and 9 Negroes passed the citizenship test but apparently failed the card. Since 12/63, white registration has decreased by 245 and Negro registration has decreased by 63.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(9) St. Helena	July 22, 1961	July 22, 1961
	Rephotographing	October 26, 1961
		May 17, 1963
	Rule 34	November 21, 1963
	Decree	July 2, 1964

Status

As of 7/31/61: 2,363/1,497; 2,082/143.* Records through May 17, 1963, analyzed; control cards typed. 1,676 accepted whites; 148 rejected whites; 224 accepted Negroes and 550 rejected Negroes. Analysis shows that since September, 1962, accepted white applications contain errors for which Negroes are rejected about 25% of the time. Analysis appears in trial file, U. S. v. Crouch and U. S. v. State Board of Registration. Records from May, 1963, through December, 1963, analyzed: 360 whites accepted, 201 whites rejected; 123 Negroes accepted, 607 Negroes rejected. Registrar's Reports, U. S. v. Louisiana, January through August, 1964: 73 whites accepted, 41 whites rejected; 110 Negroes accepted, 227 Negroes rejected. The records show that the registrar, in accordance with the U.S. v. Louisiana decree, is not using the citizenship test. However, he is rejecting both Negroes and whites for technical errors on the application card. The records are scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

45-755 O—65—pt. 2——38

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(53) St. James	By Agreement	April 23, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 4,892/4,611; 3,964/2,537.* As of 4/23/64: 20 white persons rejected, 36 Negroes rejected and 4 persons of unknown race rejected. Of these, only 1 white and 2 Negroes passed the citizenship test. Since 12/63, white registration has decreased by 85 and Negro registration has decreased by 13.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(54) St. John	By Agreement	April 23, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 4,982/4,334; 4,279/3,045.* As of 4/23/64: 4 white persons rejected, 45 Negroes rejected and 56 persons of unknown race rejected. Of these, 0 whites and 22 Negroes passed the citizenship test. It appears that the registrar rejects applicants for not correctly marking the have - have not part of the card. Since 12/63, Negro registration has remained the same.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(36) St. Landry	By Agreement	March 18, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 25,550/22,132; 14,982/10,324.* As of 3/18/64: 52 whites rejected, 276 Negroes rejected and 89 persons of unknown race rejected. Of these, 15 whites and 96 Negroes were rejected on the application card, but the registrar has used fairly low standards. Since 12/63, Negro registration has declined by 680 and white registration has increased by 14.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(40) St. Martin Parish	By Agreement	March 19, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 9,781/9,497; 4,664/3,082.* As of 3/19/64: 23 white persons rejected, 48 Negroes rejected and 97 persons of unknown race. All but a handful of these rejections were on the multiple-choice test. Negro registration was increased by 125 since 12/63.

*White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(37) St. Mary	By Agreement	March 18, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 17,991/14,833; 7,176/3,215.* As of 3/18/64: 99 whites rejected, 133 Negroes rejected and 937 persons of unknown race rejected. The citizenship test is presently the main barrier to registration here; however, the records contain the cards of 5 whites and 31 Negroes apparently rejected for not being able to fill out the application form. Negro registration has increased by 60 since 12/63.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(45) St. Tammany	By Agreement	April 21, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 16,032/18,596; 5,038/2,816.* As of 4/21/64: 10 white persons rejected, 20 Negroes rejected and 315 persons of unknown race rejected. 284 of the 315 unknown race were persons who failed the citizenship test and did not fill out an application card. Since 12/63, white registration has increased by 246, but Negro registration has declined by 87.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(24) Tangipahoa Parish		May 16-17, 1963
	Rule 34	Dec. 19-20, 1963

Status

As of 5/31/63: 22,311/18,941; 9,401/3,101.* 22,300 accepted whites; 71 rejected whites; 9,400 accepted Negroes; 329 rejected Negroes. Control cards have been typed for A-E of the accepted applications through May 1963. Records, June 1963 through December 1963: 1,824 whites accepted, 98 whites rejected; 257 Negroes accepted, 326 Negroes rejected. The registrar's standards on the applications card are extremely high. The white accepted cards are relatively free of errors for which Negroes were rejected in comparison to white accepted cards in other parishes. Since December 1963 Negro registration has decreased by 67 and white registration has decreased by 398.

*White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/ Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(49) Terrebonne	By Agreement	April 22, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 24,393/19,132; 5,464/1,645.* As of 4/22/64: 111 white persons rejected, 258 Negroes rejected and 71 persons of unknown race rejected. The registrar has extremely strict standards on the application card for a South Louisiana registrar. From these records and interviews with Negro leaders in the parish, it appears that registration was no problem for Negroes until some time in 1960. Since we have not photographed the accepted cards, we have no idea what the accepted-rejected rate is, but since 1960, 80 white persons and 198 Negroes have been rejected for errors on the card. Some of the rejected Negroes are teachers and other well qualified persons.

In addition the registrar apparently has recently instituted a strict proof of residence requirement, which may be an indication that this means of limiting Negro registration has begun to spread. Since 12/63, white registration was decreased by 353 and Negro registration has decreased by 117.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(17) Union Parish	June 28, 1962	Nov. 12-13, 1962
	Decree	Jan. 22, 1964 June 4, 1964

Status

As of 11/30/62: 7,021/5,997; 3,006/601* For the period 1957-1960: 5,750 whites accepted, 40 whites rejected; 599 Negroes accepted, 517 Negroes rejected. All accepted application cards "A-E", for this period have been typed on control cards. Limited analysis on the control cards. Analysis of records through 1963 in Union investigation file. At the present time, there seems to be littel restraining Negro registration other than tradition. The registrar is not using the citizenship test in accordance with the decree in U. S. v. Louisiana and he does not now reject for technical errors on the card. But there has been a history of attempts to limit Negro registration. There was a Citizens Council purge in 1956, and after the general re-registration in 1957, Negroes were rejected on the application card and the interpretation test. After 1959, very few Negroes applied and until late 1962 and those who did were subjected to these tests. After we photographed the records in November, 1962, the registrar relaxed his standards and Negroes started applying again. Since that time, Negro registration has increased from 600 to 864. Registrar's Reports, U. S. v. Louisiana, March through November 1964: 226 whites accepted, 0 whites rejected; 64 Negroes accepted, 10 Negroes rejected.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(38) Vermillion	By Agreement	March 18, 1964

Status

As of 10/3/64: 19,710/18,972; 2,429/2,183.* As of 3/18/64: 2 whites rejected, 7 Negroes rejected and 117 persons of unknown race rejected. The only impediment to registration is the citizenship test. Both white and Negro registrations have dropped slightly since 12/63: by 116 and 5 respectively.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(13) Webster Parish	March 12, 1962 June 20, 1963, Rule 34 Decree	August 8, 1962 June 24, 1963 Jan. 16, 1964 Oct. 7, 1964

Status

As of 8/31/62: 15,713/8,349; 7,045/98.* Records used in trial of U.S. v. Clement. 8,300 accepted whites; 80 rejected whites; 200 accepted Negroes; 45 rejected Negroes. Control cards typed and arranged in alphabetical and chronological order. Records analysis shows that since September, 1962, application form has been a test for Negroes and not for whites. Analysis in trial file of U.S. v. Clement. Records, July, 1963, through December, 1963: 2,109 whites accepted, 186 whites rejected; 174 Negroes accepted, 114 Negroes rejected. Registrar's Reports, U. S. v. Louisiana, January through September, 1964: 722 whites accepted, 6 whites rejected; 298 Negroes accepted, 164 Negroes rejected. The records show that the registrar, in accordance with the decree in U. S. v. Louisiana, has stopped using the citizenship test, but he continues to use the application card as a test for Negroes. Analysis shows that since the decree in U. S. v. Clement (July 14, 1964) the registrar has rejected Negroes for technical errors and has accepted white persons whose cards contain errors. The records are scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

* White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(46) West Baton Rouge	By Agreement	April 21, 1964 (rejects only)

Status

As of 10/3/64: 3,974/3,642; 3,502/1,245.* As of 4/21/65: 15 white persons rejected, 106 Negroes rejected and 10 persons of unknown race rejected. The records show that the registration started to reject applicants for technical errors on the card in 1962. 55 of the 60 cards rejected for this reason were filled out by Negroes; among them are some who are apparently well qualified. Negro registration has increased by only 8 since 12/63.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(19) West Carroll	June 28, 1962	Nov. 16, 1962
	Decree	March 11, 1964 Sept. 6, 1964

Status

As of 11/30/62: 6,171/2,436; 1,389/28.* For the 1957-1960 registration period: 5,180 accepted whites, 38 rejected whites; 70 accepted Negroes, 22 rejected Negroes. January 1, 1961 through December 1963: 4,065 accepted whites, 283 rejected whites; 53 accepted Negroes, 49 rejected Negroes. Registrar's Reports, U. S. v. Louisiana, March through November 1964: 158 accepted whites, 20 rejected whites; 15 accepted Negroes, 17 rejected Negroes. The records show that the registrar, in accordance with the U. S. v. Louisiana decree, has not used the citizenship test. Negro registration suffers most from lack of attempts. The quality of the rejected cards is not very high. Records are scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

*White Voting Age Population/White Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(23) West Feliciana	May 15, 1963	May 15, 1963
	Rule 34	December 18, 1963 July 17, 1964

Status

As of 5/31/63: 1,632/1,108; 2,235/0.* The records photographed in May 1963 include 980 accepted whites, 125 rejected whites; no Negro applications. Control cards typed. The records photographed in December 1963 show that since May 270 of 282, or 96% of the whites have been accepted, while 54 of 67 or 81% of Negroes have been rejected. This analysis in Trial File, U. S. v. Harvey. Registrar's Reports, U. S. v. Louisiana, June through November 1964: 44 whites accepted, 0 whites rejected; 68 Negroes accepted, 142 Negroes rejected. The records show that the registrar, in accordance with the decree in U. S. v. Louisiana, stopped using the citizenship test. However, he continues to reject Negroes for technical errors on the application cards and the Preamble. A complete re-registration is scheduled for January 1965. The records are scheduled to be photographed approximately every six months.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

Louisiana	Date of Demand	Date of Inspection
(33) Winn		March 17, 1964 June 5. 1964

Status

As of 10/3/64: 6,790/6,947; 2,590/1,175.* As of 3/17/64: 6 whites rejected, 20 Negroes rejected and 44 persons of unknown race rejected. This parish is among those enjoined from using the citizenship test, making it relatively easy for those Negroes who apply to become registered. Registrar's Reports, United States v. Louisiana (3/64 through 9/64): 186 whites accepted, 0 rejected; 24 Negroes accepted, 1 rejected.

*White Voting Age Population/Whites Registered; Negro Voting Age Population/Negroes Registered.

RECORDS INSPECTIONS AND PHOTOGRAPHING

In addition to Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi, records have been photographed or inspected in Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, in the following counties:

FLORIDA

Union

GEORGIA

Baker
Bibb
Dougherty
Early
Guinnett
Lee
Macon
Miller
Seminole
Sumter
Terrell
Telfair
Webster

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clarendon
Hampton
McCormick

1. U.S. v. Cox

145-12-925 23-049-40

Petition for writ of prohibition against Judge Cox. (Civil Division)

CCA 5th: Full Panel
Date Filed: 10/23/64 (Filed appeal from District Court Order. Petition for writ of Prohibition filed.)
Date Argued: 12/18/64
Date of Decree:
Appeal:
Appeal Decided:

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Date		Persons of Voting Age	Persons Registered	Per Cent Registered
11/3/63	White	6,072	4,785	79%
	Negro	2,998	45	1.5%
9/4/64	White	6,072	4,829	80%
	Negro	2,998	64	2.2%

In December 1962, in proceedings in the case of United States v. Ramsey, et al., S.D. Miss., a suit brought against the Registrar of Clarke County, Mississippi, and the State of Mississippi to enforce voting rights under the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, two Negro witnesses for the United States (Reverend Goff and Kendrick), testified that some seven years earlier, they had attempted to register at an outdoor place of registration temporily set up in Stonewall, Mississippi; that the Registrar, Mr. Ramsey, had declined to register them or give them application forms; that they had seen white people registering there on that day; and that one white man, B. Floyd Jones, had been near the registration table, had talked to Mr. Ramsey, the Registrar, and had signed the registration book.

Mr. Ramsey testified in direct examination that Mr. Jones had not registered at that time or place, and the registration book showed that B. F. Jones had registered in Enterprise more than a year before.

When counsel for the State, Mr. Riddell, completed Mr. Ramsey's direct examination, and before his cross-examination, Judge Cox stated:

> I want to hear from the government about why this Court shouldn't require this Negro Reverend W. G. Goff and his companion Kendrick to show cause why they shouldn't be bound over to await the action of the grand jury for perjury. I want to hear from you on that...I think they ought to be put under about a $3,000.00 bond each to await the action of a grand jury. Unless I change my mind that is going to be the order...I just want these Negroes to know that they can't come into this Court and swear to something as important as that was and is and get by with it. I don't care who brings them here...And I mean that for whites alike, but I am talking about the case at hand. I just don't intend to put up with perjury. That is something I will not tolerate.

Floyd Jones later testified that he was near the out-of-door registration table in Stonewall in 1955 and observed Mr. Ramsey registering white people there, and that he had talked to Mr. Ramsey and had shaken hands with him. It was undisputed that white people were being registered in Stonewall on that occasion.

The Government declined to prosecute for perjury after a determination by the Department of Justice that such an action was unsupportable on the facts.

On October 13, 1963, Goff and Kendrick were arrested for violations of state law for falsely testifying in Federal court before Judge Cox in the Ramsey case. The state prosecution was based on affidavits filed by Riddell.

Goff and Kendrick were arrested and placed in jail for two days; made $3,000.00 bond; and were later indicted by a state grand jury. Efforts by departmental attorneys to persuade local officials not to proceed were unavailing despite the U.S. Supreme Court case, In re Loney, 134 U.S. 372, explicitly forbidding, on grounds of preemption, state officials' prosecution for perjury allegedly committed in a federal court.

On March 20, 1964 the United States filed suit against the state district attorney, (U.S. v. Warner), seeking to enjoin the state prosecution on the grounds that the states have no authority to prosecute for perjury in a federal court, and upon the ground that the purpose and effect of that suit was to threaten and coerce Goff and Kendrick and to intimidate them and other Negro voters for the purpose of interfering with their right to vote. In answer to that suit, the defendant alleged that Riddell had intended to present the evidence to a Federal Grand Jury, and had "assembled the evidence for presentation to a Federal Grand Jury."

The defendant state prosecutor further alleged that the "purpose of instituting the state prosecution was for the reason that the Department of Justice failed, neglected, and refused to vindicate the United States District Court after having been directed to cause the matter to be presented to a Federal Grand Jury by the District Judge."

On April 21, 1964 the District Court (Judge Mize) ruled that neither the State of Mississippi nor its agents had authority to prosecute persons for giving information or sworn statements to any agency of the Federal Government, and that the threatened enforcement of the state statutes "is unlawful under the ruling in In re Loney, and is contrary to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1971(b)" and entered a preliminary injunction enjoining their prosecution.

The Federal Grand Jury which had originally been convened on September 9, 1963, was reconvened on September 21, 1964. On September 28, 1964, the Foreman of the Grand Jury advised Mr. Owen, the Government attorney who was presenting matters to the Grand Jury, that Judge Cox had asked the Foreman to hear two witnesses, Boyce Holleman and Talley Riddell, (two Mississippi attorneys), on matters unrelated to those which Mr. Owen was presenting to the Grand Jury. Two of theses matters concerned the alleged perjury of Kendrick and Goff. Holleman and Riddell appeared before the Grand Jury on October 21, 1964. The United States Attorney secured permission to be present and to advise the grand jury on the law of perjury. Acting under instructions from the Department, the United States Attorney at no time agreed or represented that he would prepare or sign the proposed indictments. On October 22nd the Foreman of the Grand Jury advised Judge Cox in open court that the United States Attorney had refused to assist in preparing true bills and requested instructions. Judge Cox then ordered the United States Attorney upon penalty of contempt to prepare the indictments. The United States Attorney restated the government's position with regard to this matter and pursuant to explicit instructions from the Attorney General, refused to prepare the indictments and was held in contempt of court by Judge Cox. At the same time, the Court ordered the Attorney General to appear and to show cause why he should not likewise be held in contempt.

The Government immediately petitioned the Court of Appeals for a Writ of Prohibition and was granted a stay of Judge Cox's order pending determination of the appeal. The theory of the application for this writ is that the District Court's order seeks to coerce the Executive Branch of the Federal Government into performing a discretionary function, the initiation of prosecutive proceedings, and as such, was an abuse of judicial discretion. The appeal was argued on December 18, 1964. No decision to date.

EXPLANATION OF THE ATTACHED TABLES DEMONSTRATING THAT THERE IS A HIGH PROBABILITY OF VOTING DISCRIMINATION WHERE THE USE OF "TESTS OR DEVICES" COINCIDES WITH LOW VOTER PARTICIPATION

Under Section 3(a) of the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 the use of certain State voting qualifications -- called "tests or devices" in the Act -- would be suspended, and the appointment of federal examiners would be authorized, upon the coincidence of two factors: (1) where such tests or devices were maintained as a qualification for voting on November 1, 1964, and (2) where less than 50% of persons of voting age were registered to vote on November 1, 1964, or voted in the Presidential election of 1964. Experience has shown that where these two factors are present low electoral participation is generally the result of racially discriminatory use of tests and devices.

The evidence supporting this conclusion is overwhelming. Statistics tell much. In the Presidential election of 1964, ballots were cast by 62% of the American electorate.[1/] Only seventeen states

---

1/ Table A-1. This table is a compilation showing the number of persons of voting age residing in each state as of November 1, 1964 as estimated by the Bureau of Census; the total vote cast in the 1964 Presidential election in each state as reported by official state sources; the percentage of the voting-age population voting in the Presidential election of 1964; the total number of persons registered to vote in each state as of the date indicated on the chart; and the percentage of voting-age population registered to vote as of the date indicated on the chart.

fell below the national average. In nine of these seventeen states, fewer than 50% of the persons of voting age voted in the Presidential election of 1964. Of these nine states, seven employed tests or devices. A survey of registration data in six of these states (Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia) indicates that a large proportion of non-whites of voting age are not registered to vote.[2/] Obviously, in these states, each of which has a large non-white population, there is a significant correlation between the small percentage of non-whites of voting age who are registered and the percentage of persons who voted in the Presidential election of 1964. Where the Department of Justice has undertaken investigations and litigation it is clear that this correlation is dramatically related to the systematic denial of the right to vote on account of race in violation of the Fifteenth Amendment.

2/ Table B-1. This table is a compilation showing the number of white persons of voting age and the number of non-white persons of voting age residing in the states which maintained a test and device on November 1, 1964 and in which less than 50% of the entire voting-age population voted in the Presidential election of 1964; the number of white and non-white persons of voting age registered to vote and the percentage of persons of voting age for each category, white and non-white, registered to vote in each such state.

In at least five of these States -- Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, South Carolina and Georgia -- the Department has uncovered evidence that there has been racial discrimination in the voting process. The Department, however, has focused its efforts primarily on areas where voting discrimination has been most severe. As a result of this policy, most of the Department's investigations and suits have involved counties in Alabama and Mississippi and parishes in Louisiana.

Court findings in these states reveal a systematic effort to use tests or devices to disfranchise Negroes. It is highly significant that no voting discrimination case has ever been concluded without a finding of racial discrimination. Thus, the Department has instituted twelve voting suits in Alabama under 42 U.S.C. 1971(a).[3/] To this date, there

---

3/ Table B-2(a). This table contains a compilation of voting suits filed by the Department of Justice under 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) in Alabama indicating the county in which the suit was brought, the type of test or device challenged or found to be used discriminatorily, and whether there was a court finding of discrimination.

The Department of Justice also has brought five suits in Alabama under 42 U.S.C. 1971(b) involving intimidation and other interference with the right to vote.

have been findings of discrimination in eight of these cases; four cases are presently pending . In each of the eight cases, the discrimination was effected by the use of tests or devices. The statistics for the counties in which these suits were brought show a large non-white voting-age population, high percentage of white registration, a low percentage of non-white registration and low voter turnout in the Presidential election of 1964.[4/]

In Mississippi, the Department has instituted twenty-two voting suits under 42 U.S.C. 1971(a).[5/] As

---

4/ Table B-2(b). This table contains, for each county in Alabama in which a suit was brought by the Department of Justice under 42 U.S.C. 1971(a), a compilation showing the percentage of persons of voting age who voted in the Presidential election of 1964; the number of white persons of voting age and the number of non-white persons of voting age as reported by the Bureau of Census in the Census of Population: 1960 for each such county; the number of white and non-white persons of voting age registered to vote as determined by the Department of Justice and the percentage of persons of voting age for each category, white and non-white, registered to vote in each such county.

5/ Table B-3(a). This table contains a compilation of voting suits filed by the Department of Justice under 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) in Mississippi indicating the county in which the suit was brought, the type of test or device challenged or found to be used discriminatorily, and whether there was a court finding of discrimination.

In Mississippi, the Department of Justice has brought seven suits under 42 U.S.C. 1971(b) involving intimidation and other interference with the right to vote. In addition, three suits challenged discriminatory application of the poll tax requirement.

of now, there are thirteen cases pending and there have been court findings of racial discrimination effectuated by the use of tests and devices in the other nine. Again, the statistics in the counties in which suits were brought show a large non-white voting age population, a high percentage of white registration, a low percentage of non-white registration and a low voter turnout in the Presidential election of 1964.[6/]

The Department has instituted fourteen voting suits in Louisiana under 42 U.S.C. 1971(a).[7/]

6/ Table B-4(b). This table contains, for each county in Mississippi in which a suit was brought by the Department of Justice under 42 U.S.C. 1971(a), a compilation showing the percentage of persons of voting age who voted in the Presidential election of 1964; the number of white persons of voting age and the number of non-white persons of voting age as reported by the Bureau of Census in the Census of Population: 1960 for each such county; the number of white and non-white persons of voting registered to vote as determined by the Department of Justice and the percentage of persons of voting age for each category, white and non-white, registered to vote in each such county.

7/ Table B-4(a). This table contains a compilation of voting suits filed by the Department of Justice under 42 U.S.C. 1971(a) in Louisiana indicating the county in which the suit was brought, the type of test or device challenged or found to be used discriminatorily, and whether there was a court finding of discrimination.

In Louisiana, the Department of Justice has brought one suit under 42 U.S.C. 1971(b) involving intimidation and other interference with the right to vote.

In nine of these there have been court findings of racial discrimination effectuated by the use of tests and devices; five cases are presently pending. Again, the statistical pattern holds true. There is a large non-white voting age population, a high percentage of white registration, a low percentage of non-white registration and a low voter turn out in the 1964 Presidential election. 8/

8/ Table B-3(b) - This table contains, for each county in Louisiana in which a suit was brought by the Department of Justice under 42 U.S.C. 1971(a), a compilation showing the percentage of persons of voting age who voted in the Presidential election of 1964; the number of white persons of voting age as reported by the Bureau of Census in the Census of Population: 1960 for each county; the number of white and non-white persons of voting age registered to vote as determined by the Department of Justice and the percentage of persons of voting age for each category, white and non-white, registered to vote in each such county.

An analysis of the registration data for six of the seven states covered by the proposed Act reveals a similar pattern: a large non-white voting age population, a high percentage of white registration, a low percentage of non-white registration, a low voter turn out in the Presidential election of 1964, and the use of a test or device.[9/]

Another similarity exists among the states of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina and Virginia. All of them have had within the past ten years a general public policy of racial segregation evidenced by statutes in force and effect in the areas of travel, recreation, schools and hospital facilities.[10/] Of the twenty-one states which maintain a test or device,[11/] there are only two others besides these

---

9/ See footnote 2, supra.

10/ Table C-1 - This table indicates in which states, of those maintaining a test or device on November 1, 1964, statutes were in effect within the past ten years requiring segregation in travel, recreation, schools, and hospital facilities.

11/ Table A-3 - This table is a compilation showing the voting age population as of November 1, 1964, as estimated by the Bureau of Census, the total vote cast in the Presidential election of 1964, and the percentage of persons of voting age who voted in the Presidential election of 1964 in states which maintained a test or device on November 1, 1964.

six which have had a policy of racial segregation, reflected by its laws. In one of these, North Carolina, thirty-four counties are covered. The other, Delaware, is a State whose statutes now reflect a reversal of that policy as evidenced by the recent enactment of anti-discrimination statutes in areas of public accommodations and employment.

Strikingly, in most of the states which maintain tests or devices but in which more than 50% of the voting age population voted in the Presidential election of 1964 there are statutes prohibiting racial discrimination in education, public accommodations, employment and housing.[12/] Since these states express, in so many areas, a public policy against racial discrimination, it is certainly reasonable to assume that voting discrimination does not exist.

12/ Table C-2 - This table indicates in which states, of those maintaining a test or device on November 1, 1964, statutes are in effect prohibiting discrimination on account of race in areas of education, public accommodations, employment and housing.

INDEX TO TABLES

A-1 - Fifty State Compilation of Voting and Registration Statistics

A-2 - States Using Tests or Devices as Defined by Section 3(b) of the Proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965

A-3 - States which Use a Test or Device as Defined by Section 3(b) of the Proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965

B-1 - Voting Age Population and Registered Voters Classified by Race in those States where Use of Tests and Devices is Suspended by the Proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965

B-2(a) - Discriminatory Use of "Tests or Devices" Challenged in Justice Department Litigation in Alabama

B-2(b) - Voting Age Population and Registered Voters Classified by Race in those Alabama Counties in which Racial Voting Suits have been Brought under 42 U.S.C. 1971A

B-3(a) - Discriminatory Use of "Tests or Devices" Challenged in Justice Department Litigation in Louisiana

B-3(b) - Voting Age Population and Registered Voters Classified by Race in those Louisiana Parishes (Counties) in which Racial Voting Suits have been Brought under 42 U.S.C. 1971A

B-4(a) - Discriminatory Use of "Tests or Devices" Challenged in Justice Department Litigation in Mississippi

B-4(b) - Voting Age Population and Registered Voters Classified by Race in those Mississippi Counties in which Racial Voting Suits have been Brought under 42 U.S.C. 1971A

C-1 - Statutes in Effect within the past 10 Years Requiring Segregated Facilities in those States which Use a Test or Device as Defined by Section 3(b) of the Proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965

C-2 - State Anti-Discrimination Laws in Force in those States which Use a Test or Device as Defined by Section 3(b) of the Proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965

D - State Voting Qualifications Unaffected by the Proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 in States and Separate Counties where Use of Tests and Devices would be Suspended

E - Voting Statistics by Counties for States having "Tests or Devices" which are not Suspended on a Statewide Basis by the Proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965

E-1 Arizona
E-2 California
E-3 Connecticut
E-4 Delaware
E-5 Hawaii
E-6 Idaho
E-7 Maine
E-8 Massachusetts
E-9 New Hampshire
E-10 New York
E-11 North Carolina
E-12 Oregon
E-13 Washington
E-14 Wyoming

	VOTING AGE POPULATION 1/	TOTAL VOTE CAST 1964 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION 2/	PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION 3/	NUMBERS OF REGISTERED VOTERS IN 1964 4/		PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION 3/
ALABAMA 6/	1,915,000	689,818	36%	1,057,477	7/64	55%
ALASKA 6/	138,000	67,259	49%	5/		
ARIZONA 6/	879,000	480,770	55%	584,284	11/64	66%
ARKANSAS	1,124,000	560,427	49.9%	633,665	1/64	56%
CALIFORNIA 6/	10,916,000	7,057,586	65%	8,184,143	11/64	75%
COLORADO	1,142,000	776,986	68%	933,312	11/64	81.7%
CONNECTICUT 6/	1,698,000	1,218,578	72%	1,373,443	11/64	80.9%
DELAWARE 6/	283,000	201,320	71%	245,494	10/64	86.7%
FLORIDA	3,516,000	1,854,481	53%	2,501,546	11/64	54%

1/ This is an estimate by the Bureau of Census as of November 1, 1964, taken from a memorandum issued by the Department of Commerce, dated September 8, 1964, number CB64-93.

2/ This column is based on figures supplied by official state sources to the Congressional Quarterly.

3/ These percentages are based on the voting age population as of November 1, 1964.

4/ These figures are mostly based on the official reports of the various states, but in some cases do not represent the actual number of persons registered, due to the lack of effective purging of voters who have died or moved away or otherwise become ineligible.

5/ These states do not have statewide registration.

6/ These states use a test or device as defined by Section 3(b) of the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965. Idaho, which does not have a literacy test, has a "good moral character" requirement. Some of the literacy tests states also have a "good moral character" requirement.

GEORGIA 6/	2,636,000	1,139,352	43%	1,666,778 7/	1964	63%
HAWAII 6/	395,000	207,271	52%	239,361	11/64	60.6%
IDAHO 6/	386,000	292,477	76%	364,231	11/64	94%
ILLINOIS	6,358,000	4,702,841	74%	5,534,676	11/64	87%
INDIANA	2,826,000	2,091,606	74%	2,628,627	10/64	93%
IOWA	1,638,000	1,184,539	72%	5/		
KANSAS	1,323,000	857,901	65%	5/		
KENTUCKY	1,976,000	1,046,105	53%	1,000,000	4/64	51%
LOUISIANA 6/	1,893,000	896,293	47%	1,195,395	1/65	63%
MAINE 6/	581,000	380,965	65%	522,236	11/3/64	90%
MARYLAND	1,995,000	1,116,457	56%	1,410,281	10/64	70.6%
MASSACHUSETTS 6/	3,290,000	2,344,798	71%	2,721,466	11/64	82.7%
MICHIGAN	4,647,000	3,203,102	69%	3,351,730	4/64	72%
MINNESOTA	2,024,000	1,554,462	77%	5/		
MISSISSIPPI 6/	1,243,000	409,146	33%	553,000	1/64	44%
MISSOURI	2,696,000	1,799,879	67%	5/		
MONTANA	399,000	278,628	70%	327,477	11/64	82%
NEBRASKA	877,000	584,154	67%	5/		

7/ This does not include Fayette County, which has approximately 2400 registered voters.

NEVADA	244,000	135,433	55%	163,475	11/64	67%
NEW HAMPSHIRE 6/	396,000	288,093	72%	365,224	11/64	92%
NEW JERSEY	4,147,000	2,846,770	69%	3,253,603	11/64	78.4%
NEW MEXICO	514,000	327,615	64%	464,911	11/64	90.4%
NEW YORK 6/	11,330,000	7,166,203	63%	8,443,430	11/64	74.5%
NORTH CAROLINA 6/	2,753,000	1,424,983	52%	2,200,000	3/65	76%
NORTH DAKOTA	358,000	258,389	72%	5/		
OHIO	5,960,000	3,969,196	67%	5/		
OKLAHOMA	1,493,000	932,499	62%	1,189,026	1/65	82%
OREGON 6/	1,130,000	785,289	69%	932,461	11/64	75%
PENNSYLVANIA	7,080,000	4,818,668	68%	5/		
RHODE ISLAND	568,000	390,078	69%	472,659	11/64	83%
SOUTH CAROLINA 6/	1,380,000	524,748	38%	772,572	9/64	56%
SOUTH DAKOTA	404,000	293,118	73%	369,782	11/64	91.5%
TENNESSEE	2,239,000	1,144,046	51%	1,628,825	2/64	72.7%
TEXAS	5,922,000	2,626,811	44%	3,338,718	1/64	56.3%
UTAH	522,000	401,413	77%	448,463	11/64	85.9%
VERMONT	240,000	163,069	68%	209,225	11/64	87%
VIRGINIA 6/	2,541,000	1,042,267	41%	1,311,023	10/64	51.6%
WASHINGTON 6/	1,759,000	1,258,374	72%	1,582,046	11/64	90%

WEST VIRGINIA	1,053,000	792,040	75%	1,055,429	11/64	102%
WISCONSIN	2,391,000	1,696,815	71%	5/		
WYOMING 6/	195,000	142,716	73%	5/		
NATIONWIDE TOTALS	113,931,000	70,642,496	62%			

STATES USING TESTS OR DEVICES AS DEFINED BY SECTION 3(b)
OF THE PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

	Read	Write	Understand	Interpret Any Matter	Knowledge	Good Moral Character	Voucher
Alabama	X 1/	X 1/	X 2/	X 2/	X 2/	X 1/	X 2/
Alaska 4/	X 3/						
Arizona 6/	X 5/	X 5/					
California	X 7/	X 7/					
Connecticut	X 8/					X 8/	
Delaware	X 9/	X 9/					
Georgia	X 10/	X 10/	X 11/	X 12/	X 12/	X 11/	
Hawaii	X 13/	X 13/					
Idaho						X 14/	

	Read	Write	Understand	Interpret Any Matter	Knowledge	Good Moral Character	Voucher
Louisiana	X[15]	X[15]	X[16]	X[16]	X[17]	X[18]	X[19]
Maine	X[20]	X[20]					
Massachusetts	X[21]	X[21]					
Mississippi	X[22]	X[22]	X[22]	X[22]	X[22]	X[23]	
New Hampshire	X[24]	X[24]					
New York	X[25]	X[25]					
North Carolina	X[26]	X[26]					
Oregon	X[27]	X[27]					
South Carolina	X[28]	X[28]					
Virginia		X[29]					
Washington	X[30]		X[30]				
Wyoming	X[31]						

Footnotes

1 / Code of Alabama Tit. 17 §32.

> The following persons . . . shall be qualified to register. . . . those who can read and write any article of the Constitution of the United States in the English language which may be submitted to them by the board of registrars [and] who are of good character. . . .

2 / Order of January 14, 1964, as amended, August 26, 1964 by the Supreme Court of Alabama Prescribing a New Application Form to be Used by the Board of Registrars Throughout the State, Part VI (vouching), Part III (knowledge, interpret, understand).

3 / Alaska Statutes §15.05.010

> A person may vote at any election who . . . (5) can speak or read English unless prevented by physical disability, or voted in the general election of November 4, 1924.

4 / The United States Attorney for the District of Alaska has stated that the Secretary of State believes that anyone who can speak English can vote, even if he cannot sign his name except with an "X". Hearings on S. 2750 before the House Judiciary Committee, 87th Congress, Second Session, p. 315.

5 / Arizona Revised Statutes §16-101(A).

> Every resident of the state is qualified to become an elector and may register to vote at all elections authorized by law if he * * *
> (4) Is able to read the Constitution of the United States in the English language. . . .
> (5) Is able to write his name . . . .

6 / The former United States Attorney for the District of Arizona has stated that an applicant must only attest to the fact that he is able to read the Constitution of the United States in the English language, and if there is any question about his ability, the registrar usually asks him to read other printed papers. Letter dated March 8, 1962, to the Civil Rights Division from Hon. Carl Muecke. See also, Hearings on S. 2750, supra, p. 317.

7 / Constitution of California, Art. II, §1.

> [N]o person who shall not be able to read the Constitution in the English language and write his or her name, shall ever exercise the privileges of an elector in this State. . . .

See also, California Election Code, §100, implementing this provision.

8 / Constitution of Connecticut, Art. VI, §1.

> Every citizen of the United States . . . who is able to read in the English language any article of the Constitution or any section of the statutes of this state, and who sustains a good moral character, shall . . . be an elector.

See also, Connecticut General Statutes, §9-12 implementing this provision.

9 / Constitution of Delaware, Art. V, §2.

> [N]o person . . . shall have the right to vote unless he shall be able to read this Constitution in the English language and write his name. . . .

See also, Delaware Code Annotated, Tit. 15 §1701 implementing this provision.

10/ Georgia Code Ann. §34-617(a).

> [The applicant] shall be required to read [the Constitution of Georgia or of the United States] aloud and write it in the English language.

11/ Georgia Code Ann. §34-117(b).

> [The applicant may also] qualify on the basis of his good character and his understanding of the duties and obligations of citizenship. . . .

12/ Georgia Code Ann. §34-618 sets forth a standard list of questions for those who seek to qualify pursuant

to §34-617(b) (e.g., what are the names of the three branches of the United States Government?) See also, Constitution of Georgia, §2-704 which sets forth the above requirements.

See also, Georgia Code Ann. §34-617(a).

13/ Constitution of Hawaii, Art. II, §1.

> No person shall be qualified to vote unless he is . . . able . . . to speak, read and write the English or Hawaiian language.

14/ Idaho Code §34-404.

> No common prostitute or person who keeps or maintains, or is interested in keeping or maintaining, or who resides in or is an inmate of, or frequents or habitually resorts to any house of prostitution or of ill fame, or any other house or place commonly used as a house of prostitution or of ill fame, or as a house or place of resort for lewd persons for the purpose of prostitution or lewdness, or who, being male or female, do lewdly and lasciviously cohabit together, shall be permitted to register as a voter or to vote at any election in this state

See also, Constitution of Idaho, Art. 6, §5 which disqualifies from voting, inter alia, persons who are members of organizations which teach, advise. counsel, encourage or aid persons to enter into bigamy or polygamy.

15/ Louisiana Rev. Stat. Tit. 18 §31(3).

> [H]e shall be able to read and write. . . .

See also, Louisiana Rev. Stat. Tit. 18 §35.

16/ Constitution of Louisiana, Art. VIII, §1(c).

> He shall be of good character and shall understand the duties and obligations of citizenship under a republican form of government.

See also, Art. VIII, §§1(d), 18; Tit. 18 §§31(2), 36. In addition a requirement that an applicant "shall be able to understand and give a reasonable interpretation

of any section of [the Louisiana or United States Constitution]", and related provisions (Tit. 18) §§35,36) was enjoined by a federal court, United States v. Louisiana, 225 F. Supp. 353 (1963), affirmed by the Supreme Court March 8, 1965.

17/ Constitution of Louisiana, Art. VIII, §18.

> The Board [of Registrars] shall . . . issue a uniform, objective written test or examination for citizenship to determine that applicants . . . understand the duties and obligations of citizenship. . . .

See also, Tit. 18 §191(A).

18/ Louisiana Rev. Stat. Tit. 18 §31(2).

> He shall be of good moral character. . . .

19/ Louisiana Rev. Stat. Tit. 18 §31(5).

> No registrar or deputy registrar shall register any applicant . . . unless the applicant brings with him two qualified electors of the precinct in which he resides to sign written affidavits attesting to the truth of the facts set forth in the application form. . . .

20/ Constitution of Maine, Art. II, §1.

> No person shall have the right to vote. . . who shall not be able to read the Constitution in the English language, and write his name. . . .

See also, Tit. 21 §241, implementing this provision.

21/ Constitution of Massachusetts, Art. XX, §122.

> No person shall have the right to vote . . . who shall not be able to read the Constitution in the English language, and write his name. . . .

See also, Massachusetts Laws Ch. 51, §1 implementing this provision.

22/ Constitution of Mississippi, Art. 12, §244

> Every elector shall ... be able to read and write any section of the Constitution of this State and give a reasonable interpretation thereof to the county registrar. He shall demonstrate ... a reasonable understanding of the duties and obligations of citizenship under a constitutional form of government.

See also, Mississippi Code §§3209.6, 3213, implementing this provision.

23/ Constitution of Mississippi, Art. 12, §241-A.

> In addition ... such person shall be of good moral character.

See also, Mississippi Code §§3209.6, 3213, 3212.7 implementing this provision.

24/ New Hampshire Rev. Stat. §55:10.

> [An applicant shall be required] to write and to read in such manner as to show that he is not being assisted in so doing and is not reciting from memory.

See also, New Hampshire Rev. Stat. §§55.11, 55.12 implementing this provision.

25/ Constitution of New York, Art. 2, §1.

> [N]o person shall become entitled to vote ...unless such person is also able, except for physical disability, to read and write English.

See also, New York Election Code, §§150, 168 implementing this provision.

26/ Constitution of North Carolina, Art. VI §4.

> Every person presenting himself for registration shall be able to read and write any section of the Constitution in the English language.

See also, General Statutes of North Carolina, §163-28, implementing this provision.

27/ Oregon Rev. Stat. §247.131

> [N]o elector shall be registered unless he is able, except for physical disability, to read and write English.

28/ Constitution of South Carolina, Art. II §4(d).

> Any person . . . shall be registered: Provided, That he can both read and write any Section of this Constitution submitted to him. . . .

As an alternative to the reading and writing test, Art. II §4(d) provides:

> Any person . . . shall be registered: Provided, That he . . . has paid all taxes collectible during the previous year on, property in this State assessed at three hundred dollars ($300) or more.

See also, Code of South Carolina, §23-62, implementing these provisions.

29/ Code of Virginia §24.68.

> [The applicant must make application] in his own handwriting, without aids, suggestions, or memorandum. . . .

30/ Washington Revised Code §29.07.070(13).

> [An applicant must be] able to read and speak the English language so as to comprehend the meaning of ordinary English prose.

31/ Wyoming Statutes §§22-118.3.

The term "qualified elector" includes every male and female citizen of the United States who . . . shall be able to read the constitution of Wyoming.

A-3

STATES WHICH USE A TEST OR DEVICE AS DEFINED BY SECTION 3(b) OF THE PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

State	Voting Age Population 1/	Total Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
(Group A) 3/			
Alabama	1,915,000	689,818	36%
Alaska	138,000	67,259	49%
Georgia	2,636,000	1,139,352	43%
Louisiana	1,893,000	896,293	47%
Mississippi	1,243,000	409,146	33%
South Carolina	1,380,000	524,748	38%
Virginia	2,541,000	1,042,267	41%

1/ This is an estimate by the Bureau of Census as of November 1, 1964, taken from a memo issued by the Dept. of Commerce, dated Sept. 8, 1964, No. CB64-93.

2/ This column is based on figures supplied by official state sources to the Congressional Quarterly.

3/ States in which less than 50% of the voting age population voted in the Presidential election of 1964.

State	Voting Age Population	Total Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
(Group B) 4/			
Arizona	879,000	480,770	55%
California	10,916,000	7,057,586	65%
Connecticut	1,698,000	1,218,578	72%
Delaware	283,000	201,320	71%
Hawaii	395,000	207,271	52%
Idaho	386,000	292,477	76%
Maine	581,000	380,965	65%
Massachusetts	3,290,000	2,344,798	71%
New Hampshire	396,000	288,093	72%
New York	11,330,000	7,166,203	63%
North Carolina	2,753,000	1,424,983	52%
Oregon	1,130,000	785,289	69%
Washington	1,759,000	1,258,374	72%
Wyoming	195,000	142,716	73%

4/ States in which more than 50% of the voting age population voted in the Presidential election of 1964.

B-1

VOTING AGE POPULATION AND REGISTERED VOTERS CLASSIFIED BY RACE IN THOSE STATES WHERE USE OF TESTS AND DEVICES IS SUSPENDED BY THE PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

State	White Voting Age Population 1964 1/	White Registration 2/	%	Non-White Voting Age Population 1964 1/	Non-White Registration 2/	%
Alabama	1,413,270	935,695 3/	66.2	501,730	92,737 3/	18.5
Alaska	112,470	4/		25,530	4/	
Georgia	1,966,456	1,124,415 5/	57.2	669,544	167,663 5/	25.0
Louisiana	1,353,495	1,037,184 6/	76.6	539,505	164,601 6/	30.5
Mississippi	794,277	525,000 7/	66.1	448,723	28,500 7/	6.4
South Carolina	975,660	677,914 8/	69.5	404,340	138,544 8/	34.3
Virginia	2,060,751	1,133,702 9/	55.0	480,249	177,321 9/	36.9

FOOTNOTES

1/ The total voting age population for the respective states is taken from an estimate by the Bureau of Census as of November 1, 1964, in a memorandum issued by the Department of Commerce, dated September 8, 1964, number CB64-93. The voting age population for white and non-white in 1964 was computed by taking the voting age population statistics for white and non-white as reported in the Census of Population: 1960, determining the ratio of each group to the total voting age population in 1960, and applying that ratio to the total voting age population as estimated by the Bureau of Census for November 1, 1964.

2/ These statistics, excepting those for Virginia, are based on findings published in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Registration and Voting Statistics, March 19, 1965. They are not based on official state sources due to the lack of official state information regarding registration by race.

The registration data based on official state sources in the chart containing voting and registration statistics for all states (master chart) reflect registration as of a later date than the data published by the Commission. For this reason, the registration figures in this chart, when totalled, differ slightly from the registration figures in the master chart. The totals here are as follows: Alabama 1,028,432; Georgia 1,292,078; Louisiana 1,201,785; Mississippi 553,500; South Carolina 816,458; Virginia 1,311,023.

3/ U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Registration and Voting Statistics, March 19, 1965.

4/ Alaska does not have statewide registration.

5/ U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Registration and Voting Statistics, March 19, 1965.

6/ Ibid.

7/ Ibid.

8/ Ibid.

9/ Obtained from official state sources.

B-2(a)

DISCRIMINATORY USE OF "TESTS OR DEVICES" CHALLENGED
IN JUSTICE DEPARTMENT LITIGATION IN ALABAMA

	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice" of Discrimination		Tests and Devices Challenged			
County	Discrimination	Pattern & Practice	Read Write Understand Interpret [3(b)(1)]	Knowledge [3(b)(2)]	Good Moral Character [3(b)(3)]	Voucher [3(b)(4)]
Bullock (U.S. v. Alabama)	X	X	X	X		X
Choctaw (U.S. v. Ford)	X	X	X	X		X
Dallas (U.S. v. Atkins)	X	X	X	X	X	
Elmore (U.S. v. Strong 230 F. Supp. 873)	X	X	X	X		

County	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice" of Discrimination: Discrimination	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice" of Discrimination: Pattern & Practice	Tests and Devices Challenged: Read Write Understand Interpret [3(b)(1)]	Tests and Devices Challenged: Knowledge [3(b)(2)]	Tests and Devices Challenged: Good Moral Character [3(b)(3)]	Tests and Devices Challenged: Voucher [3(b)(4)]
Hale (U.S. v. Tutweiler)	1/	1/	X	X		
Jefferson (U.S. v. Bellsnyder)	2/	2/	X	X	X	
Macon (U.S. v. Alabama 3/	X	X	X	X		
Montgomery (U.S. v. Parker 212 F. Supp. 193)	X	X	X	X		
Perry (U.S. v. Mayton	X	X	X	X		4/
Sumter (U.S. v. Hines)	X	X	X	X		
Wilcox (U.S. v. Wall)	5/	5/	X	X		X
Statewide (U.S. v. Baggett)	6/	6/	X	X		

FOOTNOTES

1/ Complaint filed 12/16/63, not yet decided.

2/ Complaint filed 7/13/63, not yet decided.

3/ U. S. v. Alabama, 192 F. Supp. 677; aff'd 304 F. 2d 583; aff'd 371 U.S. 37.

4/ Issue in supplemental proceeding.

5/ Judgment for defendants, case now on appeal.

6/ Complaint filed 1/15/65, not yet decided.

B-2(b)

VOTING AGE POPULATION AND REGISTERED VOTERS CLASSIFIED BY RACE
IN THOSE ALABAMA COUNTIES IN WHICH RACIAL VOTING SUITS
HAVE BEEN BROUGHT UNDER 42 U.S.C. 1971(a)

County	% 1/	White Voting Age Population 1960	White Registration	%	Non-White Voting Age Population 1960	Non-White Registration	%
Bullock	38.5	2,387	2,631 (10/64)	110	4,450	1,386	31
Choctaw	31.7	5,192	3,697 (2/63)	71	3,982	176	4
Dallas	22.6	14,400	9,542 (8/64)	66	15,115	335	2.2
Elmore	43.7	12,510	12,022 (11/64)	96	4,808	592	12.3
Hale	25.5	3,600	3,674 (12/63)	100	6,000	200	3.3
Jefferson	37.3	256,319	134,939 (10/64)	52.6	116,160	27,013	23.2

1/ This is the percentage of those of voting age who voted in the Presidential election of 1964.

County	%	White Voting Age Population 1960	White Registration	%	Non-White Voting Age Population 1960	Non-White Registration	%
Macon	32.6	2,818	2,946 (10/64)	100	8,493	4,188	49
Montgomery	31.6	62,911	40,234 (11/64)	64	33,056	7,250	22
Perry	29.6	3,441	3,260 (8/64)	94	5,200	364	7
Sumter	20.8	3,061	3,297 (11/64)	107	6,814	358	5.2
Wilcox	22.3	2,647	2,974 (5/64)	100	6,085	0	0

B-3(a)

DISCRIMINATORY USE OF "TESTS OR DEVICES" CHALLENGED
IN JUSTICE DEPARTMENT LITIGATION IN LOUISIANA

	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice" or Discrimination		Tests and Devices Challenged			
Parish (County)	Discrimination	Pattern & Practice	Read Write Understand Interpret [3(b)(1)]	Knowledge [3(b)(2)]	Good Moral Character [3(b)(3)]	Voucher [3(b)(4)]
Bienville (U.S. v. Ass'n of Citizens Councils, 196 F. Supp. 908)	X	X	X			
East Carroll (U.S. v. Manning, 205 F. Supp. 172)	X	X				X
East Feliciana (U.S. v. Palmer)	1/	1/	X			

Parish (County)	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice of Discrimination"		Tests and Devices Challenged			
	Discrimination	Pattern & Practice	Read Write Understand Interpret [3(b)(1)]	Knowledge [3(b)(2)]	Good Moral Character [3(b)(3)]	Voucher [3(b)(4)]
Jackson (U.S. v. Wilder, 222 F. Supp. 749)	X	X	X	X		
Madison (U.S. v. Ward, 222 F. Supp. 617)	X	X		X 2/		
Ouachita (U.S. v. Lucky)	3/	3/	X			X
Plaquemines (U.S. v. Fox, 211 F. Supp. 25)	X	4/	X			
Red River (U.S. v. Crawford, 229 F. Supp. 898	X	X	X			

Parish(County)	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice" of Discrimination: Discrimination	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice" of Discrimination: Pattern & Practice	Tests and Devices Challenged: Read Write Understand Interpret [3(b)(1)]	Tests and Devices Challenged: Knowledge [3(b)(2)]	Tests and Devices Challenged: Good Moral Character [3(b)(3)]	Tests and Devices Challenged: Voucher [3(b)(4)]
St. Helena (U.S. v. Crouch)	5/	5/	X			
Washington (U.S. v. McElveen, 180 F. Supp. 10; aff'd 362 U.S. 58 (1961)	X	6/	X			
Webster (U.S. v. Clement, 231 F. Supp. 913)	X	X	X			
West Feliciana (U.S. v. Harvey)	7/	7/	X			X
U.S. v. Louisiana (225 F. Supp. 353) (Statewide) 8/	X	X	X	X		
U.S. v. Board of Registration (Statewide) 10/	9/	9/	X			

FOOTNOTES

1/ Complaint filed March 26, 1964, has not yet been decided.

2/ Decided against Government by district court, being urged on appeal.

3/ Case tried February 1964, has not yet been decided.

4/ No permanent injunction yet; pattern and practice issue to be decided on permanent injunction.

5/ Complaint filed October 22, 1963, has not yet been decided.

6/ Case decided prior to Civil Rights Act of 1960; no pattern or practice relief available at that time.

7/ Complaint filed October 29, 1963, has not yet been decided.

8/ In addition to the State, the defendants included the Parishes of:

Bienville	La Salle	Richland
Claiborne	Lincoln	St. Helena
De Soto	Morehouse	Union
East Carroll	Ouachita	Webster
East Feliciana	Plaquemines	West Carroll
Franklin	Rapides	West Feliciana
Jackson	Red River	Winn

9/ Complaint was filed on October 8, 1963, but the case has not yet been decided.

10/ In addition to the State Board of Registration, the defendants included the Parishes of:

Caddo	Tangipahoa
Madison	East Feliciana
Orleans	

VOTING AGE POPULATION AND REGISTERED VOTERS CLASSIFIED BY RACE
IN THOSE LOUISIANA PARISHES (COUNTIES) IN WHICH RACIAL
VOTING SUITS HAVE BEEN BROUGHT UNDER 42 U.S.C. 1971(a)

Parish	% 1/	White Voting Age Population 1960	White Registration	%	Non-White Voting Age Population 1960	Non-White Registration	%
Bienville	47.4	5,617	5,007 (10/64)	89	4,077	584	14
East Carroll	24.3	2,990	1,939 (10/64)	64	4,183	179	4.5
East Feliciana	18.1	4,200	2,728 (10/64)	65	4,102	180	4.4
Jackson	66.4	6,607	6,082 (10/64)	91	2,535	1,244	49
Madison	29.1	3,334	2,467 (10/64)	74	5,181	294	6
Ouachita	44.5	40,185	29,575 (10/64)	73	16,377	1,746	11

1/ This is the percentage of those of voting age who voted in the Presidential election of 1964.

Parish	%	White Voting Age Population 1960	White Registration	%	Non-White Voting Age Population 1960	Non-White Registration	%
Plaquemines	49.2	8,633	7,627 (10/64)	88	2,897	96	3.3
Red River	46.9	3,294	3,530 (10/64)	100	2,181	96	4.3
St Helena	45.5	2,363	2,059 (10/64)	86	2,082	560	27
Washington	51.9	16,804	15,795 (10/64)	94	6,821	1,634	23.9
Webster	43.6	15,713	12,002 (10/64)	77	7,045	803	11
West Feliciana	15.2	1,632	1,345 (10/64)	82	2,235	85	3

DISCRIMINATORY USE OF "TESTS OR DEVICES" CHALLENGED
IN JUSTICE DEPARTMENT LITIGATION IN MISSISSIPPI

	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice" or Discrimination		Tests and Devices Challenged			
County	Discrimination	Pattern & Practice	Read Write Understand Interpret [3(b)(1)]	Knowledge [3(b)(2)]	Good Moral Character [3(b)(3)]	Voucher [3(b)(4)]
Benton (U.S. v. Mathis)	X 1/	X 1/	X	X		
Chickasaw (U.S. v. Allen)	2/	2/	X	X		
Clarke (U.S. v. Ramsey, 331 F. 2d 824)	X	X 3/	X	X		
Copiah (U.S. v. Weeks)	4/	4/	X	X		
Forrest (U.S. v. Lynd, 301 F. 2d 818, 321 F. 2d 26)	X	5/	X	X		

County	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice" of Discrimination [ ]		Tests and Devices Challenged [ ]			
	Discrimination	Pattern & Practice	Read Write Understand Interpret [3(b)(1)]	Knowledge [3(b)(2)]	Good Moral Character [3(b)(3)]	Voucher [3(b)(4)]
George (U.S. v. Ward)	X	6/	X	X	X	
Hinds (U.S. v. Ashford)	7/	7/	X	X		
Holmes (U.S. v. McClellan)	8/	8/	X	X		
Issaquena (U.S. v. Vandevender)	9/	9/	X	X		
Jasper (U.S. v. Hosey)	10/	10/	X	X		
Jefferson Davis (U.S. v. Daniel)	11/	11/	X	X	X	
Jones County (U.S. v. Caves)	11A/	11A/	X	X		
Lauderdale (U.S. v. Coleman)	12/	12/	X	X		

County	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice" of Discrimination: Discrimination	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice" of Discrimination: Pattern & Practice	Tests and Devices Challenged: Read Write Understand Interpret [3(b)(1)]	Tests and Devices Challenged: Knowledge [3(b)(2)]	Tests and Devices Challenged: Good Moral Character [3(b)(3)]	Tests and Devices Challenged: Voucher [3(b)(4)]
Madison (U.S. v. L.F. Campbell)	13/	13/	X	X		
Marion (U.S. v. Miksell)	X	X	X	X		
Marshall (U.S. v. Clayton)	X 1/	X 1/	X	X		
Oktibbeha (U.S. v. Henry)	14/	14/	X	X		
Panola (U.S. v. Duke, 332 F. 2d 759)	X	X	X	X		
Sunflower (U.S. v. C.C. Campbell)	15/	15/	X	X		

County	Court Findings of Racial Discrimination and "Pattern or Practice" of Discrimination		Tests and Devices Challenged			
	Discrimination	Pattern & Practice	Read Write Understand Interpret [3(b)(1)]	Knowledge [3(b)(2)]	Good Moral Character [3(b)(3)]	Voucher [3(b)(4)]
Tallahatchie (U.S. v. Cox)	X	X	X	X		
Walthall (U.S. v. Mississippi, 339 F. 2d 679)	X	X	X	X		
Statewide (U.S. v. Mississippi, 229 F. Supp. 925	16/	16/	X	X	X	

FOOTNOTES

1/ Defendants have admitted a pattern and practice of discrimination.

2/ Complaint filed 9/3/64, not yet decided

3/ The Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit held that the trial court was clearly erroneous in finding that there had been no pattern and practice of discrimination.

4/ Complaint filed 12/17/63, not yet decided.

5/ Judgment for defendants, appeal being considered.

6/ Judgment for defendants, case on appeal.

7/ Complaint filed 7/13/63, not yet decided.

8/ Case tried in November, 1964, not yet decided.

9/ Complaint filed in January, 1965, not yet decided.

10/ Complaint filed 9/3/64, not yet decided.

11/ Case tried February, 1965, not yet decided.

11A/ Complaint filed 2/19/65, not yet decided.

12/ Complaint filed 12/17/63, not yet decided.

13/ Case tried August, 1964, not yet decided.

14/ Complaint filed 12/16/63, not yet decided.

15/ Case tried October, 1964, not yet decided.

16/ Complaint dismissed, but Supreme Court remanded case for trial. In addition to the state, the registrars of the following counties are also defendants: Amite, Coahoma, Claiborne, Lowndes, LeFlore and Pike.

B-4(b)

VOTING AGE POPULATION AND REGISTERED VOTERS CLASSIFIED BY RACE
IN THOSE MISSISSIPPI COUNTIES IN WHICH RACIAL VOTING SUITS
HAVE BEEN BROUGHT UNDER 42 U.S.C. 1971(a)

County	% 1/	White Voting Age Population 1960	White Registration	%	Non-White Voting Age Population 1960	Non-White Registration	%
Benton	30	2,514	2,266 (9/64)	92	1,419	55	3.0
Chickasaw	36	6,388	4,607 (8/64)	72	3,054	1	.03
Clarke	42	6,072	4,829 (9/64)	80	2,998	64	2.2
Copiah	33	8,153	8,047 (10/64)	98.6	6,407	34	.5
Forrest	35	22,431	13,253 (6/64)	59	7,495	236	3.14

1/ This is the percentage of those of voting age who voted in the Presidential election of 1964.

County	%	White Voting Age Population 1960	White Registration	%	Non-White Voting Age Population 1960	Non-White Registration	%
George	52	5,276	4,200 (4/64)	79	580	14	2.4
Hinds	40	67,836	62,410 (10/64)	92	36,183	5,616	15.5
Holmes	24	4,733	4,800 (8/64)	100	8,757	20	.23
Issaquena	28	640	640 (3/65)	100	1,081	12	1.1
Jasper	36	5,327	4,200 (9/64)	79	3,675	8	.22
Jefferson Davis	38	3,629	3,236 (12/64)	89	3,222	126	3.9
Jones	42	25,943	22,000(Est) (9/63)	85	7,427	700-800 (Est.)	10
Lauderdale	37	27,200	20,000 (9/64)	74	11,924	1,700	14.3
Madison	22	5,622	6,256 (7/64)	100	10,366	218	2.0

County	%	White Voting Age Population 1960	White Registration	%	Non-White Voting Age Population 1960	Non-White Registration	%
Marion	47	8,997	10,123 (7/63)	100	3,630	383	11.0
Marshall	23	4,342	4,229 (12/64)	97	7,168	177	2.5
Oktibbeha	31	8,423	8,000 (12/63)	95	4,952	128	2.6
Panola	30	7,639	5,922 (11/64)	77	7,250	878	12.0
Sunflower	20	8,785	7,082 (10/64)	80	13,524	185	1.4
Tallahatchie	29	5,099	4,464 (11/64)	88	6,481	17	.26
Walthall	45	4,736	4,736 (11/63)	100	2,490	4	.12

STATUTES IN EFFECT WITHIN THE PAST 10 YEARS REQUIRING SEGREGATED FACILITIES IN THOSE STATES WHICH USE A TEST OR DEVICE AS DEFINED BY SECTION 3(b) OF THE PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

State (Group A) 1/	Travel	Recreation	Schools	Hospitals
Alabama	X		X	X
Alaska				
Georgia	X	X	X	X
Louisiana	X	X	X	X
Mississippi	X	X	X	X
South Carolina	X	X	X	
Virginia	X	X	X	X

1/ States in which less than 50% of the voting age population voted in the Presidential election of 1964.

State (Group B) 2/	Travel	Recreation	Schools	Hospitals
Arizona				
California				
Connecticut				
Delaware			X	X
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Maine				
Massachusetts				
New Hampshire				
New York				
North Carolina	X		X	X
Oregon				
Washington				
Wyoming				

2/ States in which more than 50% of the voting age population voted in the Presidential election of 1964.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Alabama

Travel: Ala. Code Ann. (1940), Title 48 (1958 Recomp.) §186 (declared unconstitutional in Baldwin v. Morgan, 287 F. 2d 750 (C.A. 5, 1961) (1964 Supp.); §§196-197; §§301 (31a) - (31c) (declared unconstitutional in Browder v. Gayle, 142 F. Supp. 707 (M.D. Ala. 1956)) (1964 Supp.); §464.

Schools: Ala. Const. Article XIV, Sec. 256 (amended, Amendment CXI, adopted Sept. 7, 1956); Ala. Code Ann. (1940) Title 52 (1960 Recomp.) §§56, 93 (both repealed, Acts 1957, p. 487 §11, amending Acts 1955 p. 495 §10). See also Ibid., §438, §443, §§452-455, §466, §§613(1)-613(15).

Hospitals: Ala. Code Ann. (1940) Title 45 (1960 Recomp.) §4, §248. See also Title 46 (1958 Recomp.) §189(19).

Georgia

Travel: Code of Georgia Ann., Title 18 (1936) §§205-210, §§223-224 (1963 Supp.), §606, §§9901-9902, §§9904-9906, §§9918-9919 (1963 Supp.); Title 68 (1957) §513, §616.

Recreation: Code of Georgia Ann. Title 84 (1955) §§1603-1604.

Schools: Georgia Constitution (1948) Art. VIII §1 (6576) (declared unconstitutional in Holmes v. Danner, 191 Fed. Supp. 385 (M.D. Ga. 1960) (1963 Supp). See also Art. VII, §2-5404 (1963 Supp.). Code of Georgia Ann., Title 32 (1952) §909, §937 (superseded by Acts 1961, pp. 35-38) (1963 Supp.). See also Title 52 (1952) §123.

Hospitals: Code of Georgia Ann., Title 35 (1962) §225, §308.

Louisiana

Travel: La. Rev. Stats. Ann. (1951) §§45: 194-196 (repealed by Acts 1958, No. 261, Sec. 1); §§45: 522-534; §§45: 1301-1305.

Recreation: La. Rev. Stats. Ann. (1951) §4:5; §§4:451-454 (1964 Supp.).

Schools: La. Const. Art. XII, Sec. 1 (1955) (amended Acts 1958 No. 557, adopted Nov. 4, 1958); La. Rev. Stats (1963 Recomp.) §§17:331-334 (declared unconstitutional in Bush v. Orleans Parish School Board, 188 F. Supp. 916 (E.D. La. 1960) affirmed 365 U.S. 569; repealed, Acts 1960, 1st Ex. Sess., No. 9 §1); §§17: 341-344 (declared unconstitutional in Bush v. Orleans Parish School Board, supra; repealed, Acts 1960, 1st Ex-Sess., No. 3 §1). See also §§17:336-337 (repealed Acts 1960, 1st Ex. Sess., No. 8).

Hospitals: La. Rev. Stats. Ann. (1951) §46:181.

Mississippi

Travel: Miss. Code Ann., §7784-7787, 7787.5 (1956 Supp.).

Recreation: Miss. Code Ann., §4065.3 (1956 Supp.); Miss. H.B. 1958, No. 1134.

Schools: Miss. Code Ann. §4065.3, 6220.5, 6334-01 et seq. (1956 Supp.).

Hospitals: Miss. Code Ann. §§6883, 6927, 6973, 6974 (1952).

South Carolina

Travel: S. C. Code Ann., Title 58, §§714-720 (1952).

Recreation: S. C. Code Ann., Title 51, §2.4 (1962).

Schools: S. C. Code Ann., Title 21, §751 (1962).

Virginia

Travel: Va. Code Ann., §56-325-330, 390-404 (1950), declared unconstitutional as applied to interstate travel in Morgan v. Virginia, 328 U.S. 373 (1946) but declared valid as applied to intrastate travel in New v. Atlantic Greyhound, 186 Va. 726 (1947).

Recreation: Va. Code Ann., §18-356-357, declared unconstitutional in Brown v. Richmond, 204 Va. 471 (1963).

Schools: Va. Code §22-188.3-6; §22-188.30-31; §22-188.41 et seq. (1958 Supp.), §37.5-6 (1950), declared unconstitutional in Harrison v. Day, 200 Va. 439 (1959). See also, James v. Almond, 170 F. Supp 331 (E.D. Va. 1959), later repealed by Acts 1959, Ex. Sess., c. 74-77.

Hospitals: Va. Code §§37-5 to 6 (1964 Supp.).

Delaware

Schools: Del. Code Ann., Title 14 §141, declared unconstitutional in Evans v. Buchanan, 256 F. 2d 688 (1958), cert. denied 358 U.S. 836.

Hospitals: Del. Code Ann., Title 16 §155, repealed by 51 Del. Laws. Ch. 136 (1957).

North Carolina

Travel: N. C. Gen. Stats., §60-94 to 98, 135-137, repealed by N. C. Sess. Laws of 1963, c. 1165 s. 1 (1964).

Schools: N. C. Gen. Stats., §115-274 (1960): N.C. Gen. Stats., §115-176 et seq. (1960).

Hospitals: N. C. Gen. Stats. §122-3 (1957 Supp.), amended by N. C. Sess. Laws of 1963 c. 451 (1963).

STATE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LAWS IN FORCE IN THOSE STATES
WHICH USE A TEST OR DEVICE AS DEFINED BY SECTION 3(b)
OF THE PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

State (Group A) 1/	Education	Public Accommodations	Employment	Housing		
				Public	Publicly Assisted	Private
Alabama						
Alaska	X	X	X	X	X	X
Georgia						
Louisiana						
Mississippi						
South Carolina						
Virginia						

1/ States in which less than 50% of the voting age population voted in the Presidential election of 1964.

State (Group 5) 2/	Education	Public Accommodations	Employment	Housing		
				Public	Publicly Assisted	Private
Arizona						
California		X	X	X	X	
Connecticut	X	X	X	X	X	X
Delaware		X	X			
Hawaii			X			
Idaho	X	X	X			
Maine		X				
Massachusetts	X	X	X	X	X	
New Hampshire		X		X	X	X
New York	X	X	X	X	X	
North Carolina						
Oregon	X	X	X	X	X	X
Washington		X	X	X	X	
Wyoming		X				

2/ States in which more than 50% of the voting age population voted in the Presidential election of 1964.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Alaska

Public accommodations and public and private housing: Alaska Stat. Ann., secs. 11.60.230-11.60.240 (1962)

Employment: Alaska Stat. Ann., sec. 23.10.200 (1962)

Education: Alaska Stat. Ann., sec. 14.40.050 (1962)

California

Public accommodations: Cal. Civ. Code, sec. 51 (1964 Cum. Pocket Supp.)

Employment: Cal. Lab. Code, sec. 1412 (1964 Cum. Pocket Supp.)

Public and publicly assisted housing: Cal. Health and Safety Code, sec. 35700 (1964 Cum. Pocket Supp.)

Connecticut

Public accommodations and public and private housing: Conn. Gen. Stat. Rev., sec. 53-35 (1963 Cum. Pocket Supp.)

Employment: Conn. Gen. Stat. Rev., sec. 34-126 (1963 Cum. Pocket Supp.)

Education: Conn. Gen. Stat. Rev., sec. 10-15 (1958)

Delaware

Employment: Del. Code Ann., sec. 19-710 (1964 Cum. Pocket Supp.)

Public accommodations: Del. Code Ann., Tit. 6, c. 45 (1963)

Hawaii

Employment: Hawaii Rev. Laws, ch. 90A, sec. 1 (1963 Supp.)

Idaho

Public accommodations and employment: Idaho Sess. Laws, ch. 309 (1961)

Education: Idaho Const., art. 9, sec. 6

Maine

Public accommodations: Me. Rev. Stat. Ann., ch. 137, sec. 50 (1954)

Massachusetts

Public accommodations: Mass. Ann. Laws, ch. 272, secs. 92A, 98 (1956)

Employment and housing: Mass. Ann. Laws, ch. 151 B, secs. 1-10 (1964 Cum. Pocket Supp.)

Education: Mass. Ann. Laws, ch. 151 C, secs. 1-5 (1957)

New Hampshire

Public accommodations and public and private housing (rental): N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann., ch. 354 (1963 Supp.)

New York

Public accommodations and education: N.Y. Civ. Rights Law, sec. 40

Employment: N.Y. Executive Law, sec. 296

Housing: N.Y. Executive Law, sec. 291

Oregon

Public accommodations: Ore. Rev. Stat., secs. 30.670, 659.010 (1959)

Employment and housing: Ore. Rev. Stat., sec. 659.010 (1959)

Education: Ore. Rev. Stat., sec. 345.240 (1959), proscribes discrimination in "vocational, professional or trade schools."

Washington

Public accommodations: Wash. Rev. Code Ann., secs. 49.60.030, 49.60.215 (1965)

Employment: Wash. Rev. Code Ann., secs. 49.60.030, 49.60.180, 49.60.190, 49.60.200, 49.60.210 (1965)

Housing: Wash. Rev. Code Ann., secs. 49.60.030, 49.60.217 (1965)

Wyoming

Public accommodations: Wyo. Stat. Ann., sec. 6-83.1 (1963 Cum. Supp.)

STATE VOTING QUALIFICATIONS UNAFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965
IN STATES AND SEPARATE COUNTIES WHERE USE OF TESTS AND DEVICES WOULD BE SUSPENDED

	Age	Resi dence	Oath or Affir- mation	Poll Tax	Citizen- ship	No Con- viction of Crime	No Mental Disability
Alabama	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Alaska	X	X	X		X	X	X
Arizona (Apache Co.)	X	X	X		X	X	X
Georgia	X	X	X		X	X	X
Idaho (Elmore Co.)	X	X	X		X	X	X
Louisiana	X	X	X		X	X	X
Maine (Arostook Co.)	X	X	X		X	X	X
Mississippi	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
North Carolina (34 Counties)	X	X	X		X	X	X
South Carolina	X	X	X		X	X	X
Virginia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. Alabama - Code of Alabama Tit. 17 §12 (age, residence, poll tax, citizenship); Tit. 17 §15 (no conviction of crime, no mental disability); Order of January 14, 1964, as amended, August 26, 1964, by the Supreme Court of Alabama Prescribing a New Application Form to be used by the Board of Registrars Throughout the State (residence, citizenship, oath, no mental disability).

2. Alaska - Alaska Statutes §15.0510 (age, residence, citizenship), §15.05.040 (no mental disability); §15.05.030 (no conviction of crime); §§15.15.210 to 15.15.220 (oath or affirmation). See also, Constitution of Alaska, Art. V, §§1, 2 (age, residence, citizenship, no crime, no mental disability).

3. Arizona - Arizona Revised Statutes §16-101 (age, residence, no conviction of crime, no mental disability, citizenship); §16-143 et seq. (oath or affirmation). See also, Constitution of Arizona, Art. 7 §2 (age, residence, citizenship, no conviction of crime, no mental disability).

4. Georgia - Georgia Code §34-602 (age, residence, citizenship); §§34-609, 621 (oath or affirmation, no conviction of crime); §34-621 (no mental disability).

5. Idaho - Idaho Code, Tit. 34 §401 (age, residence, citizenship); Tit. 34, §402 (no conviction of crime, no mental disability); Tit. 34, §409 (oath or affirmation). See also, Constitution of Idaho Art. 6, §§2, 3 (citizenship, age, residence, no mental disability, no conviction of crime).

6. Louisiana - Louisiana Rev. Stat. Tit. 18. 18, §31 (age, residence, citizenship); Tit. 18, §32 (oath or affirmation); Tit. 18, §42 (no conviction of crime). See also Constitution of Louisiana, Art. 8, §6.

7. Maine - Constitution of Maine, Art. II, §1 (age, residence, no mental disability, citizenship); Art. IX, §13 (no conviction of crime); Maine Rev. Stat. Ann. Tit. 21 §101 (oath or affirmation).

8. Mississippi - Constitution of Mississippi, Art. 12, §240 (age, residence, no mental disability, citizenship); Art. 12 §241 (oath or affirmation) Mississippi Code §3214 (no conviction of crime); Senate Bill No. 1783, Miss. Laws 1964 (poll tax, declared unconstitutional in Gray v. Johnson, 234 F. Supp. 743 (S.D. Miss. 1964)) for federal offices.

9. North Carolina - Constitution of North Carolina, Art. VI, §1 (age, citizenship); Art. VI, §2 (residence, no conviction of crime); General Statutes of North Carolina, Vol. 3D, §§163-24 (no mental disability); 163-29 (oath or affirmation). See also §§163-24 and 163-25, implementing constitutional provisions.

10. South Carolina - Constitution of South Carolina, Art. 2, §3 (citizenship, age); Art. 2, §4 (residence); Art. 2, §6 (no conviction of crime, no mental disability); Code of South Carolina, §23-68 (oath or affirmation). See also, Code of South Carolina §§23-62 et seq. Implementing constitutional provisions.

11. Virginia - Constitution of Virginia, Art. II, §18 (age, residence, citizenship); Art. II, §23 (poll tax, challenged in Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections, prob. jurisd. noted, 33 U.S.L.W. 3295); Art. II, §23 (no conviction of crime, no mental disability). See also, Code of Virginia, §§24-17 to 24-23 implementing these provisions.

E

VOTING STATISTICS BY COUNTIES FOR STATES HAVING "TESTS OR DEVICES" WHICH ARE NOT SUSPENDED ON A STATEWIDE BASIS BY THE PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

E-1

ARIZONA

County	Voting Age Population 1 /	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2 /	Percentage of Population
Apache 3 /	13,045	3,892	29.8
Cochise	30,913	16,697	54.0
Coconino	21,108	11,037	52.3
Gila	14,164	10,537	74.4
Graham	7,126	5,438	76.3
Greenlee	5,951	4,279	71.9
Maricopa	380,637	265,326	69.7
Mohave	4,592	4,353	94.8
Navajo	17,647	9,649	54.7
Pima	153,736	102,144	66.4
Pinal	32,294	16,872	52.2
Santa Cruz	5,973	3,460	57.9
Yavapai	18,210	13,550	74.4
Yuma	26,286	14,410	54.8

1 / Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 4, Table 27, pp. 38-41.

2 / Report of the Secretary of State for the State of Arizona on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D.C.

3 / County in which less than 50% of the voting age population voted in the 1964 presidential election.

E-2

CALIFORNIA

County	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
Alameda	569,183	427,340	75.1
Alpine	228	220	96.5
Amador	5,891	5,100	86.6
Butte	51,235	40,419	78.9
Calaveras	6,714	5,397	80.4
Colusa	7,304	4,606	63.1
Contra Costa	232,243	178,245	76.7
Del Norte	9,972	5,727	57.4
El Dorado	18,330	14,610	79.7
Fresno	208,646	136,308	65.3
Glenn	10,399	7,290	70.1
Humboldt	60,036	38,499	64.1
Imperial	41,215	21,492	52.1
Inyo	7,402	5,919	80.0
Kern	163,963	109,608	66.8
Kings	27,677	18,846	68.1

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 6, Table 27, pp. 179-194.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of California on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.

CALIFORNIA (Con't)

County	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Lake	9,622	8,302	86.3
Lassen	8,206	6,201	75.6
Los Angeles	3,830,926	2,730,898	71.3
Madera	22,729	13,862	61.0
Marin	91,574	75,364	82.3
Mariposa	3,512	2,968	84.5
Mendocino	30,952	18,227	58.9
Merced	50,282	28,269	56.2
Modoc	4,998	3,358	67.2
Mono	1,498	1,516	101.2
Monterey	116,686	64,672	55.4
Napa	43,244	31,210	72.2
Nevada	13,741	11,318	82.4
Orange	400,046	401,157	100.3
Placer	36,196	27,676	76.5
Plumas	7,149	5,713	79.9
Riverside	185,468	144,788	76.4
Sacramento	297,301	227,871	76.6
San Benito	9,073	6,237	68.7
San Bernardino	297,092	215,400	72.5

CALIFORNIA (Con't)

County	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
San Diego	601,616	426,286	70.9
San Francisco	531,774	323,908	60.9
San Joaquin	152,042	95,839	63.0
San Luis Obispo	50,831	37,186	73.2
San Mateo	270,895	219,191	80.9
Santa Barbara	103,084	86,401	83.8
Santa Clara	371,064	320,527	86.4
Santa Cruz	56,635	45,644	80.6
Shasta	34,846	28,350	81.4
Sierra	1,437	1,241	86.3
Siskiyou	20,413	14,335	70.2
Solano	79.132	50,245	63.5
Sonoma	91,136	72,136	79.2
Stanislaus	94,311	65,128	69.1
Sutter	19,391	14,044	72.4
Tehama	15,103	11,467	75.9
Trinity	5,818	3,439	59.1
Tulare	95,540	56,552	59.2
Tuolumne	9,464	7,820	82.6
Ventura	116,970	98,238	84.0
Yolo	38,568	26,274	68.1
Yuba	19,374	11,739	60.6

E-3

CONNECTICUT

County	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
Fairfield	414,664	320,358	77.3%
Hartford	433,144	328,882	75.9%
Litchfield	75,173	61,006	81.2%
Middlesex	56,229	45,134	80.3%
New Haven	417,135	316,399	75.9%
New London	112,641	78,942	64.4%
Tolland	39,592	32,146	81.2%
Windham	42,883	34,318	80.0%

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 8, Table 27, pp. 65-66.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of Connecticut on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.

E-4

DELAWARE

County	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
Kent	38,234	22,054	57.7
New Castle	185,128	146,893	79.3
Sussex	43,887	32,373	73.8

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 9, Table 27, p. 32.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of Delaware on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.

E-5

HAWAII

County	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
Hawaii	34,594	24,973	72.2
Honolulu (Oahu)	284,901	155,395	54.5
Kauzi	16,351	10,634	65.3
Maui	24,070	16,219	67.4

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 13, Table 27, pp. 36-37.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of Hawaii on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.

E-6

IDAHO

County	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
Ada	53,996	45,043	83.4
Adams	1,793	1,439	80.3
Bannock	26,303	21,308	81.0
Bear Lake	3,823	3,266	85.4
Benewah	3,637	2,777	76.4
Bingham	14,310	10,595	74.0
Blaine	2,806	2,454	87.5
Boise	957	863	90.2
Bonner	9,167	7,303	79.7
Bonneville	24,288	20,373	83.9
Boundary	3,323	2,483	76.8
Butte	1,838	1,493	81.2
Camas	529	574	108.5
Canyon	33,338	24,067	72.2
Caribou	3,068	2,725	88.8
Cassia	8,297	6,620	79.7

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 14, Table 27, pp. 49-59.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of Idaho on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.

IDAHO (Con't)

County	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Clark	489	448	91.6
Clearwater	5,104	3,213	63.0
Custer	1,682	1,434	85.3
Elmore 3/	8,909	4,167	46.8
Franklin	4,317	3,983	92.3
Fremont	4,509	3,915	86.8
Gem	5,135	5,307	103.3
Gooding	5,530	4,375	79.1
Idaho	7,541	5,168	68.5
Jefferson	5,730	4,811	84.0
Jerome	6,320	4,941	78.2
Kootenai	17,638	14,347	81.3
Latah	12,325	8,724	70.8
Lemhi	3,374	2,563	76.0
Lewis	2,601	2,054	79.0
Lincoln	2,066	1,586	76.8
Madison	4,512	4,050	90.0

3/ County in which less than 50% of the voting age population voted in the 1964 presidential election.

IDAHO (Con't)

County	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Minidoka	7,324	5,938	81.1
Nez Perce	15,945	13,147	82.5
Oneida	1,982	1,812	91.4
Owyhee	3,618	2,392	66.1
Payette	7,331	5,267	71.8
Power	2,214	2,127	96.1
Shoshone	11,967	8,079	67.5
Teton	1,290	1,273	98.7
Twin Falls	24,196	19,156	79.2
Valley	2,127	2,106	99.0
Washington	5,055	3,682	72.8

E-7

MAINE

County	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
Androscoggin	52,737	37,521	71.1
Aroostook 3/	55,787	27,546	49.4
Cumberland	112,100	73,209	65.1
Franklin	11,842	8,671	73.2
Hancock	20,291	13,719	67.6
Kennebec	54,406	36,120	66.4
Knox	18,418	11,426	62.0
Lincoln	11,736	9,083	77.4
Oxford	26,486	18,956	71.6
Penobscott	73,715	43,215	58.6
Piscataquis	10,640	7,254	68.2
Sagadahoc	13,934	9,739	69.9
Somerset	23,809	15,235	64.0
Waldo	13,349	8,721	65.3
Washington	20,560	13,128	63.9
York	61,045	47,422	77.7

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 21, Table 27, pp. 56-59.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of Maine on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.

3/ County in which less than 50% of the voting age population voted in the 1964 presidential election.

E-8

MASSACHUSETTS

County	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 1/ 2/	Percentage of Population
Barnstable	44,244	35,355	79.9
Berkshire	88,834	64,331	72.4
Bristol	254,693	186,657	73.3
Dukes	3,869	3,214	83.1
Essex	361,671	282,945	78.2
Franklin	34,280	25,624	74.7
Hampden	268,284	178,219	66.4
Hampshire	62,624	43,645	69.7
Middlesex	770,246	576,810	74.9
Nantucket	2,424	1,787	73.7
Norfolk	313,071	256,012	81.8
Plymouth	151,138	120,335	79.6
Suffolk	522,395	298,254	57.1
Worcester	367,293	273,331	74.4

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 23, Table 27, pp. 103-106.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of Massachusetts on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D.C.

E-9

NEW HAMPSHIRE

County	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
Belknap	18,019	13,932	77.3%
Carroll	10,232	9,015	88.1%
Cheshire	26,685	19,584	73.4%
Coos	22,410	16,819	75.1%
Grafton	29,305	21,027	71.8%
Hillsborough	110,431	89,739	81.3%
Merrimac	43,048	32,382	75.2%
Rockingham	59,557	46,754	78.5%
Stafford	35,849	26,079	72.7%
Sullivan	17,189	12,762	74.2%

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 31, Table 27, pp. 39-41.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of New Hampshire on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D.C.

E-10

NEW YORK

County	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
Albany	174,414	149,926	86.0
Allegany	25,264	18,365	72.7
Bronx	965,315	555,309	57.5
Broome	132,408	92,254	69.7
Cattaraugus	48,299	33,514	69.4
Cayuga	45,196	36,218	80.1
Chautauqua	90,925	62,937	69.2
Chemung	59,614	41,773	70.1
Chenango	25,743	19,276	74.9
Clinton	41,713	24,914	59.7
Columbia	30,401	24,126	79.4
Cortland	24,233	17,577	72.5
Delaware	26,445	20,442	77.3
Dutchess	116,036	80,995	69.8
Erie	660,623	477,528	72.3
Essex	21,075	17,023	80.8
Franklin	25,951	17,673	68.1

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 34, Table 27, pp. 155-173.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of New York on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D.C. These figures include ballots which were spoiled.

NEW YORK (Cont'd)

County	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Fulton	33,011	23,685	71.7
Genesee	32,245	24,398	75.7
Greene	20,188	18,204	90.2
Hamilton	2,703	2,958	109.4
Herkimer	41,465	30,986	74.7
Jefferson	53,111	36,638	69.0
Kings	1,745,408	941,567	53.9
Lewis	13,054	10,043	76.9
Livingston	26,598	21,022	79.0
Madison	31,140	23,606	75.8
Monroe	369,189	290,326	78.6
Montgomery	37,990	28,463	74.9
Nassau	765,494	640,721	83.7
New York	1,257,867	645,557	51.3
Niagara	144,912	97,280	67.1
Oneida	164,395	115,354	70.2
Onondaga	258,516	194,538	75.3
Ontario	41,599	31,359	75.4
Orange	116,324	80,106	68.9
Orleans	20,872	15,177	72.7
Oswego	50,021	37,831	75.6
Otsego	31,953	24,287	76.0

NEW YORK (Cont'd)

County	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Putnam	19,748	22,205	112.4
Queens	1,240,073	838,769	67.6
Rensselner	88,542	72,983	82.4
Richmond	137,461	95,028	69.1
Rockland	83,365	73,424	88.1
St. Lawrence	62,555	42,421	67.8
Saratoga	53,805	43,553	80.9
Schenectady	99,183	74,980	75.6
Schoharie	13,831	11,615	84.0
Schuyler	8,851	7,414	83.8
Seneca	20,232	13,591	67.2
Steuben	58,795	41,274	70.2
Suffolk	399,989	330,015	82.5
Sullivan	29,177	25,441	87.2
Tioga	21,754	17,847	82.0
Tompkins	38,397	25,666	66.8
Ulster	75,551	60,423	80.0
Warren	27,256	21,064	77.3
Washington	29,152	22,450	77.0

NEW YORK (Cont'd)

County	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Wayne	41,831	29,765	71.2
Westchester	526,518	399,626	75.9
Wyoming	21,477	15,214	70.8
Yates	11,339	8,862	78.2

E-11

NORTH CAROLINA

County (Group A) 3 /	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2 /	Percentage of Population
Anson	13,065	5865	44.9
Beaufort	19,933	9685	48.6
Bertie	12,417	4263	34.3
Bladen	14,320	6685	46.7
Camden	3,042	1404	46.2
Caswell	10,155	4306	42.4
Chowan	6,332	2483	39.2
Craven	31,236	12,113	38.8
Cumberland	77,068	22,957	29.8
Edgecombe	27,845	11,766	42.3
Franklin	15,396	6,651	43.2
Gates	5,058	2,258	44.6
Granville	18,580	7,220	38.9
Greene	8,061	3,613	44.9
Halifax	30,262	13,709	45.3
Hertford	11,708	4,947	42.3
Hoke	7,745	3,033	39.2
Hyde	3,301	1,641	49.7

1 / Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 35, Table 27, pp. 98-122

2 / Report of the Secretary of State for the State of North Carolina on file at the Governmental Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.

3 / Counties in which less than 50% of the voting age population voted in the 1964 presidential election.

NORTH CAROLINA (Con't)

County (Group A)	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Lenoir	29,553	13,234	44.7
Martin	13,735	6,332	46.1
Nash	32,334	15,559	48.1
Northampton	13,482	6,233	46.2
Onslow	39,003	9,726	24.9
Pasquotank	14,345	6,649	46.4
Perquimans	5,110	2,399	46.9
Person	14,221	6,902	48.5
Pitt	36,196	16,466	45.5
Robeson	42,275	17,387	41.1
Scotland	12,498	5,073	40.6
Union	24,467	11,437	46.7
Vance	17,525	8,638	49.3
Warren	9,929	4,758	47.9
Wayne	45,103	17,346	38.5
Wilson	31,336	12,240	39.1

NORTH CAROLINA (Con't)

County (Group B) 4/	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Alamace	50,184	30,574	60.9
Alexander	8,876	7,482	84.3
Alleghany	4,707	3,941	83.7
Ashe	11,391	9,156	80.4
Avery	6,631	4,161	62.8
Brunswick	10,772	7,961	73.9
Buncombe	80,759	50,995	63.1
Burke	31,427	22,896	72.9
Cabarras	40,545	25,099	61.9
Caldwell	27,243	19,579	71.9
Carteret	17,962	10,520	58.6
Catawba	41,838	32,930	78.7
Chatham	15,253	9,406	61.7
Cherokee	9,328	6,929	74.3
Clay	3,149	2,743	87.1
Cleveland	36,830	18,710	50.8
Columbus	25,212	13,475	53.4

4/ Counties in which more than 50% of the voting age population voted in the 1964 presidential election.

NORTH CAROLINA (Con't)

County (Group B)	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Currituck	3,921	2,196	56.0
Dare	3,704	2,343	63.3
Davidson	45,953	31,027	67.5
Davie	9,978	7,546	75.6
Duplin	21,432	10,990	51.3
Durham	66,573	38,138	57.3
Forsyth	112,171	61,891	55.2
Gaston	72,519	37,326	51.5
Graham	3,449	3,135	90.9
Guilford	144,040	75,604	52.5
Harnett	26,211	13,360	51.0
Haywood	23,555	16,239	69.0
Henderson	22,232	14,846	66.8
Iredell	36,611	24,123	65.9
Jackson	10,068	8,088	80.3
Johnston	34,654	17,849	51.5
Jones	5,499	2,905	52.8
Lee	14,844	7,483	50.4
Lincoln	16,439	13,173	80.1

NORTH CAROLINA (Con't)

County (Group B)	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
McDowell	15,448	10,488	67.9
Macon	8,753	6,674	76.2
Madison	9,649	7,165	74.3
Mecklenburg	157,937	96,171	60.9
Mitchell	8,006	4,999	62.4
Montgomery	10,194	7,318	71.8
Moore	20,536	11,546	56.2
New Hanover	42,210	24,724	58.6
Orange	24,363	14,991	61.5
Pamlico	5,301	2,900	54.7
Pender	9,716	5,166	53.2

NORTH CAROLINA (Con't)

County (Group B)	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Polk	6,870	5,782	84.2
Randolph	36,068	24,377	67.6
Richmond	21,533	11,639	54.1
Rockingham	40,836	20,495-	50.2
Rowan	50,075	29,738	59.4
Rutherford	26,592	16,656	62.6
Sampson	25,581	15,701	61.4
Stanly	24,220	16,855	69.6
Stokes	12,811	9,562	74.6
Surry	28,219	17,780	63.0
Swain	4,634	3,828	82.6
Transylvania	9,092	8,030	88.3
Tyrrell	2,446	1,370	56.0
Wake	99,655	54,195	54.4
Washington	7,008	3,649	52.1
Watauga	9,765	7,963	81.5
Wilkes	25,223	20,190	80.0
Yadkin	13,615	9,498	69.8
Yancey	7,932	5,718	72.1

E-12

OREGON

County	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
Baker	10,509	6,585	62.70
Benton	22,093	16,486	74.60
Clackamas	67,145	57,043	84.90
Clatsop	17,662	12,393	70.10
Columbia	13,335	10,268	77.00
Coos	31,910	21,149	66.27
Crook	5,451	3,586	65.70
Curry	8,132	4,686	57.60
Deschutes	13,928	10,095	72.47
Douglas	38,870	25,717	66.10
Gilliam	1,832	1,220	66.59
Grant	4,559	3,032	66.50
Harney	3,992	2,759	69.10
Hood River	8,146	5,472	67.10
Jackson	45,348	34,084	75.10

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 39, Table 27, pp. 57-65.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of Oregon on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.

OREGON (Con't)

County	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Jefferson	3,868	2,938	75.90
Josephine	18,504	13,801	74.50
Klamath	28,047	17,599	62.70
Lake	4,289	2,723	63.40
Lane	94,003	74,200	78.90
Lincoln	15,278	10,323	67.50
Linn	33,882	23,308	68.70
Malheur	12,894	7,983	61.90
Marion	73,925	51,209	69.20
Morrow	2,889	2,097	72.50
Multnomah	335,281	243,749	72.60
Polk	15,742	11,629	73.80
Sherman	1,492	1,353	90.60
Tillamook	10,971	7,573	69.00
Umatilla	26,822	16,859	62.80
Union	10,992	7,489	68.10
Wallowa	4,308	2,848	66.10
Wasco	12,258	8,597	70.10
Washington	53,916	50,181	93.00
Wheeler	1,566	798	50.90
Yamhill	19,592	14,463	73.80

E-13

WASHINGTON

County	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
Adams	5,553	4,273	76.9
Asotin	7,746	5,436	70.1
Benton	34,063	28,372	83.2
Chelan	24,696	17,822	72.1
Clallam	17,902	13,455	75.1
Clark	55,815	41,790	74.8
Columbia	2,875	2,187	76.0
Cowitz	33,746	24,501	72.6
Douglas	8,335	6,376	76.4
Ferry	2,155	1,459	68.9
Franklin	12,837	10,058	78.3
Garfield	1,797	1,532	85.2
Grant	25,080	14,427	57.5
Grays Harbor	33,377	23,027	68.9
Island	10,974	6,999	63.7

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 49, Table 27, pp. 65-74.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of Washington on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.

WASHINGTON (Con't)

County	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Jefferson	5,642	4,456	78.9
King	578,897	450,640	77.8
Kitsap	50,495	37,714	74.6
Kittitas	12,267	8,592	70.0
Klickitat	7,793	5,674	72.8
Lewis	25,692	19,022	74.0
Lincoln	6,738	5,213	77.3
Mason	9,841	8,071	82.0
Okanogan	14,922	10495	70.3
Pacific	9,302	6860	73.7
Pend Oreille	4,117	2965	72.0
Pierce	195,195	125973	64.5
San Juan	1,992	1750	87.8
Skagit	31,650	22308	70.5
Skamania	3,079	2414	78.4
Snohomish	99,911	81405	81.4
Spokane	168,083	111581	66.3
Stevens	10,478	7528	71.8
Thurston	32,790	27021	82.4
Wahkiakum	2,091	1624	77.6
Walla Walla	26,406	17594	66.6
Whatcom	42,700	31422	73.5
Whitman	17,925	13538	75.5
Yakima	82,641	52730	63.8

E-14

WYOMING

County	Voting Age Population 1/	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election 2/	Percentage of Population
Albany	12,166	8,942	73.5
Big Horn	6,591	5,358	81.29
Campbell	3,380	2,802	85.89
Carbon	8,881	6,482	72.99
Converse	3,752	2,809	74.86
Crook	2,699	1,994	73.88
Fremont	14,321	10,794	75.37
Goshen	6,924	5,353	77.31
Hot Springs	3,804	2,608	68.56
Johnson	3,264	2,492	76.35
Laramie	35,110	24,622	70.13
Lincoln	4,790	4,084	85.26
Natrona	28,239	21,302	75.79
Niobrara	2,372	1,965	82.84
Park	9,282	7,443	80.29

1/ Census of Population: 1960, Volume 1, Part 52, Table 27, pp. 35-40.

2/ Report of the Secretary of State for the State of Wyoming on file at the Government Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.

WYOMING (Con't)

County	Voting Age Population	Vote Cast 1964 Presidential Election	Percentage of Population
Platte	4,300	3,360	78.14
Sheridan	11,989	9,238	77.06
Sublette	2,160	1,691	78.29
Sweetwater	10,630	7,913	74.44
Teton	1,807	2,049	113.38
Uinta	4,443	3,115	72.58
Washakie	4,750	3,408	73.87
Weston	4,384	2,892	65.96